Communist Party of Peru
Center of Intellectual Study "Mariategui"

Outline for the Study of Maxism

Vol 3: Outline for the Study of Scientific Socialism

Lima, 1973

[1] Collected and Prepared by Maoism Library from https://cedoc.sisbib.unmsm.edu.pe/public/pdf/cdfp/1.110.pdf

Unit 1: Introduction

Topics Covered:

I. Utopic socialism and scientific socialism.
II. Class struggle and the State
III. Revolutionary violence.
IV. Dictatorship of the proletariat and the new society.

Bibliography:

- Engels:
  - Socialism: Utopic and Scientific, Chapter I.
  - Anti-Dühring. Socialism, Chapter II.
- Mao Tse-tung:
  - Quotations, Chapter II and III.
- Marx:
  - The Civil War in France, Chapter III.
  - Critique of the Gotha Program, Chapter IV.
- Marx-Engels:
  - Manifesto of the Communist Party, Chapter I and II.

Selection:

Frederick Engels: Socialism: Utopian and Scientific

Chapter 1: The Development of Utopian Socialism

Modern Socialism is, in its essence, the direct product of the recognition, on the one hand, of the class antagonisms existing in the society of today between proprietors and non-proprietors, between capitalists and wage-workers; on the other hand, of the anarchy existing in production. But, in its theoretical form, modern Socialism originally appears ostensibly as a more logical extension of the principles laid down by the great French philosophers of the 18th century. Like every new theory, modern Socialism had, at first, to connect itself with the intellectual stock-in-trade ready to its hand, however deeply its roots lay in material economic facts.

The great men, who in France prepared men's minds for the coming revolution, were themselves extreme revolutionists. They recognized no external authority of any kind whatever. Religion, natural science, society, political institutions – everything was subjected to the most unsparing criticism: everything must justify its existence before the judgment-seat of reason or give up existence. Reason became the sole measure of everything. It was the time when, as Hegel says, the world stood upon its head; [2] first in the sense that the human head, and the principles arrived at by

[2] This is the passage on the French Revolution: "Thought, the concept of law, all at once made itself felt, and against this the old scaffolding of wrong could make no stand. In this conception of law, therefore, a constitution has now been

its thought, claimed to be the basis of all human action and association; but by and by, also, in the wider sense that the reality which was in contradiction to these principles had, in fact, to be turned upside down. Every form of society and government then existing, every old traditional notion, was flung into the lumber-room as irrational; the world had hitherto allowed itself to be led solely by prejudices; everything in the past deserved only pity and contempt. Now, for the first time, appeared the light of day, the kingdom of reason; henceforth superstition, injustice, privilege, oppression, were to be superseded by eternal truth, eternal Right, equality based on Nature and the inalienable rights of man.

We know today that this kingdom of reason was nothing more than the idealized kingdom of the bourgeoisie; that this eternal Right found its realization in bourgeois justice; that this equality reduced itself to bourgeois equality before the law; that bourgeois property was proclaimed as one of the essential rights of man; and that the government of reason, the *Contrat Social* of Rousseau, came into being, and only could come into being, as a democratic bourgeois republic. The great thinkers of the 18th century could, no more than their predecessors, go beyond the limits imposed upon them by their epoch.

But, side by side with the antagonisms of the feudal nobility and the burghers, who claimed to represent all the rest of society, was the general antagonism of exploiters and exploited, of rich idlers and poor workers. It was this very circumstance that made it possible for the representatives of the bourgeoisie to put themselves forward as representing not one special class, but the whole of suffering humanity. Still further. From its origin the bourgeoisie was saddled with its antithesis: capitalists cannot exist without wage-workers, and, in the same proportion as the mediaeval burgher of the guild developed into the modern bourgeois, the guild journeyman and the day-laborer, outside the guilds, developed into the proletarian. And although, upon the whole, the bourgeoisie, in their struggle with the nobility, could claim to represent at the same time the interests of the different working-classes of that period, yet in every great bourgeois movement there were independent outbursts of that class which was the forerunner, more or less developed, of the modern proletariat. For example, at the time of the German Reformation and the Peasants' War, the Anabaptists and Thomas Münzer; in the great English Revolution, the Levellers; in the great French Revolution, Babeuf.

These were theoretical enunciations, corresponding with these revolutionary uprisings of a class not yet developed; in the 16th and 17th centuries, Utopian pictures of ideal social conditions; in the 18th century, actual communistic theories (Morelly and Mably). [3] The demand for equality was no longer limited to political rights; it was extended also to the social conditions of individuals. It was

established, and henceforth everything must be based upon this. Since the Sun had been in the firmament, and the planets circled around him, the sight had never been seen of man standing upon his head – i.e., on the Idea – and building reality after this image. Anaxagoras first said that the Nous, Reason, rules the world; but now, for the first time, had men come to recognize that the Idea must rule the mental reality. And this was a magnificent sunrise. All thinking Beings have participated in celebrating this holy day. A sublime emotion swayed men at that time, an enthusiasm of reason pervaded the world, as if now had come the reconciliation of the Divine Principle with the world." [Hegel: "The Philosophy of history", 1840, p.535] Is it not high time to set the anti-Socialist law in action against such teachings, subversive and to the common danger, by the late Professor Hegel?

[3] Engels refers here to the works of the utopian Socialists Thomas More (16th century) and Tommaso Campanella (17th century). See Code de la nature, Morelly, Paris 1841 and De la législation, ou principe des lois, Mably, Amsterdam 1776.

not simply class privileges that were to be abolished, but class distinctions themselves. A Communism, ascetic, denouncing all the pleasures of life, Spartan, was the first form of the new teaching. Then came the three great Utopians: Saint-Simon, to whom the middle-class movement, side by side with the proletarian, still had a certain significance; Fourier; and Owen, who in the country where capitalist production was most developed, and under the influence of the antagonisms begotten of this, worked out his proposals for the removal of class distinction systematically and in direct relation to French materialism.

One thing is common to all three. Not one of them appears as a representative of the interests of that proletariat which historical development had, in the meantime, produced. Like the French philosophers, they do not claim to emancipate a particular class to begin with, but all humanity at once. Like them, they wish to bring in the kingdom of reason and eternal justice, but this kingdom, as they see it, is as far as Heaven from Earth, from that of the French philosophers.

For, to our three social reformers, the bourgeois world, based upon the principles of these philosophers, is quite as irrational and unjust, and, therefore, finds its way to the dust-hole quite as readily as feudalism and all the earlier stages of society. If pure reason and justice have not, hitherto, ruled the world, this has been the case only because men have not rightly understood them. What was wanted was the individual man of genius, who has now arisen and who understands the truth. That he has now arisen, that the truth has now been clearly understood, is not an inevitable event, following of necessity in the chains of historical development, but a mere happy accident. He might just as well have been born 500 years earlier, and might then have spared humanity 500 years of error, strife, and suffering.

We saw how the French philosophers of the 18th century, the forerunners of the Revolution, appealed to reason as the sole judge of all that is. A rational government, rational society, were to be founded; everything that ran counter to eternal reason was to be remorselessly done away with. We saw also that this eternal reason was in reality nothing but the idealized understanding of the 18th century citizen, just then evolving into the bourgeois. The French Revolution had realized this rational society and government.

But the new order of things, rational enough as compared with earlier conditions, turned out to be by no means absolutely rational. The state based upon reason completely collapsed. Rousseau's *Contrat Social* had found its realization in the Reign of Terror, from which the bourgeoisie, who had lost confidence in their own political capacity, had taken refuge first in the corruption of the Directorate, and, finally, under the wing of the Napoleonic despotism. The promised eternal peace was turned into an endless war of conquest. The society based upon reason had fared no better. The antagonism between rich and poor, instead of dissolving into general prosperity, had become intensified by the removal of the guild and other privileges, which had to some extent bridged it over, and by the removal of the charitable institutions of the Church. The "freedom of property" from feudal fetters, now veritably accomplished, turned out to be, for the small capitalists and small proprietors, the freedom to sell their small property, crushed under the overmastering competition of the large capitalists and landlords, to these great lords, and thus, as far as the small capitalists and peasant proprietors were concerned, became "freedom *from* property". The development of industry upon a capitalistic basis made poverty and misery of the working masses conditions of existence of

society. Cash payment became more and more, in Carlyle's phrase [See Thomas Carlyle, *Past and Present*, London 1843], the sole nexus between man and man. The number of crimes increased from year to year. Formerly, the feudal vices had openly stalked about in broad daylight; though not eradicated, they were now at any rate thrust into the background. In their stead, the bourgeois vices, hitherto practiced in secret, began to blossom all the more luxuriantly. Trade became to a greater and greater extent cheating. The "fraternity" of the revolutionary motto was realized in the chicanery and rivalries of the battle of competition. Oppression by force was replaced by corruption; the sword, as the first social lever, by gold. The right of the first night was transferred from the feudal lords to the bourgeois manufacturers. Prostitution increased to an extent never heard of. Marriage itself remained, as before, the legally recognized form, the official cloak of prostitution, and, moreover, was supplemented by rich crops of adultery.

In a word, compared with the splendid promises of the philosophers, the social and political institutions born of the "triumph of reason" were bitterly disappointing caricatures. All that was wanting was the men to formulate this disappointment, and they came with the turn of the century. In 1802, Saint-Simon's Geneva letters appeared; in 1808 appeared Fourier's first work, although the groundwork of his theory dated from 1799; on January 1, 1800, Robert Owen undertook the direction of New Lanark.

At this time, however, the capitalist mode of production, and with it the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, was still very incompletely developed. Modern Industry, which had just arisen in England, was still unknown in France. But Modern Industry develops, on the one hand, the conflicts which make absolutely necessary a revolution in the mode of production, and the doing away with its capitalistic character – conflicts not only between the classes begotten of it, but also between the very productive forces and the forms of exchange created by it. And, on the other hand, it develops, in these very gigantic productive forces, the means of ending these conflicts. If, therefore, about the year 1800, the conflicts arising from the new social order were only just beginning to take shape, this holds still more fully as to the means of ending them. The "have-nothing" masses of Paris, during the Reign of Terror, were able for a moment to gain the mastery, and thus to lead the bourgeois revolution to victory in spite of the bourgeoisie themselves. But, in doing so, they only proved how impossible it was for their domination to last under the conditions then obtaining. The proletariat, which then for the first time evolved itself from these "have-nothing" masses as the nucleus of a new class, as yet quite incapable of independent political action, appeared as an oppressed, suffering order, to whom, in its incapacity to help itself, help could, at best, be brought in from without or down from above.

This historical situation also dominated the founders of Socialism. To the crude conditions of capitalistic production and the crude class conditions correspond crude theories. The solution of the social problems, which as yet lay hidden in undeveloped economic conditions, the Utopians attempted to evolve out of the human brain. Society presented nothing but wrongs; to remove these was the task of reason. It was necessary, then, to discover a new and more perfect system of social order and to impose this upon society from without by propaganda, and, wherever it was possible, by the example of model experiments. These new social systems were foredoomed as Utopian; the more completely they were worked out in detail, the more they could not avoid drifting off into pure phantasies.

These facts once established, we need not dwell a moment longer upon this side of the question, now wholly belonging to the past. We can leave it to the literary small fry to solemnly quibble over these phantasies, which today only make us smile, and to crow over the superiority of their own bald reasoning, as compared with such "insanity". For ourselves, we delight in the stupendously grand thoughts and germs of thought that everywhere break out through their phantastic covering, and to which these Philistines are blind.

Saint-Simon was a son of the great French Revolution, at the outbreak of which he was not yet 30. The Revolution was the victory of the 3rd estate – i.e., of the great masses of the nation, *working* in production and in trade, over the privileged *idle* classes, the nobles and the priests. But the victory of the 3rd estate soon revealed itself as exclusively the victory of a smaller part of this "estate", as the conquest of political power by the socially privileged section of it – i.e., the propertied bourgeoisie. And the bourgeoisie had certainly developed rapidly during the Revolution, partly by speculation in the lands of the nobility and of the Church, confiscated and afterwards put up for sale, and partly by frauds upon the nation by means of army contracts. It was the domination of these swindlers that, under the Directorate, brought France to the verge of ruin, and thus gave Napoleon the pretext for his *coup d'état*.

Hence, to Saint-Simon the antagonism between the 3rd Estate and the privileged classes took the form of an antagonism between "workers" and "idlers". The idlers were not merely the old privileged classes, but also all who, without taking any part in production or distribution, lived on their incomes. And the workers were not only the wage-workers, but also the manufacturers, the merchants, the bankers. That the idlers had lost the capacity for intellectual leadership and political supremacy had been proved, and was by the Revolution finally settled. That the non-possessing classes had not this capacity seemed to Saint-Simon proved by the experiences of the Reign of Terror. Then, who was to lead and command? According to Saint-Simon, science and industry, both united by a new religious bond, destined to restore that unity of religious ideas which had been lost since the time of the Reformation – a necessarily mystic and rigidly hierarchic "new Christianity". But science, that was the scholars; and industry, that was, in the first place, the working bourgeois, manufacturers, merchants, bankers. These bourgeois were, certainly, intended by Saint-Simon to transform themselves into a kind of public officials, of social trustees; but they were still to hold, *vis-à-vis* of the workers, a commanding and economically privileged position. The bankers especially were to be called upon to direct the whole of social production by the regulation of credit. This conception was in exact keeping with a time in which Modern Industry in France and, with it, the chasm between bourgeoisie and proletariat was only just coming into existence. But what Saint-Simon especially lays stress upon is this: what interests him first, and above all other things, is the lot of the class that is the most numerous and the poorest ("*la classe la plus nombreuse et la plus pauvre*").

Already in his Geneva letters, Saint-Simon lays down the proposition that "all men ought to work". In the same work he recognizes also that the Reign of Terror was the reign of the non-possessing masses.

"See," says he to them, "what happened in France at the time when your comrades held sway there; they brought about a famine." [*Lettres d'un habitant de Genève à ses contemporains*, Saint-Simon, 1803]

But to recognize the French Revolution as a class war, and not simply one between nobility and bourgeoisie, but between nobility, bourgeoisie, and the non-possessors, was, in the year 1802, a most pregnant discovery. In 1816, he declares that politics is the science of production, and foretells the complete absorption of politics by economics. The knowledge that economic conditions are the basis of political institutions appears here only in embryo. Yet what is here already very plainly expressed is the idea of the future conversion of political rule over men into an administration of things and a direction of processes of production – that is to say, the "abolition of the state", about which recently there has been so much noise.

Saint-Simon shows the same superiority over his contemporaries, when in 1814, immediately after the entry of the allies into Paris, and again in 1815, during the Hundred Days' War, he proclaims the alliance of France and England, and then of both of these countries, with Germany, as the only guarantee for the prosperous development and peace of Europe. To preach to the French in 1815 an alliance with the victors of Waterloo required as much courage as historical foresight.

If in Saint-Simon we find a comprehensive breadth of view, by virtue of which almost all the ideas of later Socialists that are not strictly economic are found in him in embryo, we find in Fourier a criticism of the existing conditions of society, genuinely French and witty, but not upon that account any the less thorough. Fourier takes the bourgeoisie, their inspired prophets before the Revolution, and their interested eulogists after it, at their own word. He lays bare remorselessly the material and moral misery of the bourgeois world. He confronts it with the earlier philosophers' dazzling promises of a society in which reason alone should reign, of a civilization in which happiness should be universal, of an illimitable human perfectibility, and with the rose-colored phraseology of the bourgeois ideologists of his time. He points out how everywhere the most pitiful reality corresponds with the most high-sounding phrases, and he overwhelms this hopeless fiasco of phrases with his mordant sarcasm.

Fourier is not only a critic, his imperturbably serene nature makes him a satirist, and assuredly one of the greatest satirists of all time. He depicts, with equal power and charm, the swindling speculations that blossomed out upon the downfall of the Revolution, and the shopkeeping spirit prevalent in, and characteristic of, French commerce at that time. Still more masterly is his criticism of the bourgeois form of the relations between sexes, and the position of woman in bourgeois society. He was the first to declare that in any given society the degree of woman's emancipation is the natural measure of the general emancipation.

But Fourier is at his greatest in his conception of the history of society. He divides its whole course, thus far, into four stages of evolution – savagery, barbarism, the patriarchate, civilization. This last is identical with the so-called civil, or bourgeois, society of today – i.e., with the social order that came in with the 16th century. He proves "that the civilized stage raises every vice practiced by barbarism in a simple fashion into a form of existence, complex, ambiguous, equivocal, hypocritical" – that civilization moves "in a vicious circle", in contradictions which it constantly reproduces without being able to solve them; hence it constantly arrives at the very opposite to that which it wants to attain, or pretends to want to attain, so that, e.g., "under civilization poverty is born of superabundance itself". [*Théorie de l'unite universelle*, Fourier, 1843 and *Le nouveau monde industriel et*

sociétaire, ou invention du procédé d'industrie attrayante et enaturelle distribuée en séries passionnées, Fourier, 1845]

Fourier, as we see, uses the dialectic method in the same masterly way as his contemporary, Hegel. Using these same dialectics, he argues against talk about illimitable human perfectibility, that every historical phase has its period of ascent and also its period of descent, and he applies this observation to the future of the whole human race. As Kant introduced into natural science the idea of the ultimate destruction of the Earth, Fourier introduced into historical science that of the ultimate destruction of the human race.

Whilst in France the hurricane of the Revolution swept over the land, in England a quieter, but not on that account less tremendous, revolution was going on. Steam and the new tool-making machinery were transforming manufacture into modern industry, and thus revolutionizing the whole foundation of bourgeois society. The sluggish march of development of the manufacturing period changed into a veritable storm and stress period of production. With constantly increasing swiftness the splitting-up into large capitalists and non-possessing proletarians went on. Between these, instead of the former stable middle-class, an unstable mass of artisans and small shopkeepers, the most fluctuating portion of the population, now led a precarious existence.

The new mode of production was, as yet, only at the beginning of its period of ascent; as yet it was the normal, regular method of production – the only one possible under existing conditions. Nevertheless, even then it was producing crying social abuses – the herding together of a homeless population in the worst quarters of the large towns; the loosening of all traditional moral bonds, of patriarchal subordination, of family relations; overwork, especially of women and children, to a frightful extent; complete demoralization of the working-class, suddenly flung into altogether new conditions, from the country into the town, from agriculture into modern industry, from stable conditions of existence into insecure ones that change from day to day.

At this juncture, there came forward as a reformer a manufacturer 29-years-old – a man of almost sublime, childlike simplicity of character, and at the same time one of the few born leaders of men. Robert Owen had adopted the teaching of the materialistic philosophers: that man's character is the product, on the one hand, of heredity; on the other, of the environment of the individual during his lifetime, and especially during his period of development. In the industrial revolution most of his class saw only chaos and confusion, and the opportunity of fishing in these troubled waters and making large fortunes quickly. He saw in it the opportunity of putting into practice his favorite theory, and so of bringing order out of chaos. He had already tried it with success, as superintendent of more than 500 men in a Manchester factory. From 1800 to 1829, he directed the great cotton mill at New Lanark, in Scotland, as managing partner, along the same lines, but with greater freedom of action and with a success that made him a European reputation. A population, originally consisting of the most diverse and, for the most part, very demoralized elements, a population that gradually grew to 2,500, he turned into a model colony, in which drunkenness, police, magistrates, lawsuits, poor laws, charity, were unknown. And all this simply by placing the people in conditions worthy of human beings, and especially by carefully bringing up the rising generation. He was the founder of infant schools, and introduced them first at New Lanark. At the age of two, the children came to school, where they enjoyed themselves so much that they could

scarcely be got home again. Whilst his competitors worked their people 13 or 14 hours a day, in New Lanark the working-day was only 10 and a half hours. When a crisis in cotton stopped work for four months, his workers received their full wages all the time. And with all this the business more than doubled in value, and to the last yielded large profits to its proprietors.

In spite of all this, Owen was not content. The existence which he secured for his workers was, in his eyes, still far from being worthy of human beings. "The people were slaves at my mercy." The relatively favorable conditions in which he had placed them were still far from allowing a rational development of the character and of the intellect in all directions, much less of the free exercise of all their faculties.

> "And yet, the working part of this population of 2,500 persons was daily producing as much real wealth for society as, less than half a century before, it would have required the working part of a population of 600,000 to create. I asked myself, what became of the difference between the wealth consumed by 2,500 persons and that which would have been consumed by 600,000?" [4]

The answer was clear. It had been used to pay the proprietors of the establishment 5 per cent on the capital they had laid out, in addition to over £300,000 clear profit. And that which held for New Lanark held to a still greater extent for all the factories in England.

> "If this new wealth had not been created by machinery, imperfectly as it has been applied, the wars of Europe, in opposition to Napoleon, and to support the aristocratic principles of society, could not have been maintained. And yet this new power was the creation of the working-classes."
>
> Note, l. c., p.22.

To them, therefore, the fruits of this new power belonged. The newly-created gigantic productive forces, hitherto used only to enrich individuals and to enslave the masses, offered to Owen the foundations for a reconstruction of society; they were destined, as the common property of all, to be worked for the common good of all.

Owen's communism was based upon this purely business foundation, the outcome, so to say, of commercial calculation. Throughout, it maintained this practical character. Thus, in 1823, Owen proposed the relief of the distress in Ireland by Communist colonies, and drew up complete estimates of costs of founding them, yearly expenditure, and probable revenue. And in his definite plan for the future, the technical working out of details is managed with such practical knowledge – ground plan, front and side and bird's-eye views all included – that the Owen method of social reform once accepted, there is from the practical point of view little to be said against the actual arrangement of details.

[4] From The Revolution in Mind and Practice, p.21, a memorial addressed to all the "red Republicans, Communists and Socialists of Europe," and sent to the provisional government of France, 1848, and also "to Queen Victoria and her responsible advisers."

His advance in the direction of Communism was the turning-point in Owen's life. As long as he was simply a philanthropist, he was rewarded with nothing but wealth, applause, honor, and glory. He was the most popular man in Europe. Not only men of his own class, but statesmen and princes listened to him approvingly. But when he came out with his Communist theories that was quite another thing. Three great obstacles seemed to him especially to block the path to social reform: private property, religion, the present form of marriage.

He knew what confronted him if he attacked these – outlawry, excommunication from official society, the loss of his whole social position. But nothing of this prevented him from attacking them without fear of consequences, and what he had foreseen happened. Banished from official society, with a conspiracy of silence against him in the press, ruined by his unsuccessful Communist experiments in America, in which he sacrificed all his fortune, he turned directly to the working-class and continued working in their midst for 30 years. Every social movement, every real advance in England on behalf of the workers links itself on to the name of Robert Owen. He forced through in 1819, after five years' fighting, the first law limiting the hours of labor of women and children in factories. He was president of the first Congress at which all the Trade Unions of England united in a single great trade association. He introduced as transition measures to the complete communistic organization of society, on the one hand, cooperative societies for retail trade and production. These have since that time, at least, given practical proof that the merchant and the manufacturer are socially quite unnecessary. On the other hand, he introduced labor bazaars for the exchange of the products of labor through the medium of labor-notes, whose unit was a single hour of work; institutions necessarily doomed to failure, but completely anticipating Proudhon's bank of exchange of a much later period, and differing entirely from this in that it did not claim to be the panacea for all social ills, but only a first step towards a much more radical revolution of society.

The Utopians' mode of thought has for a long time governed the Socialist ideas of the 19th century, and still governs some of them. Until very recently, all French and English Socialists did homage to it. The earlier German Communism, including that of Weitling, was of the same school. To all these, Socialism is the expression of absolute truth, reason and justice, and has only to be discovered to conquer all the world by virtue of its own power. And as an absolute truth is independent of time, space, and of the historical development of man, it is a mere accident when and where it is discovered. With all this, absolute truth, reason, and justice are different with the founder of each different school. And as each one's special kind of absolute truth, reason, and justice is again conditioned by his subjective understanding, his conditions of existence, the measure of his knowledge and his intellectual training, there is no other ending possible in this conflict of absolute truths than that they shall be mutually exclusive of one another. Hence, from this nothing could come but a kind of eclectic, average Socialism, which, as a matter of fact, has up to the present time dominated the minds of most of the socialist workers in France and England. Hence, a mish-mash allowing of the most manifold shades of opinion: a mish-mash of such critical statements, economic theories, pictures of future society by the founders of different sects, as excite a minimum of opposition; a mish-mash which is the more easily brewed the more definite sharp edges of the individual constituents are rubbed down in the stream of debate, like rounded pebbles in a brook.

To make a science of Socialism, it had first to be placed upon a real basis.

Chapter 2: Theoretical

The materialist conception of history starts from the proposition that the production and, next to production, the exchange of things produced, is the basis of all social structure; that in every society that has appeared in history, the manner in which wealth is distributed and society divided into classes or estates is dependent upon what is produced, how it is produced, and how the products are exchanged. From this point of view the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in men's brains, not in man's better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought, not in the *philosophy*, but in the *economics* of each particular epoch. The growing perception that existing social institutions are unreasonable and unjust, that reason has become unreason, and right wrong, is only proof that in the modes of production and exchange changes have silently taken place with which the social order, adapted to earlier economic conditions, is no longer in keeping. From this it also follows that the means of getting rid of the incongruities that have been brought to light must also be present, in a more or less developed condition, within the changed modes of production themselves. These means are not to be *invented*, spun out of the head, but *discovered* with the aid of the head in the existing material facts of production.

What is, then, the position of modern socialism in this connection?

The present structure of society — this is now pretty generally conceded — is the creation of the ruling class of today, of the bourgeoisie. The mode of production peculiar to the bourgeoisie, known, since Marx, as the capitalist mode of production, was incompatible with the local privileges and the privileges of estate as well as with the reciprocal personal ties of the feudal system. The bourgeoisie broke up the feudal system and built upon its ruins the capitalist order of society, the kingdom of free. competition, of personal liberty, of the equality, before the law, of all commodity owners, of all the rest of the capitalist blessings. Thenceforward the capitalist mode of production could develop in freedom. Since steam, machinery, and the making of machines by machinery transformed the older manufacture into modern industry, the productive forces evolved under the guidance of the bourgeoisie developed with a rapidity and in a degree unheard of before. But just as the older manufacture, in its time, and handicraft, becoming more developed under its influence, had come into- collision with the feudal trammels of the guilds, so now modern industry, in its more complete development, comes into collision with the bounds within which the capitalistic mode of production holds it confined. The new productive forces have already outgrown the capitalistic mode of using them. And this conflict between productive forces and modes of production is not a conflict engendered in the mind of man, like that between original sin and divine justice. It exists, in fact, objectively, outside us, independently of the will and actions even of the men that have brought it on. Modern socialism is nothing but the reflex, in thought, of this conflict in fact; its ideal reflection in the minds, first, of the class directly suffering under it, the working class.

Now, in what does this conflict consist?

Before capitalistic production, i.e., in the Middle Ages, the system of petty industry obtained generally, based upon the private property of the laborers in their means of production; {in the country,} the agriculture of the small peasant, freeman or serf; in the towns, the handicrafts. The instruments of labor — land, agricultural implements, the workshop, the tool — were the instruments of labor of single individuals, adapted for the use of one worker, and, therefore, of necessity, small, dwarfish, circumscribed. But, for this very reason they belonged, as a rule, to the producer himself. To concentrate these scattered, limited means of production, to enlarge them, to turn them into the powerful levers of production of the present day — this was precisely the historic role of capitalist production and of its upholder, the bourgeoisie. In Part IV of *Capital*, Marx has explained in detail, how since the fifteenth century this has been historically worked out through the three phases of simple co-operation, manufacture and modern industry. But the bourgeoisie, as is also shown there, could not transform these puny means of production into mighty productive forces without transforming them, at the same time, from means of production of the individual into *social* means of production only workable by a *collectivity of men.* The spinning-wheel, the hand-loom, the blacksmith's hammer, were replaced by the spinning-machine, the power-loom, the steam-hammer; the individual workshop by the factory implying the co-operation of hundreds and thousands of workmen. In like manner, production itself changed from a series of individual into a series of social acts, and the products from individual to social products. The yarn, the cloth, the metal articles that now came out of the factory were the joint product of many workers, through whose hands they had successively to pass before they were ready. No one person could say of them: "I made that; this is *my* product."

But where, in a given society, the fundamental form of production is that spontaneous division of labor, there the products take on the form of *commodities* whose mutual exchange, buying and selling, enable the individual producers to satisfy their manifold wants. And this was the case in the Middle Ages. The peasant, e.g., sold to the artisan agricultural products and bought from him the products of handicraft. Into this society of individual producers, of commodity producers, the new mode of production thrust itself. In the midst of the old division of labor, grown up spontaneously and upon *no definite plan*, which had governed the whole of society, now arose division of labor upon *a definite plan*, as organized in the factory; side by side with *individual* production appeared *social* production. The products of both were sold in the same market, and, therefore, at prices at least approximately equal. But organisation upon a definite plan was stronger than spontaneous division of labor. The factories working with the combined social forces of a collectivity of individuals produced their commodities far more cheaply than the individual small producers. Individual production succumbed in one department after another. Socialized production revolutionized all the old methods of production. But its revolutionary character was, at the same time, so little recognized that it was, on the contrary, introduced as a means of increasing and developing the production of commodities. When it arose, it found readymade, and made liberal use of, certain machinery for the

production and exchange of commodities: merchants' capital, handicraft, wage-labor. Socialized production thus introducing itself as a new form of the production of commodities, it was a matter of course that under it the old forms of appropriation remained in full swing, and were applied to its products as well.

In the mediaeval stage of evolution of the production of commodities, the question as to the owner of the product of labor could not arise. The individual producer, as a rule, had, from raw material belonging to himself, and generally his own handiwork, produced it with his own tools, by the labor of his own hands or of his family. There was no need for him to appropriate the new product. It belonged wholly to him, as a matter of course. His property in the product was, therefore, based *upon his own labor.* Even where external help was used, this was, as a rule, of little importance, and very generally was compensated by something other than wages. The apprentices and journeymen of the guilds worked less for board and wages than for education, in order that they might become master craftsmen themselves. Then came the concentration of the means of production in large workshops and manufactories, their transformation into actual socialized means of production. But the socialized means of production and their products were still treated, after this change, just as they had been before, i.e., as the means of production and the products of individuals. Hitherto, the owner of the instruments of labor had himself appropriated the product, because, as a rule, it was his own product and the assistance of others was the exception. Now the owner of the instruments of labor always appropriated to himself the product, although it was no longer *his* product but exclusively the product of the *labor of others.* Thus, the products now produced socially were not appropriated by those who had actually set in motion the means of production and actually produced the commodities, but by the *capitalists.* The means of production, and production itself had become in essence socialized. But they were subjected to a form of appropriation which presupposes the private production of individuals, under which, therefore, everyone owns his own product and brings it to market. The mode of production is subjected to this form of appropriation, although it abolishes the conditions upon which the latter rests. [*8] This contradiction, which gives to the new mode of production its capitalistic character, *contains the germ of the whole of the social antagonisms of today.* The greater the mastery obtained by the new mode of production over all decisive fields of production and in all economically decisive countries, the more it reduced individual production to an insignificant residuum, *the more clearly was brought out the incompatibility of socialized production with capitalistic appropriation.*

The first capitalists found, as we have said, wage-labor ready-made for them. But it was exceptional, complementary, accessory, transitory wage-labor. The agricultural laborer, though, upon occasion, he hired himself out by the day, had a few acres of his own land on which he could at all events live at a pinch. The guilds were so organized that the journeyman of today became the master of tomorrow. But all this changed, as soon as the means of production became socialized and concentrated in the hands of capitalists. The means of production, as well as the product, of the individual producer became more and more worthless; there was nothing left for him but to turn

wage-worker under the capitalist. Wage-labor, aforetime the exception and accessory, now became the rule and basis of all production; aforetime complementary, it now became the sole remaining function of the worker. The wage-worker for a time became a wage-worker for life. The number of these permanent wageworkers was further enormously increased by the breaking-up of the feudal system that occurred at the same time, by the disbanding of the retainers of the feudal lords, the eviction of the peasants from their homesteads, etc. The separation was made complete between the means of production concentrated in the hands of the capitalists, on the one side, and the producers, possessing nothing but their labor-power, on the other. *The contradiction between socialized production and capitalistic appropriation manifested itself as the antagonism of proletariat and bourgeoisie.*

We have seen that the capitalistic mode of production thrust its way into a society of commodity producers, of individual producers, whose social bond was the exchange of their products. But every society based upon the production of commodities has this peculiarity: that the producers have lost control over their own social interrelations. Each man produces for himself with such means of production as he may happen to have, and for such exchange as he may require to satisfy his remaining wants. No one knows how much of his particular article is coming on the market, nor how much of it will be wanted. No one knows whether his individual product will meet an actual demand, whether he will be able to make good his costs of production or even to sell his commodity at all. Anarchy reigns in socialized production. But the production of commodities, like every other form of production, has its peculiar, inherent laws inseparable from it; and these laws work, despite anarchy, in and through anarchy. They reveal themselves in the only persistent form of social interrelations, i.e., in exchange, and here they affect the individual producers as compulsory laws of competition. They are, at first, unknown to these producers themselves, and have to be discovered by them gradually and as the result of experience. They work themselves out, therefore, independently of the producers, and in antagonism to them, as inexorable natural laws of their particular form of production. The product governs the producers.

In mediaeval society, especially in the earlier centuries, production was essentially directed towards satisfying the wants of the individual. It satisfied, in the main, only the wants of the producer and his family. Where relations of personal dependence existed, as in the country, it also helped to satisfy the wants of the feudal lord. In all this there was, therefore, no exchange; the products, consequently, did not assume the character of commodities. The family of the peasant produced almost everything they wanted: clothes and furniture, as well as means of subsistence. Only when it began to produce more than was sufficient to supply its own wants and the payments in kind to the feudal lord, only then did it also produce commodities. This surplus, thrown into socialized exchange and offered for sale, became commodities. The artisans of the towns, it is true, had from the first to produce for exchange. But they, also, themselves supplied the greatest part of their own individual wants. They had gardens and plots of land. They turned their cattle out into the communal forest, which also, yielded them timber and firing. The women spun flax, wool, and so forth. Production for the purpose of exchange, production of commodities, was only in its infancy.

Hence, exchange was restricted, the market narrow, the methods of production stable; there was local exclusiveness without, local unity within, the mark [5] in the country; in the town, the guild.

But with the extension of the production of commodities, and especially with the introduction of the capitalist mode of production, the laws of commodity production, hitherto latent, came into action more openly and with greater force. The old bonds were loosened, the old exclusive limits broken through, the producers were more and more turned into independent, isolated producers of commodities. The anarchy of social production became apparent and grew to greater and greater height. But the chief means by aid of which the capitalist mode of production intensified this anarchy of socialized production was the exact opposite of anarchy. It was the increasing organisation of production, upon a social basis, in every individual productive establishment. By this, the old, peaceful, stable condition of things was ended. Wherever this organisation of production was introduced into a branch of industry, it brooked no other method of production by its side. Where it laid hold of a handicraft, that old handicraft was wiped out. The field of labor became a battle-ground. The great geographical discoveries, and the Colonisation following upon them, multiplied markets and quickened the transformation of handicraft into manufacture. The war did not simply break out between the individual producers of particular localities. The local struggles begot in their turn national conflicts, the commercial wars of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. [6] Finally, modern industry and the opening of the world market made the struggle universal, and at the same time gave it an unheard-of virulence. Advantages in natural or artificial conditions of production now decide the existence or non-existence of individual capitalists, as well as of whole industries and countries. He that falls is remorselessly cast aside. It is the Darwinian struggle of the individual for existence transferred from nature to society with intensified violence. The conditions of existence natural to the animal appear as the final term of human development. The contradiction between socialized production and capitalistic appropriation now presents itself as *an antagonism between the organisation of production in the individual workshop, and the anarchy of production in society generally.*

The capitalistic mode of production moves in these two forms of the antagonism immanent to it from its very origin. It is never able to get out of that "vicious circle" which Fourier had already discovered. What Fourier could not, indeed, see in his time is that this circle is gradually narrowing; that the movement becomes more and more a spiral, and must come to an end, like the movement of the planets, by collision with the centre. It is the compelling force of anarchy in the production of society at large that more and more completely turns the great majority of men into proletarians; and it is the masses of the proletariat again who will finally put an end to anarchy in production. It is the compelling force of anarchy in social production that turns the limitless perfectibility of machinery

[5] In Socialism Utopian and Scientific, Engels gives a note referring to his work The Mark (see MECW, Vol. 24).
[6] This refers to the wars between the major European powers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries for control of trade with India and America and for seizure of colonial markets. The principal rivals were initially England and Holland, later England and France. England won these wars and, towards the close of the eighteenth century, almost all world trade was concentrated in her hands.

under modern industry into a compulsory law by which every individual industrial capitalist must perfect his machinery more and more, under penalty of ruin. But the perfecting of machinery is making human labor superfluous. If the introduction and increase of machinery means the displacement of millions of manuals by a few machine-workers, improvement in machinery means the displacement of more and more of the machine-workers themselves. It means, in the last instance, the production of a number of available wage-workers in excess of the average needs of capital, the formation of a complete industrial reserve army, as I called it in 1845, [7] available at the times when industry is working at high pressure, to be cast out upon the street when the inevitable crash comes, a constant dead-weight upon the limbs of the working class in its struggle for existence with capital, a regulator for the keeping of wages down to the low level that suits the interests of capital. Thus, it comes about, to quote Marx, that machinery becomes the most powerful weapon in the war of capital against the working class; that the instruments of labor constantly tear the means of subsistence out of the hands of the laborer; that the very product of the worker is turned into an instrument for his subjugation. Thus it comes about that the economizing of the instruments of labor becomes at the same time, from the outset, the most reckless waste of labor-power, and robbery based upon the normal conditions under which labor functions; that machinery, the most powerful instrument for shortening labor-time, becomes the most unfailing means for placing every moment of the laborer's time and that of his family at the disposal of the capitalist for the purpose of expanding the value of his capital. Thus, it comes about that the overwork of some becomes the preliminary condition for the idleness of others, and that modern industry, which hunts after new consumers over the whole world, forces the consumption of the masses at home down to a starvation minimum, and in doing this destroys its own home market. "The law that always equilibrates the relative surplus-population, or industrial reserve army, to the extent and energy of accumulation, this law rivets the laborer to capital more firmly than the wedges of Vulcan did Prometheus to the rock. It establishes an accumulation of misery corresponding with accumulation of capital. Accumulation of wealth at one pole is, therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, i.e., on the side of the class that *produces its own product in the form of capital"* (Marx's *Capital*, p. 671.) And to expect any other division of the products from the capitalistic mode of production is the same as expecting the electrodes of a battery not to decompose acidulated water, not to liberate oxygen at the positive, hydrogen at the negative pole, so long as they are connected with the battery.

We have seen that the ever-increasing perfectibility of modern machinery is, by the anarchy of social production, turned into a compulsory law that forces the individual industrial capitalist always to improve his machinery, always to increase its productive force. The bare possibility of extending the field of production is transformed for him into a similar compulsory law. The enormous expansive force of modern industry, compared with which that of gases is mere child's play, appears to us now as a *necessity* for expansion, both qualitative and quantitative, that laughs at all resistance.

[7] The Condition of the Working-Class in England, p. 109.

Such resistance is offered by consumption, by sales, by the markets for the products of modern industry. But the capacity for extension, extensive and intensive, of the markets is primarily governed by quite different laws that work much less energetically. The extension of the markets cannot keep pace with the extension of production. The collision becomes inevitable, and as this cannot produce any real solution so long as it does not break in pieces the capitalist mode of production, the collisions become periodic. Capitalist production has begotten another "vicious circle".

As a matter of fact, since 1825, when the first general crisis broke out, the whole industrial and commercial world, production and exchange among all civilized peoples and their more or less barbaric hangers-on, are thrown out of joint about once every ten years. Commerce is at a standstill, the markets are glutted, products accumulate, as multitudinous as they are unsaleable, hard cash disappears, credit vanishes, factories are closed, the mass of the workers is in want of the means of subsistence, because they have produced too much of the means of subsistence; bankruptcy follows upon bankruptcy, execution upon execution. The stagnation lasts for years; productive forces and products are wasted and destroyed wholesale, until the accumulated mass of commodities finally filters off, more or less depreciated in value, until production and exchange gradually begin to move again. Little by little the pace quickens. It becomes a trot. The industrial trot breaks into a canter, the canter in turn grows into the headlong gallop of a perfect steeplechase of industry, commercial credit, and speculation, which finally, after break-neck leaps, ends where it began — in the ditch of a crisis. And so over and over again. We have now, since the year 1825, gone through this five times, and at the present moment (1877) we are going through it for the sixth time. And the character of these crises is so clearly defined that Fourier hit all of them off when he described the first as *crise plethorique*, a crisis from plethora.

In these crises, the contradiction between socialized production and capitalist appropriation ends in a violent explosion. The circulation of commodities is, for the time being, stopped. Money, the means of circulation, becomes a hindrance to circulation. All the laws of production and circulation of commodities are turned upside down. The economic collision has reached its apogee. *The mode of production is in rebellion against the mode of exchange*; *the productive forces are in rebellion against the mode of production which they have outgrown.*

The fact that the socialized organisation of production within the factory has developed so far that it has become incompatible with the anarchy of production in society, which exists side by side with and dominates it, is brought home to the capitalists themselves by the violent concentration of capital that occurs during crises, through the ruin of many large, and a still greater number of small, capitalists. The whole mechanism of the capitalist mode of production breaks down under the pressure of the productive forces, its own creations. It is no longer able to turn all this mass of means of production into capital. They lie fallow, and for that very reason the industrial reserve army must also lie fallow. Means of production, means of subsistence, available laborers, all the elements of production and of general wealth, are present in abundance. But "abundance becomes the source of

distress and want" (Fourier), because it is the very thing that prevents the transformation of the means of production and subsistence into capital. For in capitalistic society the means of production can only function when they have undergone a preliminary transformation into capital, into the means of exploiting human labor-power. The necessity of this transformation into capital of the means of production and subsistence stands like a ghost between these and the workers. It alone prevents the coming together of the material and personal levers of production; it alone forbids the means of production to function, the workers to work and live. On the one hand, therefore, the capitalistic mode of production stands convicted of its own incapacity to further direct these productive forces. On the other, these productive forces themselves, with increasing energy, press forward to the removal of the existing contradiction, to the abolition of their quality as capital, *to the practical recognition of their character as social productive forces.*

This rebellion of the productive forces, as they grow more and more powerful, against their quality as capital, this stronger and stronger command that their social character shall be recognized, forces the capitalist class itself to treat them more and more as social productive forces, so far as this is possible under capitalist conditions. The period of industrial high pressure, with its unbounded inflation of credit, not less than the crash itself, by the collapse of great capitalist establishments, tends to bring about that form of the socialization of great masses of means of production which we meet with in the different kinds of joint-stock companies. Many of these means of production and of communication are, from the outset, so colossal that, like the railways, they exclude all other forms of capitalistic exploitation. At a further stage of evolution this form also becomes insufficient: the official representative of capitalist society — the state — will ultimately have to [8] undertake the direction of production. This necessity for conversion into state property is felt first in the great institutions for intercourse and communication — the post office, the telegraphs, the railways.

If the crises demonstrate the incapacity of the bourgeoisie for managing any longer modern productive forces, the transformation of the great establishments for production and distribution into joint-stock companies and state property shows how unnecessary the bourgeoisie are for that purpose. All the social functions of the capitalist are now performed by salaried employees. The

[8] I say "have to". For only when the means of production and distribution have actually outgrown the form of management by joint-stock companies, and when, therefore, the taking them over by the state has become economically inevitable, only then — even if it is the state of today that effects this — is there an economic advance, the attainment of another step preliminary to the taking over of all productive forces by society itself. But of late, since Bismarck went in for state-ownership of industrial establishments, a kind of spurious socialism has arisen, degenerating, now and again, into something of flunkeyism, that without more ado declares all state ownership, even of the Bismarckian sort, to be socialistic. Certainly, if the taking over by the state of the tobacco industry is socialistic, then Napoleon and Metternich must be numbered among the founders of socialism. If the Belgian state, for quite ordinary political and financial reasons, itself constructed its chief railway lines; if Bismarck, not under any economic compulsion, took over for the state the chief Prussian lines, simply to be the better able to have them in hand in case of war, to bring up the railway employees as voting cattle for the government, and especially to create for himself a new source of income independent of parliamentary votes — this was, in no sense, a socialistic measure, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously. Otherwise, the Royal Maritime Company, [116] the Royal porcelain manufacture, and even the regimental tailor of the army would also be socialistic institutions.

capitalist has no further social function than that of pocketing dividends, tearing off coupons, and gambling on the Stock Exchange, where the different capitalists despoil one another of their capital. At first the capitalist mode of production forces out the workers. Now it forces out the capitalists, and reduces them, just as it reduced the workers, to the ranks of the surplus population, although not immediately into those of the industrial reserve army.

But the transformation, either into joint-stock companies, or into state ownership, does not do away with the capitalistic nature of the productive forces. In the joint-stock companies this is obvious. And the modern state, again, is only the organisation that bourgeois society takes on in order to support the general external conditions of the capitalist mode of production against the encroachments as well of the workers as of individual capitalists. The modern state, no matter what its form, is essentially a capitalist machine, the state of the capitalists, the ideal personification of the total national capital. The more it proceeds to the taking over of productive forces, the more does it actually become the national capitalist, the more citizens do it exploit. The workers remain wage-workers — proletarians. The capitalist relation is not done away with. It is rather brought to a head. But, brought to a head, it topples over. State ownership of the productive forces is not the solution of the conflict, but concealed within it are the technical conditions that form the elements of that solution.

This solution can only consist in the practical recognition of the social nature of the modern forces of production, and therefore in the harmonizing of the modes of production, appropriation, and exchange with the socialized character of the means of production and this can only come about by society openly and directly taking possession of the productive forces which have outgrown all control except that of society as a whole. The social character of the means of production and of the products today reacts against the producers, periodically disrupts all production and exchange, acts only like a law of nature working blindly, forcibly, destructively. But with the taking over by society of the productive forces, the social character of the means of production and of the products will be utilized by the producers with a perfect understanding of its nature, and instead of being a source of disturbance and periodical collapse, will become the most powerful lever of production itself.

Active social forces work exactly like natural forces: blindly, forcibly, destructively, so long as we do not understand, and reckon with them. But when once we understand them, when once we grasp their action, their direction, their effects, it depends only upon ourselves to subject them more and more to our own will, and by means of them to reach our own ends. And this holds quite especially of the mighty productive forces of today. As long as we obstinately refuse to understand the nature and the character of these social means of action — and this understanding goes against the grain of the capitalist mode of production and its defenders — so long these forces are at work in spite of us, in opposition to us, so long they master us, as we have shown above in detail. But when once their nature is understood, they can, in the hands of the producers working together, be transformed from master demons into willing servants. The difference is as that between the

destructive force of electricity in the lightning of the storm, and electricity under command in the telegraph and the voltaic arc; the difference between a conflagration, and fire working in the service of man. With this recognition, at last, of the real nature of the productive forces of today, the social anarchy of production gives place to a social regulation of production upon a definite plan, according to the needs of the community and of each individual. Then the capitalist mode of appropriation, in which the product enslaves first the producer and then the appropriator, is replaced by the mode of appropriation of the products that is based upon the nature of the modern means of production: upon the one hand, direct social appropriation, as means to the maintenance and extension of production — on the other, direct individual appropriation, as means of subsistence and of enjoyment.

Whilst the capitalist mode of production more and more completely transforms the great majority of the population into proletarians, it creates the power which, under penalty of its own destruction, is forced to accomplish this revolution. Whilst it forces on more and more the transformation of the vast means of production, already socialized, into state property, it shows itself the way to accomplishing this revolution. *The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production in the first instance into state property.* But, in doing this, it abolishes itself as proletariat, abolishes all class distinctions and class antagonisms, abolishes also the state as state. Society thus far, based upon class antagonisms, had need of the state, that is, of an organisation of the particular class, which was *pro tempore* the exploiting class, for the maintenance of its external conditions of production, and, therefore, especially, for the purpose of forcibly keeping the exploited classes in the condition of oppression corresponding with the given mode of production (slavery, serfdom, wage-labor). The state was the official representative of society as a whole; the gathering of it together into a visible embodiment. But it was this only in so far as it was the state of that class which itself represented, for the time being, society as a whole: in ancient times, the state of slave-owning citizens; in the Middle Ages, the feudal lords; in our own time, the bourgeoisie. When at last it becomes the real representative of the whole of society, it renders itself unnecessary. As soon as there is no longer any social class to be held in subjection; as soon as class rule, and the individual struggle for existence based upon our present anarchy in production, with the collisions and excesses arising from these, are removed, nothing more remains to be repressed, and a special repressive force, a state, is no longer necessary. The first act by virtue of which the state really constitutes itself the representative of the whole of society — the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society — this is, at the same time, its last independent act as a state. State interference in social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous, and then dies out of itself; the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of processes of production. The state is not "abolished". *It dies out.* This gives the measure of the value of the phrase "a free people's state", both as to its justifiable use at times by agitators, and as to its ultimate scientific insufficiency [117]; and also of the demands of the so-called anarchists for the abolition of the state out of hand.

Since the historical appearance of the capitalist mode of production, the appropriation by society of all the means of production has often been dreamed of, more or less vaguely, by individuals, as well as by sects, as the ideal of the future. But it could become possible, could become a historical necessity, only when the actual conditions for its realization were there. Like every other social advance, it becomes practicable, not by men understanding that the existence of classes is in contradiction to justice, equality, etc., not by the mere willingness to abolish these classes, but by virtue of certain new economic conditions. The separation of society into an exploiting and an exploited class, a ruling and an oppressed class, was the necessary consequence of the deficient and restricted development of production in former times. So long as the total social labor only yields a produce which but slightly exceeds that barely necessary for the existence of all; so long, therefore, as labor engages all or almost all the time of the great majority of the members of society — so long, of necessity, this society is divided into classes. Side by side with the great majority, exclusively bond slaves to labor, arises a class freed from directly productive labor, which looks after the general affairs of society: the direction of labor, state business, law, science, art, etc. It is, therefore, the law of division of labor that lies at the basis of the division into classes. But this does not prevent this division into classes from being carried out by means of violence and robbery, trickery and fraud. It does not prevent the ruling class, once having the upper hand, from consolidating its power at the expense of the working class, from turning its social leadership into an exploitation of the masses.

But if, upon this showing, division into classes has a certain historical justification, it has this only for a given period, only under given social conditions. It was based upon the insufficiency of production. It will be swept away by the complete development of modern productive forces. And, in fact, the abolition of classes in society presupposes a degree of historical evolution at which the existence, not simply of this or that particular ruling class, but of any ruling class at all, and, therefore, the existence of class distinction itself has become an obsolete anachronism. It presupposes; therefore, the development of production carried out to a degree at which appropriation of the means of production and of the products, and, with this, of political domination, of the monopoly of culture, and of intellectual leadership by a particular class of society, has become not only superfluous but economically, politically, intellectually a hindrance to development. This point is now reached. Their political and intellectual bankruptcy is scarcely any longer a secret to the bourgeoisie themselves. Their economic bankruptcy recurs regularly every ten years. In every crisis, society is suffocated beneath the weight of its own productive forces and products, which it cannot use, and stands helpless face to face with the absurd contradiction that the producers have nothing to consume, because consumers are wanting. The expansive force of the means of production bursts the bonds that the capitalist mode of production had imposed upon them. Their deliverance from these bonds is the one precondition for an unbroken, constantly accelerated development of the productive forces, and therewith for a practically unlimited increase of production itself. Nor is this all. The socialized appropriation of the means of production does away, not only with the present artificial restrictions upon production, but also with the positive waste and devastation of productive forces and products

that are at the present time the inevitable concomitants of production, and that reach their height in the crises. Further, it sets free for the community at large a mass of means of production and of products, by doing away with the senseless extravagance of the ruling classes of today and their political representatives. The possibility of securing for every member of society, by means of socialized production, an existence not only fully sufficient materially, and becoming day by day fuller, but an existence guaranteeing to all the free development and exercise of their physical and mental faculties — this possibility is now for the first time here, but it is *here*. [9]

With the seizing of the means of production by society production of commodities is done away with, and, simultaneously, the mastery of the product over the producer. Anarchy in social production is replaced by systematic, definite organisation. The struggle for individual existence disappears. Then for the first time man, in a certain sense, is finally marked off from the rest of the animal kingdom, and emerges from mere animal conditions of existence into really human ones. The whole sphere of the conditions of life which environ man, and which have hitherto ruled man, now comes under the dominion and control of man who for the first time becomes the real, conscious lord of nature because he has now become master of his own social organisation. The laws of his own social action, hitherto standing face to face with man as laws of nature foreign to, and dominating him, will then be used with full understanding, and so mastered by him. Man's own social organisation, hitherto confronting him as a necessity imposed by nature and history, now becomes the result of his own free action. The extraneous objective forces that have hitherto governed history pass under the control of man himself. Only from that time will man himself, with full consciousness, make his own history — only from that time will the social causes set in movement by him have, in the main and in a constantly growing measure, the results intended by him. It is the humanity's leap from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom.

To accomplish this act of universal emancipation is the historical mission of the modern proletariat. To thoroughly comprehend the historical conditions and thus the very nature of this act, to impart to the now oppressed class a full knowledge of the conditions and of the meaning of the momentous act it is called upon to accomplish, this is the task of the theoretical expression of the proletarian movement, scientific socialism.

---

[9] A few figures may serve to give an approximate idea of the enormous expansive force of the modern means of production, even under capitalist pressure. According to Mr. Giffen, [118] the total wealth of Great Britain and Ireland amounted, in round numbers, in
1814 to £2,200,000,000 = 44 mld marks
1865 to £6,100,000,000 = 122 mld marks
1875 to £8,500,000,000 = 170 mld marks.

As an instance of the squandering of means of production and of products during a crisis, the total loss in the German iron industry alone, in the recent crisis {of 1873-78} was given at the second German Industrial Congress (Berlin, February 21, 1878) as 455,000,000 marks.

Chapter 2: Classes and Class Struggle

Classes struggle, some classes triumph, others are eliminated. Such is history; such is the history of civilization for thousands of years. To interpret history from this viewpoint is historical materialism; standing in opposition to this viewpoint is historical idealism.

"Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle" (August 14, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 428.

In class society, everyone lives as a member of a particular class, and every kind of thinking, without exception, is stamped with the brand of a class.

"On Practice" (July 1937), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 296.

Changes in society are due chiefly to the development of the internal contradictions in society, that is, the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, the contradiction between classes and the contradiction between the old and the new; it is the development of these contradictions that pushes society forward and gives the impetu6 for the suppression of the old society by the new.

"On Contradiction" (August 1937), Selected Works, Vol. I, P. 314.

The ruthless economic exploitation and political oppression of the peasants by the landlord class forced them into numerous uprisings against its rule.... It was the class struggles of the peasants, the peasant uprisings and peasant wars that constituted the real motive force of historical development in Chinese feudal society.

"The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party" (December 1939), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 308.*

In the final analysis, national struggle is a matter of class struggle. Among the whites in the United States, it is only the reactionary ruling circles that oppress the black people. They can in no way represent the workers, farmers, revolutionary intellectuals and other enlightened persons who comprise the overwhelming majority of the white people.

"Statement Supporting the American Negroes in Their Just Struggle Against Racial Discrimination by U.S. Imperialism" (August 8, 1963), People of the World, Unite and Defeat the U.S. Aggressors and All Their Lackeys, 2nd ed., pp. 3-4. *

It is up to us to organize the people. As for the reactionaries in China, it is up to us to organize the people to overthrow them. Everything reactionary is the same; if you do not hit it, it will not fall. This is also like sweeping the floor; as a rule, where the broom does not reach, the dust will not vanish of itself.

"The Situation and Our Policy After the Victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan" (August 13, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 19.

The enemy will not perish of himself. Neither will the Chinese reactionaries nor the aggressive forces of U.S. imperialism in China step down from the stage of history of their own accord.

"Carry the Revolution Through to the End" (December 30, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 301.

A revolution is not a dinner party, or writing an essay, or painting a picture, or doing embroidery; it cannot be so refined, so leisurely and gentle, so temperate, kind, courteous, restrained and magnanimous. A revolution is an insurrection, an act of violence by which one class overthrows another.

"Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan" (March 1927), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 28.*

Chiang Kai-shek always tries to wrest every ounce of power and every ounce of gain from the people. And we? Our policy is to give him retaliation and to fight for every inch of land. We act after his fashion. He always tries to impose war on the people, one sword in his left hand and another in his right. We take up swords, too, following his example.... As Chiang Kai-shek is now sharpening his swords, we must sharpen ours too.

"The Situation and Our Policy After the Victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan" (August 13, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. IV, pp. 14-l5.

Who are our enemies? Who are our friends? This is a question of the first importance for the revolution. The basic reason why all previous revolutionary struggles in China achieved so little was their failure to unite with real friends in order to attack real enemies. A revolutionary party is the guide of the masses, and no revolution ever succeeds when the revolutionary party leads them astray. To ensure that we will definitely achieve success in our revolution and will not lead the masses astray, we must pay attention to uniting with our real friends in order to attack our real enemies. To distinguish real friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in Chinese society and of their respective attitudes towards the revolution.

"Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society" (March 1926), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 13.

Our enemies are all those in league with imperialism - the warlords, the bureaucrats, the comprador class, the big Landlord class and the reactionary section of the intelligentsia attached to them. The leading force in our revolution is the industrial proletariat. Our closest friends are the entire semi-proletariat and petty bourgeoisie. As for the vacillating middle bourgeoisie, their right wing may become our enemy and their left wing may become our friend - but we must be constantly on our guard and not let them create confusion within our ranks.

Ibid. p. 19.*

Whoever sides with the revolutionary people are a revolutionary. Whoever sides with imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism are a counter-revolutionary. Whomever sides with the revolutionary people in words only but acts otherwise is a revolutionary in speech. Whoever sides with the revolutionary people in deed as well as in word is a revolutionary in the full sense.

Closing speech at the Second Session of the First National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (June 23, 1950).

I hold that it is bad as far as we are concerned if a person, a political party, an army or a school is not attacked by the enemy, for in that case it would definitely mean that we have sunk to the level of the enemy. It is good if we are attacked by the enemy, since it proves that we have drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves. It is still better if the enemy attacks us wildly and paints us as utterly black and without a single virtue; it demonstrates that we have not only drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves but achieved a great deal in our work.

To Be Attacked by the Enemy Is Not a Bad Thing but a Good Thing (May 26, 1939), first pocket ed., p. two. *

We should support whatever the enemy opposes and opposes whatever the enemy supports.

"Interview with Three Correspondents from the Central News Agency, the Sao Tang Pao and the Hsin Min Pao" (September 16, 1939), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 272.

Our stand is that of the proletariat and of the masses. For members of the Communist Party, this means keeping to the stand of the Party, keeping to Party spirit and Party policy.

"Talks at the Yenan Forum on Literature and Art" (May 1942), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 70.

After the enemies with guns have been wiped out, there will still be enemies without guns; they are bound to struggle desperately against us, and we must never regard these enemies lightly. If we do nor now raise and understand the problem in this way, we shall commit the gravest mistakes.

"Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China" (March 5, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 364.

The imperialists and domestic reactionaries will certainly not take their defeat Lying down and they will struggle to the last ditch. After there are peace and order throughout the country, they will still engage in sabotage and create disturbances in various ways and will try every day and every minute to stage a comeback. This is inevitable, beyond all doubt, and under no circumstances must we relax our vigilance.

Opening address at the First Plenary Session of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (September 21. 1949).

In China, although in the main socialist transformation has been completed with respect to the system of ownership, and although the large-scale and turbulent class struggles of the masses characteristic of the previous revolutionary periods have in the main come to an end, there are still remnants of the overthrown landlord and comprador classes, there is still a bourgeoisie, and the remolding of the petty bourgeoisie has only just started. The class struggle is by no means over. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the class struggle between the different political forces, and the class struggle in the ideological held between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will continue to be long and tortuous and at times will even become very acute. The proletariat seeks to transform the world according to its own world outlook, and so does the bourgeoisie. In this respect, the question of which will win out, socialism or capitalism, is still not really settled.

On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People (February 27, 1957), 1st pocket ed., pp. 51-52.

It will take a long period to decide the issue in the ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism in our country. The reason is that the influence of the bourgeoisie and of the intellectuals who come from the old society will remain in our country for a long time to come, and so will their class ideology. If this is not sufficiently understood, or is not understood at all, the gravest mistakes will be made and the necessity of waging the struggle in the ideological field will be ignored.

Ibid. pp. 52-53.

In our country bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology, anti-Marxist ideology will continue to exist for a long time. Basically, the socialist system has been established in our country. We have won the basic victory in transforming the ownership of the means of production, but we have not yet won complete victory on the political and ideological fronts. In the ideological field, the question of who will win in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie has not been really settled yet. We still have to wage a protracted struggle against bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideology. It is wrong not to understand this and to give up ideological struggle. All erroneous ideas, all poisonous weeds, all ghosts and monsters, must be subjected to criticism; in no circumstance should they be allowed to spread unchecked. However, the criticism should be fully reasoned, analytical and convincing, and not rough, bureaucratic, metaphysical or dogmatic.

Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work (March 12, 1957), 1st pocket ed., and pp. 26-27. *

Both dogmatism and revisionism run counter to Marxism. Marxism must certainly advance; it must develop along with the development of practice and cannot stand still. It would become lifeless if it remained stagnant and stereotyped. However, the basic principles of Marxism must never be violated, or otherwise mistakes will be made. It is dogmatism to approach Marxism from a metaphysical point of view and to regard it as something rigid. It is revisionism to negate the basic principles of Marxism and to negate its universal truth. Revisionism is one form of bourgeois ideology. The revisionists deny the differences between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line. In present circumstances, revisionism is more pernicious than dogmatism. One of our current important tasks on the ideological front is to unfold criticism of revisionism.

Ibid. pp. 27-28.

Revisionism, or Right opportunism, is a bourgeois trend of thought that is even more dangerous than dogmatism. The revisionists, the Right opportunists, pay lip service to Marxism; they too attack "dogmatism". However, what they are really attacking is the quintessence of Marxism. They oppose or distort materialism and dialectics, oppose or try to weaken the people's democratic dictatorship and the leading role of the Communist Party, and oppose or try to weaken socialist transformation and socialist construction. After the basic victory of the socialist revolution in our

country, there are still a number of people who vainly hope to restore the capitalist system and fight the working class on every front, including the ideological one. Moreover, their right-hand men in this struggle are the revisionists.

On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People (February 27, 1957), 1st pocket ed., pp. 56-57.

Chapter 3: Socialism and Communism

Communism is at once a complete system of proletarian ideology and a new social system. It is different from any other ideological and social system, and is the most complete, progressive, revolutionary and rational system in human history. The ideological and social system of feudalism has a place only in the museum of history. The ideological and social system of capitalism has also become a museum piece in one part of the world (in the Soviet Union), while in other countries it resembles "a dying person who is sinking fast, like the sun setting beyond the western hills", and will soon be relegated to the museum. The communist ideological and social system alone is full of youth and vitality, sweeping the world with the momentum of an avalanche and the force of a thunderbolt.

"On New Democracy" (January 1940), Selected Works, Vol. II, pp. 360-61. *

The socialist system will eventually replace the capitalist system; this is an objective law independent of man's will. However much the reactionaries try to hold back the wheel of history, eventually revolution will take place and will inevitably triumph.

"Speech at the Meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in Celebration of the 40th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution" (November 6, 1957).

We Communists never conceal our political views. Definitely and beyond all doubt, our future or maximum program is to carry China forward to socialism and communism. Both the name of our Party and our Marxist world outlook unequivocally point to this supreme ideal of the future, a future of incomparable brightness and splendor.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 282. *

Taken as a whole, the Chinese revolutionary movement led by the Communist Party embraces the two stages, i.e., the democratic and the socialist revolutions, which are two essentially different revolutionary processes, and the second process can be carried through only after the first has been completed. The democratic revolution is the necessary preparation for the socialist revolution, and the socialist revolution is the inevitable sequel to the democratic revolution. The ultimate aim for which all communists strive is to bring about a socialist and communist society.

"The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party" (December 1939), Selected Works, Vol. II, pp. 330-31. *

Socialist revolution aims at liberating the productive forces. The changeover from individual to socialist, collective ownership in agriculture and handicrafts and from capitalist to socialist ownership in private industry and commerce is bound to bring about a tremendous liberation of the productive forces. Thus, the social conditions are being created for a tremendous expansion of industrial and agricultural production.

Speech at the Supreme State Conference (January 25, 1956).

We are now carrying out a revolution not only in the social system, the change from private to public ownership, but also in technology, the change from handicraft to large-scale modern machine production, and the two revolutions are interconnected. In agriculture, with conditions as they are in our country co-operation must precede the use of big machinery (in capitalist countries agriculture develops in a capitalist way). Therefore, we must on no account regard industry and agriculture, socialist industrialization and the socialist transformation of agriculture as two separate and isolated things, and on no account must we emphasize the one and play down the other.

On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation (July 51, 1955), 3rd ed., pp. 19-20.

The new social system has only just been established and requires time for its consolidation. It must not be assumed that the new system can be completely consolidated the moment it is established, for that is impossible. It has to be consolidated systematically. To achieve its ultimate consolidation, it is necessary not only to bring about the socialist industrialization of the country and persevere in the socialist revolution on the economic front, but also to carry on constant and arduous socialist revolutionary struggles and socialist education on the political and ideological fronts. Moreover, various contributory international factors are required.

Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work (March 12, 1957), first pocket ed., and p. two. *

In China the struggle to consolidate the socialist system, the struggle to decide whether socialism or capitalism will prevail, will still take a long historical period. However, we should all realize that the new system of socialism will unquestionably be consolidated. We can assuredly build a socialist state with modern industry, modern agriculture, and modern science and culture.

Ibid. pp. 2-3.

The number of intellectuals who are hostile to our state is very small. They do not like our state, i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat, and yearn for the old society. Whenever there is an opportunity, they will stir up trouble and attempt to overthrow the Communist Party and restore the old China. As between the proletarian and the bourgeois roads, as between the socialist and the capitalist roads, these people stubbornly choose to follow the latter. In fact, this road is impossible, and in fact, therefore, they are ready to capitulate to imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism. Such people are to be found in political circles and in industrial and commercial, cultural and educational, scientific, technological, and religious circles, and they are extremely reactionary.

Ibid. pp. 3-4.

The serious problem is the education of the peasantry. The peasant economy is scattered, and the socialization of agriculture, judging by the Soviet Union's experience, will require a long time and painstaking work. Without socialization of agriculture, there can be no complete, consolidated socialism.

"On the People's Democratic Dictatorship" June 30, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 419.

We must have faith, first, that the peasant masses are ready to advance step by step along the road of socialism under the leadership of the Party, and second, that the Party is capable of leading the peasants along this road. These two points are the essence of the matter, the main current.

On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation (July 31, 1955), 3rd ed., p. 18. *

The leading bodies in co-operatives must establish the dominant position of the poor peasants and the new lower middle peasants in these bodies, with the old lower middle peasants and the upper middle peasants - whether old or new - as the supplementary force. Only thus can unity between the poor and middle peasants be attained. Moreover, the co-operatives can also be consolidated, production can be expanded and the socialist transformation of the entire countryside be correctly accomplished in accordance with the Party's policy. Otherwise, unity between the middle and poor peasants cannot be attained, the co-operatives cannot be consolidated, production cannot be expanded, and the socialist transformation of the entire countryside cannot be achieved.

Introductory note to "How Control of the Wu tang Co-operative Shifted from the Middle to the Poor Peasants" (1955), The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside, Chinese ed., Vol. II.

It is essential to unite with the middle peasants, and it is wrong not to do so. But on whom must the working class and the Communist Party rely in the countryside in order to unite with the middle peasants and realize the socialist transformation of the entire countryside? Surely on none other than the poor peasants. That was the case when the struggle against the landlords was being waged and the land reform was being carried out, and that is the case today when the struggle against the rich peasants and other capitalist elements is being waged to achieve the socialist transformation of agriculture. In both these revolutionary periods, the middle peasants wavered in the initial stages. It is only after they clearly see the general trend of events and the approaching triumph of the revolution that the middle peasants will come in on the side of the revolution. The poor peasants must work on the middle peasants and win them over, so that the revolution will broaden from day to day until final victory.

Introductory note to "The Lesson of the 'Middle-Peasant Cooperative' and the 'Poor-Peasant Co-operative' in Fuan County" (1955), The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside, Chinese ed., Vol. II.

There is a serious tendency towards capitalism among the well-to-do peasants. This tendency will become rampant if we in the slightest way neglect political work among the peasants during the co-operative movement and for a very long period after.

Introductory note to "A Resolute Struggle Must Be Waged Against the Tendency Towards Capitalism" (1955), The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside, Chinese ed., Vol. I.

The agricultural co-operative movement has been a severe ideological and political struggle from the very beginning. No cooperative can be established without going through such a struggle. Before a brand-new social system can be built on the site of the old, the site must be swept clean. Invariably, remnants of old ideas reflecting the old system remain in people's minds for a long time,

and they do not easily give way. After a co-operative is established, it must go through many more struggles before it can be consolidated. Even then, the moment it relaxes its efforts it may collapse.

Introductory note to "A Serious Lesson" (1955), The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside, Chinese ed., Vol. I.

The spontaneous forces of capitalism have been steadily growing in the countryside in recent years, with new rich peasants springing up everywhere and many well-to-do middle peasants striving to become rich peasants. On the other hand, many poor peasants are still living in poverty for lack of sufficient means of production, with some in debt and others selling or renting out their land. If this tendency goes unchecked, the polarization in the countryside will inevitably be aggravated day by day. Those peasants who lose their land and those who remain in poverty will complain that we are doing nothing to save them from ruin or to help them overcome their difficulties. Nor will the well-to-do middle peasants who are heading in the capitalist direction be pleased with us, for we shall never be able to satisfy their demands unless we intend to take the capitalist road. Can the worker-peasant alliance continue to stand him in these circumstances? Obviously not! There is no solution to this problem except on a new basis. And that means to bring about, step by step, the socialist transformation of the whole of agriculture simultaneously with the gradual realization of socialist industrialization and the socialist transformation of handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce; in other words, it means to carry out co-operation and eliminate the rich-peasant economy and the individual economy in the countryside so that all the rural people will become increasingly well off together. We maintain that this is the only way to consolidate the worker-peasant alliance.

On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation (July 31, 1955), 3rd ed., pp. 26-27.*

By over-all planning, we mean planning which takes into consideration the interests of the 600 million people of our country. In drawing up plans, handling affairs or thinking over problems, we must proceed from the fact that China has a population of 600 million people, and we must never forget this fact.

On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People (February 27, 1957), first pocket ed. p. 47.

In addition to the leadership of the Party, a decisive factor is our population of 600 million. More people mean a greater ferment of ideas, more enthusiasm and more energy. Never before have the masses of the people been so inspired, so militant and so daring as at present.

"Introducing a Co-operative" (April 15, 1958).

Apart from their other characteristics, the outstanding thing about China's 600 million people is that they are "poor and blank". This may seem a bad thing, but in reality, it is a good thing. Poverty gives rise to the desire for changes the desire for action and the desire for revolution. On a blank sheet of paper free from any mark, the freshest and most beautiful characters can be written; the freshest and most beautiful pictures can be painted.

Ibid .

After the countrywide victory of the Chinese revolution and the solution of the land problem, two basic contradictions will still exist in China. The first is internal, that is, the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie. The second is external, which is the contradiction between China and the imperialist countries. Consequently, after the victory of the people's democratic revolution, the state power of the people's republic under the leadership of the working class must not be weakened but must be strengthened.

"Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China" (March 5, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 369.

"Don't you want to abolish state power?" Yes, we do, but not right now. We cannot do it yet. Why? Because imperialism still exists, because domestic reaction still exists, because classes still exist in our country. Our present task is to strengthen the people's state apparatus - mainly the people's army, the people's police and the people's courts - in order to consolidate national defense and protect the people's interests.

"On the People's Democratic Dictatorship" (June 30, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 418.

Our state is a people's democratic dictatorship led by the working class and based on the worker-peasant alliance. What is this dictatorship for? Its first function is to suppress the reactionary classes and elements and those exploiters in our country who resist the socialist revolution, to suppress those who try to wreck our socialist construction, or in other words, to resolve the internal contradictions between ourselves and the enemy. For instance, to arrest, try and sentence certain counterrevolutionaries, and to deprive landlords and bureaucrat-capitalists of their right to vote and their freedom of speech for a specified period of time - all this comes within the scope of our dictatorship. To maintain public order and safeguard the interests of the people, it is likewise necessary to exercise dictatorship over embezzlers, swindlers, arsonists, murderers, criminal gangs and other scoundrels who seriously disrupt public order. The second function of this dictatorship is to protect our country from subversion and possible aggression by external enemies. In that event, it is the task of this dictatorship to resolve the external contradiction between the enemy and us. The aim of this dictatorship is to protect all our people so that they can devote themselves to peaceful labor and build China into a socialist country with a modern industry, agriculture, science and culture.

On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People (February 27, 1957), 1st pocket ed., pp. 6-7.

The People's democratic dictatorship needs the leadership of the working class. For it is only the working class that is most far-sighted, most selfless and most thoroughly revolutionary. The entire history of revolution proves that without the leadership of the working-class revolution fails and that with the leadership of the working-class revolution triumphs.

"On the People's Democratic Dictatorship" (June 30, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 421.

The People's democratic dictatorship is based on the alliance of the working class, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie, and mainly on the alliance of the workers and the peasants, because these two classes comprise 80 to go per cent of China's population. These two classes are the main force in overthrowing imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionaries. The transition from New Democracy to socialism also depends mainly upon their alliance.

Ibid.

Class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment are the three great revolutionary movements for building a mighty socialist country. These movements are a sure guarantee that Communists will be free from bureaucracy and immune against revisionism and dogmatism, and will forever remain invincible. They are a reliable guarantee that the proletariat will be able to unite with the broad working masses and realize a democratic dictatorship. If, in the absence of these movements, the landlords, rich peasants, counterrevolutionaries, bad elements and monsters were all allowed to crawl out, while our cadres were to shut their eyes to all this and in many cases fail even to differentiate between the enemy and ourselves but were to collaborate with the enemy and were corrupted, divided and demoralized by him, if our cadres were thus pulled out or the enemy were able to sneak in, and if many of our workers, peasants, and intellectuals were left defenseless against both the soft and the hard tactics of the enemy, then it would not take long, perhaps only several years or a decade, or several decades at most, before a counterrevolutionary restoration on a national scale inevitably occurred, the Marxist-Leninist party would undoubtedly become a revisionist party or a fascist party, and the whole of China would change its color.

Note on "The Seven Well-Written Documents of Chekiang Province Concerning Cadres' Participation in Physical Labor" (May 9, 1963), quoted in On Khrushchev's Phony Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World, pp. 71-72. *

The People's democratic dictatorship uses two methods. Towards the enemy, it uses the method of dictatorship, that is, for as long a period of time as is necessary it does not let them take part in political activities and compels them to obey the law of the People's Government and to engage in labor and, through labor, transform themselves into new men. Towards the people, on the contrary, it uses the method not of compulsion but of democracy, that is, it must necessarily let them take part in political activities and does not compel them to do this or that, but uses the method of democracy in educating and persuading them.

Closing speech at the Second Session of the First National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (June 23, 1950).

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Chinese people are carrying out a vigorous rectification movement in order to bring about the rapid development of socialism in China on a firmer basis. It is a movement for carrying out a nation-wide debate which is both guided and free, a debate in the city and the countryside on such questions as the socialist road versus the capitalist road, the basic system of the state and its major policies, the working style of Party and government functionaries, and the question of the welfare of the people, a debate which is conducted by setting

forth facts and reasoning things out, so as correctly to resolve those actual contradictions among the people which demand immediate solution. This is a socialist movement for the self-education and self-remolding of the people.

"Speech at the Meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in Celebration of the 40th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution" (November 6, 1957)

Most arduous tasks lie ahead of us in the great work of construction. Although there are over I0 million members in our Party, they still constitute a very small minority of the country's population. In government departments and public organizations and enterprises, much work has to be done by non-Party people. It is impossible to get this work well done unless we are good at relying on the masses and co-operating with non-Party people. While continuing to strengthen the unity of the whole Party, we must also continue to strengthen the unity of all our nationalities, democratic classes, democratic parties and people's organizations, and to consolidate and expand the people's democratic united front, and we must conscientiously get rid of every unhealthy manifestation in any link in our work that is detrimental to the unity between the Party and the people.

"Opening Address at the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China" (September 15, 1956).

Karl Marx: The Civil War in France

Chapter 3: France Capitulates & the Government of Thiers

In September 4, 1870, when the working men of Paris proclaimed the republic, which was almost instantaneously acclaimed throughout France, without a single voice of dissent, a cabal of place-hunting barristers, with Thiers for their statesman, and Trochu for their general, took hold of the Hotel de Ville. At that time, they were imbued with so fanatical a faith in the mission of Paris to represent France in all epochs of historical crisis that, to legitimate their usurped titles as governors of France, they thought it quite sufficient to produce their lapsed mandates as representatives of Paris.

In our second address on the late war, five days after the rise of these men, we told you who they were. Yet, in the turmoil of surprise, with the real leaders of the working class still shut up in Bonapartist prisons and the Prussians already marching on Paris, Paris bore with their assumption of power, on the express condition that it was to be wielded for the single purpose of national defense. Paris, however, was not to be defended without arming its working class, organizing them into an effective force, and training their ranks by the war itself. But Paris armed was the revolution armed. A victory of Paris over the Prussian aggressor would have been a victory of the French workmen over the French capitalist and his state parasites. In this conflict between national duty and class interest, the Government of National Defense did not hesitate one moment to turn into a Government of National Defection.

The first step they took was to send Thiers on a roving tour to all the courts of Europe, there to beg mediation by offering the barter of the republic for a king. Four months after the commencement of the siege [of Paris], when they thought the opportune moment came for breaking the first word of

capitulation, Trochu, in the presence of Jules Favre, and others of his colleagues, addressed the assembled mayors of Paris in these terms:

> "The first question put to me by my colleagues on the very evening of the 4th of September was this: Paris, can it, with any chance of success, stand a siege by the Prussian army? I did not hesitate to answer in the negative. Some of my colleagues here present will warrant the truth of my words and the persistence of my opinion. I told them, in these very terms, that, under the existing state of things, the attempt of Paris to hold out a siege by the Prussian army would be a folly. Without doubt, I added, it would be a heroic folly; but that would be all.... The events [managed by himself] have not given the lie to my prevision."

This nice little speech of Trochu was afterwards published by M. Carbon, one of the mayors presents.

Thus, on the very evening of the proclamation of the republic, Trochu's "plan" was known to his colleagues to be the capitulation of Paris. If national defense has been more than a pretext for the personal government of Thiers, Favre, and Co., the upstarts of September 4 would have abdicated on the 5th – would have initiated the Paris people into Trochu's "plan," and called upon them to surrender at once, or to take their own fate into their own hands. Instead of this, the infamous impostors resolved upon curing the heroic folly of Paris by a regimen of famine and broken heads, and to dupe her in the meanwhile by ranting manifestos, holding forth that Trochu, "the governor of Paris, will never capitulate", and Jules Favre, the foreign minister, will "not cede an inch of our territory, nor a stone of our fortresses."

In a letter to Gambetta, the very same Jules Favre avows that what they were "defending" against were not the Prussian soldiers, but the working men of Paris. During the whole continuance of the siege, the Bonapartist cut-throats, whom Trochu had wisely entrusted with the command of the Paris army, exchanged, in their intimate correspondence, ribald jokes at the well-understood mockery of defense. (See, for instance, the correspondence of Alphonse Simon Guido, supreme commander of the artillery of the Army of Defense of Paris and Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor, to Suzanne, general of division of artillery, a correspondence published by the *Journal official* of the Commune.) The mask of the true heroism was at last dropped on January 28, 1871. With the true heroism of utter self-debasement, the Government of National Defense, in their capitulation, came out as the government of France by Bismarck's prisoners – a part so base that Louis Bonaparte himself had, at Sedan, shrunk from accepting it. After the events of March 18 on their wild flight to Versailles, the *capitulards* left in the hands of Paris the documentary evidence of their treason, to destroy which, as the Commune says in its manifesto to the provinces, "those men would not recoil from battering Paris into a heap of ruins washed by a sea of blood."

To be eagerly bent upon such a consummation, some of the leading members of the Government of Defense had, besides, most peculiar reasons of their own.

Shortly after the conclusion of the armistice, M. Milliere, one of the representatives of Paris to the National Assembly, now shot by express orders of Jules Favre, published a series of authentic legal documents in proof that Jules Favre, living in concubinage with the wife of a drunken resident at Algiers, had, by a most daring concoction of forgeries, spread over many years, contrived to grasp, in the name of the children of his adultery, a large succession, which made him a rich man, and that, in a lawsuit undertaken by the legitimate heirs, he only escaped exposure by the connivance of the Bonapartist tribunals. As these dry legal documents were not to be got rid of by any amount of rhetorical horse-power, Jules Favre, for the first time in his life, held his tongue, quietly awaiting the outbreak of the civil war, in order, then, frantically to denounce the people of Paris as a band of escaped convicts in utter revolt against family, religion, order, and property. This same forger had hardly got into power, after September 4, when he sympathetically let loose upon society Pic and Taillefer, convicted, even under the empire, of forgery in the scandalous affair of "Standard." One of these men, Taillefer, having dared to return to Paris under the Commune, was at once reinstated in prison; and then Jules Favre exclaimed, from the tribune of the National Assembly, that Paris was setting free all her jailbirds!

Ernest Picard, the Joe Miller of the Government of National Defense, who appointed himself Finance Minister of the republic after having in vain striven to become home minister of the empire, is the brother of one Arthur Picard, an individual expelled from the Paris *Bourse* as a blackleg (see report of the Prefecture of Police, dated July 13, 1867), and convicted, on his own confession, of theft of 300,000 francs, while manager of one of the branches of the *Societe Generale*,[10] Rue Palestro, No.5 (see report of the Prefecture of Police, dated December 11, 1868). This Arthur Picard was made by Ernest Picard the editor of his paper, *l'Electeur Libre*. While the common run of stockjobbers was led astray by the official lies of this finance office paper, Arthur was running backwards and forwards between the finance office and the *Bourse*, there to discount the disasters of the French army. The whole financial correspondence of that worthy pair of brothers fell into the hands of the Commune.

Jules Ferry, a penniless barrister before September 4, contrived, as mayor of Paris during the siege, to job a fortune out of famine. The day on which he would have to give an account of his maladministration would be the day of his conviction.

These men, then, could find in the ruins of Paris only their tickets-of-leave;[11] they were the very men Bismarck wanted. With the help of some shuffling of cards, Thiers, hitherto the secret prompter of the government, now appeared at its head, with the tickets-of-leave men for his ministers.

---

[10] Société Générale du Credit Mobilier – A large French joint-stock bank founded in 1852. Its main source of income was speculation in securities. The bank was closely linked with the government circles of the Second Empire. In 1867 it went bankrupt and was liquidated in 1871.

[11] In England common criminals are often discharged on parole after serving the greater part of their term, and are placed under police surveillance. On such discharge they receive a certificate called ticket-of-leave, their possessor is being referred to as ticket-of-leave-men.

Theirs, that monstrous gnome, has charmed the French bourgeoisie for almost half a century, because he is the most consummate intellectual expression of their own class corruption. Before he became a statesman, he had already proved his lying powers as an historian. The chronicle of his public life is the record of the misfortunes of France. Banded, before 1830, with the republicans, he slipped into office under Louis Philippe by betraying his protector Lafitte, ingratiating himself with the king by exciting mob riots against the clergy, during which the church of Saint Germain l'Auxerrois and the archbishop's palace were plundered, and by acting the minister-spy upon, and the jail-*accoucheur* of the Duchess de Berry. [12] The massacre of the republicans in the Rue Transnonian, and the subsequent infamous laws of September against the press and the right of association, were his work. [13] Reappearing as the chief of the cabinet in March 1840, he astonished France with his plan for fortifying France. [14] To the republicans, who denounced this plan as a sinister plot against the liberty of Paris, he replied from the tribune of the Chamber of Deputies:

> "What! To fancy that any works of fortification could ever endanger liberty! And first of all, you calumniate any possible government in supposing that it could someday attempt to maintain itself by bombarding the capital; [...] but that the government would be a hundred times more impossible after its victory than before."

Indeed, no government would ever have dared to bombard Paris from the forts, save that government which had previously surrendered these forts to the Prussians.

When King Bomba [Ferdinand II of Spain] tried his hand at Palermo, in January 1848, Thiers, then long since out of office, again rose in the Chamber of Deputies:

> "You know, gentlemen, what is happening at Palermo. You, all of you, shake with horror [in the parliamentary sense] on hearing that during 48 hours a large town has been bombarded – by whom? Was it a foreign enemy exercising the rights of war? No, gentlemen, it was by its

---

[12] On February 14 and 15, 1831 the Paris mob plundered the church of St. Germain l' Auxerroisand Archbishop Quélen's palace in protest against the Legitimist demonstration during the Requiem mass for the Duke de Barry. Thiers, who was present among the rioting crowd while it was committing excesses in the church and in the Archbishop's palace, persuaded the French National Guards not to interfere.

In 1832, by the order of Thiers, who was at that time minister of the Interior, the Duchesse de Berry (mother of the Comte de Chambord) – the Legitimist pretender to the French throne – was arrested and subjected to a humiliating medical examination aimed at giving publicity to her secret marriage and in this way ruling her political career.

[13] An allusion to the ignominious role of Thiers, then Minister of the Interior, in suppressing the people's insurrection in Paris against the July monarchy on April 13-14, 1834. The insurrection was put down with savage brutality by the military who, for example, massacred the inhabitants of one of the houses on Rue Transnonain.

September Laws – reactionary laws against the press introduced by the French Government in September 1835. They provided for imprisonment and large fines for publications criticizing the existing social and political system.

[14] In January 1841, Thiers submitted to the Chamber of Deputies a plan for building a range of military fortifications around Paris. Revolutionary-democratic sections saw this move as a preparatory step for the crushing of popular demonstrations. The plan provided for the building of particularly strong fortifications in the vicinity of the workers districts.

own government. And why? Because the unfortunate town demanded its rights. Well, then, for the demand of its rights it has got 48 hours of bombardment.... Allow me to appeal to the opinion of Europe. It is doing a service to mankind to arise, and to make reverberate, from what is perhaps the greatest tribune in Europe, some words [indeed words] of indignation against such acts.... When the Regent Espartero, who had rendered services to his country [which M. Thiers never did] intended bombarding Barcelona, in order to suppress its insurrection, there arose from all parts of the world a general outcry of indignation."

Eighteen months afterwards, M. Thiers was amongst the fiercest defenders of the bombardment of Rome by a French army. [15] In fact, the fault of King Bomba seems to have consisted in this only – that he limited his bombardment to 48 hours.

A few days before the February Revolution, fretting at the long exile from place and pelf to which Guizot had condemned him, and sniffing in the air the scent of an approaching popular commotion, Thiers, in that pseudo-heroic style which won him the nickname *Mirabeau-mouche* [Mirabeau the fly], declared, to the Chamber of Deputies:

"I am of the party of revolution, not only in France, but in Europe. I wish the government of the revolution to remain in the hands of moderate men... but if that government should fall into the hand of ardent minds, even into those of radicals, I shall, for all that, not desert my cause. I shall always be of the party of the revolution."

The February Revolution came. Instead of displacing the Guizot Cabinet by the Thiers Cabinet, as the little man had dreamt, it superseded Louis Philippe by the republic. On the first day of the popular victory, he carefully hid himself, forgetting that the contempt of the working men screened him from their hatred. Still, with his legendary courage, he continued to shy the public stage, until the June [1848] massacres had cleared it for his sort of action. Then he became the leading mind of the "Party of Order" [16] and its parliamentary republic, that anonymous interregnum, in which all the rival factions of the ruling class conspired together to crush the people, and conspired against each other to restore to each of them its own monarchy. Then, as now, Thiers denounced the republicans as the only obstacle to the consolidation of the republic; then, as now, he spoke to the republic as the hangman spoke to Don Carlos: "I shall assassinate thee, but for thy own good." Now, as then, he will have to exclaim on the day after his victory: *L'Empire est fait* – the empire is consummated.

Despite his hypocritical homilies about the necessary liberties and his personal grudge against Louis Bonaparte, who had made a dupe of him, and kicked out parliamentarism – and, outside of its

[15] In April 1849 France, in conjunction with Austria and Naples, organized an intervention campaign against the republic of Rome in order to crush it and restore the pope's temporal power. French troops severely bombarded Rome. Despite heroic resistance, the Republic was crushed and Rome occupied by French troops.

[16] Party of Order – A party of the influential conservative bourgeoisie founded in 1848. It was a coalition of the two French monarchist factions – the Legitimists and Orleanists; from 1849 until the coup d'etat of December 2, 1851, it held the leading position in the Legislative Assembly of the Second Republic.

factitious atmosphere, the little man is conscious of withering into nothingness – he had a hand in all the infamies of the Second Empire, from the occupation of Rome by French troops to the war with Prussia, which he incited by his fierce invective against German unity – not as a cloak of Prussian despotism, but as an encroachment upon the vested right of France in German disunion. Fond of brandishing, with his dwarfish arms in the face of Europe, the sword of the first Napoleon, whose historical shoeblack he had become, his foreign policy always culminated in the utter humiliation of France – from the London convention [17] of 1840 to the Paris capitulation of 1871, and the present civil war, where he hounds on the prisoners of Sedan and Metz [18] against Paris by special permission of Bismarck.

Despite his versatility of talent and shiftiness of purpose, this man has his whole lifetime been wedded to the most fossil routine. It is self-evident that to him the deeper undercurrents of modern society remained forever hidden; but even the most palpable changes on its surface were abhorrent to a brain (all the vitality of which) had fled to the tongue. Thus, he never tired of denouncing as a sacrilege any deviation from the old French protective system.

When a minister of Louis Philippe, he railed at railways as a wild chimera; and when in opposition under Louis Bonaparte, he branded as a profanation every attempt to reform the rotten French army system. Never in his long political career has he been guilty of a single – even the smallest – measure of any practical use. Thiers was consistent only in his greed for wealth and his hatred of the men that produce it. Having entered his first ministry, under Louis Philippe, poor as Job, he left it a millionaire. His last ministry under the same king (of March 1, 1840) exposed him to public taunts of peculation in the Chamber of Deputies, to which he was content to reply by tears – a commodity he deals in as freely as Jules Favre, or any other crocodile. At Bordeaux, his first measure for saving France from impending financial ruin was to endow himself with three million a year, the first and the last word of the "Economical Republic," the vista of which he had opened to his Paris electors in 1869. One of his former colleagues of the Chamber of Deputies of 1830, himself a capitalist and, nevertheless, a devoted member of the Paris Commune, M. Beslay, lately addressed Thiers thus in a public placard:

> "The enslavement of labor by capital has always been the cornerstone of your policy, and from the very day you saw the Republic of Labor installed at the Hotel de Ville, you have never ceased to cry out to France: 'These are criminals!'"

A master in small state roguery, a virtuoso in perjury and treason, a craftsman in all the petty stratagems, cunning devices, and base perfidies of parliamentary warfare; never scrupling, when out

[17] On July 15, 1840, England, Russia, Prussia, Austria and Turkey signed the London Convention, without the participation of France, on rendering aid to the Turkish Sultan against the Egyptian ruler Mohammed Ali, who had the support of France. As a result, a threat of war arose between France and the coalition of European powers, but King Louis Philippe did not dare begin hostilities and abandoned his support of Mohammed Ali.

[18] In order to suppress the Paris Commune Thiers appealed to Bismarck for permission to supplement the Versailles Army with French prisoners of war, most of whom had been serving in the armies that surrendered at Sedan and Metz.

of office, to fan a revolution, and to stifle it in blood when at the helm of the state; with class prejudices standing him in the place of ideas, and vanity in the place of a heart; his private life as infamous as his public life is odious – even now, when playing the part of a French Sulla, he cannot help setting off the abomination of his deeds by the ridicule of his ostentation.

The capitulation of Paris, by surrendering to Prussia not only Paris, but all France, closed the long-continued intrigues of treason with the enemy, which the usurpers of September 4 had begun, as Trochu himself said, on the very same day. On the other hand, it initiated the civil war they were now to wage, with the assistance of Prussia, against the republic and Paris. The trap was laid in the very terms of the capitulation. At that time, above one-third of the territory was in the hands of the enemy, the capital was cut off from the provinces, all communications were disorganized. To elect, under such circumstances, a real representation of France was impossible, unless ample time were given for preparation. In view of this, the capitulation stipulated that a National Assembly must be elected within eight days; so that in many parts of France the news of the impending election arrived on its eve only. This assembly, moreover, was, by an express clause of the capitulation, to be elected for the sole purpose of deciding on peace or war, and, eventually, to conclude a treaty of peace. The population could not but feel that the terms of the armistice rendered the continuation of the war impossible, and that for sanctioning the peace imposed by Bismarck, the worst men in France were the best. But not content with these precautions, Thiers even before the secret of the armistice had been broached to Paris, set out for an electioneering tour through the provinces, there to galvanize back into life the Legitimist party, which now, along with the Orleanists, had to take the place of the then impossible Bonapartists. He was not afraid of them. Impossible as a government of modern France, and, therefore, contemptible as rivals, what party were more eligible as tools of counter-revolution than the party whose action, in the words of Thiers himself (Chamber of Deputies, January 5, 1833), "Had always been confined to the three resources of foreign invasion, civil war, and anarchy"? They verily believed in the advent of their long-expected retrospective millennium. There were the heels of foreign invasion trampling upon France; there was the downfall of an empire, and the captivity of Bonaparte; and there they were themselves. The wheel of history had evidently rolled back to stop at the "Chambers introuvable" of 1816. [19] In the assemblies of the republic, 1848 to 1851, they had been represented by their educated and trained parliamentary champions; it was the rank-and-file of the party which now rushed in – all the Pourceaugnacs of France. [a character in one of Molière's comedies, typifying the dull-witted, narrow-minded petty landed gentry.]

As soon as this Assembly of "Rurals" [20] had met at Bordeaux, Thiers made it clear to them that the peace preliminaries must be assented to at once, without even the honors of a parliamentary

[19] Chamber of Deputies in France in 1815 and 1816 (during the early years of the Restoration), which consisted of extreme reactionaries.

[20] Landlord Chamber, the Assembly of "Rurals" – A nickname of the National Assembly of 1871, which met in Bordeaux and was largely made up of reactionary monarchists, provincial landlords, officials, rentiers and traders "elected" in rural districts. There were about 430 monarchists among the Assembly's 630 deputies.

debate, as the only conditions on which Prussia would permit them to open the war against the republic and Paris, its stronghold. The counter-revolution had, in fact, no time to lose. The Second Empire had more than doubled the national debt, and plunged all the large towns into heavy municipal debts. The war had fearfully swelled the liabilities, and mercilessly ravaged the resources of the nation. To complete the ruin, the Prussian Shylock was there with his bond for the keep of half a million of his soldiers on French soil, his indemnity for five milliards, [21] and interest at 5 per cent on the unpaid instalments thereof. Who was to pay this bill? It was only by the violent overthrow of the republic that the appropriators of wealth could hope to shift onto the shoulders of its producers the cost of a war which they, the appropriators, had themselves originated. Thus, the immense ruin of France spurred on these patriotic representatives of land and capital, under the very eyes and patronage of the invader, to graft upon the foreign war a civil war – a slaveholders' rebellion.

There stood in the way of this conspiracy one great obstacle – Paris. To disarm Paris was the first condition of success. Paris was therefore summoned by Thiers to surrender its arms. Then Paris was exasperated by the frantic anti-republican demonstrations of the "Rural" Assembly and by Thiers' own equivocations about the legal status of the republic; by the threat to decapitate and decapitalize Paris; the appointment of Orleanist ambassadors; Dufaure's laws on over-due commercial bills and house rents, [22] inflicting ruin on the commerce and industry of Paris; Pouyer-Quertier's tax of two centimes upon every copy of every imaginable publication; the sentences of death against Blanqui and Flourens; the suppression of the republican journals; the transfer of the National Assembly to Versailles; the renewal of the state of siege declared by Palikao, and expired on September 4; the appointment of Vinoy, the *Décembriseur*, [23] as governor of Paris – of Valentin, the imperialist *gendarme*, as its prefect of police – and of D'Aurelles de Paladine, the Jesuit general, as the commander-in-chief of its National Guard.

And now we have to address a question to M. Thiers and the men of national defense, his under-strappers. It is known that, through the agency of M. Pouyer-Quertier, his finance ministers, Thiers had contracted a loan of two milliards. Now, is it true or not –

1. That the business was so managed that a consideration of several hundred million was secured for the private benefit of Thiers, Jules Favre, Ernest Picard, Pouyer-Quertier, and Jules Simon? and –

[21] The preliminary peace treaty between France and Germany signed at Versailles on February 26, 1871 by Thiers and Jules Favre, on the one hand, and Bismarck, on the other. According to the terms of this treaty, France ceded Alsace and East Lorraine to Germany and paid it indemnities to the sum of 5 billion francs. The final peace treaty was signed in Frankfort-on-Main on May 10, 1871.

[22] On March 10, 1871, the National Assembly passed a law on the deferred payment of overdue bills; under this law the payment of debts on obligations concluded between August 13 and November 12, 1870 could be deferred. Thus, law led to the bankruptcy of many petty bourgeoisie.

[23]] Décembriseur – a participant in the Bonapartist coup d'etat of December 2, 1851 and supporter of acts in the spirit of this coup.

2. That no money was to be paid down until after the "pacification" of Paris? [24]

At all events, there must have been something very pressing in the matter, for Thiers and Jules Favre, in the name of the majority of the Bordeaux Assembly, unblushingly solicited the immediate occupation of Paris by Prussian troops. Such, however, was not the game of Bismarck, as he sneeringly, and in public, told the admiring Frankfort philistines on his return to Germany.

Marx: Critique of the Gotha Program

Chapter 4

I come now to the democratic section.

Section A: "The free basis of the state."

First of all, according to II, the German Workers' party strives for "the free state".

Free state — what is this?

It is by no means the aim of the workers, who have got rid of the narrow mentality of humble subjects, to set the state free. In the German Empire, the "state" is almost as "free" as in Russia. Freedom consists in converting the state from an organ superimposed upon society into one completely subordinate to it; and today, too, the forms of state are more free or less free to the extent that they restrict the "freedom of the state".

The German Workers' party — at least if it adopts the program — shows that its socialist ideas are not even skin-deep; in that, instead of treating existing society (and this holds good for any future one) as the *basis* of the existing state (or of the future state in the case of future society), it treats the state rather as an independent entity that possesses its own intellectual, ethical, and libertarian bases.

And what of the riotous misuse which the program makes of the words "present-day state", "present-day society", and of the still more riotous misconception it creates in regard to the state to which it addresses its demands?

"Present-day society" is capitalist society, which exists in all civilized countries, more or less free from medieval admixture, more or less modified by the particular historical development of each country, more or less developed. On the other hand, the "present-day state" changes with a country's frontier. It is different in the Prusso-German Empire from what it is in Switzerland, and different in England from what it is in the United States. The "present-day state" is therefore a fiction.

Nevertheless, the different states of the different civilized countries, in spite of their motley diversity of form, all have this in common: that they are based on modern bourgeois society, only one more or less capitalistically developed. They have, therefore, also certain essential characteristics in

[24] According to the newspapers, the internal loan, which the Thiers government wanted to float, gave Thiers and members of his government over 300 million francs "commission." On June 20, 1871, after the suppression of the Paris Commune, the law on the loan was passed.

common. In this sense, it is possible to speak of the "present-day state" in contrast with the future, in which its present root, bourgeois society, will have died off.

The question then arises: What transformation will the state undergo in communist society? In other words, what social functions will remain in existence there that are analogous to present state functions? This question can only be answered scientifically, and one does not get a flea-hop nearer to the problem by a thousand-fold combination of the word 'people' with the word 'state'.

Between capitalist and communist society there lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*.

Now the program does not deal with this nor with the future state of communist society.

Its political demands contain nothing beyond the old democratic litany familiar to all: universal suffrage, direct legislation, popular rights, a people's militia, etc. They are a mere echo of the bourgeois People's party, of the League of Peace and Freedom. They are all demands which, insofar as they are not exaggerated in fantastic presentation, have already been *realized*. Only the state to which they belong does not lie within the borders of the German Empire, but in Switzerland, the United States, etc. This sort of "state of the future" is a present-day state, although existing outside the "framework" of the German Empire.

But one thing has been forgotten. Since the German Workers' party expressly declares that it acts within "the present-day national state", hence within its own state, the Prusso-German Empire — its demands would indeed be otherwise largely meaningless, since one only demands what one has not got — it should not have forgotten the chief thing, namely, that all those pretty little gewgaws rest on the recognition of the so-called sovereignty of the people and hence are appropriate only in a *democratic republic*.

Since one has not the courage — and wisely so, for the circumstances demand caution — to demand the democratic republic, as the French workers' programs under Louis Philippe and under Louis Napoleon did, one should not have resorted, either, to the subterfuge, neither "honest" [25] nor decent, of demanding things which have meaning only in a democratic republic from a state which is nothing but a police-guarded military despotism, embellished with parliamentary forms, alloyed with a feudal admixture, already influenced by the bourgeoisie, and bureaucratically carpentered, and then to assure this state into the bargain that one imagines one will be able to force such things upon it "by legal means".

Even vulgar democracy, which sees the millennium in the democratic republic, and has no suspicion that it is precisely in this last form of state of bourgeois society that the class struggle has to

[25] Epitaph used by the Eisenachers. Here a play on words in German.

be fought out to a conclusion — even it towers mountains above this kind of democratism, which keeps within the limits of what is permitted by the police and not permitted by logic.

That, in fact, by the word "state" is meant the government machine, or the state insofar as it forms a special organism separated from society through division of labor, is shown by the words "the German Workers' party demands as the economic basis of the state: a single progressive income tax", etc. Taxes are the economic basis of the government machinery and of nothing else. In the state of the future, existing in Switzerland, this demand has been pretty well fulfilled. Income tax presupposes various sources of income of the various social classes, and hence capitalist society. It is, therefore, nothing remarkable that the Liverpool financial reformers — bourgeois headed by Gladstone's brother — are putting forward the same demand as the program.

Marx-Engels: Manifesto of the Communist Party

Chapter I: Bourgeois and Proletarians[26]

The history of all hitherto existing society [27] is the history of class struggles.

Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master [28] and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes.

In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.

The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones.

---

[26] By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage labor.

By proletariat, the class of modern wage laborers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labor power in order to live. [Engels, 1888 English edition]

[27] That is, all written history. In 1847, the pre-history of society, the social organisation existing previous to recorded history, all but unknown. Since then, August von Haxthausen (1792-1866) discovered common ownership of land in Russia, Georg Ludwig von Maurer proved it to be the social foundation from which all Teutonic races started in history, and, by and by, village communities were found to be, or to have been, the primitive form of society everywhere from India to Ireland. The inner organisation of this primitive communistic society was laid bare, in its typical form, by Lewis Henry Morgan's (1818-1881) crowning discovery of the true nature of the gens and its relation to the tribe. With the dissolution of the primeval communities, society begins to be differentiated into separate and finally antagonistic classes. I have attempted to retrace this dissolution in The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, second edition, Stuttgart, 1886. [Engels, 1888 English Edition and 1890 German Edition (with the last sentence omitted)]

[28] Guild-master, that is, a full member of a guild, a master within, not a head of a guild. [Engels, 1888 English Edition]

Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinct feature: it has simplified class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other — Bourgeoisie and Proletariat.

From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these burgesses the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed.

The discovery of America, the rounding of the Cape, opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie. The East-Indian and Chinese markets, the Colonisation of America, trade with the colonies, the increase in the means of exchange and in commodities generally, gave to commerce, to navigation, to industry, an impulse never before known, and thereby, to the revolutionary element in the tottering feudal society, a rapid development.

The feudal system of industry, in which industrial production was monopolized by closed guilds, now no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the new markets. The manufacturing system took its place. The guild-masters were pushed on one side by the manufacturing middle class; division of labor between the different corporate guilds vanished in the face of division of labor in each single workshop.

Meantime the markets kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. Even manufacturer no longer sufficed. Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionized industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, Modern Industry; the place of the industrial middle class by industrial millionaires, the leaders of the whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois.

Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility, an armed and self-governing association in the medieval commune [29]: here independent urban republic (as in

[29] This was the name given their urban communities by the townsmen of Italy and France, after they had purchased or conquered their initial rights of self-government from their feudal lords. [Engels, 1890 German edition]

"Commune" was the name taken in France by the nascent towns even before they had conquered from their feudal lords and masters local self-government and political rights as the "Third Estate." Generally speaking, for the economical development of the bourgeoisie, England is here taken as the typical country, for its political development, France. [Engels, 1888 English Edition]

Italy and Germany); there taxable "third estate" of the monarchy (as in France); afterwards, in the period of manufacturing proper, serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and, in fact, cornerstone of the great monarchies in general, the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern Industry and of the world market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part.

The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors", and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment". It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom — Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage laborers.

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.

The bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigor in the Middle Ages, which reactionaries so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former Exoduses of nations and crusades.

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind.

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the entire surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connexons everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilized nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the production of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilization. The cheap prices of commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilization into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilized ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralized the means of production, and had concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralization. Independent, or but loosely connected provinces, with separate interests, laws, governments, and systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, one frontier, and one customs-tariff.

The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of Nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam-navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalization of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground — what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labor?

We see then: the means of production and of exchange, on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder.

Into their place stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted in it, and the economic and political sway of the bourgeois class.

A similar movement is going on before our own eyes. Modern bourgeois society, with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeois and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put the existence of the entire bourgeois society on its trial, each time more threateningly. In these crises, a great part not only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises, there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity — the epidemic of over-production. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation, had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed; and why? Because there is too much civilization, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them. And how does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented.

The weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself.

But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons — the modern working class — the proletarians.

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, i.e., capital, is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed — a class of laborers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labor increases capital. These laborers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.

Owing to the extensive use of machinery, and to the division of labor, the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charm for the workman. He becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the simplest, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack, that is required of him. Hence, the cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for maintenance, and for the propagation of his race. But the price of a commodity, and therefore also of labor, is equal to its cost of production. In proportion, therefore, as the repulsiveness of the work increases, the wage decreases. Nay more, in proportion as the use of machinery and division of labor increases, in the same proportion the burden of toil also increases, whether by prolongation of the working hours, by the increase of the work exacted in a given time or by increased speed of machinery, etc.

Modern Industry has converted the little workshop of the patriarchal master into the great factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of laborers, crowded into the factory, are organized like soldiers. As privates of the industrial army, they are placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of officers and sergeants. Not only are they slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois State; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overlooker, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. The more openly this despotism proclaims gain to be its end and aim, the pettier, the more hateful and the more embittering it is.

The less the skill and exertion of strength implied in manual labor, in other words, the more modern industry becomes developed, the more is the labor of men superseded by that of women. Differences of age and sex have no longer any distinctive social validity for the working class. All are instruments of labor, more or less expensive to use, according to their age and sex.

No sooner is the exploitation of the laborer by the manufacturer, so far, at an end, that he receives his wages in cash, then he is set upon by the other portions of the bourgeoisie, the landlord, the shopkeeper, the pawnbroker, etc.

The lower strata of the middle class — the small tradespeople, shopkeepers, and retired tradesmen generally, the handicraftsmen and peasants — all these sinks gradually into the

proletariat, partly because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which Modern Industry is carried on, and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists, partly because their specialized skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production. Thus, the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the population.

The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first the contest is carried on by individual laborers, then by the workpeople of a factory, then by the operative of one trade, in one locality, against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits them. They direct their attacks not against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves; they destroy imported wares that compete with their labor, they smash to pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages.

At this stage, the laborers still form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country, and broken up by their mutual competition. If anywhere they unite to form more compact bodies, this is not yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie, which class, in order to attain its own political ends, is compelled to set the whole proletariat in motion, and is moreover yet, for a time, able to do so. At this stage, therefore, the proletarians do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landowners, the non-industrial bourgeois, the petty bourgeois. Thus, the whole historical movement is concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie; every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie.

But with the development of industry, the proletariat not only increases in number; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength more. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalized, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labor, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level. The growing competition among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The increasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon, the workers begin to form combinations (Trades' Unions) against the bourgeois; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there, the contest breaks out into riots.

Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruit of their battles lies, not in the immediate result, but in the ever-expanding union of the workers. This union is helped on by the improved means of communication that are created by modern industry, and that place the workers of different localities in contact with one another. It was just this contact that was needed to centralize the numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into one national struggle between classes. But every class struggle is a political struggle. And that union, to attain which the burghers of

the Middle Ages, with their miserable highways, required centuries, the modern proletarian, thanks to railways, achieve in a few years.

This organisation of the proletarians into a class, and, consequently into a political party, is continually being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves. But it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers, by taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself. Thus, the ten-hours' bill in England was carried.

Altogether collisions between the classes of the old society further, in many ways, the course of development of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie finds itself involved in a constant battle. At first with the aristocracy; later on, with those portions of the bourgeoisie itself, whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry; at all time with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries. In all these battles, it sees itself compelled to appeal to the proletariat, to ask for help, and thus, to drag it into the political arena. The bourgeoisie itself, therefore, supplies the proletariat with its own elements of political and general education, in other words, it furnishes the proletariat with weapons for fighting the bourgeoisie.

Further, as we have already seen, entire sections of the ruling class are, by the advance of industry, precipitated into the proletariat, or are at least threatened in their conditions of existence. These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress.

Finally, in times when the class struggle nears the decisive hour, the progress of dissolution going on within the ruling class, in fact within the whole range of old society, assumes such a violent, glaring character, that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift, and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands. Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and in particular, a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole.

Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of Modern Industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product.

The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fights against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are therefore not revolutionary, but conservative. Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. If by chance, they are revolutionary, they are only so in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat; they thus defend not their present, but their future interests, they desert their own standpoint to place themselves at that of the proletariat.

The "dangerous class", [*lumpenproletariat*] the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of the old society, may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a

proletarian revolution; its conditions of life, however, prepare it far more for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue.

In the condition of the proletariat, those of old society at large are already virtually swamped. The proletarian is without property; his relation to his wife and children has no longer anything in common with the bourgeois family relations; modern industry labor, modern subjection to capital, the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany, has stripped him of every trace of national character. Law, morality, religion, are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests.

All the preceding classes that got the upper hand sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation. The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property.

All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air.

Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie.

In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.

Hitherto, every form of society has been based, as we have already seen, on the antagonism of oppressing and oppressed classes. But in order to oppress a class, certain conditions must be assured to it under which it can, at least, continue its slavish existence. The serf, in the period of serfdom, raised himself to membership in the commune, just as the petty bourgeois, under the yoke of the feudal absolutism, managed to develop into a bourgeois. The modern laborer, on the contrary, instead of rising with the process of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth. And here it becomes evident, that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society, and to impose its conditions of existence upon society as an over-riding law. It is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because

it cannot help letting him sink into such a state, that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him. Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie, in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society.

The essential conditions for the existence and for the sway of the bourgeois class is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage-labor. Wage-labor rests exclusively on competition between the laborers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the laborers, due to competition, by the revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.

Chapter 2: Proletarians and Communists

In what relation do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole?

The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to the other working-class parties.

They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.

They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own, by which to shape and mold the proletarian movement.

The Communists are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.

The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.

The theoretical conclusions of the Communists are in no way based on ideas or principles that have been invented, or discovered, by this or that would-be universal reformer.

They merely express, in general terms, actual relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes. The abolition of existing property relations is not at all a distinctive feature of communism.

All property relations in the past have continually been subject to historical change consequent upon the change in historical conditions.

The French Revolution, for example, abolished feudal property in favor of bourgeois property.

The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property. But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products, that is based on class antagonisms, on the exploitation of the many by the few.

In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.

We Communists have been reproached with the desire of abolishing the right of personally acquiring property as the fruit of a man's own labor, which property is alleged to be the groundwork of all personal freedom, activity and independence.

Hard-won, self-acquired, self-earned property! Do you mean the property of petty artisan and of the small peasant, a form of property that preceded the bourgeois form? There is no need to abolish that; the development of industry has to a great extent already destroyed it, and is still destroying it daily.

Or do you mean the modern bourgeois private property?

But does wage-labor create any property for the laborer? Not a bit. It creates capital, *i.e.*, that kind of property which exploits wage-labor, and which cannot increase except upon condition of begetting a new supply of wage-labor for fresh exploitation. Property, in its present form, is based on the antagonism of capital and wage labor. Let us examine both sides of this antagonism.

To be a capitalist, is to have not only a purely personal, but a social *status* in production. Capital is a collective product, and only by the united action of many members, nay, in the last resort, only by the united action of all members of society, can it be set in motion.

Capital is therefore not only personal; it is a social power.

When, therefore, capital is converted into common property, into the property of all members of society, personal property is not thereby transformed into social property. It is only the social character of the property that is changed. It loses its class character.

Let us now take wage-labor.

The average price of wage-labor is the minimum wage, *i.e.*, that quantum of the means of subsistence which is absolutely requisite to keep the laborer in bare existence as a laborer. What, therefore, the wage-laborer appropriates by means of his labor, merely suffices to prolong and reproduce a bare existence. We by no means intend to abolish this personal appropriation of the products of labor, an appropriation that is made for the maintenance and reproduction of human life, and that leaves no surplus wherewith to command the labor of others. All that we want to do away with is the miserable character of this appropriation, under which the laborer lives merely to increase capital, and is allowed to live only in so far as the interest of the ruling class requires it.

In bourgeois society, living labor is but a means to increase accumulated labor. In Communist society, accumulated labor is but a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the laborer.

In bourgeois society, therefore, the past dominates the present; in Communist society, the present dominates the past. In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality.

And the abolition of this state of things is called by the bourgeois, abolition of individuality and freedom! And rightly so. The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at.

By freedom is meant, under the present bourgeois conditions of production, free trade, free selling and buying.

But if selling and buying disappears, free selling and buying disappears also. This talk about free selling and buying, and all the other "brave words" of our bourgeois about freedom in general, have a meaning, if any, only in contrast with restricted selling and buying, with the fettered traders of the Middle Ages, but have no meaning when opposed to the Communistic abolition of buying and selling, of the bourgeois conditions of production, and of the bourgeoisie itself.

You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. But in your existing society, private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population; its existence for the few is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine-tenths. You reproach us, therefore, with intending to do away with a form of property, the necessary condition for whose existence is the non-existence of any property for the immense majority of society.

In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend.

From the moment when labor can no longer be converted into capital, money, or rent, into a social power capable of being monopolized, *i.e.*, from the moment when individual property can no longer be transformed into bourgeois property, into capital, from that moment, you say, individuality vanishes.

You must, therefore, confess that by "individual" you mean no other person than the bourgeois, than the middle-class owner of property. This person must, indeed, be swept out of the way, and made impossible.

Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society; all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labor of others by means of such appropriations.

It has been objected that upon the abolition of private property, all work will cease, and universal laziness will overtake us.

According to this, bourgeois society ought long ago to have gone to the dogs through sheer idleness; for those of its members who work, acquire nothing, and those who acquire anything do not work. The whole of this objection is but another expression of the tautology: that there can no longer be any wage-labor when there is no longer any capital.

All objections urged against the Communistic mode of producing and appropriating material products, have, in the same way, been urged against the Communistic mode of producing and appropriating intellectual products. Just as, to the bourgeois, the disappearance of class property is the disappearance of production itself, so the disappearance of class culture is to him identical with the disappearance of all culture.

That culture, the loss of which he laments, is, for the enormous majority, a mere training to act as a machine.

But don't wrangle with us so long as you apply, to our intended abolition of bourgeois property, the standard of your bourgeois notions of freedom, culture, law, &c. Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will whose essential character and direction are determined by the economic conditions of existence of your class.

The selfish misconception that induces you to transform into eternal laws of nature and of reason, the social forms springing from your present mode of production and form of property – historical relations that rise and disappear in the progress of production – this misconception you share with every ruling class that has preceded you. What you see clearly in the case of ancient property, what you admit in the case of feudal property, you are of course forbidden to admit in the case of your own bourgeois form of property.

Abolition [*Aufhebung*] of the family! Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists.

On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form, this family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution.

The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital.

Do you charge us with wanting to stop the exploitation of children by their parents? To this crime we plead guilty.

But, you say, we destroy the most hallowed of relations, when we replace home education by social.

And your education! Is not that also social, and determined by the social conditions under which you educate, by the intervention direct or indirect, of society, by means of schools, &c.? The Communists have not invented the intervention of society in education; they do but seek to alter the character of that intervention, and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class.

The bourgeois clap-trap about the family and education, about the hallowed co-relation of parents and child, becomes all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of Modern Industry, all the family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder, and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labor.

But you Communists would introduce community of women, screams the bourgeoisie in chorus.

The bourgeois sees his wife as a mere instrument of production. He hears that the instruments of production are to be exploited in common, and, naturally, can come to no other conclusion than that the lot of being common to all will likewise fall to the women.

He has not even a suspicion that the real point aimed at is to do away with the status of women as mere instruments of production.

For the rest, nothing is more ridiculous than the virtuous indignation of our bourgeois at the community of women which, they pretend, is to be openly and officially established by the Communists. The Communists have no need to introduce community of women; it has existed almost from time immemorial.

Our bourgeois, not content with having wives and daughters of their proletarians at their disposal, not to speak of common prostitutes, take the greatest pleasure in seducing each other's wives.

Bourgeois marriage is, in reality, a system of wives in common and thus, at the most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized community of women. For the rest, it is self-evident that the abolition of the present system of production must bring with it the abolition of the community of women springing from that system, *i.e.*, of prostitution both public and private.

The Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationality.

The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got. Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself *the* nation, it is so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word.

National differences and antagonism between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world market, to uniformity in the mode of production and in the conditions of life corresponding thereto.

The supremacy of the proletariat will cause them to vanish still faster. United action, of the leading civilized countries at least, is one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat.

In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another will also be put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end.

The charges against Communism made from a religious, a philosophical and, generally, from an ideological standpoint, are not deserving of serious examination.

Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views, and conception, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life?

What else does the history of ideas prove, then that intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class.

When people speak of the ideas that revolutionize society, they do but express that fact that within the old society the elements of a new one have been created, and that the dissolution of the old ideas keeps even pace with the dissolution of the old conditions of existence.

When the ancient world was in its last throes, the ancient religions were overcome by Christianity. When Christian ideas succumbed in the 18th century to rationalist ideas, feudal society fought its death battle with the then revolutionary bourgeoisie. The ideas of religious liberty and freedom of conscience merely gave expression to the sway of free competition within the domain of knowledge.

"Undoubtedly," it will be said, "religious, moral, philosophical, and juridical ideas have been modified in the course of historical development. But religion, morality, philosophy, political science, and law, constantly survived this change."

"There are, besides, eternal truths, such as Freedom, Justice, etc., that are common to all states of society. But Communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religion, and all morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis; it therefore acts in contradiction to all past historical experience."

What does this accusation reduce itself to? The history of all past society has consisted in the development of class antagonisms, antagonisms that assumed different forms at different epochs.

But whatever form they may have taken, one fact is common to all past ages, *viz.*, the exploitation of one part of society by the other. No wonder, then, that the social consciousness of past ages, despite all the multiplicity and variety it displays, moves within certain common forms, or general ideas, which cannot completely vanish except with the total disappearance of class antagonisms.

The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involved the most radical rupture with traditional ideas.

But let us have done with the bourgeois objections to Communism.

We have seen above, that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class to win the battle of democracy.

The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State, *i.e.*, of the proletariat organized as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.

Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production; by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which, in the course of the movement, outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order, and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionizing the mode of production.

These measures will, of course, be different in different countries.

Nevertheless, in most advanced countries, the following will be pretty generally applicable.

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.

7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste-lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country by a more equable distribution of the populace over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, &c, &c.

When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.

Unit 2: Marxism, Base of Revolutionary Struggle

Topics Covered:

I. The theory of revolution.
II. Development of Marxism; its stages.
III. Mao Tse-tung Thought

Bibliography:

- Chen Po-ta:
  - Mao Tse-tung on the Chinese Revolution.
- Lenin:
  - The Historical Destiny of The Teaching of Karl Marx.
- Mao Zedong:
  - Quotations, Chapter XXIII.
  - Reform our Study. Selected Works, Vol. III.
  - Our Study and the Current Situation; part I and III. Selected Works, Vol. III.
  - Rectify the Party's Style of Work. Selected Works, Vol III.

- Stalin:
    - Foundations of Leninism: Introduction, The Historical Roots of Leninism.

Selection:

Chen Po-ta: Mao Tse-tung on the Chinese Revolution.

Section 1: Comrade Mao Tse-tung Is the Most Outstanding Exponent of Marxism-Leninism in China

Comrade Mao Zedong writes in On People's Democratic Dictatorship:

> "The salvoes of the October Revolution awoke us to Marxism-Leninism. The October Revolution helped the progressives of China and of the whole world to adopt the proletarian world outlook as an instrument for foreseeing a nation's future and considering anew one's own problems. 'Follow the path of the Russians' was the conclusion."

As everybody knows, the first and most outstanding representative of such progressives in China is none other than Comrade Mao Zedong.

Comrade Mao Zedong's greatest contribution to the Chinese revolution is his correct and living synthesis of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the actual practice of the Chinese revolution, which has resulted in the solution of a series of problems in the Chinese revolution. He has further developed the science of Marxism-Leninism with reference to the conditions in China and in the East, there-by leading the Chinese people's revolution to victory.

Comrade Mao Zedong says:

> "The theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin is a 'universally applicable' truth." [30]

However, to correctly apply their theory to China and to transform it into an invincible power of the masses, it is essential to make constant efforts to clear away ideological obstacles and to wage ideological struggles, and bitter struggles at that. For 30 years Comrade Mao Zedong has waged unceasing and irreconcilable struggles against various reactionary ideologies outside the Party and against opportunism which took various forms inside the Party; such as the struggles against the nationalists, against the Right wing and the compromisers within the Kuomintang, against Chen Tu-hsiu-ism and Trotskyism, against the Right wing of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie who harbored various reformist illusions about the reactionary Kuomintang rule, against the "Left" adventurism which occur-red inside the Party on several occasions, against the repetition of the mistakes of Chen Tu-hsiu-ism and so forth and so on. In the course of this series of struggles, Comrade Mao Zedong has proved himself a great master in propagating and applying the revolutionary theories of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The series of struggles which he conducted have served to strengthen and consolidate the Communist Party of China.

[30] *The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War.*

Marxism-Leninism is characterized by its unity of theory and practice. Following in the footsteps of the great teachers—Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin—Comrade Mao Zedong likewise pays the utmost attention to the great creative power of the revolutionary masses in revolutionary China. Comrade Mao Zedong has never separated his Marxist-Leninist theoretical work from the revolutionary movement of the masses. Under all circumstances and at all times, he combines Marxist-Leninist theory with the practice of the Chinese revolution and "uses the basic Marxist viewpoint-the method of class analysis," as Comrade Mao Zedong often says, to study, absorb and crystallize the practical experiences of the Chinese revolution. By so doing the correct-ness of Marxism-Leninism has been further demonstrated and its boundless, living, revolutionary power revealed.

It is precisely by relying upon the creative power of the revolutionary masses of China; by relying upon the many-sided, complex experiences of the Chinese revolution (it is precisely on this basis) that Comrade Mao Zedong has developed Marxism-Leninism, forcing every kind of nonsense aimed at vitiating or distorting Marxism-Leninism to declare its bankruptcy before the masses.

In his famous article On the Significance of Militant Materialism published in 1922, Lenin said:

> "...the dialectics which Marx. . applied so successfully that now every day of the awakening to life and struggle of new classes in the East (Japan, India and China) –I.e., the hundreds of millions of human beings who form the greater part of the population of the world and whose historical passivity and historical torpor have hitherto been conditions responsible for stagnation and decay in many advanced European countries— every day of the awakening to life of new peoples and new classes serves as a fresh confirmation of Marxism."

Without doubt, the very fact that the Chinese under the leadership of the Chinese people working class rose to struggle and have recently won great victories is a fresh confirmation of the large-scale, outstanding victory of Marxism-Leninism in the East; a confirmation that the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin are a universal, all-powerful science applicable everywhere without exception; and a confirmation that Comrade Mao Zedong, the leader of the Communist Party of China, has applied this science to the conditions of China and developed it with very brilliant success.

V. I. Lenin: The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx

The chief thing in the doctrine of Marx is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society. Has the course of events all over the world confirmed this doctrine since it was expounded by Marx?

Marx first advanced it in 1844. The Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, published in 1848, gave an integral and systematic exposition of this doctrine, an exposition which has remained the best to this day. Since then, world history has clearly been divided into three main periods: (1)

from the revolution of 1848 to the Paris Commune (1871); (2) from the Paris Commune to the Russian revolution (1905); (3) since the Russian revolution.

Let us see what has been the destiny of Marx's doctrine in each of these periods.

I

At the beginning of the first period Marx's doctrine by no means dominated. It was only one of the very numerous groups or trends of socialism. The forms of socialism that did dominate were in the main akin to our Narodism: in comprehension of the materialist basis of historical movement, inability to single out the role and significance of each class in capitalist society, concealment of the bourgeois nature of democratic reforms under diverse, quasi-socialist phrases about the "people", "justice", "right", and so on.

The revolution of 1848 struck a deadly blow at all these vociferous, motley and ostentatious forms of pre-Marxian socialism. In all countries, the revolution revealed the various classes of society *in action*. The shooting of the workers by the republican bourgeoisie in Paris in the June days of 1848 finally revealed that the proletariat *alone* was socialist by nature. The liberal bourgeoisie dreaded the independence of this class a hundred times more than it did any kind of reaction. The craven liberals groveled before reaction. The peasantry was content with the abolition of the survivals of feudalism and joined the supporters of order, wavering but occasionally between *workers' democracy and bourgeois liberalism*. All doctrines of non-class socialism and *non*-class politics proved to be sheer nonsense.

The Paris Commune (1871) completed this development of bourgeois changes; the republic, i.e., the form of political organisation in which class relations appear in their most unconcealed form, owed its consolidation solely to the heroism of the proletariat.

In all the other European countries, a more tangled and less complete development led to the same result—a bourgeois society that had taken definite shape. Towards the end of the first period (1848–71), a period of storms and revolutions, pre-Marxian socialism was *dead*. Independent *proletarian* parties came into being: the First International (1864–72) and the German Social-Democratic Party.

II

The second period (1872–1904) was distinguished from the first by its "peaceful" character, by the absence of revolutions. The West had finished with bourgeois revolutions. The East had not yet risen to them.

The West entered a phase of "peaceful" preparations for the changes to come. Socialist parties, basically proletarian, were formed everywhere, and learned to use bourgeois parliamentarism and to found their own daily press, their educational institutions, their trade unions and their co-operative societies. Marx's doctrine gained a complete victory and *began to spread*. The selection and mustering

of the forces of the proletariat and its preparation for the coming battles made slow but steady progress.

The dialectics of history were such that the theoretical victory of Marxism compelled its enemies to *disguise themselves* as Marxists. Liberalism, rotten within, tried to revive itself in the form of socialist *opportunism*. They interpreted the period of preparing the forces for great battles as renunciation of these battles. Improvement of the conditions of the slaves to fight against wage slavery they took to mean the sale by the slaves of their right to liberty for a few pence. They cravenly preached "social peace" (i.e., peace with the slave-owners), renunciation of the class struggle, etc. They had very many adherents among socialist members of parliament, various officials of the working-class movement, and the "sympathizing" intelligentsia.

III

However, the opportunists had scarcely congratulated themselves on "social peace" and on the non-necessity of storms under "democracy" when a new source of great world storms opened up in Asia. The Russian revolution was followed by revolutions in Turkey, Persia and China. It is in this era of storms and their "repercussions" in Europe that we are now living. No matter what the fate of the great Chinese republic, against which various "civilized" hyenas are now whetting their teeth, no power on earth can restore the old serfdom in Asia or wipe out the heroic democracy of the masses in the Asiatic and semi-Asiatic countries.

Certain people who were inattentive to the conditions for preparing and developing the mass struggle were driven to despair and to anarchism by the lengthy delays in the decisive struggle against capitalism in Europe. We can now see how short-sighted and faint-hearted this anarchist despair is.

The fact that Asia, with its population of eight hundred million, has been drawn into the struggle for these same European ideals should inspire us with optimism and not despair.

The Asiatic revolutions have again shown us the spinelessness and baseness of liberalism, the exceptional importance of the independence of the democratic masses, and the pronounced demarcation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie of all kinds. After the experience both of Europe and Asia, anyone who speaks of non-class politics and non-class socialism, ought simply to be put in a cage and exhibited alongside the Australian kangaroo or something like that.

After Asia, Europe has also begun to stir, although not in the Asiatic way. The "peaceful" period of 1872–1904 has passed, never to return. The high cost of living and the tyranny of the trusts are leading to an unprecedented sharpening of the economic struggle, which has set into movement even the British workers who have been most corrupted by liberalism. We, see a political crisis brewing even in the most "diehard", bourgeois-Junker country, Germany. The frenzied arming and the policy of imperialism are turning modern Europe into a "social peace" which is more like a

gunpowder barrel. Meanwhile the decay of *all* the bourgeois parties and the maturing of the proletariat are making steady progress.

Since the appearance of Marxism, each of the three great periods of world history has brought Marxism new confirmation and new triumphs. But a still greater triumph awaits Marxism, as the doctrine of the proletariat, in the coming period of history.

Mao Zedong: Quotations from Mao Zedong

Chapter 24: Investigation and Study

Everyone engaged in practical work must investigate conditions at the lower levels. Such investigation is especially necessary for those who know theory but do not know the actual conditions, for otherwise they will not be able to link theory with practice. Although my assertion, "No investigation no right to speak", has been ridiculed as "narrow empiricism", to this day I do not regret having made it; far from regretting it, I still insist that without investigation there cannot possibly be any right to speak. There are many people who "the moment they alight from the official carriage" make a hullabaloo, spout opinions, criticize this and condemn that; but, in fact, ten out of ten of them will meet with failure. For such views or criticisms, which are not based on thorough investigation, are nothing but ignorant twaddle. Countless times our Party suffered at the hands of these "imperial envoys", who rushed here, there and everywhere. Stalin rightly says "theory becomes purposeless if it is not connected with revolutionary practice". And he rightly adds that "practice gropes in the dark if its path is not illumined by revolutionary theory". Nobody should be labeled a "narrow empiricist" except the "practical man" who gropes in the dark and lacks perspective and foresight.

"Preface and Postscript to Rural Surveys" (March and April 1941), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 13. *

To take such an attitude is to seek truth from facts. "Facts" are all the things that exist objectively, "truth" means their internal relations, that is, the laws governing them, and "to seek," means to study. We should proceed from the actual conditions inside and outside the country, the province, county or district, and derive from them, as our guide to action, laws that are inherent in them and not imaginary, that is, we should find the internal relations of the events occurring around us. And in order to do that we must rely not on subjective imagination, not on momentary enthusiasm, not on lifeless books, but on facts that exist objectively; we must appropriate the material in detail and, guided by the general principles of Marxism-Leninism, draw correct conclusions from it.

"Reform Our Study" (May 1941), Selected Works, Vol. III, pp. 22-23.

To behave like "a blindfolded man catching sparrows", or "a blind man groping for fish", to be crude and careless, to indulge in verbiage, to rest content with a smattering of knowledge - such is the extremely bad style of work that still exists among many comrades in our Party, a style utterly opposed to the fundamental spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have taught

us that it is necessary to study conditions conscientiously and to proceed from objective reality and not from subjective wishes; however, many of our comrades act in direct violation of this truth.

Ibid. p. 18.

You can't solve a problem? Well, get down and investigate the present facts and its past history! When you have investigated the problem thoroughly, you will know how to solve it. Conclusions invariably come after investigation, and not before. Only a blockhead cudgels his brains on his own, or together with a group, to "find a solution" or "evolve an idea" without making any investigation. It must be stressed that this cannot possibly lead to any effective solution or any good idea.

Oppose Book Worship (May 1930), 1st pocket ed., and p. 2.

Investigation may be likened to the long months of pregnancy, and solving a problem to the day of birth. To investigate a problem is, indeed, to solve it.

Ibid. p. 3.

[With the Marxist-Leninist attitude,] a person applies the theory and method of Marxism-Leninism to the systematic and thorough investigation and study of the environment. He does not work by enthusiasm alone but, as Stalin says, combines revolutionary sweep with practicalness.

"Reform Our Study" (May 1941), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 22.

The only way to know conditions is to make social investigations, to investigate the conditions of each social class in real life. For those charged with directing work, the basic method for knowing conditions is to concentrate on a few cities and villages according to a plan and, using the fundamental viewpoint of Marxism, i.e., the method of class analysis, make a number of thorough investigations.

"Preface and Postscript to Rural Surveys" (March and April 1941), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 11. *

A fact-finding meeting need not be large; from three to five or seven or eight people are enough. Ample time must be allowed and an outline for the investigation must be prepared; furthermore, one must personally ask questions, take notes and have discussions with those at the meeting. Therefore, one certainly cannot make an investigation, or do it well, without zeal, a determination to direct one's eyes downward and a thirst for knowledge, and without shedding the ugly mantle of pretentiousness and becoming a willing pupil.

Ibid. p. 12.

A commander's correct dispositions stem from his correct decisions, his correct decisions stem from his correct judgements, and his correct judgements stem from a thorough and necessary reconnaissance and from pondering on and piecing together the data of various kinds gathered through reconnaissance. He applies all possible and necessary methods of reconnaissance, and ponders on the information gathered about the enemy's situation, discarding the dross and selecting

the essential, eliminating the false and retaining the true, proceeding from the one to the other and from the outside to the inside; then, he takes the conditions on his own side into account, and makes a study of both sides and their interrelations, thereby forming his judgements, making up his mind and working out his plans. Such is the complete process of knowing a situation that a military man goes through before he formulates a strategic plan, a campaign plan or a battle plan.

"Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War" (December 1936), Selected Works, Vol. I. p. 188.

Mao Zedong: Reform Our Study

[Comrade Mao Tse-tung made this report to a cadres' meeting in Yenan. The report and the two articles, "Rectify the Party's Style of Work" and "Oppose Stereotyped Party Writing", are Comrade Mao Tse-tung's basic works on the rectification movement. In these he summed up, on the ideological plane, past differences in the Party over the Party line and analyzed the petty-bourgeois ideology and style which, masquerading as Marxism-Leninism, were prevalent in the Party, and which chiefly manifested themselves in subjectivist and sectarian tendencies, their form of expression being stereotyped Party writing. Comrade Mao Tse-tung called for a Party-wide movement of Marxist-Leninist education to rectify style of work in accordance with the ideological principles of Marxism-Leninism. His call very quickly led to a great debate between proletarian and petty-bourgeois ideology inside and outside the Party. This consolidated the position of proletarian ideology inside and outside the Party, enabled the broad ranks of cadres to take a great step forward ideologically and the Party to achieve unprecedented unity.]

I propose that we should reform the method and the system of study throughout the Party. The reasons are as follows:

I

The twenty years of the Communist Party of China have been twenty years in which the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism has become more and more integrated with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. If we recall how superficial meagre our understanding of Marxism-Leninism and of the Chinese revolution was during our Party's infancy, we can see how much deeper and richer it is now. For a hundred years, the finest sons and daughters of the disaster-ridden Chinese nation fought and sacrificed their lives, one stepping into the breach as another fell, in quest of the truth that would save the country and the people. This moves us to song and tears. But it was only after World War I and the October Revolution in Russia that we found Marxism-Leninism, the best of truths, the best of weapons for liberating our nation. And the Communist Party of China has been the initiator, propagandist and organizer in the wielding of this weapon. As soon as it was linked with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution, the universal truth of Marxism Leninism gave an entirely new complexion to the Chinese revolution. Since the outbreak of the War of Resistance Against Japan, our Party, basing itself on the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, has taken a further step in its study of the concrete practice of this war and in its study of China and the world today, and has also made a beginning in the study of Chinese history. These are all very good signs.

II

However, we still have shortcomings, and very big ones too. Unless we correct these shortcomings, we shall not, in my opinion, be able to take another step forward in our work and in our great cause of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution.

First, take the study of current conditions. We have achieved some success in our study of present domestic and international conditions, but for such a large political party as ours, the material we have collected is fragmentary and our research work unsystematic on each and every aspect of these subjects, whether it be the political, military, economic or cultural aspect. Generally speaking, in the last twenty years we have not done systematic and thorough work in collecting and studying material on these aspects, and we are lacking in a climate of investigation and study of objective reality. To behave like "a blindfolded man catching sparrows", or "a blind man groping for fish", to be crude and careless, to indulge in verbiage, to rest content with a smattering of knowledge--such is the extremely bad style of work that still exists among many comrades in our Party, a style utterly opposed to the fundamental spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have taught us that it is necessary to study conditions conscientiously and to proceed from objective reality and not from subjective wishes; but many of our comrades act in direct violation of this truth.

Second, take the study of history. Although a few Party members and sympathizers have undertaken this work, it has not been done in an organized way. Many Party members are still in a fog about Chinese history, whether of the last hundred years or of ancient times. There are many Marxist-Leninist scholars who cannot open their mouths without citing ancient Greece; but as for their own ancestors--sorry, they have been forgotten. There is no climate of serious study either of current conditions or of past history.

Third, take the study of international revolutionary experience, the study of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism. Many comrades seem to study Marxism-Leninism not to meet the needs of revolutionary practice, but purely for the sake of study. Consequently, though they read, they cannot digest. They can only cite odd quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin in a one-sided manner, but are unable to apply the stand, viewpoint and method of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin to the concrete study of China's present conditions and her history or to the concrete analysis and solution of the problems of the Chinese revolution. Such an attitude towards Marxism-Leninism does a great deal of harm, particularly among cadres of the middle and higher ranks.

The three aspects I have just mentioned, neglect of the study of current conditions, neglect of the study of history and neglect of the application of Marxism-Leninism, all constitute an extremely bad style of work. Its spread has harmed many of our comrades.

There are indeed many comrades in our ranks who have been led astray by this style of work. Unwilling to carry on systematic and thorough investigation and study of the specific conditions

inside and outside the country, the province, county or district, they issue orders on no other basis than their scanty knowledge and "It must be so because it seems so to me". Does not this subjectivist style still exist among a great many comrades?

There are some who are proud, instead of ashamed, of knowing nothing or very little of our own history. What is particularly significant is that very few really know the history of the Communist Party of China and the history of China in the hundred years since the Opium War. Hardly anyone has seriously taken up the study of the economic, political, military and cultural history of the last hundred years. Ignorant of their own country, some people can only relate tales of ancient Greece and other foreign lands, and even this knowledge is quite pathetic, consisting of odds and ends from old foreign books.

For several decades, many of the returned students from abroad have suffered from this malady. Coming home from Europe, America or Japan, they can only parrot things foreign. They become gramophones and forget their duty to understand and create new things. This malady has also infected the Communist Party.

Although we are studying Marxism, the way many of our people study it runs directly counter to Marxism. That is to say, they violate the fundamental principle earnestly enjoined on us by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the unity of theory and practice. Having violated this principle, they invent an opposite principle of their own, the separation of theory from practice. In the schools and in the education of cadres at work, teachers of philosophy do not guide students to study the logic of the Chinese revolution; teachers of economics do not guide them to study the characteristics of the Chinese economy; teachers of political science do not guide them to study the tactics of the Chinese revolution; teachers of military science do not guide them to study the strategy and tactics adapted to China's special features; and so on and so forth. Consequently, error is disseminated, doing people great harm. A person does not know how to apply in Fuhsien [31] what he has learned in Yenan. Professors of economics cannot explain the relationship between the Border Region currency and the Kuomintang currency, [32] so naturally the students cannot explain it either. Thus, a perverse mentality has been created among many students; instead of showing an interest in China's problems and taking the Party's directives seriously, they give all their hearts to the supposedly eternal and immutable dogmas learned from their teachers.

Of course, what I have just said refers to the worst type in our Party, and I am not saying that it is the general case. However, people of this type do exist; what is more, there are quite a few of them and they cause a great deal of harm. This matter should not be treated lightly.

---

[31] Fuhsien County is about seventy kilometers south of Yenan.

[32] The Border Region currency consisted of the currency notes issued by the Bank of the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region Government. The Kuomintang currency was the paper currency issued by the four big Kuomintang bureaucrat-capitalist banks from 1935 onwards with British and U.S. imperialist support. Comrade Mao Tse-tung was referring to the fluctuations in the rates of exchange between these two currencies.

III

In order to explain this idea further, I should like to contrast two opposite attitudes.

First, there is the subjectivist attitude.

With this attitude, a person does not make a systematic and thorough study of the environment, but works by sheer subjective enthusiasm and has a blurred picture of the face of China today. With this attitude, he chops up history, knows only ancient Greece but not China and is in a fog about the China of yesterday and the day before yesterday. With this attitude, a person studies Marxist-Leninist theory in the abstract and without any aim. He goes to Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin not to seek the stand, viewpoint and method with which to solve the theoretical and tactical problems of the Chinese revolution but to study theory purely for theory's sake. He does not shoot the arrow at the target but shoots at random. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have taught us that we should proceed from objective realities and that we should derive laws from them to serve as our guide to action. For this purpose, we should, as Marx has said, appropriate the material in detail and subject it to scientific analysis and synthesis. [33] Many of our people do not act in this way but do the opposite. A good number of them are doing research work but have no interest in studying either the China of today or the China of yesterday and confine their interest to the study of empty "theories" divorced from reality. Many others are doing practical work, but they too pay no attention to the study of objective conditions, often rely on sheer enthusiasm and substitute their personal feelings for policy. Both kinds of people, relying on the subjective, ignore the existence of objective realities. When making speeches, they indulge in a long string of headings, A, B, C, D, 1, 2, 3, 4, and when writing articles, they turn out a lot of verbiage. They have no intention of seeking truth from facts, but only a desire to curry favor by claptrap. They are flashy without substance, brittle without solidity. They are always right, they are the Number One authority under Heaven, "imperial envoys" who rush everywhere. Such is the style of work of some comrades in our ranks. To govern one's own conduct by this style is to harm oneself, to teach it to others is to harm others, and to use it to direct the revolution is to harm the revolution. To sum up, this subjectivist method which is contrary to science and Marxism-Leninism is a formidable enemy of the Communist Party, the working class, the people and the nation; it is a manifestation of impurity in Party spirit. A formidable enemy stands before us, and we must overthrow him. Only when subjectivism is overthrown can the truth of Marxism-Leninism prevail, can Party spirit be strengthened, can the revolution be victorious. We must assert that the absence of a scientific attitude, that is, the absence of the Marxist-Leninist approach of uniting theory and practice, means that Party spirit is either absent or deficient.

There is a couplet which portrays this type of person. It runs:

---

[33] See Karl Marx, "Afterword to the Second German Edition" of Capital in which he wrote: "The latter [the method of inquiry] has to appropriate the material in detail, to analyze its different forms of development, to trace out their inner connexon. Only after this work is done, can the actual movement be adequately described." (Capital, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, Vol. I, p. 19.)

The reed growing on the wall--top-heavy, thin-stemmed and shallow of root;

The bamboo shoot in the hills--sharp-tongued, thick-skinned and hollow inside.

Is this not an apt description of those who do not have a scientific attitude, who can only recite words and phrases from the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and who enjoy a reputation unwarranted by any real learning? If anyone really wishes to cure himself of his malady, I advise him to commit this couplet to memory or to show still more courage and paste it on the wall of his room. Marxism-Leninism is a science, and science means honest, solid knowledge; there is no room for playing tricks. Let us, then, be honest.

Secondly, there is the Marxist-Leninist attitude.

With this attitude, a person applies the theory and method of Marxism-Leninism to the systematic and thorough investigation and study of the environment. He does not work by enthusiasm alone but, as Stalin says, combines revolutionary sweep with practicalness. [34] With this attitude he will not chop up history. It is not enough for him to know ancient Greece, he must know China; he must know the revolutionary history not only of foreign countries but also of China, not only the China of today but also the China of yesterday and of the day before yesterday. With this attitude, one studies the theory of Marxism-Leninism with a purpose, that is, to integrate Marxist-Leninist theory with the actual movement of the Chinese revolution and to seek from this theory the stand, viewpoint and method with which to solve the theoretical and tactical problems of the Chinese revolution. Such an attitude is one of shooting the arrow at the target. The "target" is the Chinese revolution, the "arrow" is Marxism-Leninism. We Chinese Communists have been seeking this arrow because we want to hit the target of the Chinese revolution and of the revolution of the East. To take such an attitude is to seek truth from facts. "Facts" are all the things that exist objectively, "truth" means their internal relations, that is, the laws governing them, and "to seek" means to study. We should proceed from the actual conditions inside and outside the country, the province, county or district, and derive from them, as our guide to action, laws which are inherent in them and not imaginary, that is, we should find the internal relations of the events occurring around us. And in order to do that we must rely not on subjective imagination, not on momentary enthusiasm, not on lifeless books, but on facts that exist objectively; we must appropriate the material in detail and, guided by the general principles of Marxism-Leninism, draw correct conclusions from it. Such conclusions are not mere lists of phenomena in A, B, C, D order or writings full of platitudes, but are scientific conclusions. Such an attitude is one of seeking truth from facts and not of currying favor by claptrap. It is the manifestation of Party spirit, the Marxist-Leninist style of uniting theory and practice. It is the attitude every Communist Party member should have at the very least. He who adopts this attitude will be neither "top-heavy, thin-stemmed and shallow of root" nor "sharp-tongued, thick-skinned and hollow inside".

[34] See J. V. Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism", Problems of Leninism Russ. ed., Moscow, 1952, p. 80.

IV

In accordance with the above views, I would like to make the following proposals:

1. We should place before the whole Party the task of making a systematic and thorough study of the situation around us. On the basis of the theory and method of Marxism-Leninism, we should make a detailed investigation and study of developments in the economic, financial, political, military, cultural and party activities of our enemies, our friends and ourselves, and then draw the proper and necessary conclusions. To this end, we should direct our comrades' attention to the investigation and study of these practical matters. We should get our comrades to understand that the twofold basic task of the leading bodies of the Communist Party is to know conditions and to master policy; the former means knowing the world and the latter changing the world. We should get our comrades to understand that without investigation there is no right to speak, and that bombastic twaddle and a mere list of phenomena in 1, 2, 3, 4 orders are of no use. Take propaganda work, for instance; if we do not know the situation with regard to the propaganda of our enemies, our friends and ourselves, we shall be unable to decide on a correct propaganda policy. In the work of any department, it is necessary to know the situation first and only then can the work be well handled. The fundamental link in changing the Party's style of work is to carry out plans for investigation and study throughout the Party.

2. As for China's history in the last hundred years, we should assemble qualified persons to study it, in co-operation and with a proper division of labor, and so overcome the present disorganized state of affairs. First it is necessary to make analytical studies in the several fields of economic history, political history, military history and cultural history, and only then will it be possible to make synthetical studies.

3. As for education for cadres whether at work or in schools for cadres, a policy should be established of focusing such education on the study of the practical problems of the Chinese revolution and using the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism as the guide, and the method of studying Marxism-Leninism statically and in isolation should be discarded. Moreover, in studying Marxism-Leninism, we should use the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course* as the principal material. It is the best synthesis and summing-up of the world communist movement of the past hundred years, a model of the integration of theory and practice, and so far, the only comprehensive model in the whole world. When we see how Lenin and Stalin integrated the universal truth of Marxism with the concrete practice of the Soviet revolution and thereby developed Marxism, we shall know how we should work in China.

We have made many detours. But error is often the precursor of what is correct. I am confident that in the context of the Chinese revolution and the world revolution, which is so intensely alive and so richly varied, this reform of our study will certainly yield good results.

[From 1942 to 1944 the central organ and senior cadres of the Communist Party of China held discussions on the history of the Party, especially of the period from the beginning of 1931 to the end of 1934. These discussions greatly helped in bringing about ideological unity in the Party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee at Tsunyi, Kweichow, in January 1935, had corrected the erroneous "Left" line pursued from early 1931 to late 1934, changed the composition of the central leading organ, established the leadership headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung and set the Party line on the correct Marxist-Leninist track; nevertheless, many Party cadres had not yet reached a thorough understanding of the character of the erroneous lines of the past. In order to raise the Marxist-Leninist ideological level of Party cadres still higher, in 1942-43 the Political Bureau held several discussions on the history of the Party, and then led the senior cadres of the whole Party in holding similar discussions during 1943-44. These discussions were an important preparation for the Seventh National Congress of the Party in 1945, enabling it to attain an ideological and political unity without precedent in the history of the Communist Party of China. "Our Study and the Current Situation" was a speech made by Comrade Mao Tse-tung at a meeting of senior cadres in Yenan on April 12, 1944 on the subject of these discussions.]

I

Since last winter, the senior cadres of our Party have been studying the question of the two lines that existed in the history of the Party. This has very greatly raised the political level of those numerous senior cadres. In the course of the study, comrades have brought up many questions, and the Political Bureau of the Central Committee has reached conclusions on some of the important ones. They are as follows:

1. On the question of what attitude to adopt in studying our historical experience. The Central Committee holds that we should enable the cadres to become perfectly clear ideologically on the questions which arose in the history of the Party and that at the same time we should adopt a lenient policy in arriving at decisions about comrades who formerly committed errors, so that on the one hand the cadres should thoroughly understand the historical experience of our Party and avoid repeating past errors, and on the other hand all comrades can be united for our common endeavor. In the history of our Party there were great struggles against the erroneous lines of Chen Tu-hsiu [35] and of Li Li-san, and they were absolutely necessary. But there were defects in the methods employed. For one thing, the cadres were not brought to a full ideological understanding of the causes of these

[35] Chen Tu-hsiu was originally a professor at Peking University and became famous as an editor of New Youth. He was one of the founders of the Communist Party of China. Because of his reputation at the time of the May 4th Movement and owing to the Party's immaturity in its initial period, he became General Secretary of the Party. In the last period of the revolution of 1924-27, the Rightist thinking in the Party represented by Chen Tu-hsiu developed into a line of capitulationism. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has observed that the capitulationists at that dime "voluntarily gave up the Party's leadership of the peasant masses, urban petty bourgeoisie and middle bourgeoisie, and in particular gave up the Party's leadership of the armed forces, thus causing the defeat of the revolution" ("The Present Situation and Our Tasks", Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Eng. ed., FLP, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 171). After the defeat of 1927 Chen Tu-hsiu and a handful of other capitulationists lost faith in the future of the revolution and became liquidationists. They took the reactionary Trotskyist stand and together with the Trotskyites formed a small anti-Party group. Consequently Chen Tu-hsiu was expelled from the Party in November 1929. He died in 1942.

errors, the circumstances in which they were committed and the detailed ways and means of correcting them, so that errors of a similar nature came to be repeated; and for another, too much stress was placed on the responsibility of individuals, so that we failed to unite as many people as we could have done for our common endeavor. We should take warning from those two defects. This time, in dealing with questions of Party history we should lay the stress not on the responsibility of certain individual comrades but on the analysis of the circumstances in which the errors were committed, on the content of the errors and on their social, historical and ideological roots, and this should be done in the spirit of "learning from past mistakes to avoid future ones" and "curing the sickness to save the patient", in order to achieve the twofold objective of clarity in ideology and unity among comrades. The adoption of a careful attitude in handling cases of individual comrades, neither glossing things over nor doing harm to comrades, is a sign that our Party is vigorous and flourishing

2. Treat all questions analytically; do not negate everything. The question concerning the line of the central leadership during the period from the Fourth Plenary Session [36] to the Tsunyi Meeting, [37] for example, should be analyzed from two aspects. It should be pointed out on the one hand that the political tactics, the military tactics and the cadres policy which the central leading body adopted during that period were wrong in their main aspects, but on the other hand that on such fundamental issues as opposing Chiang Kai-shek and carrying on the Agrarian Revolution and the struggle of the Red Army there was no dispute between ourselves and the comrades who committed errors. And even the tactical side needs to be analyzed. On the land question, for instance, their error consisted in the ultra-Left policy of allotting no land to the landlords and poor land to the rich peasants, but these comrades were at one with us on confiscating the land of the landlords for distribution among peasants who had little or no land. Concrete analysis of concrete conditions, Lenin said, is "the most essential thing in Marxism, the living soul of Marxism". [38] Lacking an analytical approach, many of our comrades do not want to go deeply into complex matters, to analyze and study them over and over again, but like to draw simple conclusions which are either absolutely affirmative or absolutely negative. The fact that our newspapers are lacking in analytical articles and that the habit of analysis is not yet fully cultivated in the Party shows that there are such shortcomings. From now on we should remedy this state of affairs.

3. On the discussion of the documents of the Sixth National Congress of the Party. It should be stated that the line of the Sixth National Congress was basically correct, since that Congress defined the character of the present revolution as bourgeois-democratic, defined the situation at that time as an interval between two revolutionary high tides, repudiated opportunism and putschism and

[36] The Fourth Plenary Session of the Sixth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China was held in January 1931.
[37] The Tsunyi Meeting was the enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau called by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China at Tsunyi Kweichow Province, in January 1935.
[38] See V. I. Lenin, " 'Communism' ", in which Lenin, criticizing the Hungarian Communist Bela Kun, said that he "gives up the most essential thing in Marxism, the living soul of Marxism, the concrete analysis of concrete conditions" (Collected Works, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1950, Vol. XXXI, p. 143).

promulgated the Ten-Point Programme. [39] All this was correct. The Congress also had its defects. For instance, among its other shortcomings or mistakes, it failed to point out the very protracted nature of the Chinese revolution and the very great importance of rural base areas in the revolution. Nonetheless, the Sixth National Congress played a progressive role in the history of our Party.

4. On the question of whether the provisional central leadership that was formed in Shanghai in 1931 and the Fifth Plenary Session [40] which it subsequently convened were legal or not. The Central Committee holds that both were legal, but it should be stated that the procedures for the election were inadequate and that this case should be taken as a historical lesson.

5. On the question of factions in the history of the Party. It should be stated that as a result of the series of changes since the Tsunyi Meeting the factions which formerly existed and played an unwholesome role in the history of our Party no longer exist. In our present study of the two lines within the Party, it is absolutely necessary to point out that those factions did exist and did play an unwholesome role. But it would be wrong to think that factions with the same erroneous political program and organizational forms still exist in the Party, after all the changes brought about by so many inner-Party struggles--the Tsunyi Meeting of January 1935, the Sixth Plenary Session of the Sixth Central Committee in October 1938, the enlarged session of the Political Bureau in September 1941, [41] the Party-wide rectification movement in 1942 and the campaign begun in the winter of 1943 for the study of the past struggles between the two lines within the Party. The old factions are gone. What is left is only the remnants of dogmatist and empiricist ideology, which can be overcome by continuing and intensifying our rectification movement. But what still exists in our Party to a serious extent, and almost everywhere, is a more or less blind "mountain-stronghold" mentality. [42] For instance, there is a lack of mutual understanding, mutual respect and unity among comrades of different units, which arises from differences in their background of struggle, differences in the areas in which they work (as between one base area and another and as between the Japanese-occupied areas, the Kuomintang areas and the revolutionary base areas) and differences in their departments of work (as between one army unit and another and as between one kind of work and another); this

[39] The Sixth National Congress of the Communist Party of China held in July 1928 adapted the following Ten-Point Programme: (1) overthrow imperialist role; (2) confiscate foreign capitalist enterprises and banks; (3) unify China and recognize the right of the nationalities to self-determination; (4) overthrow the Kuomintang warlord government; (5) establish a government of councils of workers, peasants and soldiers; (6) institute the eight-hour day, increase wages, and establish unemployment relief and social insurance; (7) confiscate the land of all landlords and distribute the land among the peasants, (8) improve the living conditions of the soldiers, give land and jobs to ex-soldiers; (9) abolish all exorbitant taxes and miscellaneous levies and adopt a consolidated progressive tax; and (10) unite with the world proletariat, unite with the Soviet Union.

[40] The Fifth Plenary Session of the Sixth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China was held in January 1934.

[41] This session of the Political Bureau in September 1941 reviewed the question of the political line in the past history of the Party, especially during the Second Revolutionary Civil War.

[42] The "mountain-stronghold" mentality was a tendency to form cliques and arose mainly out of the circumstances of the protracted guerrilla war in which rural revolutionary bases were scattered and cut off from each other. Most of these bases were first established in mountain regions. Each tended to regard itself as a compact unit, like a single mountain stronghold, so this wrong tendency became known as mountain-stronghold mentality.

phenomenon seems quite commonplace but in fact it seriously obstructs the unity of the Party and the growth of its fighting capacity. The social and historical roots of the mountain-stronghold mentality lie in the fact that the Chinese petty bourgeoisie is particularly large and that for a long period our rural base areas have been cut off from one another by the enemy, while the subjective cause is the insufficiency of inner-Party education. The important task now confronting us is to point out these causes, to persuade our comrades to get rid of their blindness and raise the level of their political awareness, to break down the ideological barriers that separate comrades and to promote mutual understanding and respect, so as to bring about unity throughout the Party.

A clear understanding of these questions by the whole Party will not only assure the success of our present course of study within the Party, but will also assure the victory of the Chinese revolution.

II

The present situation has two characteristics: one is that the anti-fascist front is growing stronger and the fascist front is declining, and the second is that within the anti-fascist front the people's forces are growing stronger and the anti-popular forces are declining. The first characteristic is quite obvious and can readily be seen. Hitler will be defeated before long, and the Japanese aggressors, too, are heading for defeat. The second characteristic is not so obvious and cannot readily be seen, but it is daily becoming more manifest in Europe, in Britain and the United States and in China.

The growth of the people's forces in China has to be explained with our Party as the centre of the picture.

The growth of our Party during the War of Resistance Against Japan can be divided into three stages. The first stage was from 1937 to 1940. In 1937 and 1938, the first two years of this stage, the Japanese militarists took the Kuomintang seriously and the Communist Party lightly; therefore they threw their main forces against the Kuomintang front, and, in their policy towards the Kuomintang, military attack was primary and political blandishments to bring about capitulation were supplementary; they did not take the Communist-led anti-Japanese base areas seriously, believing that these amounted to only a handful of Communists engaged in guerrilla actions. But after occupying Wuhan in October 1938, the Japanese imperialists began to change their policy and to take the Communist Party seriously and the Kuomintang lightly. In their policy towards the Kuomintang, political blandishments to bring about capitulation became primary and military attack supplementary, while at the same time they gradually shifted their main forces to deal with the Communists. For the Japanese imperialists now felt it was no longer the Kuomintang, but the Communist Party, that was to be feared. In 1937 and 1938, the Kuomintang put rather more effort into the War of Resistance, its relations with our Party were comparatively good and it permitted

rather more freedom, although imposing many restrictions on the people's anti-Japanese movement. After the fall of Wuhan, however, because of its defeats in the war and its increasing hostility towards the Communist Party, the Kuomintang gradually became more reactionary, more active against the Communists and more passive in the war against Japan. In 1937, as a result of the setbacks in the civil war period, the Communist Party had only about 40,000 organized members and an army of 30,000 men; hence it was taken lightly by the Japanese militarists. But by 1940 the Party's membership had risen to 800,000, our army had grown to nearly 500,000 and the population of the base areas, including those paying grain tax only to us and those paying it both to us and to the Japanese and puppets, [43] totaled about 100,000,000. In the course of several years our Party had opened up such an extensive theatre of war, namely, the Liberated Areas, that for no less than five and a half years we were able to prevent any strategic offensive by the main forces of the Japanese invaders against the Kuomintang front, draw these forces around ourselves, extricate the Kuomintang from the crisis in its theatre of war and maintain the protracted War of Resistance. But during that stage some comrades in our Party committed an error; they underestimated Japanese imperialism (and so did not see the protracted and ruthless nature of the war, maintained that mobile warfare with large formations should be primary and belittled guerrilla warfare), placed reliance on the Kuomintang, and failed to pursue an independent policy soberly (hence their capitulationism towards the Kuomintang and their vacillation in applying the policy of boldly and freely arousing the masses to establish anti-Japanese democratic base areas behind the enemy lines and greatly expanding the armed forces led by our Party). Meanwhile our Party had recruited large numbers of new members who were still inexperienced, and all the base areas in the enemy's rear were newly established and not yet consolidated. During this stage, a kind of conceit appeared within the Party because of the favorable development of the general situation and the growth of our Party and armed forces, and many members became swelled-headed. During this stage, however, we overcame the Right deviation in the Party and carried out an independent policy; we not only hit Japanese imperialism hard, created base areas and expanded the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies, but also repulsed the first large-scale anti-Communist onslaught by the Kuomintang.

The years 1941 and 1942 formed the second stage. In order to prepare and prosecute the war against Britain and the United States, the Japanese imperialists more actively pursued the policy to which they had switched after the fall of Wuhan, the policy of concentrating on the Communist Party and not on the Kuomintang. They massed a still larger part of their main forces around all the Communist-led base areas, conducted one "mopping-up" operation after another, and executed the ruthless policy of "burn all, kill all, loot all", concentrating their attacks on our Party. As a result, in the two years 1941-42, our Party was placed in an extremely difficult position. During this stage its base areas shrank in size, the population fell to under 50,000,000, the Eighth Route Army was

[43] In the relatively stable parts of the base areas the people paid the regular grain tax only to the anti-Japanese democratic government. But in the outlying parts of the base areas and the guerrilla zones, which were constantly harassed by the enemy, the people were often forced to pay another grain levy to the enemy's puppet government.

reduced to 300,000, the loss of cadres was very great, and our finances and economy were very heavily strained. Meanwhile, the Kuomintang, finding its hands free, moved against our Party in a thousand and one ways, unleashed its second large-scale anti-Communist onslaught and attacked us in co-ordination with the Japanese imperialists. But this difficult position served to educate us Communists and we learned many things. We learned how to combat the enemy's "mopping-up" operations, his policy of "nibbling" our territory, his "tighten public security" campaign, [44] his policy of "burn all, kill all, loot all" and his policy of extorting political recantations. We learned or began to learn how to carry out the "three thirds system" in the state organs of the united front, how to carry out the land policy, the rectification movement to correct our style of study, style in Party relations and style of writing, the policy of better troops and simpler administration, the policy of unified leadership, the movement for supporting the government and cherishing the people, and the development of production. And we overcame many shortcomings, including the conceit of many people that had arisen during the first stage. Although our losses in the second stage were very heavy, we held our ground; we repulsed the offensives of the Japanese invaders on the one hand and the second large-scale anti-Communist onslaught of the Kuomintang on the other. The Kuomintang's attacks on the Communist Party and the struggles we had to wage in self-defense gave rise to a kind of ultra-Left deviation in the Party, one example being the belief that Kuomintang-Communist cooperation would soon break down, with the result that excessive attacks were made on the landlords and unity with public figures outside the Party was neglected. But we overcame this deviation also. In the struggle to counter the friction created by the Kuomintang we affirmed the principle of waging struggles "on just grounds, to our advantage, and with restraint", and in united front work we pointed out the necessity of "unity, struggle, unity through struggle". Thus, we maintained the Anti-Japanese National United Front throughout the country as well as in the base areas.

The third stage extends from 1943 to the present. Our various policies have become more effective and, in particular, the rectification movement and the development of production have yielded results of a fundamental nature, thereby making our Party invincible both ideologically and materially. Moreover, last year we learned, or began to learn, how to carry out our policy on the examination of the histories of cadres and our policy on combating secret agents. It is in those circumstances that our base areas have again expanded, that the population has risen to over 80,000,000, including those paying the grain tax only to us and those paying it both to us and to the Japanese and puppets, that our army has grown to 470,000 and our people's militia to 2,270,000, and that our Party membership has reached 900,000 and more.

In 1943 the Japanese militarists made no appreciable change in their policy towards China and continued to direct their main attacks at the Communist Party. For more than three years, from 1941

[44] In March 1941 the Japanese invaders and Chinese traitors in northern China proclaimed a "campaign for tightening public security", which included raiding the people's houses, establishing the neighborhood guarantee system, making house-to-house check-ups and organizing puppet troops, all for the purpose of suppressing the anti-Japanese forces.

to the present, over 60 per cent of the Japanese troops in China have been pressing hard on the anti-Japanese base areas led by our Party. During these years the several hundred thousand Kuomintang troops who were left behind the enemy lines have been unable to withstand the blows of Japanese imperialism; about half surrendered, about half were wiped out, and only a small number-survived and withdrew. Those Kuomintang troops who surrendered have turned and attacked our Party, which has consequently had to resist over 90 per cent of the puppet troops. The Kuomintang has only had to resist less than 40 per cent of the Japanese forces and less than 10 per cent of the puppet troops. For fully five and a half years since the fall of Wuhan in October 1938, the Japanese militarists have not launched a single strategic offensive on the Kuomintang front; there have been only a few relatively big operations (in Chekiang-Kiangsi, Changsha, western Hupeh, southern Honan and Changteh), and even these were mere raids, while they concentrated their main attention on the anti-Japanese base areas led by our Party. In this situation, the Kuomintang has pursued the policy of "retreating into the mountains" and "watching others fight", simply staving off blows when the enemy advanced and looking on with folded arms when he withdrew. In 1943 the Kuomintang became even more reactionary in its domestic policy and made its third large-scale anti-Communist onslaught, which we again repulsed.

From 1943 to the spring of this year, the Japanese aggressors have been steadily losing ground in the Pacific theatre, the United States has been intensifying its counter-offensive, and now, in the West, Hitler is tottering under the heavy blows of the Soviet Red Army. In an effort to avert their doom, the Japanese imperialists have conceived the idea of forcing the Peiping-Hankow and Hankow-Canton Railways open for through traffic and, since they have not yet succeeded in their policy of inducing the Kuomintang in Chungking to capitulate, they have found it necessary to deal it another blow; hence their plan for a large-scale offensive on the Kuomintang front this year. The Honan campaign [45] has been going on for over a month.

The enemy forces there, amount to only a few divisions, yet several hundred thousand Kuomintang troops have collapsed without a battle, and only the troops of miscellaneous brands have been able to put up some sort of fight. In Tang En-po's command, utter disorder prevails, with the officers estranged from their men and the troops from the people, and more than two-thirds of his total forces have been lost. Likewise, the divisions which Hu Tsung-nan dispatched to Honan collapsed at their first encounter with the enemy. This is wholly the result of the reactionary policies which the Kuomintang has rigorously enforced for the past few years. During the five and a half years since the fall of Wuhan, the theatre of war of the Liberated Areas led by the Communist Party has borne the brunt of resisting the main forces of the Japanese and puppets; and although there may be same change in the future, it can only be temporary because the Kuomintang rendered utterly

[45] In March 1944 the Japanese invaders launched their campaign in Honan Province with a force of 50,000 to 60,000 men. The 400,000 Kuomintang troops under Chiang Ting-wen, Tang En-po and Hu Tsung-nan melted away before the Japanese invaders. Thirty-eight counties, including Chengchow and Loyang, fell to the enemy one after another. Tang En-po lost 200,000 men.

degenerate by its reactionary policy of passive resistance to Japan and active opposition to the Communists, is bound to suffer serious reverses. When that happens, our Party's task in fighting the enemy and the puppet's will become heavier still. What the Kuomintang has gained from looking on with folded arms for five and a half years is the loss of its fighting capacity. What the Communist Party has gained from fighting and struggling hard for five and a half years is the strengthening of its fighting capacity. This is what will decide China's destiny.

Comrades can see for themselves that in the seven years since July 1937 the people's democratic forces under the leadership of our Party have gone through three phases--a rise, a decline and a new rise. We have beaten back the ferocious attacks of the Japanese invaders, established extensive revolutionary base areas, greatly expanded the Party and the army, repulsed three large-scale anti-Communist onslaughts by the Kuomintang and overcome the erroneous Right and "Left" ideologies in the Party; and the whole Party has gained much valuable experience. This sums up our work over the past seven years.

Our present task is to prepare ourselves for a still greater responsibility. We must prepare to drive the Japanese invaders out of China, whatever the circumstances. To enable our Party to shoulder this responsibility, we must further expand and consolidate our Party, our army and base areas, pay attention to work in the big cities and along the main lines of communication and raise the work in the cities to a position of equal importance with that in the base areas.

As for our work in the base areas, during the first stage these areas were greatly expanded but not consolidated, and so in the second stage they contracted as soon as they came under the heavy blows of the enemy. In the second stage all the anti-Japanese base areas led by our Party went through a hard tempering process and improved greatly as compared with the first stage; the cadres and Party members considerably advanced their ideological and political level, and learned many things they did not know before. But it takes time to clarify thinking and to study policy, and we have still much to learn. Our Party is not yet sufficiently strong, not yet sufficiently united or consolidated, and so cannot yet take on greater responsibility than we now carry. From now on the problem is further to expand and consolidate our Party, our army and base areas in the continued prosecution of the War of Resistance; this is the first indispensable item in our ideological and material preparation for the gigantic work of the future. Without this preparation, we shall not be able to drive out the Japanese invaders and liberate the whole of China.

Our work in the big cities and along the main lines of communication has always been very inadequate. If now we do not strive to rally around our Party the tens of millions of the toiling masses and other people oppressed by the Japanese imperialists in the big cities and along the main lines of communication, and do not prepare armed mass insurrections, our army and rural base areas will face all sorts of difficulties for lack of co-ordination with the cities. For more than ten years we have been in the countryside and have had to encourage people to know the countryside well and to build the rural base areas. During these ten years and more the task of preparing insurrections in the cities,

as decided by the Party's Sixth National Congress, was not and could not have been carried out. But now it is different, and the resolution of the Sixth National Congress will be carried out after the Seventh National Congress. This Congress will probably be held soon and will discuss the problems of strengthening our work in the cities and winning nation-wide victory.

The industrial conference of the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region, now in session, is of great significance. In 1937 the number of factory workers in the Border Region was only 700, it increased to 7,000 by 1942 and is now 12,000. Those figures are not to be treated lightly. While we are in the base areas, we must learn how to administer the industry, commerce and communications of big cities, or otherwise we shall not know what to do when the time comes.

Thus, the second indispensable item in our ideological and material preparation for the future is to organize for armed insurrections in the big cities and along the main lines of communication and to learn how to administer industry and commerce. Without this preparation too, we shall not be able to drive out the Japanese invaders and liberate the whole of China.

III

In order to win new victories, we must call on our Party cadres to get rid of the baggage and start up the machinery. "To get rid of the baggage" means to free our minds of many encumbrances. Many things may become baggage, may become encumbrances, if we cling to them blindly and uncritically. Let us take some illustrations. Having made mistakes, you may feel that, come what may, you are saddled with them and so become dispirited if you have not made mistakes, you may feel that you are free from error and so become conceited. Lack of achievement in work may breed pessimism and depression, while achievement may breed pride and arrogance. A comrade with a short record of struggle may shirk responsibility on this account, while a veteran may become opinionated because of his long record of struggle. Worker and peasant comrades, because of pride in their class origin, may look down upon intellectuals, while intellectuals, because they have a certain amount of knowledge, may look down upon workers and peasants. Any specialized skill may be capitalized on and so may lead to arrogance and contempt of others. Even one's age may become ground for conceit. The young, because they are bright and capable, may look down upon the old; and the old, because they are rich in experience, may look down upon the young. All such things become encumbrances or baggage if there is no critical awareness. An important reason why some comrades are very lofty, isolating themselves from the masses and making repeated mistakes, is that they carry such baggage. Thus, a prerequisite for maintaining close links with the masses and making fewer mistakes is to examine one's baggage, to get rid of it and so emancipate the mind. There have been several occasions in the history of our Party when great conceit manifested itself and we suffered in consequence. The first was in the early half of 1927. The Northern Expeditionary Army had reached Wuhan, and some comrades became so proud and overweening as to forget that the Kuomintang was about to assault us. The result was the error of the Chen Tu-hsiu line, which brought defeat to the revolution. The second occasion was in 1930. Taking advantage of Chiang Kai-

shek's large-scale war against Feng Yu-hsiang and Yen Hsi-shan, [46] the Red Army won a number of battles, and again some comrades became proud and overweening. The result was the error of the Li Li-san line, again causing some losses to the revolutionary forces. The third occasion was in 1931. The Red Army had smashed the Kuomintang's third "encirclement and suppression" campaign and, immediately afterwards, faced with the Japanese invasion, the people throughout the country started the stormy and heroic anti-Japanese movement; and again, some comrades became proud and overweening. The result was an even more serious error in the political line, which cost us about 90 per cent of the revolutionary forces that we had built up with so much toil. The fourth occasion was in 1938. The War of Resistance had begun and the united front had been established; and once again some comrades became proud and overweening. As a result, they committed an error somewhat similar to the Chen Tu-hsiu line. This time the revolutionary work suffered serious damage in those places where the effects of those comrades' erroneous ideas were more especially pronounced. Comrades throughout the Party should take warning from these instances of pride and error. Recently we have reprinted Kuo Mo-jo's essay on Li Tzu-cheng, [47] so that comrades may also take warning from this story and not repeat the error of becoming conceited at the moment of success.

"To start up the machinery" means to make good use of the organ of thought. Although some people carry no baggage and have the virtue of close contact with the masses, they fail to accomplish anything because they do not know how to think searchingly or are unwilling to use their brains to think much and think hard. Others refuse to use their brains because they are carrying baggage which cramps their intellect. Lenin and Stalin often advised people to use their brains, and we should give the same advice. This mechanism, the brain, has the special function of thinking. Mencius said, "The office of the mind is to think." [48] He defined the function of the brain correctly. We should always use our brains and think everything over carefully. A common saying goes, "Knit the brows and you will hit upon a stratagem." In other words, much thinking yields wisdom. In order to get rid of the practice of acting blindly which is so common in our Party, we must encourage our comrades to think, to learn the method of analysis and to cultivate the habit of analysis. There is all too little of this habit in our Party. If we get rid of our baggage and start up the machinery, if we march with light packs and know how to think hard, then we are sure to triumph.

[46] This large-scale war between the warlords, with Chiang Kai-shek on the one side and Feng Yu-hsiang and Yen Hsi-shan on the other, was fought along the Luaghai and Tientsin-Pukow Railways. It lasted six months, from May to October 1930. Casualties on both sides reached 300,000.

[47] Kuo Mo-jo wrote the essay "The Tercentenary of the 1644 Uprising" in 1944 to commemorate the victory of the peasant uprising led by Li Tzu-cheng in the last years of the Ming Dynasty. He explained that the uprising met with defeat in 1645 because, after the entry of the peasant forces into Peking in 1644, some of their leaders were corrupted by luxurious living, and factional strife arose. The essay first appeared in New China Daily in Chungking and was later published as a pamphlet in Yenan and elsewhere in the Liberated Areas.

[48] From Mencius, Book XI, "Kao Tzu", Part I.

[This speech was delivered by Comrade Mao Tse-tung at the opening of the Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.]

The Party School opens today and I wish it every success.

I would like to say something about the problem of our Party's style of work.

Why must there be a revolutionary party? There must be a revolutionary party because the world contains enemies who oppress the people and the people want to throw off enemy oppression. In the era of capitalism and imperialism, just such a revolutionary party as the Communist Party is needed. Without such a party it is simply impossible for the people to throw off enemy oppression. We are Communists, we want to lead the people in overthrowing the enemy, and so we must keep our ranks in good order, we must march in step, our troops must be picked troops and our weapons good weapons. Without these conditions the enemy cannot be overthrown.

What is the problem now facing our Party? The general line of the Party is correct and presents no problem, and the Party's work has been fruitful. The Party has several hundred thousand members who are leading the people in extremely hard and bitter struggles against the enemy. This is plain to everybody and beyond all doubt.

Then is there or is there not any problem still facing our Party? I say there is and, in a certain sense, the problem is quite serious.

What is the problem? It is the fact that there is something in the minds of a number of our comrades which strikes one as not quite right, not quite proper.

In other words, there is still something wrong with our style of study, with our style in the Party's internal and external relations and with our style of writing. By something wrong with the style of study we mean the malady of subjectivism. By something wrong with our style in Party relations we mean the malady of sectarianism. By something wrong with the style of writing we mean the malady of stereotyped Party writing. [49] All these are wrong, they are ill winds, but they are not like the wintry north winds that sweep across the whole sky. Subjectivism, sectarianism and stereotyped Party writing are no longer the dominant styles, but merely gusts of contrary wind, ill winds from the air-raid tunnels. *(Laugher.)* It is bad, however, that such winds should still be blowing

[49] Stereotyped writing, or the "eight-legged essay", was the special form of essay prescribed in the imperial examinations under China's feudal dynasties from the 15th to the 19th centuries; it consisted in juggling with words, concentrated only on form and was devoid of content. Structurally the main body of the essay had eight parts--presentation, amplification, preliminary exposition, initial argument, inceptive paragraphs, middle paragraphs, rear paragraphs and concluding paragraphs, and the fifth to eighth parts each had to have two "legs", i.e., two antithetical paragraphs, hence the name "eight-legged essay". The "eight-legged essay" became a byword in China denoting stereotyped formalism and triteness. Thus "stereotyped Party writing", characterizes the writings of certain people in the revolutionary ranks who piled up revolutionary phrases and terms higgledy-piggledy instead of analyzing the facts. Like the "eight-legged essay", their writings were nothing but verbiage.

in the Party. We must seal off the passages which produce them. Our whole Party should undertake the job of sealing off these passages, and so should the Party School. These three ill winds, subjectivism, sectarianism and stereotyped Party writing, have their historical origins. Although no longer dominant in the whole Party, they still constantly create trouble and assail us. Therefore, it is necessary to resist them and to study, analyze and elucidate them.

Fight subjectivism in order to rectify the style of study, fight sectarianism in order to rectify the style in Party relations, and fight Party stereotypes in order to rectify the style of writing--such is the task before us.

To accomplish the task of overthrowing the enemy, we must accomplish the task of rectifying these styles within the Party. The style of study and the style of writing are also the Party's style of work. Once our Party's style of work is put completely right, the people all over the country will learn from our example. Those outside the Party who have the same kind of bad style will, if they are good and honest people, learn from our example and correct their mistakes, and thus the whole nation will be influenced. So long as our Communist ranks are in good order and march in step, so long as our troops are picked troops and our weapons are good weapons, any enemy, however powerful, can be overthrown.

Let me speak now about subjectivism.

Subjectivism is an improper style of study; it is opposed to Marxism-Leninism and is incompatible with the Communist Party. What we want is the Marxist-Leninist style of study. What we call style of study means not just style of study in the schools but in the whole Party. It is a question of the method of thinking of comrades in our leading bodies, of all cadres and Party members, a question of our attitude towards Marxism-Leninism, of the attitude of all Party comrades in their work. As such, it is a question of extraordinary, indeed of primary, importance.

Certain muddled ideas find currency among many people. There are, for instance, muddled ideas about what is a theorist, what is an intellectual and what is meant by linking theory and practice.

Let us first ask, is the theoretical level of our Party high or low? Recently more Marxist-Leninist works have been translated and more people have been reading them. That is a very good thing. But can we therefore say that the theoretical level of our Party has been greatly raised? True, the level is now somewhat higher than before. But our theoretical front is very much out of harmony with the rich content of the Chinese revolutionary movement, and a comparison of the two shows that the theoretical side is lagging far behind. Generally speaking, our theory cannot as yet keep pace with our revolutionary practice, let alone lead the way as it should. We have not yet raised our rich and varied practice to the proper theoretical plane. We have not yet examined all the problems of revolutionary practice--or even the important ones--and raised them to a theoretical plane. Just think, how many of us have created theories worthy of the name on China's economics, politics, military

affairs or culture, theories which can be regarded as scientific and comprehensive, and not crude and sketchy? Especially in the field of economic theory: Chinese capitalism has had a century of development since the Opium War, and yet not a single theoretical work has been produced which accords with the realities of China's economic development and is genuinely scientific. Can we say that in the study of China's economic problems, for instance, the theoretical level is already high? Can we say that our Party already has economic theorists worthy of the name? Certainly not. We have read a great many Marxist-Leninist books, but can we claim, then, that we have theorists? We cannot. For Marxism-Leninism is the theory created by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the basis of practice, their general conclusion drawn from historical and revolutionary reality. If we merely read their works but do not proceed to study the realities of China's history and revolution in the light of their theory or do not make any effort to think through China's revolutionary practice carefully in terms of theory, we should not be so presumptuous as to call ourselves Marxist theorists. Our achievements on the theoretical front will be very poor indeed if, as members of the Communist Party of China, we close our eyes to China's problems and can only memorize isolated conclusions or principles from Marxist writings. If all a person can do is to commit Marxist economics or philosophy to memory, reciting glibly from Chapter I to Chapter X, but is utterly unable to apply them, can he be considered a Marxist theorist? No! He cannot. What kind of theorists do we want? We want theorists who can, in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method, correctly interpret the practical problems arising in the course of history and revolution and give scientific explanations and theoretical elucidations of China's economic, political, military, cultural and other problems. Such are the theorists we want. To be a theorist of this kind, a person must have a true grasp of the essence of Marxism-Leninism, of the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method and of the theories of Lenin and Stalin on the colonial revolution and the Chinese revolution, and he must be able to apply them in a penetrating and scientific analysis of China's practical problems and discover the laws of development of these problems. Such are the theorists we really need.

The Central Committee of our Party has now made a decision calling upon our comrades to learn how to apply the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method in the serious study of China's history, and of China's economics, politics, military affairs and culture, and to analyze every problem concretely on the basis of detailed material and then draw theoretical conclusions. This is the responsibility we must shoulder.

Our comrades in the Party School should not regard Marxist theory as lifeless dogma. It is necessary to master Marxist theory and apply it, master it for the sole purpose of applying it. If you can apply the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint in elucidating one or two practical problems, you should be commended and credited with some achievement. The more problems you elucidate and the more comprehensively and profoundly you do so, the greater will be your achievement. Our Party School should also lay down the rule to grade students good or poor according to how they look at China's problems after they have studied Marxism-Leninism, according to whether or not they see the problems clearly and whether or not they see them at all.

Next let us talk about the question of the "intellectuals". Since China is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country and her culture is not well developed, intellectuals are particularly treasured. On this question of the intellectuals, the Central Committee of the Party made the decision [50] over two years ago that we should win over the great numbers of intellectuals and, insofar as they are revolutionary and willing to take part in the resistance to Japan, welcome them one and all. It is entirely right for us to esteem intellectuals, for without revolutionary intellectuals the revolution cannot triumph. But we all know there are many intellectuals who fancy themselves very learned and assume airs of erudition without realizing that such airs are bad and harmful and hinder their own progress. They ought to be aware of the truth that actually many so-called intellectuals are, relatively speaking, most ignorant and the workers and peasants sometimes know more than they do. Here some will say, "Ha! You are turning things upside down and talking nonsense." (Laughter.) But, comrades, don't get excited; there is some sense in what I am saying.

What is knowledge? Ever since class society came into being the world has had only two kinds of knowledge, knowledge of the struggle for production and knowledge of the class struggle. Natural science and social science are the crystallization of these two kinds of knowledge, and philosophy is the generalization and summation of the knowledge of nature and the knowledge of society. Is there any other kind of knowledge? No. Now let us take a look at certain students, those brought up in schools that are completely cut off from the practical activities of society. What about them? A person goes from a primary school of this kind all the way through to a university of the same kind, graduates and is reckoned to have a stock of learning. But all he has is book-learning; he has not yet taken part in any practical activities or applied what he has learned to any field of life. Can such a person be regarded as a completely developed intellectual? Hardly so, in my opinion, because his knowledge is still incomplete. What then is relatively complete knowledge? All relatively complete knowledge is formed in two stages: the first stage is perceptual knowledge, the second is rational knowledge, the latter being the development of the former to a higher stage. What sort of knowledge is the students' book-learning? Even supposing all their knowledge is truth, it is still not knowledge acquired through their own personal experience, but consists of theories set down by their predecessors in summarizing experience of the struggle for production and of the class struggle. It is entirely necessary that students should acquire this kind of knowledge, but it must be understood that as far as they are concerned such knowledge is in a sense still one-sided, something which has been verified by others but not yet by themselves. What is most important is to be good at applying this knowledge in life and in practice. Therefore, I advise those who have only book-learning but as yet no contact with reality, and also those with little practical experience, to realize their own shortcomings and become a little more modest.

[50] This was the decision on recruiting intellectuals adopted by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in December 1939, which is printed under the title "Recruit Large Numbers of Intellectuals" in the Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. II.

How can those who have only book-learning be turned into intellectuals in the true sense? The only way is to get them to take part in practical work and become practical workers, to get those engaged in theoretical work to study important practical problems. In this way our aim can be attained.

What I have said will probably make some people angry. They will say, "According to your explanation, even Marx would not be regarded as an intellectual." I say they are wrong. Marx took part in the practice of the revolutionary movement and also created revolutionary theory. Beginning with the commodity, the simplest element of capitalism, he made a thorough study of the economic structure of capitalist society. Millions of people saw and handled commodities every day but were so used to them that they took no notice. Marx alone studied commodities scientifically. He carried out a tremendous work of research into their actual development and derived a thoroughly scientific theory from what existed universally. He studied nature, history and proletarian revolution and created dialectical materialism, historical materialism and the theory of proletarian revolution. Thus, Marx became a most completely developed intellectual, representing the acme of human wisdom; he was fundamentally different from those who have only book-learning. Marx undertook detailed investigations and studies in the course of practical struggles, formed generalizations and then verified his conclusions by testing them in practical struggles--this is what we call theoretical work. Our Party needs a large number of comrades who will learn how to do such work. In our Party there are many comrades who can learn to do this kind of theoretical research; most of them are intelligent and promising and we should value them. But they must follow correct principles and not repeat the mistake of the past. They must discard dogmatism and not confine themselves to ready-made phrases in books.

There is only one kind of true theory in this world, theory that is drawn from objective reality and then verified by objective reality; nothing else is worthy of the name of theory in our sense. Stalin said that theory becomes aimless when it is not connected with practice. [51] Aimless theory is useless and false and should be discarded. We should point the finger of scorn at those who are fond of aimless theorizing. Marxism-Leninism is the most correct, scientific and revolutionary truth, born out of and verified by objective reality, but many who study Marxism-Leninism take it as lifeless dogma, thus impeding the development of theory and harming themselves as well as other comrades.

On the other hand, our comrades who are engaged in practical work will also come to grief if they misuse their experience. True, these people are often rich in experience, which is very valuable, but it is very dangerous if they rest content with their own experience. They must realize that their knowledge is mostly perceptual and partial and that they lack rational and comprehensive knowledge; in other words, they lack theory and their knowledge, too, is relatively incomplete. Without comparatively complete knowledge it is impossible to do revolutionary work well.

[51] See J. V. Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism", *Problems of Leninism,* Eng. ed., FLPH Moscow, 1954. p. 31.

Thus, there are two kinds of incomplete knowledge, one is ready-made knowledge found in books and the other is knowledge that is mostly perceptual and partial; both are one-sided. Only an integration of the two can yield knowledge that is sound and relatively complete.

In order to study theory, however, our cadres of working-class and peasant origin must first acquire an elementary education. Without it they cannot learn Marxist-Leninist theory. Having acquired it, they can study Marxism-Leninism at any time. In my childhood I never attended a Marxist-Leninist school and was taught only such things as, "The Master said: 'How pleasant it is to learn and constantly review what one has learned.'" [52] Though this teaching material was antiquated, it did me some good because from it I learned to read. Nowadays we no longer study the Confucian classics but such new subjects as modern Chinese, history, geography and elementary natural science, which, once learned, are useful everywhere. The Central Committee of our Party now emphatically requires that our cadres of working-class and peasant origin should obtain an elementary education because they can then take up any branch of study--politics, military science or economics. Otherwise, for all their rich experience they will never be able to study theory.

It follows that to combat subjectivism we must enable people of each of these two types to develop in whichever direction they are deficient and to merge with the other type. Those with book learning must develop in the direction of practice; it is only in this way that they will stop being content with books and avoid committing dogmatist errors. Those experienced in work must take up the study of theory and must read seriously; only then will they be able to systematize and synthesize their experience and raise it to the level of theory, only then will they not mistake their partial experience for universal truth and not commit empiricist errors. Dogmatism and empiricism alike are subjectivism, each originating from an opposite pole.

Hence there are two kinds of Subjectivism in our Party, dogmatism and empiricism. Each sees only a part and not the whole. If people are not on guard, do not realize that such one-sidedness is a shortcoming and do not strive to overcome it, they are liable to go astray.

However, of the two kinds of subjectivism, dogmatism is still the greater danger in our Party. For dogmatists can easily assume a Marxist guise to bluff, capture and make servitors of cadres of working-class and peasant origin who cannot easily see through them; they can also bluff and ensnare the naive youth. If we overcome dogmatism, cadres with book-learning will readily join with those who have experience and will take to the study of practical things, and then many good cadres who integrate theory with experience, as well as some real theorists, will emerge. If we overcome dogmatism, the comrades with practical experience will have good teachers to help them raise their experience to the level of theory and so avoid empiricist errors.

Besides muddled ideas about the "theorist" and the "intellectual", there is a muddled idea among many comrades about "linking theory and practice", a phrase they have on their lips every

[52] This is the opening sentence of the Confucian Analects, a record of the dialogues of Confucius and his disciples.

day. They talk constantly about "linking", but actually they mean "separating", because they make no effort at linking. How is Marxist-Leninist theory to be linked with the practice of the Chinese revolution? To use a common expression, it is by "shooting the arrow at the target". As the arrow is to the target, so is Marxism-Leninism to the Chinese revolution. Some comrades, however, are "shooting without a target", shooting at random, and such people are liable to harm the revolution. Others merely stroke the arrow fondly, exclaiming, "What a fine arrow! What a fine arrow!", but never want to shoot it. These people are only connoisseurs of curios and have virtually nothing to do with the revolution. The arrow of Marxism-Leninism must be used to shoot at the target of the Chinese revolution. Unless this point is made clear, the theoretical level of our Party can never be raised and the Chinese revolution can never be victorious.

Our comrades must understand that we study Marxism-Leninism not for display, nor because there is any mystery about it, but solely because it is the science which leads the revolutionary cause of the proletariat to victory. Even now, there are not a few people who still regard odd quotations from Marxist-Leninist works as a ready-made panacea which, once acquired, can easily cure all maladies. These people show childish ignorance, and we should enlighten them. It is precisely such ignorant people who take Marxism-Leninism as a religious dogma. To them we should say bluntly, "Your dogma is worthless." Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have repeatedly stated that our theory is not a dogma but a guide to action. But such people prefer to forget this statement which is of the greatest, indeed the utmost, importance. Chinese Communists can be regarded as linking theory with practice only when they become good at applying the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method and the teachings of Lenin and Stalin concerning the Chinese revolution and when, furthermore, through serious research into the realities of China's history and revolution, they do creative theoretical work to meet China's needs in different spheres. Merely talking about linking theory and practice without actually doing anything about it is of no use, even if one goes on talking for a hundred years. To oppose the subjectivist, one-sided approach to problems, we must demolish dogmatist subjectiveness and one-sidedness.

So much for today about combating subjectivism in order to rectify the style of study throughout the Party.

Let me now speak about the question of sectarianism.

Having been steeled for twenty years, our Party is no longer dominated by sectarianism. Remnants of sectarianism, however, are still found both in the Party's internal relations and in its external relations. Sectarian tendencies in internal relations lead to exclusiveness towards comrades inside the Party and hinder inner-Party unity and solidarity, while sectarian tendencies in external relations lead to exclusiveness towards people outside the Party and hinder the Party in its task of uniting the whole people. Only by uprooting this evil in both its aspects can the Party advance unimpeded in its great task of achieving unity among all Party comrades and among all the people of our country.

What are the remnants of inner-Party sectarianism? They are mainly as follows:

First, the assertion of "independence". Some comrades see only the interests of the part and not the whole; they always put undue stress on that part of the work for which they themselves are responsible and always wish to subordinate the interests of the whole to the interests of their own part. They do not understand the Party's system of democratic centralism; they do not realize that the Communist Party not only needs democracy but needs centralization even more. They forget the system of democratic centralism in which the minority is subordinate to the majority, the lower level to the higher level, the part to the whole and the entire membership to the Central Committee. Chang Kuo-tao[53] asserted his "independence" of the Central Committee of the Party and as a result "asserted" himself into betraying the Party and became a Kuomintang agent. Although the sectarianism we are now discussing is not of this extremely serious kind, it must still be guarded against and we must do away completely with all manifestations of disunity. We should encourage comrades to take the interests of the whole into account. Every Party member, every branch of work, every statement and every action must proceed from the interests of the whole Party; it is absolutely impermissible to violate this principle.

Those who assert this kind of "independence" are usually wedded to the doctrine of "me first" and are generally wrong on the question of the relationship between the individual and the Party. Although in words they profess respect for the Party, in practice they put themselves first and the Party second. What are these people after? They are after fame and position and want to be in the limelight. Whenever they are put in charge of a branch of work, they assert their "independence". With this aim, they draw some people in, push others out and resort to boasting, flattery and touting among the comrades, thus importing the vulgar style of the bourgeois political parties into the Communist Party. It is their dishonesty that causes them to come to grief. I believe we should do things honestly, for without an honest attitude it is absolutely impossible to accomplish anything in this world. Which are the honest people? Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin are honest, men of science are honest. Which are the dishonest people? Trotsky, Bukharin, Chen Tu-hsiu and Chang Kuo-tao are extremely dishonest; and those who assert "independence" out of personal or sectional interest are dishonest too. All sly people, all those who do not have a scientific attitude in their work, fancy themselves resourceful and clever, but in fact they are most stupid and will come to no good. Students in our Party School must pay attention to this problem. We must build a centralized, unified

[53] Chang Kuo-tao was a renegade from the Chinese revolution. In early life, speculating on the revolution he joined the Chinese Communist Party. In the Party he made many mistakes resulting in serious crimes. The most notorious of these was his opposition in 1935 to the Red Army's northward march and his defeatism and liquidationism in advocating withdrawal by the Red Army to the minority-nationality areas on the Szechuan-Sikang borders; what is more, he openly carried out traitorous activities against the Party and the Central Committee, established his own bogus central committee, disrupted the unity of the Party and the Red Army, and caused heavy losses to the Fourth Front Army of the Red Army. But thanks to patient education by Comrade Mao Tse-tung and the Central Committee, the Fourth Front Army and its numerous cadres soon returned to the correct leadership of the Central Committee of the Party and played a glorious role in subsequent struggles. Chang Kuo-tao, however, proved incorrigible and in the spring of 1938, he slipped out of the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region and joined the Kuomintang secret police.

Party and make a clean sweep of all unprincipled factional struggles. We must combat individualism and sectarianism so as to enable our whole Party to march in step and fight for one common goal.

Cadres from the outside and those from the locality must unite and combat sectarian tendencies. Very careful attention must be given to the relations between outside and local cadres because many anti-Japanese base areas were established only after the arrival of the Eighth Route Army or the New Fourth Army and much of the local work developed only after the arrival of outside cadres. Our comrades must understand that in these conditions it is possible for our base areas to be consolidated and for our Party to take root there only when the two kinds of cadres unite as one and when a large number of local cadres develop and are promoted; otherwise, it is impossible. Both the outside and the local cadres have their strong and weak points, and to make any progress they must overcome their own weak points by learning from each other's strong points. The outside cadres are generally not up to the local cadres in familiarity with local conditions and links with the masses. Take me for instance. Although I have been in northern Shensi five or six years, I am far behind the local comrades in understanding local conditions and in links with the people here. Our comrades going to the anti-Japanese base areas in Shansi, Hopei, Shantung and other provinces must pay attention to this. Moreover, even within the same base area, owing to the fact that some districts develop earlier and others later, there is a difference between the local cadres of a district and those from outside it. Cadres who come from a more developed to a less developed district are also outside cadres in relation to that locality, and they, too, should pay great attention to fostering and helping local cadres. Generally speaking, in places where outside cadres are in charge, it is they who should bear the main responsibility if their relations with the local cadres are not good. And the chief comrades in charge should bear greater responsibility. The attention paid to this problem in some places is still very inadequate. Some people look down on the local cadres and ridicule them, saying, "What do these locals know? Clodhoppers!" Such people utterly fail to understand the importance of local cadres; they know neither the latter's strong points nor their own weaknesses and adopt an incorrect, sectarian attitude. All outside cadres must cherish the local cadres and give them constant help and must not be permitted to ridicule or attack them. Of course, the local cadres on their part must learn from the strong points of the outside cadres and rid themselves of inappropriate, narrow views so that they and the outside cadres become as one, with no distinction between "them" and "us", and thus avoid sectarian tendencies.

The same applies to the relationship between cadres in army service and other cadres working in the locality. They must be completely united and must oppose sectarian tendencies. The army cadres must help the local cadres, and vice versa. If there is friction between them, each should make allowance for the other and carry out proper self-criticism. Generally speaking, in places where army cadres are actually in positions of leadership, it is they who should bear the main responsibility if their relations with the local cadres are not good. Only when the army cadres understand their own responsibility and are modest in their attitude towards the local cadres can the conditions be created for the smooth progress of our war effort and our work of construction in the base areas.

The same applies to the relationship among different army units, different localities and different departments. We must oppose the tendency towards selfish departmentalism by which the interests of one's own unit are looked after to the exclusion of those of others. Whoever is indifferent to the difficulties of others, refuses to transfer cadres to other units on request, or releases only the inferior ones, "using the neighbor's field as an outlet for his overflow", and does not give the slightest consideration to other departments, localities or people--such a person is a selfish departmentalist who has entirely lost the spirit of communism. Lack of consideration for the whole and complete indifference to other departments, localities and people are characteristics of a selfish departmentalist. We must intensify our efforts to educate such persons and to make them understand that selfish departmentalism is a sectarian tendency which will become very dangerous, if allowed to develop.

Another problem is the relationship between old and new cadres. Since the beginning of the War of Resistance, our Party has grown enormously, and large numbers of new cadres have emerged; that is a very good thing. In his report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B.), Comrade Stalin said, "... there are never enough old cadres, there are far less than required, and they are already partly going out of commission owing to the operation of the laws of nature." Here he was discussing the cadres situation and not only the laws of nature. If our Party does not have a great many new cadres working in unity and co-operation with the old cadres, our cause will come to a stop. All old cadres, therefore, should welcome the new ones with the utmost enthusiasm and show them the warmest solicitude. True, new cadres have their shortcomings. They have not been long in the revolution and lack experience, and unavoidably some have brought with them vestiges of the unwholesome ideology of the old society, remnants of the ideology of petty-bourgeois individualism. But such shortcomings can be gradually eliminated through education and tempering in the revolution. The strong point of the new cadres, as Stalin has said, is that they are acutely sensitive to what is new and are therefore enthusiastic and active to a high degree--the very qualities which some of the old cadres lack. [54] Cadres, new and old, should respect each other, learn from each other and overcome their own shortcomings by learning from each other's strong points, so as to unite as one in the common cause and guard against sectarian tendencies. Generally speaking, in places where the old cadres are mainly in charge, it is they who should bear the chief responsibility if relations with the new cadres are not good.

All the above--relations between the part and the whole, relations between the individual and the Party, relations between outside and local cadres, relations between army cadres and other cadres working in the locality, relations between this and that army unit, between this and that locality, between this and that department and relations between old and new cadres--are relations within the Party. In all these relations it is necessary to enhance the spirit of communism and guard against

[54] See J. V. Stalin, "Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.) on the Work of the Central Committee", Problems of Leninism, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1954, pp. 784-86.

sectarian tendencies, so that the ranks of our Party will be in good order, march in step and therefore fight well. This is a very important problem which we must solve thoroughly in rectifying the Party's style of work. Sectarianism is an expression of subjectivism in organizational relations; if we want to get rid of subjectivism and promote the Marxist-Leninist spirit of seeking truth from facts, we must sweep the remnants of sectarianism out of the Party and proceed from the principle that the Party's interests are above personal or sectional interests, so that the Party can attain complete solidarity and unity.

The remnants of sectarianism must be eliminated from the Party's external as well as its internal relations. The reason is this: we cannot defeat the enemy by merely uniting the comrades throughout the Party, we can defeat the enemy only by uniting the people throughout the country. For twenty years the Communist Party of China has done great and arduous work in the cause of uniting the people of the whole country, and the achievements in this work since the outbreak of the War of Resistance are even greater than in the past. This does not mean, however, that all our comrades already have a correct style in dealing with the masses and are free from sectarian tendencies. No. In fact, sectarian tendencies still exist among a number of comrades, and in some cases to a very serious degree. Many of our comrades tend to be overbearing in their relations with non-Party people, look down upon them, despise or refuse to respect them or appreciate their strong points. This is indeed a sectarian tendency. After reading a few Marxist books, such comrades become more arrogant instead of more modest, and invariably dismiss others as no good without realizing that in fact their own knowledge is only half-baked. Our comrades must realize the truth that Communist Party members are at all times a minority as compared with non-Party people. Supposing one out of every hundred persons were a Communist, then there would be 4,500,000 Communists among China's population of 450,000,000. Yet, even if our membership reached this huge figure, Communists would still form only one per cent of the whole population, while 99 per cent would be non-Party people. What reason can we then have for not co-operating with non-Party people? As regards all those who wish to co-operate with us or might co-operate with us, we have only the duty of co-operating and absolutely no right to shut them out. But some Party members do not understand this and look down upon, or even shut out, those who wish to co-operate with us. There are no grounds whatsoever for doing so. Have Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin given us any grounds? They have not. On the contrary, they have always earnestly enjoined us to form close ties with the masses and not divorce ourselves from them. Or has the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China given us any grounds? No. Among all its resolutions there is not a single one that says we may divorce ourselves from the masses and so isolate ourselves. On the contrary, the Central Committee has always told us to form close ties with the masses and not to divorce ourselves from them. Thus, any action divorcing us from the masses has no justification at all and is simply the mischievous result of the sectarian ideas some of our comrades have themselves concocted. As such sectarianism remains very serious among some of our comrades and still obstructs the application of the Party line, we should carry out extensive education within the Party

to meet this problem. Above all, we should make our cadres really understand how serious the problem is and how utterly impossible it is to overthrow the enemy and attain the goal of the revolution unless Party members unite with the non-Party cadres and with non-Party people.

All sectarian ideas are subjectivist and are incompatible with the real needs of the revolution; hence the struggle against sectarianism and the struggle against subjectivism should go on simultaneously.

There is no time today to talk about the question of stereotyped Party writing; I shall discuss it at another meeting. Stereotyped Party writing is a vehicle for filth, a form of expression for subjectivism and sectarianism. It does people harm and damages the revolution, and we must get rid of it completely.

To combat subjectivism, we must propagate materialism and dialectics. However, there are many comrades in our Party who lay no stress on the propaganda either of materialism or of dialectics. Some tolerate subjectivist propaganda and regard it with equanimity. They think they believe in Marxism, but make no effort to propagate materialism and do not give it a thought or express any opinion when they hear or read subjectivist stuff. This is not the attitude of a Communist. It allows many of our comrades to be poisoned by subjectivist ideas, which numb their sensitivity. We should therefore launch a campaign of enlightenment within the Party to free the minds of our comrades from the fog of subjectivism and dogmatism and should call upon them to boycott subjectivism, sectarianism and stereotyped Party writing. Such evils are like Japanese goods, for only our enemy wishes us to preserve them and continue to befuddle ourselves with them; so, we should advocate a boycott against them, just as we boycott Japanese goods. [55] We should boycott all the wares of subjectivism, sectarianism and stereotyped Party writing, make their sale difficult, and not allow their purveyors to ply their trade by exploiting the low theoretical level in the Party. Our comrades must develop a good nose for this purpose; they should take a sniff at everything and distinguish the good from the bad before they decide whether to welcome it or boycott it. 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 they follow blindly and encourage slavishness.

Finally, in opposing subjectivism, sectarianism and stereotyped Party writing we must have in mind two purposes: first, "learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones", and second, "cure the sickness to save the patient". The mistakes of the past must be exposed without sparing anyone's sensibilities; it is necessary to analyze and criticize what was bad in the past with a scientific attitude so that work in the future will be done more carefully and done better. This is what is meant by "learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones". But our aim in exposing errors and criticizing

[55] Boycotting Japanese goods was a method of struggle frequently used by the Chinese people against Japanese imperialist aggression in the first half of the 20th century, as in the patriotic May 4th Movement of 1919, after the September 18th Incident of 1931, and during the War of Resistance Against Japan.

shortcomings, like that of a doctor curing a sickness, is solely to save the patient and not to doctor him to death. A person with appendicitis is saved when the surgeon removes his appendix. So long as a person who has made mistakes does not hide his sickness for fear of treatment or persist in his mistakes until he is beyond cure, so long as he honestly and sincerely wishes to be cured and to mend his ways, we should welcome him and cure his sickness so that he can become a good comrade. We can never succeed if we just let ourselves go, and lash out at him. In treating an ideological or a political malady, one must never be rough and rash but must adopt the approach of "curing the sickness to save the patient", which is the only correct and effective method.

I have taken this occasion of the opening of the Party School to speak at length, and I hope comrades will think over what I have said. *(Enthusiastic applause.)*

J. V. Stalin: Foundations of Leninism

Chapter: Introduction

The foundations of Leninism is a big subject. To exhaust it a whole volume would be required. Indeed, a whole number of volumes would be required. Naturally, therefore, my lectures cannot be an exhaustive exposition of Leninism; at best they can only offer a concise synopsis of the foundations of Leninism. Nevertheless, I consider it useful to give this synopsis, in order to lay down some basic points of departure necessary for the successful study of Leninism.

Expounding the foundations of Leninism still does not mean expounding the basis of Lenin's world outlook. Lenin's world outlook and the foundations of Leninism are not identical in scope. Lenin was a Marxist, and Marxism is, of course, the basis of his world outlook. But from this it does not at all follow that an exposition of Leninism ought to begin with an exposition of the foundations of Marxism. To expound Leninism means to expound the distinctive and new in the works of Lenin that Lenin contributed to the general treasury of Marxism and that is naturally connected with his name. Only in this sense will I speak in my lectures of the foundations of Leninism.

And so, what is Leninism?

Some say that Leninism is the application of Marxism to the conditions that are peculiar to the situation in Russia. This definition contains a particle of truth, but not the whole truth by any means. Lenin, indeed, applied Marxism to Russian conditions, and applied it in a masterly way. But if Leninism were only the application of Marxism to the conditions that are peculiar to Russia it would be a purely national and only a national, a purely Russian and only a Russian, phenomenon. We know, however, that Leninism is not merely a Russian, but an international phenomenon rooted in the whole of international development. That is why I think this definition suffers from one-sidedness.

Others say that Leninism is the revival of the revolutionary elements of Marxism of the forties of the nineteenth century, as distinct from the Marxism of subsequent years, when, it is alleged, it became moderate, non-revolutionary. If we disregard this foolish and vulgar division of the teachings

of Marx into two parts, revolutionary and moderate, we must admit that even this totally inadequate and unsatisfactory definition contains a particle of truth. This particle of truth is that Lenin did indeed restore the revolutionary content of Marxism, which had been suppressed by the opportunists of the Second International. Still, that is but a particle of the truth. The whole truth about Leninism is that Leninism not only restored Marxism, but also took a step forward, developing Marxism further under the new conditions of capitalism and of the class struggle of the proletariat.

What, then, in the last analysis, is Leninism?

Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. To be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular. Marx and Engels pursued their activities in the pre-revolutionary period, (we have the proletarian revolution in mind), when developed imperialism did not yet exist, in the period of the proletarians' preparation for revolution, in the period when the proletarian revolution was not yet an immediate practical inevitability. But Lenin, the disciple of Marx and Engels, pursued his activities in the period of developed imperialism, in the period of the unfolding proletarian revolution, when the proletarian revolution had already triumphed in one country, had smashed bourgeois democracy and had ushered in the era of proletarian democracy, the era of the Soviets.

That is why Leninism is the further development of Marxism.

It is usual to point to the exceptionally militant and exceptionally revolutionary character of Leninism. This is quite correct. But this specific feature of Leninism is due to two causes: firstly, to the fact that Leninism emerged from the proletarian revolution, the imprint of which it cannot but bear; secondly, to the fact that it grew and became strong in clashes with the opportunism of the Second International, the fight against which was and remains an essential preliminary condition for a successful fight against capitalism. It must not be forgotten that between Marx and Engels, on the one hand, and Lenin, on the other, there lies a whole period of undivided domination of the opportunism of the Second International, and the ruthless struggle against this opportunism could not but constitute one of the most important tasks of Leninism.

Chapter 1: The Historical Roots of Leninism

Leninism grew up and took shape under the conditions of imperialism, when the contradictions of capitalism had reached an extreme point, when the proletarian revolution had become an immediate practical question, when the old period of preparation of the working class for revolution had arrived at and passed into a new period, that of direct assault on capitalism.

Lenin called imperialism "moribund capitalism." Why? Because imperialism carries the contradictions of capitalism to their last bounds, to the extreme limit, beyond which revolution begins. Of these contradictions, there are three which must be regarded as the most important.

The first contradiction is the contradiction between labor and capital. Imperialism is the omnipotence of the monopolist trusts and syndicates, of the banks and the financial oligarchy, in the industrial countries. In the fight against this omnipotence, the customary methods of the working class-trade unions and cooperatives, parliamentary parties and the parliamentary struggle-have proved to be totally inadequate. Either place yourself at the mercy of capital, eke out a wretched existence as of old and sink lower and lower, or adopt a new weapon--this is the alternative imperialism puts before the vast masses of the proletariat. Imperialism brings the working class to revolution.

The second contradiction is the contradiction among the various financial groups and imperialist Powers in their struggle for sources of raw materials, for foreign territory. Imperialism is the export of capital to the sources of raw materials, the frenzied struggle for monopolist possession of these sources, the struggle for a re-division of the already divided world, a struggle waged with particular fury by new financial groups and Powers seeking a "place in the sun" against the old groups and Powers, which cling tenaciously to what they have seized. This frenzied struggle among the various groups of capitalists is notable in that it includes as an inevitable element imperialist war, wars for the annexation of foreign territory. This circumstance, in its turn, is notable in that it leads to the mutual weakening of the imperialists, to the weakening of the position of capitalism in general, to the acceleration of the advent of the proletarian revolution and to the practical necessity of this revolution.

The third contradiction is the contradiction between the handful of ruling, "civilized" nations and the hundreds of millions of the colonial and dependent peoples of the world. Imperialism is the most barefaced exploitation and the most inhumane oppression of hundreds of millions of people inhabiting vast colonies and dependent countries. The purpose of this exploitation and of this oppression is to squeeze out super-profits. But in exploiting these countries imperialism is compelled to build these railways, factories and mills, industrial and commercial centers. The appearance of a class of proletarians, the emergence of a native intelligentsia, the awakening of national consciousness, the growth of the liberation movement--such are the inevitable results of this "policy." The growth of the revolutionary movement in all colonies and dependent countries without exception clearly testifies to this fact. This circumstance is of importance for the proletariat inasmuch as it saps radically the position of capitalism by converting the colonies and dependent countries from reserves of imperialism into reserves of the proletarian revolution.

Such, in general, are the principal contradictions of imperialism which have converted the old, "flourishing" capitalism into moribund capitalism.

The significance of the imperialist war which broke out ten years ago lies, among other things, in the fact that it gathered all these contradictions into a single knot and threw them on to the scales, thereby accelerating and facilitating the revolutionary battles of the proletariat.

In other words, imperialism was instrumental not only in making the revolution a practical inevitability, but also in creating favorable conditions for a direct assault on the citadels of capitalism.

Such was the international situation which gave birth to Leninism.

Some may say: this is all very well, but what has it to do with Russia, which was not and could not be a classical land of imperialism? What has it to do with Lenin, who worked primarily in Russia and for Russia? Why did Russia, of all countries, become the home of Leninism, the birthplace of the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution?

Because Russia was the focus of all these contradictions of imperialism.

Because Russia, more than any other country, was pregnant with revolution, and she alone, therefore, was in a position to solve those contradictions in a revolutionary way.

To begin with, tsarist Russia was the home of every kind of oppression--capitalist, colonial and militarist-in its most inhuman and barbarous form. Who does not know that in Russia the omnipotence of capital was combined with the despotism of tsarism, the aggressiveness of Russian nationalism with tsarism's role of executioner in regard to the non-Russian peoples, the exploitation of entire regions--Turkey, Persia, China-with the seizure of these regions by tsarism, with wars of conquest? Lenin was right in saying that tsarism was "military-feudal imperialism." Tsarism was the concentration of the worst features of imperialism, raised to a high pitch.

To proceed. Tsarist Russia was a major reserve of Western imperialism, not only in the sense that it gave free entry to foreign capital, which controlled such basic branches of Russia's national economy as the fuel and metallurgical industries, but also in the sense that it could supply the Western imperialists with millions of soldiers. Remember the Russia army, fourteen million strong, which shed its blood on the imperialist fronts to safeguard the staggering profits of the British and French capitalists.

Further, Tsarism was not only the watchdog of imperialism in the east of Europe, but, in addition, it was the agent of Western imperialism for squeezing out of the population hundreds of millions by way of interest on loans obtained in Paris and London, Berlin and Brussels.

Finally, tsarism was a most faithful ally of Western imperialism in the partition of Turkey, Persia, China, etc. Who does not know that the imperialist war was waged by tsarism in alliance with the imperialists of the Entente, and that Russia was an essential element in that war?

That is why the interests of tsarism and of Western imperialism were interwoven and ultimately became merged in a single skein of imperialist interests.

Could Western imperialism resign itself to the loss of such a powerful support in the East and of such a rich reservoir of manpower and resources as old, tsarist, bourgeois Russia was without

exerting all its strengths to wage a life-and-death struggle against the revolution in Russia, with the object of defending and preserving tsarism? Of course not.

But from this it follows that whoever wanted to strike at tsarism necessarily raised his hand against imperialism, whoever rose against tsarism had to rise against imperialism as well; for whoever was bent on overthrowing tsarism had to overthrow imperialism too, if he really intended not merely to defeat tsarism, but to make a clean sweep of it. Thus, the revolution against tsarism verged on and had to pass into a revolution against imperialism, into a proletarian revolution.

Meanwhile, in Russia a tremendous popular revolution was rising, headed by the most revolutionary proletariat in the world, which possessed such an important ally as the revolutionary peasantry of Russia. Does it need proof that such a revolution could not stop half-way, that in the event of success it was bound to advance further and raise the banner of revolt against imperialism?

That is why Russia was bound to become the focus of the contradictions of imperialism, not only in the sense that it was in Russia that these contradictions were revealed most plainly, in view of their particularly repulsive and particularly intolerable character, and not only because Russia was a highly important prop of Western imperialism, connecting Western finance capital with the colonies in the East, but also because Russia was the only country in which there existed a real force capable of resolving the contradictions of imperialism in a revolutionary way.

From this it follows, however, that the revolution in Russia could not but become a proletarian revolution, that from its very inception it could not but assume an international character, and that, therefore, it could not but shake the very foundations of world imperialism.

Under these circumstances, could the Russian Communist confine their work within the narrow national bounds of the Russian revolution? Of course not. On the contrary, the whole situation, both internal (the profound revolutionary crisis) and external (the war), impelled them to go beyond these bounds in their work, to transfer the struggle to the international arena, to expose the ulcers of imperialism, to prove that the collapse of capitalism was inevitable, to smash social-chauvinism and social-pacifism, and, finally, to overthrow capitalism in their own country and to forge a new fighting weapon for the proletariat-the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution-in order to facilitate the task of overthrowing capitalism for the proletarians of all countries. Nor could the Russian Communist act otherwise, for only this path offered the chance of producing certain changes in the international situation which could safeguard Russia against the restoration of the bourgeois order.

That is why Russia became the home of Leninism, and why Lenin, the leader of the Russian Communist, became its creator.

The same thing, approximately, "happened" in the case of Russia and Lenin as in the case of Germany and Marx and Engels in the forties of the last century. Germany at that time was pregnant

with bourgeois revolution just like Russia at the beginning of the twentieth century. Marx wrote at that time in the Communist Manifesto:

> "The Communists turn their attention chiefly to Germany, because that country is on the eve of a bourgeois revolution that is bound to be carried out under more advanced conditions of European civilization, and with a much more developed proletariat, than that of England was in the seventeenth, and of France in the eighteenth century, and because the bourgeois revolution in Germany will be but the prelude to an immediately following proletarian revolution." [56]

In other words, the centre of the revolutionary movement was shifting to Germany.

There can hardly be any doubt that it was this very circumstance, noted by Marx in the above-quoted passage, that served as the probable reason why it was precisely Germany that became the birthplace of scientific socialism and why the leaders of the German proletariat, Marx and Engels, became its creators.

The same, only to a still greater degree, must be said of Russia at the beginning of the twentieth century. Russia was then on the eve of a bourgeois revolution; she had to accomplish this revolution at a time when conditions in Europe were more advanced, and with a proletariat that was more developed than that of Germany in the forties of the nineteenth (let alone Britain and France); moreover, all the evidence went to show that this revolution was bound to serve as a ferment and as a prelude to the proletarian revolution. We cannot regard it as accidental that as early as 1902, when the Russian revolution was still in an embryonic state, Lenin wrote the prophetic words in his pamphlet *What Is to Be Done?* :

> "History has now confronted us (i.e., the Russian Marxists-J. St.) with an immediate task which is the most revolutionary of all the immediate tasks that confront the proletariat of any country," and that … "the fulfilment of this task, the destruction of the most powerful bulwark, not only of European, but also (it may now be said) of Asiatic reaction, would make the Russian proletariat the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat" (see Vol. IV, p. 382).

In other words, the centre of the revolutionary movement was bound to shift to Russia.

As we know, the course of the revolution in Russia has more than vindicated Lenin's prediction.

Is it surprising, after all this, that a country which has accomplished such a revolution and possesses such a proletariat should have been the birthplace of the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution?

---

[56] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (*Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow 1951, p. 61).

Is it surprising that Lenin, the leader of Russia's proletariat, became also the creator of this theory and tactics and the leader of the international proletariat?

Unit 3: The Masses Make History

Topics covered:

I. Role of the masses in history.
II. The individual and the leaders.
III. The masses, the leaders and their relationships.

Bibliography:

- Lenin:
  - On the Road.
  - Thesis on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International.
  - Draft Theses on National and Colonial Questions for the Second Congress of the Communist International.
  - What is to be Done? Chapter II.
  - "Left Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder. Chapter V, VI.
- Mao Zedong:
  - Quotations, Chapter XI, XVI, XIX, XXVIII.
  - Combat Liberalism. Selected Works, Vol. II.
  - Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership. Selected Works, Vol III
- Mariátegui:
  - Statutes of the CGTP.
  - Manifesto of the CGTP to the Working Class of the Country.
- Tien Chi-sung:
  - The Masses Are the Makers of History.

Selection:

V. I. Lenin: On the Road

A year of disintegration, a year of ideological and political disunity, a year of Party driftage lies behind us. The membership of all our Party organisations has dropped. Some of them—namely, those whose membership was least proletarian—have fallen to pieces. The Party's semi-legal institutions created by the revolution have been broken up time after time. Things reached a point when some elements within the Party, under the impact of the general break-up, began to ask whether it was necessary to preserve the old Social-Democratic Party, whether it was necessary to continue *its* work, whether it was necessary to go "underground" once more, and how this was to be done. And the extreme Right (the liquidationist trend, so called) answered this question in the sense

that it was necessary to legalize ourselves at all costs, even at the price of an open renunciation of the Party programme, tactics and organisation. This was undoubtedly an ideological and political crisis as well as an organisational one.

The recent All-Russian Conference of the Russian Social- Democratic Labor Party has led the Party out on to the road, and evidently marks a turning-point in the development of the Russian working-class movement after the victory of the counter-revolution. The decisions of the conference, published in a special Report issued by the Central Committee of our Party, have been confirmed by the Central Committee, and therefore, pending the next Congress, stand as the decisions of the whole Party. These decisions give a very definite answer to the question of the causes and the significance of the crisis, as well as the means of overcoming it. By working in the spirit of the conference resolutions, by striving to make *all* Party workers realize clearly and fully the present tasks of the Party, our organisations will be able to strengthen and consolidate their forces for united and effective revolutionary Social-Democratic work.

The main cause of the Party crisis is indicated in the preamble of the resolution on organisation. This main cause is the wavering intellectual and petty-bourgeois elements, of which the workers' party had to rid itself; elements who joined the working-class movement mainly in the hope of an early triumph of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and could not stand up to a period of reaction. Their instability was revealed both in theory ("retreat from revolutionary Marxism": the resolution on the present situation) and in tactics (the "whittling down of slogans"), as well as in Party organisation. The class-conscious workers repelled this instability, came out resolutely against the liquidators, began to take the management and guidance of the Party organisations into their own hands. If this hard core of our Party was unable at the outset to overcome the elements of disunity and crisis, this was not only because the task was a great and difficult one amidst the triumph of the counter-revolution, but also because a certain indifference towards the Party showed itself among those workers who, although revolutionary-minded, were not sufficiently socialist-minded. It is precisely to the class-conscious workers of Russia that the decisions of the conference are addressed in the first place—as the crystallized opinion of Social- Democracy concerning the means of combating disunity and vacillation.

A Marxist analysis of present-day class relations and of the new policy of tsarism; an indication of the immediate aim of the struggle which our Party continues as before to set itself; an appreciation of the lessons of the revolution as regards the correctness of the revolutionary Social-Democrats' tactics; elucidation of the causes of the Party crisis; pointing out the role in combating it of the proletarian elements of the Party; solution of the problem of relations between the illegal and legal organisations; recognition of the necessity of utilizing the Duma tribune and drawing up precise instructions for the guidance of our Duma group, linked with direct criticism of its mistakes—such was the principal content of the decisions of the conference, which provide a complete answer to the

question of the party of the working class choosing a definite path in the present difficult period. Let us examine this answer more carefully.

The interrelation of classes in their political groupings remains the same as that which prevailed during the past period of direct revolutionary struggle of the masses. The overwhelming majority of the peasants cannot but strive for an agrarian revolution which would destroy semi-feudal landownership, and which cannot be achieved without the overthrow of tsarism. The triumph of reaction has borne down heavily on the democratic elements of the peasantry, which is incapable of forming a solid organisation; but despite all oppression, despite the Black-Hundred Duma, despite the extreme instability of the Trudoviks, the revolutionary mood of the peasant masses is clearly evidenced even by the debates in the Third Duma. The fundamental position of the proletariat in regard to the tasks of the bourgeois- democratic revolution in Russia remains unaltered: to guide the democratic peasantry and to wrest it from the influence of the liberal bourgeoisie, the Cadet Party—which continues to draw closer and closer to the Octobrists notwithstanding petty private squabbles, and which recently has been striving to establish national-liberalism and to support tsarism and reaction by chauvinist agitation. The struggle goes on as before—says the resolution—for the complete abolition of the monarchy and the conquest of political power by the proletariat and the revolutionary peasantry.

The autocracy, as hitherto, is the principal enemy of the proletariat and of all democratic trends. It would be a mistake, however, to imagine that it remains unchanged. The Stolypin "constitution" and Stolypin's agrarian policy mark a new stage in the break-down of the old, semi-patriarchal, semi-feudal tsarism, a new step towards its transformation into a bourgeois monarchy. The delegates from the Caucasus, who wished either to delete such a characterization of the present situation altogether, or to substitute "plutocratic" for "bourgeois", were wrong. The autocracy has long been plutocratic; but it is only after the first stage of the revolution, under the impact of its blows, that. the autocracy is becoming bourgeois, both in its agrarian policy and its direct, nationally-organized alliance with certain strata of the bourgeoisie. The autocracy has been nursing the bourgeoisie for a long time now; the bourgeoisie, by means of the ruble, has long been winning its way to "the top", securing influence on legislation and administration, and a place beside the noble aristocracy. But the peculiar feature of the present situation is that the autocracy has been forced to set up a representative assembly for certain strata of the bourgeoisie, to balance between them and the feudalist landlords, to form an alliance of these sections in the Duma; it has been forced to abandon all the hopes it had placed in the patriarchalism of the muzhik, and to seek support against the rural masses among the rich peas ants, who are ruining the village commune.

The autocracy cloaks itself with pseudo-constitutional institutions, but at the same time its class essence is being exposed as never before, owing to the alliance concluded by the tsar with the Purishkeviches and the Guchkovs, and with no one else. The autocracy is attempting to take upon itself the fulfilment of those tasks of the bourgeois revolution which are objectively necessary—the

setting-up of a representative assembly of the people which would really manage the affairs of bourgeois society, and the purging of the countryside of medieval, entangled and antiquated agrarian relations. But the practical results of these new steps taken by the autocracy are, so far, exactly nil, and this only shows more clearly than ever that other forces and other means are necessary for the fulfilment of the historical task. In the minds of millions of people inexperienced in politics, the autocracy was hitherto contrasted with popular representation in general; now, the struggle is narrowing its aims, and is more concretely defining its task as the struggle for power in the state, which determines the character and significance of representation itself. That is why the Third Duma marks a special stage in the break-down of the old tsarism, in the intensification of its adventurist character, in the deepening of the old revolutionary aims, in the widening of the field of struggle (and of the numbers taking part in the struggle) for these aims.

We must get over this stage. The present new conditions require new forms of struggle. The use of the Duma tribune is an absolute necessity. A prolonged effort to educate and organize the masses of the proletariat becomes particularly important. The combination of illegal and legal organisation raises special problems before the Party. The popularization and clarification of the experience of the revolution, which the liberals and liquidationist intellectuals are seeking to discredit, are necessary both for theoretical and practical purposes. But the tactical line of the Party—which must be able to take the new conditions into account in its methods and means of struggle—remains unchanged. The correctness of revolutionary Social-Democratic tactics, states one of the resolutions of the conference, is confirmed by the experience of the mass struggle in 1905-07. The defeat of the revolution resulting from this first campaign revealed, not that the tasks were wrong, not that the immediate aims were "utopian", not that the methods and means were mistaken, but that the forces were insufficiently prepared, that the revolutionary crisis was insufficiently wide and deep—and Stolypin and Co. are working to widen and deepen it with most praiseworthy zeal! Let the liberals and terrified intellectuals lose heart after the first genuinely mass battle for freedom, let them repeat like cowards: don't go where you have been beaten before, don't tread that fatal path again. The class-conscious proletariat will answer them: the great wars in history, the great problems of revolutions, were solved only by the advanced classes returning to the attack again and again—and they achieved victory after having learned the lessons of defeat. Defeated armies learn well. The revolutionary classes of Russia have been defeated in their first campaign, but the revolutionary situation remains. In new forms and by other ways, sometimes much more slowly than we would wish, the revolutionary crisis is approaching, coming to a head again. We must carry on with the lengthy work of preparing larger masses for that crisis; this preparation must be more serious, taking account of higher and more concrete tasks; and the more successfully we do this work, the more certain will be our victory in the new struggle. The Russian proletariat can be proud of the fact that in 1905, under its leadership, a nation of slaves for the first time became a million-strong host, an army of the revolution, striking at tsarism. And now the same proletariat will know how to do persistently,

staunchly and patiently the work of educating and training the new cadres of a still mightier revolutionary force.

As we have said, utilization of the Duma tribune is an essential element of this work of education and training. The conference resolution on the Duma group indicates to our Party that road which comes nearest—if we are to seek instances in history—to the experience of German Social- Democracy at the time of the Anti-Socialist Law. The illegal Party must know how to use, it must learn how to use, the legal Duma group; it must train up the latter into a Party organisation equal to its tasks. The most mistaken tactics, the most regrettable deviation, from consistent proletarian work, dictated by the conditions of the present period, would be to raise the question of recalling the group from the Duma (there were two "Otzovists" at the conference, but they did not raise the question openly), or to refrain from directly and openly criticizing its mistakes and from enumerating them in the resolution (as some delegates insisted at the conference). The resolution fully recognizes that the group has committed mistakes for which it was not alone to blame, and which were quite similar to the inevitable mistakes of all our Party organisations. But there are other mistakes— departures from the *political line* of the Party. Since these departures occurred, since they were made by an organisation openly acting in the name of the whole Party, the Party was bound to declare clearly and definitely that these were deviations. In the history of West-European socialist parties there have been a number of instances of abnormal relations between the parliamentary groups and the Party; to this day these relations are quite often abnormal in the Latin countries, where the groups do not display sufficient Party spirit. We must from the very outset organize Social-Democratic parliamentarism in Russia on a different basis; we must at once establish team-work in this field—so that every Social- Democratic deputy may really feel that he has the Party behind him, that the Party is deeply concerned over his mistakes and tries to straighten out his path—so that every Party worker may take part in the general Duma work of the Party, learning from the practical Marxist criticism of its steps, feeling it his duty to assist it, and striving to gear the special work of the group to the whole propaganda and agitation activity of the Party.

The conference was the first authoritative meeting of delegates from the biggest Party organisations to discuss the work of the Duma Social-Democratic group during the whole session. And the decision of the conference shows very clearly how our Party will shape its Duma work, how very exacting it will be in this field both to itself and to the group, how undeviatingly and consistently it proposes to work on developing genuinely Social-Democratic parliamentarism.

The question of our attitude to the Duma group has a tactical and an organisational aspect. In the latter respect the resolution on the Duma group is only the application of our general principles of organisational policy to a particular case, principles laid down by the conference in the resolution giving instructions on the question of organisation. The conference has recorded that two main tendencies exist in the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party on this question: one of them throws the weight of emphasis on the illegal Party organisation, the other—which is more or less akin to

liquidationism—throws the weight of emphasis on the legal and semi-legal organisations. The point is that the present situation is characterized, as we have already pointed out, by a certain number of Party workers leaving the Party—especially intellectuals, but also some proletarians. The liquidationist trend raises the question as to whether it is the best, the most active elements that are abandoning the Party and choosing the legal organisations as their field of activity, or whether it .is the "vacillating intellectualist and petty-bourgeois elements" that are leaving the Party. Needless to say, by emphatically rejecting and condemning liquidationism, the conference replied that it was the latter elements. The most proletarian elements of the Party, and those elements of the intelligentsia that were most consistent in principle and most Social Democratic, remained true to the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party. The desertions from the Party mean its purification, they mean getting rid of its least stable element, of its unreliable friends, of its "fellow-travelers" (*Mitläufer*), who always joined the proletariat for a while and who were recruited from among the petty bourgeoisie or from among the "declassed", i. e., people thrown out of the orbit of some definite class.

From this evaluation of the principle of Party organisation logically follows the line of organisational policy adopt ed by the conference. To strengthen the illegal Party organisation, to create Party cells in all spheres of work, to set up first of all "entirely Party committees consisting of workers, even if their number be small, in each industrial enterprise", to concentrate the functions of leadership in the hands of leaders of the Social-Democratic movement from among the workers themselves—such is the task today. Needless to say, the task of these cells and committees must be to utilize all the semi-legal and, as far as possible, legal organisations, to maintain "close contact with the masses", and to direct the work in such a way that Social-Democracy responds to all the needs of the masses. Every Party cell and workers' committee must become a "base for agitation, propaganda and practical organizing work among the masses", i. e., they must go where the masses go, and try at every step to push the consciousness of the masses in the direction of socialism, to link up every specific question with the general tasks of the proletariat, to transform every act of organisation into one of *class* consolidation, to win by dint of energy and ideological influence (not by their ranks and titles, of course) the leading role in all the proletarian legal organisations. Even if these cells and commit tees be very small at times, they will be linked together by Party tradition and Party organisation, by a definite class programme; and two or three Social-Democratic members of the Party will thus be able to avoid becoming sub merged in an amorphous legal organisation and to pursue their *Party* line under all conditions, in all circumstances and in all kinds of situations, to influence their environment in the spirit of the whole Party, and not allow the environment to swallow them up.

Though mass organisations of one type or another may be dissolved, though the legal trade unions may be hounded out of existence, though every open act of workers' initiative under a regime of counter-revolution may be ruined by the police on one pretext or another—no power on earth can prevent the concentration of masses of workers in a capitalist country, such as Russia has

already become. One way or another, legally or semi-legally, openly or covertly, the working class will find its own rallying points; the class- conscious Party Social-Democrats will everywhere and always march in front of the masses, everywhere and always act together in order to influence the masses in the spirit of the Party. And Social-Democracy, which has proved in open revolution that it is the party of the class, the party that succeeded in leading millions in strikes, in the uprising of 1905, as well as in the elections of 1906-07, will now also be able to remain the party of the class, the party of. the masses, the vanguard, which in the hardest times will not lose touch with the bulk of the army, but will be able to help the latter overcome these hard times, consolidate its ranks once more, and train more and more new fighters.

Let the Black-Hundred diehards rejoice and howl inside the Duma and outside it, in the capital and in the remote provinces, let the reaction rage—the ever so wise Mr. Stolypin cannot take a single step without bringing the precariously balancing autocracy nearer its fall, without creating a new tangle of political impossibilities and absurdities, without adding new and fresh forces to the ranks of the proletariat and to the ranks of the revolutionary elements of the peasant masses. A party which succeeds in consolidating itself for persistent work in contact with the masses, a party of the advanced class, which succeeds in organizing its vanguard, and which directs its forces in such a way as to influence in a Social-Democratic spirit every sign of life of the proletariat—such a party will win no matter what happens.

V. I. Lenin: Theses on Fundamental Tasks of The Second Congress of the Communist International

1 .The present stage in the development of the international communist movement is marked by the fact that the finest representatives of the revolutionary proletariat in all capitalist countries have fully grasped the fundamental principles of the Communist International, viz., dictatorship of the proletariat and Soviet power, and have ranged themselves with unbounded enthusiasm on the side of the Communist International. An even bigger and more important step forward is the definite sympathy with these fundamental principles that has everywhere taken shape among the broadest masses; not only of the urban proletariat, but of the advanced section of the rural workers as well.

On the other hand, two errors, or failings, are to be observed in the very rapidly growing international communist movement. One, which is very grave and constitutes an immense and immediate danger to the success of the cause of proletarian emancipation, is that a section of the old leaders and of the old parties of the Second International—some yielding half-unconsciously to the wishes and pressure of the masses, and some deliberately deceiving the masses in order to retain their function of agents and assistants of the bourgeoisie within the working-class movement—declare their qualified or even unqualified adherence to the Third International, while actually remaining in all their practical party and political work, on the level of the Second International. Such a state of affairs is absolutely intolerable, because it leads to downright corruption of the masses, detracts from the Third International's prestige, and threatens a repetition of the same acts of treachery as were perpetrated by the Hungarian Social-Democrats, who so hastily assumed the title

of Communists. The other error, which is far less significant and is more in the nature of growing pains of the movement, consists in a tendency towards "Leftism" which results in a wrong appraisal of the role and the tasks of the party with regard to the class and the masses, and a wrong attitude towards the revolutionary Communists' obligation to work in bourgeois parliaments and reactionary trade unions.

Communists are in duty bound, not to gloss over shortcomings in their movement, but to criticize them openly so as to remedy them the more speedily and radically. For this purpose it is necessary: first, to define as concretely as possible, particularly on the basis of the practical experience already acquired, the content of the concepts "dictatorship of the proletariat" and "Soviet power"; second, to specify the precise content of the immediate and systematic preparatory work to be carried on in all countries so as to give effect to these slogans; and third, to specify the methods and means of rectifying the faults in our movement.

Chapter 1: The Essence of The Dictatorship of The Proletariat and of Soviet Power

2. The victory of socialism (as the first stage of communism) over capitalism requires that the proletariat, as the only really revolutionary class, shall accomplish the following three tasks. First—overthrow the exploiters, and first and foremost the bourgeoisie, as their principal economic and political representative; utterly rout them; crush their resistance; absolutely preclude any attempt on their part to restore the yoke of capital and wage-slavery. Second—win over and bring under the leadership of the Communist Party, the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, not only the entire proletariat, or its vast majority, but all who labor and are exploited by capital; educate, organize, train and discipline them in the actual course of a supremely bold and ruthlessly firm struggle against the exploiters; wrest this vast majority of the population in all the capitalist countries from dependence on the bourgeoisie; imbue it, through its own practical experience, with confidence in the leading role of the proletariat and of its revolutionary vanguard. Third—neutralize, or render harmless, the inevitable vacillation between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between bourgeois democracy and Soviet power, to be seen in the class of petty proprietors in agriculture, industry and commerce—a class which is still fairly numerous in nearly all advanced countries, although comprising only a minority of the population—as well as in the stratum of intellectuals, salary earners, etc., which corresponds to this class.

The first and second tasks are independent ones, each requiring its own special methods of action with regard to the exploiters and to the exploited respectively. The third task follows from the first two, and merely requires a skillful, timely and flexible combination of methods of the first and second type, depending on the specific circumstances in each separate instance of vacillation.

3. In the concrete situation created throughout the world, and above all in the most advanced, powerful, enlightened and free capitalist countries, by militarism, imperialism, the oppression of colonies and weak countries, the worldwide imperialist butchery and the "Peace" of Versailles—in that situation the very idea of the capitalists peacefully submitting to the will of the majority of the

exploited, the very idea of a peaceful, reformist transition to socialism, is not merely sheer philistine stupidity but also down right deception of the workers, embellishment of capitalist wage-slavery, and concealment of the truth. That truth consists in the bourgeoisie, even the most enlightened and democratic, no longer hesitating at any fraud or crime, even the massacre of millions of workers and peasants, so as to preserve private ownership of the means of production. Only the forcible overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the confiscation of its property, the destruction of the entire bourgeois state apparatus from top to bottom—parliamentary. judicial, military, bureaucratic, administrative, municipal, etc.—right down to the wholesale deportation or internment of the most dangerous and stubborn exploiters and the institution of strict surveillance over them so as to foil their inevitable attempts to resist and to restore capitalist slavery—only such measures can ensure real submission of the whole class of exploiters.

On the other hand, the idea, common among the old parties and the old leaders of the Second International, that the majority of the exploited toilers can achieve complete clarity of socialist consciousness and firm socialist convictions and character under capitalist slavery, under the yoke of the bourgeoisie (which assumes an infinite variety of forms that become more subtle and at the same time more brutal and ruthless the higher the cultural level in a given capitalist country) is also idealization of capitalism and of bourgeois democracy, as well as deception of the workers. In fact, it is only after the vanguard of the proletariat, supported by the whole or the majority of this, the only revolutionary class, overthrows the exploiters, suppresses them, emancipates the exploited from their state of slavery and-immediately improves their conditions of life at the expense of the expropriated capitalists—it is only after this, and only in the actual process of an acute class struggle, that the masses of the toilers and exploited can be educated, trained and organized around the proletariat under whose influence and guidance, they can get rid of the selfishness, disunity, vices and weaknesses engendered by private property; only then will they be converted into a free union of free workers.

4. Victory over capitalism calls for proper relations between the leading (Communist) party, the revolutionary class (the proletariat) and the masses, i.e., the entire body of the toilers and the exploited. Only the Communist Party, if it is really the vanguard of the revolutionary class, if it really comprises all the finest representatives of that class, if it consists of fully conscious and staunch Communists who have been educated and steeled by the experience of a persistent revolutionary struggle, and if it has succeeded in linking itself inseparably with the whole life of its class and, through it, with the whole mass of the exploited, and in completely winning the confidence of this class and this mass—only such a party is capable of leading the proletariat in a final, most ruthless and decisive struggle against all the forces of capitalism. On the other hand, it is only under the leadership of such a party that the proletariat is capable of displaying the full might of its revolutionary onslaught, and of overcoming the inevitable apathy and occasional resistance of that small minority, the labor aristocracy, who have been corrupted by capitalism, the old trade union and co-operative leaders, etc.—only then will it be capable of displaying its full might, which, because of

the very economic structure of capitalist society, is infinitely greater than its proportion of the population. Finally, it is only after they have been really emancipated from the yoke of the bourgeoisie and of the bourgeois machinery of state, only after they have found an opportunity of organizing in their Soviets in a really freeway (free from the exploiters), that the masses, i.e., the toilers and exploited as a body, can display, for the first time in history, all the initiative and energy of tens of millions of people who have been crushed by capitalism. Only when the Soviets have become the sole state apparatus is it really possible to ensure the participation, in the work of administration, of the entire mass of the exploited, who, even under the most enlightened and freest bourgeois democracy, have always actually been excluded 99 per cent from participation in the work of administration. It is only in the Soviets that the exploited masses really begin to learn—not in books, but from their own practical experience—the work of socialist construction, of creating a new social discipline and a free union of free workers.

Chapter 2: What Immediate and Universal Preparation for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat Should Consist of

5. The present stage in the development of the international communist movement is marked by the fact that in the vast majority of capitalist countries, the proletariat's preparations to affect its dictatorship have not been completed, and, in many cases, have not even been systematically begun. From this it does not, however, follow that the proletarian revolution is impossible in the immediate future; it is perfectly possible, since the entire economic and political situation is most inflammable and abounds in causes of a sudden flare-up; the other condition for revolution, apart from the proletariat's preparedness, viz., a general state of crisis in all the ruling and in all bourgeois parties, also exists. However, it does follow that the Communist Parties' current task consists not in accelerating the revolution, but in intensifying the preparation of the proletariat. On the other hand, the facts cited above from the history of many socialist parties make it incumbent on us to see that "recognition" of the dictatorship of the proletariat shall not remain a more matter of words.

Hence, from the point of view of the international proletarian movement, it is the Communist parties ' principal task at the present moment to unite the scattered Communist forces, to form a single Communist Party in every country (or to reinforce or renovate the already existing Party) in order to increase tenfold, the work of preparing the proletariat for the conquest of political power—political power, moreover, in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The ordinary socialist work conducted by groups and parties which recognize the dictatorship of the proletariat has by no means undergone that fundamental reorganization, that fundamental renovation, which is essential before this work can be considered communist work and adequate to the tasks to be accomplished on the eve of proletarian dictatorship.

6. The proletariat's conquest of political power does not put a stop to its class struggle against the bourgeoisie; on the contrary, it renders that struggle most widespread, intense and ruthless. Owing to the extreme intensification of the struggle all groups, parties and leaders in the working-

class movement who have fully or partly adopted the stand of reformism, of the "Centre", etc., inevitably side with the bourgeoisie or join the waverers, or else (what is the most dangerous of all) land in the ranks of the unreliable friends of the victorious proletariat. Hence, preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat calls, not only for an intensification of the struggle against reformist and "Centrist" tendencies, but also for a change in the character of that struggle. The struggle cannot be restricted to explaining the erroneousness of these tendencies; it must unswervingly and ruthlessly expose any leader of the working-class movement who reveals such tendencies, for otherwise the proletariat cannot know who it will march with into the decisive struggle against the bourgeoisie. This struggle is such that at any moment it may—and actually does, as experience has shown—substitute criticism with weapons for the weapon of criticism. [57] Any inconsistency or weakness in exposing those who show themselves to be reformists or "Centrists" means directly increasing the danger of the power of the proletariat being overthrown by the bourgeoisie, which tomorrow will utilize for the counter-revolution that which short-sighted people today see merely as "theoretical difference".

7. In particular, we must not restrict ourselves to the usual repudiation, in principle, of all collaboration between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, of all "collaborationism". Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, which will never be able, at one stroke, to abolish private property completely, mere defense of "liberty"' and "equality", while private ownership of the means of production is preserved, turns into "collaboration" with the bourgeoisie, and undermines the rule of the working class. The dictatorship of the proletariat means that the state uses its whole machinery of power to uphold and perpetuate "no-liberty" for the exploiters to continue their oppression and exploitation, "inequality" between the owner of property (i.e., one who has appropriated for himself certain means of production created by social labor) and the non-owner. That which, prior to the victory of the proletariat, seems merely a theoretical difference on the question of "democracy" inevitably becomes, on the day following victory, a question that is settled by force of arms. Consequently, even preliminary work in preparing the masses to affect the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible without a radical change in the entire character of the struggle against the "Centrists" and the "champions of democracy ".

8. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most determined and revolutionary form of the proletariat's class struggle against the bourgeoisie. This struggle can be successful only when the most revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat has the backing of the overwhelming majority of the proletariat. Hence, preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat entails not only explanation of the bourgeois character of all reformism, of all defense of democracy, while private ownership of the means of production is preserved; it entails, not only exposure of such trends, which are in fact a defense of the bourgeoisie within the labor movement; it also calls for old leaders being replaced by

[57] Lenin is quoting from Marx's work "Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie" (see Marx/Engels, Werke, Bd. 1, S. 385).

Communists in proletarian organisations of absolutely every type—not only political, but also trade union, co-operative, educational, etc. The more complete, lengthy and firmly established the rule of bourgeois democracy has been in a given country, the more the bourgeoisie will have succeeded in securing the appointment to such leading posts of people whose minds have been molded by it and imbued with its views and prejudices, and who have very often been directly or indirectly bought by it. These representatives of the labor aristocracy, bourgeoisified workers, should be ousted from all their posts a hundred times more sweepingly than hitherto, and replaced by workers—even by wholly inexperienced men, provided they are connected with the exploited masses and enjoy their confidence in the struggle against the exploiters. The dictatorship of the proletariat will require the appointment of such inexperienced workers to the most responsible posts in the state; otherwise, the workers' government will be impotent and will not have the support of the masses.

9. The dictatorship of the proletariat means that all toiling and exploited people, who have been disunited, deceived, intimidated, oppressed, downtrodden and crushed by the capitalist class, come under the full leadership of the only class trained for that leadership by the whole history of capitalism. That is why the following is one of the methods whereby preparations for the dictatorship of the proletariat should be started everywhere and immediately:

In all organisations, unions and associations without exception, and first and foremost in proletarian organisations, but also in those of the non-proletarian toiling and exploited masses (political, trade union, military, co-operative, educational, sports, etc., etc.), groups or cells of Communists should be formed—preferably open groups, but underground groups as well, the latter being essential whenever there is reason to expect their suppression, or the arrest or banishment of their members on the part of the bourgeoisie; these cells, which are to be in close touch with one another and with the Party centre, should, by pooling their experience, carrying on work of agitation, propaganda and organisation, adapting themselves to absolutely every sphere of public life and to every variety and category of the toiling masses, systematically educate themselves, the Party, the class, and the masses by means of such diversified work.

In this connection, it is of the utmost importance that necessary distinctions between the methods of work should be evolved in practice: on the one hand, in relation to the "leaders", or "responsible representatives", who are very often hopelessly beset with petty-bourgeois and imperialist prejudices—such "leaders" must be ruthlessly exposed and expelled from the working-class movement—and, on the other hand, in relation to the masses, who, particularly after the imperialist holocaust, are for the most part inclined to listen to and accept the doctrine that the guidance from the proletariat is essential, as the only way of escape from capitalist slavery. We must learn to approach the masses with particular patience and caution so as to be able to understand the distinctive features in the mentality of each stratum, calling, etc., of these masses.

10. In particular, there is a group or cell of Communists that deserves exceptional attention and care from the Party, i.e., the parliamentary group of Party members, who are deputies to bourgeois

representative institutions (primarily the national, but also local, municipal, etc., representative institutions). On the one hand, it is this tribune which is held in particular regard by large sections of the toiling masses, who are backward or imbued with petty-bourgeois prejudices; it is therefore imperative for Communists to utilize this tribune to conduct propaganda, agitation and organisational work and to explain to the masses why the dispersal of the bourgeois parliament by the national congress of Soviets was legitimate in Russia (and, at the proper time, will be legitimate in any country). On the other hand, the entire history of bourgeois democracy, particularly in the advanced countries, has converted the parliamentary rostrum into one of the principals, if not the principal, venues of unparalleled fraudulency, financial and political deception of the people, careerism, hypocrisy and oppression of the working people. The intense hatred of parliaments felt by the best representatives of the revolutionary proletariat is therefore quite justified. The Communist parties and all parties affiliated to the Third International—especially those which have not arisen by splitting away from the old parties and by waging a long and persistent struggle against them, but through the old parties accepting (often nominally) the new stand—should therefore adopt a most strict attitude towards their parliamentary groups; the latter must be brought under the full control and direction of the Central Committees of the Parties; they must consist, in the main, of revolutionary workers; speeches by members of parliament should be carefully analyzed in the Party press and at Party meetings, from a strictly communist standpoint; deputies should be sent to carry on agitational work among the masses; those who manifest Second International leanings should be expelled from the parliamentary groups, etc.

11. One of the chief causes hampering the revolutionary working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries is the fact that because of their colonial possessions and the super-profits gained by finance capital, etc., the capitalists of these countries have been able to create a relatively larger and more stable labor aristocracy, a section which comprises a small minority of the working class. This minority enjoys better terms of employment and is most-imbued with a narrow-minded craft spirit and with petty-bourgeois and imperialist prejudices. It forms the real social pillar of the Second International, of the reformists and the "Centrists"; at present it might even be called the social mainstay of the bourgeoisie. No preparation of the proletariat for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie is possible, even in the preliminary sense, unless an immediate, systematic, extensive and open struggle is waged against this stratum, which, as experience has already fully shown, will no doubt provide the bourgeois White guards with many a recruit after the victory of the proletariat. All parties affiliated to the Third International must at all costs give effect to the slogans: "Deeper into the thick of the masses", "Closer links with the masses"—meaning by the masses all those who toil and are exploited by capital, particularly those who are least organized and educated, who are most oppressed and least amenable to organisation.

The proletariat becomes revolutionary only insofar as it does not restrict itself to the narrow framework of craft interests, only when in all matters and spheres of public life, it acts as the leader of all the toiling and exploited masses; it cannot achieve its dictatorship unless it is prepared and able to

make the greatest sacrifices for the sake of victory over the bourgeoisie. In this respect, the experience of Russia is significant both in principle and in practice. The proletariat could not have achieved its dictatorship there, or won the universally acknowledged respect and confidence of all the toiling masses, had it not made the most sacrifices, or starved more than any other section of those masses at the most crucial moments of the onslaught, war and blockade effected by the world bourgeoisie.

In particular, the Communist Party and all advanced proletarians must give all-round and unstinted support especially to the spontaneous and mass strike movement, which, under the yoke of capital, is alone capable of really rousing, educating and organizing the masses, of imbuing them with complete confidence in the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat. Without such preparation, no dictatorship of the proletariat is possible; those who are capable of publicly opposing strikes, such as Kautsky in Germany and Turati in Italy, cannot possibly be tolerated in the ranks of parties affiliated to the Third International. This applies even more, of course, to those trade union and parliamentary leaders who so often betray the workers by using the experience of strikes to teach them reformism, and not revolution (for instance, in Britain and in France in recent years).

12. In all countries, even in those that are freest, most "legal", and most "peaceful" in the sense that the class struggle is least acute there, it is now absolutely indispensable for every Communist Party to systematically combine legal and illegal work, legal and illegal organisations. Notwithstanding their false and hypocritical declarations, the governments of even the most enlightened and freest of countries, where the bourgeois-democratic system is most "stable", are already systematically and secretly drawing up blacklists of Communists and constantly violating their own constitutions so as to give secret or semi-secret encouragement to the white guards and to the murder of Communists in all countries, making secret preparations for the arrest of Communists, planting *agents provocateurs* among the Communists, etc., etc. Only a most reactionary philistine, no matter what cloak of fine "democratic" and pacifist phrases he may don, will deny this fact or the conclusion that of necessity follows from it viz., that all legal Communist parties must immediately form illegal organisations for the systematic conduct of illegal work and for complete preparations for the moment the bourgeoisie resorts to persecution. Illegal work is most necessary in the army, the navy and the police because, since the imperialist holocaust, governments the world over have begun to stand in dread of people's armies which are open to the workers and peasants, and are secretly resorting to all kinds of methods to set up military units specially recruited from the bourgeoisie and equipped with the most up-to-date weapons.

On the other hand, it is likewise necessary that, in all cases without exception, the parties should not restrict themselves to illegal work, but should conduct legal work as well, overcoming all obstacles, starting legal publications, and forming legal organisations under the most varied names, which should be frequently changed if necessary. This is being practiced by the illegal Communist parties in Finland, Hungary, partly in Germany, Poland, Latvia, etc. It should be practiced by the Industrial Workers of the World in the U.S.A. and by all Communist parties at present legal, should

public prosecutors see fit to take proceedings against them on the grounds of resolutions adopted by Congresses of the Communist International, etc.

A combination of illegal and legal work is an absolute principle dictated, not only by all features of the present period, that of the eve of the proletarian dictatorship, but also by the necessity of proving to the bourgeoisie that there is not, nor can there be, any sphere of activity that cannot be won by the Communists; above all, it is dictated by the fact that broad strata of the proletariat and even broader strata of the non-proletarian toiling and exploited masses still exist everywhere, who continue to believe in bourgeois-democratic legality and whom we must undeceive without fail.

13. In particular, the conditions of the working-class press in most advanced capitalist countries strikingly reveal the utter fraudulency of liberty and equality under bourgeois democracy, as well as the necessity of systematically combining legal work with illegal work. Both in vanquished Germany and in victorious America, the entire power of the bourgeoisie's machinery of state and all the machinations of the financial magnates are employed to deprive the workers of their press, these including legal proceedings, the arrest (or murder by hired assassins) of editors, denial of mailing privileges, the cutting off of paper supplies, and so on and so forth. Besides, the news services essential to daily newspapers are run by bourgeois telegraph agencies, while advertisements, without which a large newspaper cannot pay its way, depend on the "good will" of the capitalists. To sum up: through skullduggery and the pressure of capital and the bourgeois state, the bourgeoisie is depriving the revolutionary proletariat of its press.

To combat this, the Communist parties must create a new type of periodical press for mass distribution among the workers: first, legal publications, which, without calling themselves communist and without publicizing their links with the Party, must learn to make use of any legal opportunity, however slight, just as the Bolsheviks did under the tsar, after 1905; secondly, illegal leaflets, even the briefest and published at irregular intervals, but reprinted at numerous printshops by workers (secretly, or, if the movement has become strong enough, by the revolutionary seizure of printshops), and providing the proletariat with outspoken revolutionary information and revolutionary slogans.

Preparations for the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible without a revolutionary struggle, into which the masses are drawn, for the freedom of the communist press.

Chapter 3: Rectification Of the Political Line—Partly Also of The Composition—Of Parties Affiliated or Desiring to Affiliate to the Communist International

14. The measure in which the proletariat in countries most important from the viewpoint of world economics and politics is prepared to establish its dictatorship can be seen with the greatest objectivity and precision in the fact that the most influential parties of the Second International, viz., the French Socialist Party, the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany, the Independent

Labor Party of Great Britain and the Socialist Party of America, [58] have withdrawn from this yellow International, and have decided—the first three conditionally, the latter even unconditionally—to affiliate to the Third International. This proves that not only the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat but its majority too have begun to come over to our side, convinced by the entire course of events. The main thing now is the ability to consummate this process and to consolidate firmly in point of organisation what has been achieved, so as to advance all along the line, without the slightest wavering.

15. All the activities of the parties mentioned (to which should be added the Socialist Party of Switzerland, [59] if the telegraph reports of its decision to join the Third International are true) show—as any periodical of these parties will strikingly confirm—that they are not yet communist, and quite often run directly counter to the fundamental principles of the Third International, viz., the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and Soviet government in place of bourgeois democracy.

Accordingly, the Second Congress of the Communist International must resolve that it cannot immediately accept the affiliation of these parties; that it endorses the reply given by the Executive Committee of the Third International to the German "Independents"; [60] that it confirms its readiness to conduct negotiations with any party that withdraws from the Second International and desires to enter into closer relations with the Third International; that it will admit the delegates of such parties

---

[58] The American Socialist Party was formed in July 1901 at a congress held in Indianapolis, as the result of a merger of groups that had broken away from the Socialist Workers' Party and the Social-Democratic Party of the U.S.A. Among the new party's organizers was Eugene Debs, a popular figure in the U.S. labor movement. The social composition of the party was not uniform, it contained native-born and immigrant workers, as well as small farmers and people of petty-bourgeois origin. The Centrist and the Right-wing opportunist leaders of the party (Victor Berger, Morris Hillquit and others) denied the necessity of the proletarian dictatorship, renounced revolutionary methods of struggle, and reduced all party activities to participation in election campaigns. During the First World War (1914-18) three trends appeared in the Socialist Party: the social-chauvinists, who supported the imperialist policy of the Administration, the Centrists, who opposed the imperialist war only in word, and the revolutionary minority, who took an internationalist stand and struggled against the war.

The Socialist Party's Left wing, headed by Charles Ruthenberg, William Foster, William Haywood and others, relying on the proletarian elements, waged a struggle against the party's opportunist leadership, for independent proletarian action and the formation of industrial trade unions based on the principles of the class struggle. In 1919 a split took place in the Socialist Party. The party's Left wing broke away, becoming the initiator and nucleus of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. At present the Socialist Party is a small sectarian organisation.

[59] The Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland (known as the Swiss Socialist Party) was formed in the seventies of the last century and affiliated to the First International. The party was re-formed in 1888. The opportunists were very influential in the party, and during the First World War took a social-chauvinist stand. In the autumn of 1916, the Party's Right wing broke away to form their own organisation. The majority, headed by Robert Grimm, took a Centrist, social-pacifist stand, while the Left wing of the party adhered to an internationalist stand. The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia influenced and strengthened the Left wing which, in December 1920, broke away and joined the Communist Party of Switzerland in 1921 (see Note 69).

[60] "Draft (or the Theses) of the R.C.P.'s Reply to a Letter from the German Independent Social-Democratic Party" (see present edition, Vol. 30, pp. 337-44).

in a deliberative capacity to all its congresses and conferences; that it sets the following conditions for the complete adhesion of these (and similar), parties with the Communist International:

1)All decisions of all Congresses of the Communist International and of its Executive Committee to be published in all the periodicals of the parties concerned;

2)These decisions to be discussed at special meetings of all sections or local organisations of the parties;

3)After such discussion, special congresses of the parties to be convened to sum up the results, and for the purpose of—

4)Purging the parties of elements that continue to act in the spirit of the Second International;

5)All periodical publications of the parties to be placed under exclusively Communist editorship.

The Second Congress of the Third International should instruct its Executive Committee formally to accept these and similar parties into the Third International after ascertaining that all these conditions have actually been met and that the activities of the parties have assumed a communist character.

16. As to the question of the conduct of Communists now holding a minority of the responsible posts in these and similar parties, the Second Congress of the Communist International should resolve that, in view of the obvious growth of sincere sympathy for communism among working men belonging to these parties, it would be undesirable for Communists to resign from the latter, as long as they can carry on work within them for the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and Soviet government, and as long as it is possible to criticize the opportunists and Centrists who still remain in these parties.

At the same time, the Second Congress of the Third International should declare in favor of Communist groups and organisations, or groups and organisations sympathizing with communism, joining the Labor Party in Great Britain, despite its membership in the Second International. As long as this party ensures its affiliated organisations their present freedom of criticism and freedom to carry on work of propaganda, agitation and organisation in favor of the dictatorship of the proletariat and Soviet government, and as long as this party preserves the character of a federation of all trade union organisations of the working class, it is imperative for Communists to do everything and to make certain compromises in order to be able to exercise their influence on the broadest masses of the workers, to expose their opportunist leaders from a higher tribune, that is in fuller view of the masses, and to hasten the transfer of political power from the direct representatives of the bourgeoisie to the “labor lieutenants of the capitalist class”, so that the masses may be more quickly weaned away from their last illusions on this score.

17. Concerning the Socialist Party of Italy, the Second Congress of the Third International considers that the criticism of that party and the practical proposals submitted to the National Council of the Socialist Party of Italy in the name of the party's Turin section, [61] as set forth in *L'Ordine Nuovo* of May 8, 1920, are in the main correct and are fully in keeping with the fundamental principles of the Third International.

> Accordingly, the Second Congress of the Third International requests the Socialist Party of Italy to convene a special congress to discuss these proposals and also all the decisions of the two Congresses of the Communist International for the purpose of rectifying the party's line and of purging it, particularly its parliamentary group, of non-Communist elements.

18. The Second Congress of the Third International considers erroneous the views on the Party's relation to the class and to the masses, and the view that it is not obligatory for Communist parties to participate in bourgeois parliaments and in reactionary trade unions. These views have been refuted in detail in special decisions of the present Congress, and advocated most fully by the Communist Workers' Party of Germany, and partly by the Communist Party of Switzerland, [62] by *Kommunismus*, organ of the East-European Secretariat of the Communist International in Vienna, by the now dissolved secretariat in Amsterdam, by several Dutch comrades, by several Communist organisations in Great Britain, as, for example, the Workers' Socialist Federation, etc., and also by the Industrial Workers of the World in the U.S.A. and the Shop Stewards' Committees in Great Britain, etc.

Nevertheless, the Second. Congress of the Third International considers it possible and desirable that those of the above-mentioned organisations which have not yet officially affiliated to the Communist International should do so immediately; for in the present instance, particularly as regards the Industrial Workers of the World in the U.S.A. and Australia, as well as the Shop Stewards' Committees in Great Britain, we are dealing with a profoundly proletarian and mass movement, which in all essentials actually stands by the basic principles of the Communist International. The erroneous views held by these organisations regarding participation in bourgeois

---

[61] The Turin section accused the Italian Socialist Party with its conciliatory leadership, of failing to give a correct analysis of events, in the conditions of the revolutionary upsurge in Italy (1919-20) that had created the possibility of the seizure of political power by the proletariat, and of having failed to advance any slogan acceptable to the revolutionary masses, and expel the reformists from its ranks. The section made a number of practical proposals: the expulsion of the opportunists from the party; the formation of communist groups in each factory, in the trade unions, co-operatives, and army barracks, the setting-up of factory T.U. committees to organize control of production in industry and agriculture. The section demanded that work to prepare the working masses for the creation of Soviets should be begun at once.

[62] In October 1918, part of the Social-Democrat Left wing united to form the Communist Party of Switzerland. It was not a big party at the time, being represented by two delegates at the Second Congress of the Comintern.

In December 1920, the Left wing of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party broke away from it, and raised the question of forming a strong section of the Communist International in Switzerland. At a congress held in Zurich in March 1921, attended by 28 delegates from the Communist Party and 145 delegates representing the former Left wing of the Social-Democratic Party, the two groups officially united to form a single Communist Party of Switzerland.

parliaments can be explained, not so much by the influence of elements coming from the bourgeoisie, who bring their essentially petty-bourgeois views into the movement—views such as anarchists often hold—as by the political inexperience of proletarians who are quite revolutionary and connected with the masses.

For this reason, the Second Congress of the Third International requests all Communist organisations and groups in the Anglo-Saxon countries, even if the Industrial Workers of the World and the Shop Stewards' Committees do not immediately affiliate to the Third International, to pursue a very friendly policy towards these organisations, to establish closer contacts with them and the masses that sympathies with them, and to explain to them in a friendly spirit—on the basis of the experience of all revolutions, and particularly of the three Russian revolutions of the twentieth century—the erroneousness of their views as set forth above, and not to desist from further efforts to amalgamate with these organisations to form a single Communist party.

19. In this connection, the Congress draws the attention of all comrades, particularly in the Latin and Anglo-Saxon countries, to the fact that, since the war, a profound ideological division has been taking place among anarchists all over the world regarding the attitude to be adopted towards the dictatorship of the proletariat and Soviet government. Moreover, a proper understanding of these principles is particularly to be seen among proletarian elements that have often been impelled towards anarchism by a perfectly legitimate hatred of the opportunism and reformism of the parties of the Second International. That understanding is growing the more widespread among them, the more familiar they become with the experience of Russia, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Poland and Germany.

The Congress therefore considers it the duty of all Communists to do everything to help all proletarian mass elements to abandon anarchism and come over to the side of the Third International. The Congress points out that the measure in which genuinely Communist parties succeed in winning mass proletarian elements rather than intellectual, and petty-bourgeois elements away from anarchism, is a criterion of the success of those Parties.

V. I. Lenin: Draft Theses on National and Colonial Questions for The Second Congress of The Communist International [63]

In submitting for discussion by the Second Congress of the Communist International the following draft theses on the national and the colonial questions I would request all comrades,

[63] Notes to "Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions" were received by Lenin from G. V. Chicherin, N. N. Krestinsky, J. V. Stalin, M. G. Rafes, Y. A. Preobrazhensky, N. D. Lapinsky, and I. Nedelkov (N. Shablin), representative of the Bulgarian Communists, as well as from a number of leaders in Bashkiria, Kirghizia, and Turkestan. Along with correct ideas, the notes contained certain grave errors. Thus, Chicherin gave a wrong interpretation to Lenin's theses on the necessity of support for national liberation movements and on agreements with the national bourgeoisie, without due regard for Lenin's distinction between the bourgeoisie and the peasantry. With regard to this Lenin wrote: "I lay greater stress on the alliance with the peasantry (which does not quite mean the bourgeoisie)" (Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.C. C.P.S.U.). Referring to the relations between the future socialist Europe

especially those who possess concrete information on any of these very complex problems, to let me have their opinions, amendments, addenda and concrete remarks *in the most concise form* (*no more than two or three pages*), particularly on the following points:

- Austrian experience;
- Polish-Jewish and Ukrainian experience;
- Alsace-Lorraine and Belgium;
- Ireland;
- Danish-German, Italo-French and Italo-Slav relations;
- Balkan experience;
- Eastern peoples;
- The struggle against Pan-Islamism;
- Relations in the Caucasus;
- The Bashkir and Tatar Republics;
- Kirghizia; Turkestan, its experience;
- Negroes in America;
- Colonies;
- China-Korea-Japan.

N. Lenin

June 5, 1920

1) An abstract or formal posing of the problem of equality in general and national equality in particular is in the very nature of bourgeois democracy. Under the guise of the equality of the individual in general, bourgeois democracy proclaims the formal or legal equality of the property-owner and the proletarian, the exploiter and the exploited, thereby grossly deceiving the oppressed classes. On the plea that all men are absolutely equal, the bourgeoisie is transforming the idea of equality, which is itself a reflection of relations in commodity production, into a weapon in its struggle against the abolition of

---

and the economically underdeveloped and dependent countries, Preobrazhensky wrote: ". . . if it proves impossible to reach economic agreement with the leading national groups, the latter will inevitably be suppressed by force and economically important regions will be compelled to join a union of European Republics." Lenin decisively objected to this remark: ". . . it goes too far. It cannot be proved, and it is wrong to say that suppression by force is "inevitable". That is radically wrong" (see Voprosy Istorii KPSS [Problems of the C.P.S.U. History] 1958, No. 2, p. 16).

A grave error was made by Stalin, who did not agree with Lenin's proposition on the difference between federal relations among the Soviet republics based on autonomy, and federal relations among independent republics. In a letter to Lenin, dated June 12, 1920, he declared that in reality "there is no difference between these two types of federal relations, or else it is so small as to be negligible". Stalin continued to advocate this later, when, in 1922, he proposed the "autonomisation" of the independent Soviet republics. These ideas were criticized in detail by Lenin in his article "The Question of Nationalities or 'Autonomisation'", and in his letter to members of the Political Bureau "On the Formation of the U.S.S.R" (see present edition, Vol. 36, and Lenin Miscellany XXXVI; pp. 496-98).

classes. The real meaning of the demand for equality consists in its being a demand for the abolition of classes.

2) In conformity with its fundamental task of combating bourgeois democracy and exposing its falseness and hypocrisy, the Communist Party, as the avowed champion of the proletarian struggle to overthrow the bourgeois yoke, must base its policy, in the national question too, not on abstract and formal principles but, first, on a precise appraisal of the specific historical situation and, primarily, of economic conditions; second, on a clear distinction between the interests of the oppressed classes, of working and exploited people, and the general concept of national interests as a whole, which implies the interests of the ruling class; third, on an equally clear distinction between the oppressed, dependent and subject nations and the oppressing, exploiting and sovereign nations, in order to counter the bourgeois-democratic lies that play down this colonial and financial enslavement of the vast majority of the world's population by an insignificant minority of the richest and advanced capitalist countries, a feature characteristic of the era of finance capital and imperialism.
3) The imperialist war of 1914-18 has very clearly revealed to all nations and to the oppressed classes of the whole world the falseness of bourgeois-democratic phrases, by practically demonstrating that the Treaty of Versailles of the celebrated "Western democracies" is an even more brutal and foul act of violence against weak nations than was the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk of the German Junkers and the Kaiser. The League of Nations and the entire post war policy of the Entente reveal this truth with even greater clarity and distinctness. They are everywhere intensifying the revolutionary struggle both of the proletariat in the advanced countries and of the toiling masses in the colonial and dependent countries. They are hastening the collapse of the petty-bourgeois nationalist illusions that nations can live together in peace and equality under capitalism.
4) From these fundamental premises it follows that the Communist International's entire policy on the national and the colonial questions should rest primarily on a closer union of the proletarians and the working masses of all nations and countries for a joint revolutionary struggle to overthrow the landowners and the bourgeoisie. This union alone will guarantee victory over capitalism, without which the abolition of national oppression and inequality is impossible.
5) The world political situation has now placed the dictatorship of the proletariat on the order of the day. World political developments are of necessity concentrated on a single focus—the struggle of the world bourgeoisie against the Soviet Russian Republic, around which are inevitably grouped, on the one hand, the Soviet movements of the advanced workers in all countries, and, on the other, all the national liberation movements in the colonies and among the oppressed nationalities, who are learning

from bitter experience that their only salvation lies in the Soviet system's victory over world imperialism.

6) Consequently, one cannot at present confine oneself to a bare recognition or proclamation of the need for closer union between the working people of the various nations; a policy must be pursued that will achieve the closest alliance, with Soviet Russia, of all the national and colonial liberation movements. The form of this alliance should be determined by the degree of development of the communist movement in the proletariat of each country, or of the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement of the workers and peasants in backward countries or among backward nationalities.
7) Federation is a transitional form to the complete unity of the working people of different nations. The feasibility of federation has already been demonstrated in practice both by the relations between the R.S.F.S.R. and other Soviet Republics (the Hungarian, Finnish [64] and Latvian [65] in the past, and the Azerbaijan and Ukrainian at present), and by the relations within the R.S.F.S.R. in respect of nationalities which formerly enjoyed

[64] As a result of the revolution which commenced in Finland on January 27, 1918, the bourgeois government of Svinhufvud was overthrown and the working class assumed power. On January 29, the revolutionary government of Finland, the Council of People's Representatives was formed by Edvard Gylling, Yrjö Sirola, Otto Kuusinen, A. Taimi and others. The following were among the most important measures taken by the workers' government: the law on the transfer to landless peasants, without indemnification, of the land they actually tilled; tax-exemption for the poorest sections of the population; the expropriation of enterprises whose owners had fled the country; the establishment of state control over private banks (their functions being assumed by the State Bank).

On March 1, 1918, a treaty between the Finnish Socialist Workers' Republic and the R.S.F.S.R. was signed in Petrograd. Based on the principle of complete equality and respect for the sovereignty of the two sides, this was the first treaty in world history to be signed between two socialist countries.

The proletarian revolution, however, was victorious only in the south of Finland. The Svinhufvud government concentrated all counter-revolutionary forces in the north of the country, and appealed to the German Kaiser's government for help. As a result of German armed intervention, the Finnish revolution was put down in May 1918, after a desperate civil war. White terror reigned in the country, tens of thousands of revolutionary workers and peasants were executed or tortured to death in the prisons.

[65] As a result of mass action by the Lettish proletariat and peasantry against the German invaders and the counter-revolutionary government of Ulmanis, a provisional Soviet government was established in Latvia on December 17, 1918, which issued a Manifesto on the assumption of state power by the Soviets. Soviet Russia gave fraternal help to the Lettish people in their struggle to establish Soviet rule and strengthen the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Under the leadership of the Latvian Communist Party and the Latvian Soviet Government, a Red Army was formed, the landed estates were confiscated, the banks and big commercial and industrial enterprises were nationalized, social insurance and an eight-hour working day were introduced, and a system of public catering for working people was organized.

In March 1919, German troops and the white guards, armed and equipped by the U.S. and the Entente imperialists, attacked Soviet Latvia. In May they captured Riga, the capital of Soviet Latvia. After fierce fighting the entire territory of Latvia had been overrun by the interventionists by the beginning of 1920. The counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie established a regime of bloody terror, thousands of revolutionary workers and peasants being killed or thrown into prison.

neither statehood nor autonomy (e.g., the Bashkir and Tatar autonomous republics in the R.S.F.S.R., founded in 1919 and 1920 respectively).

8) In this respect, it is the task of the Communist International to further develop and also to study and test by experience these new federations, which are arising on the basis of the Soviet system and the Soviet movement. In recognizing that federation is a transitional form to complete unity, it is necessary to strive for ever closer federal unity, bearing in mind, first, that the Soviet republics, surrounded as they are by the imperialist powers of the whole world—which from the military standpoint are immeasurably stronger—cannot possibly continue to exist without the closest alliance; second, that a close economic alliance between the Soviet republics is necessary, otherwise the productive forces which have been ruined by imperialism cannot be restored and the well-being of the working people cannot be ensured; third, that there is a tendency towards the creation of a single world economy, regulated by the proletariat of all nations as an integral whole and according to a common plan. This tendency has already revealed itself quite clearly under capitalism and is bound to be further developed and consummated under socialism.
9) The Communist International's national policy in the sphere of relations within the state cannot be restricted to the bare, formal, purely declaratory and actually non-committal recognition of the equality of nations to which the bourgeois democrats confine themselves—both those who frankly admit being such, and those who assume the name of socialists (such as the socialists of the Second International).

   In all their propaganda and agitation—both within parliament and outside it—the Communist parties must consistently expose that constant violation of the equality of nations and of the guaranteed rights of national minorities which is to be seen in all capitalist countries, despite their "democratic" constitutions. It is also necessary, first, constantly to explain that only the Soviet system is capable of ensuring genuine equality of-nations, by uniting first the proletarians and then the whole mass of the working population in the struggle against the bourgeoisie; and, second, that all Communist parties should render direct aid to the revolutionary movements among the dependent and underprivileged nations (for example, Ireland, the American Negroes, etc.) and in the colonies.

   without the latter condition, which is particularly important, the struggle against the oppression of dependent nations and colonies, as well as recognition of their right to secede, are but a false signboard, as is evidenced by the parties of the Second International.
10) Recognition of internationalism in word, and its replacement in deed by petty-bourgeois nationalism and pacifism, in all propaganda, agitation and practical work, is

very common, not only among the parties of the Second International, but also among those which have withdrawn from it, and often even among parties which now call themselves communist. The urgency of the struggle against this evil, against the most deep-rooted petty-bourgeois national prejudices, looms ever larger with the mounting exigency of the task of converting the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national dictatorship (i.e., existing in a single country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (i.e., a dictatorship of the proletariat involving at least several advanced countries, and capable of exercising a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole). Petty-bourgeois nationalism proclaims as internationalism the mere recognition of the equality of nations, and nothing more. Quite apart from the fact that this recognition is purely verbal, petty-bourgeois nationalism preserves national self-interest intact, whereas proletarian internationalism demands, first, that the interests of the proletarian struggle in any one country should be subordinated to the interests of that struggle on a world-wide scale, and, second, that a nation which is achieving victory over the bourgeoisie should be able and willing to make the greatest national sacrifices for the overthrow of international capital.

Thus, in countries that are already fully capitalist and have workers' parties that really act as the vanguard of the proletariat, the struggle against opportunist and petty-bourgeois pacifist distortions of the concept and policy of internationalism is a primary and cardinal task.

11) With regard to the more backward states and nations, in which feudal or patriarchal and patriarchal-peasant relations predominate, it is particularly important to bear in mind:

first, that all Communist parties must assist the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement in these countries, and that the duty of rendering the most active assistance rests primarily with the workers of the country the backward nation is colonially or financially dependent on;

second, the need for a struggle against the clergy and other influential reactionary and medieval elements in backward countries;

third, the need to combat Pan-Islamism and similar trends, which strive to combine the liberation movement against European and American imperialism with an attempt to strengthen the positions of the khans, landowners, mullahs, etc.;[In the proofs Lenin inserted a brace opposite points 2 and 3 and wrote "2 and 3 to be united".—Editor.]

fourth, the need, in backward countries, to give special support to the peasant movement against the landowners, against landed proprietorship, and against all

manifestations or survivals of feudalism, and to strive to lend the peasant movement the most revolutionary character by establishing the closest possible alliance between the West European communist proletariat and the revolutionary peasant movement in the East, in the colonies, and in the backward countries generally. It is particularly necessary to exert every effort to apply the basic principles of the Soviet system in countries where pre-capitalist relations predominate—by setting up "working people's Soviets", etc.;

fifth, the need for a determined struggle against attempts to give a communist coloring to bourgeois-democratic liberation trends in the backward countries; the Communist International should support bourgeois-democratic national movements in colonial and backward countries only on condition that, in these countries, the elements of future proletarian parties, which will be communist not only in name, are brought together and trained to understand their special tasks, i.e., those of the struggle against the bourgeois-democratic movements within their own nations. The Communist International must enter into a temporary alliance with bourgeois democracy in the colonial and backward countries, but should not merge with it, and should under all circumstances uphold the independence of the proletarian movement even if it is in its most embryonic form;

sixth, the need constantly to explain and expose among the broadest working masses of all countries, and particularly of the backward countries, the deception systematically practiced by the imperialist powers, which, under the guise of politically independent states, set up states that are wholly dependent upon them economically, financially and militarily. Under present-day international conditions there is no salvation for dependent and weak nations except in a union of Soviet republics.

12) The age-old oppression of colonial and weak nationalities by the imperialist powers has not only filled the working masses of the oppressed countries with animosity towards the oppressor nations, but has also aroused distrust in these nations in general, even in their proletariat. The despicable betrayal of socialism by the majority of the official leaders of this proletariat in 1914-19, when "defense of country" was used as a social-chauvinist cloak to conceal the defense of the "right" of their "own" bourgeoisie to oppress colonies and fleece financially dependent countries, was certain to enhance this perfectly legitimate distrust. On the other hand, the more backward the country, the stronger is the hold of small-scale agricultural production, patriarchalism and isolation, which inevitably lend particular strength and tenacity to the deepest of petty-bourgeois prejudices, i.e., to national egoism and national narrow-mindedness. These prejudices are bound to die out very slowly, for they can disappear only after imperialism and capitalism have disappeared in the advanced countries, and after the entire foundation

of the backward countries' economic life has radically changed. It is therefore the duty of the class-conscious communist proletariat of all countries to regard with particular caution and attention the survivals of national sentiments in the countries and among nationalities which have been oppressed the longest; it is equally necessary to make certain concessions with a view to more rapidly overcoming this distrust and these prejudices. Complete victory over capitalism cannot be won unless the proletariat and, following it, the mass of working people in all countries and nations throughout the world voluntarily strive for alliance and unity.

V. I. Lenin: What Is to Be Done?

Chapter 2: The Spontaneity of the Masses and the Consciousness of the Social-Democrats

We have said that our movement, much more extensive and deeper than the movement of the seventies, must be inspired with the same devoted determination and energy that inspired the movement at that time. Indeed, no one, we think, has until now doubted that the strength of the present-day movement lies in the awakening of the masses (principally, the industrial proletariat) and that its weakness lies in the lack of consciousness and initiative among the revolutionary leaders.

However, of late a staggering discovery has been made, which threatens to disestablish all hitherto prevailing views on this question. This discovery was made by *Rabocheye Dyelo*, which in its polemic with *Iskra* and *Zarya* did not confine itself to making objections on separate points, but tried to ascribe "general disagreements" to a more profound cause — to the "different appraisals of the *relative* importance of the spontaneous and consciously 'methodical' element". *Rabocheye Dyelo* formulated its indictment as a "*belittling of the significance of the objective or the spontaneous element of development*".[66] To this we say: Had the polemics with *Iskra* and *Zarya* resulted in nothing more than causing *Rabocheye Dyelo* to hit upon these "general disagreements", that alone would give us considerable satisfaction, so significant is this thesis and so clear is the light it sheds on the quintessence of the present-day theoretical and political differences that exist among Russian Social-Democrats.

For this reason, the question of the relation between consciousness and spontaneity is of such enormous general interest, and for this reason the question must be dealt with in great detail.

Section A: The Beginning of the Spontaneous Upsurge

In the previous chapter we pointed out how *universally* absorbed the educated youth of Russia was in the theories of Marxism in the middle of the nineties. In the same period the strikes that followed the famous St. Petersburg industrial war of 1896 assumed a similar general character. Their spread over the whole of Russia clearly showed the depth of the newly awakening popular movement, and if we are to speak of the "spontaneous element" then, of course, it is this strike movement which, first and foremost, must be regarded as spontaneous. But there is spontaneity and

[66] Rabocheye Dyelo, No. 10, September 1901, pp. 17-18. Rabocheye Dyelo's italics.—Lenin

spontaneity. Strikes occurred in Russia in the seventies and sixties (and even in the first half of the nineteenth century), and they were accompanied by the "spontaneous" destruction of machinery, etc. Compared with these "revolts", the strikes of the nineties might even be described as "conscious", to such an extent do they mark the progress which the working-class movement made in that period. This shows that the "spontaneous element", in essence, represents nothing more nor less than. consciousness in an *embryonic form*. Even the primitive revolts expressed the awakening of consciousness to a certain extent. The workers were losing their age-long faith in the permanence of the system which oppressed them and began... I shall not say to understand, but to sense the necessity for collective resistance, definitely abandoning their slavish submission to the authorities. But this was, nevertheless, more in the nature of outbursts of desperation and vengeance than of *struggle*. The strikes of the nineties revealed far greater flashes of consciousness; definite demands were advanced, the strike was carefully timed, known cases and instances in other places were discussed, etc. The revolts were simply the resistance of the oppressed, whereas the systematic strikes represented the class struggle in embryo, but only in embryo. Taken by themselves, these strikes were simply trade union struggles, not yet Social Democratic struggles. They marked the awakening antagonisms between workers and employers; but the workers, were not, and could not be, conscious of the irreconcilable antagonism of their interests to the whole of the modern political and social system, i.e., theirs was not yet Social-Democratic consciousness. In this sense, the strikes of the nineties, despite the enormous progress they represented as compared with the "revolts", remained a purely spontaneous movement.

We have said that *there could not have been* Social-Democratic consciousness among the workers. It would have to be brought to them from without. The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade union consciousness, i.e., the conviction that it is necessary to combine in unions, fight the employers, and strive to compel the government to pass necessary labor legislation, etc. [67] The theory of socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical, and economic theories elaborated by educated representatives of the propertied classes, by intellectuals. By their social status the founders of modern scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, themselves belonged to the bourgeois intelligentsia. In the very same way, in Russia, the theoretical doctrine of Social-Democracy arose altogether independently of the spontaneous growth of the working-class movement; it arose as a natural and inevitable outcome of the development of thought among the revolutionary socialist intelligentsia. In the period under discussion, the middle nineties, this doctrine not only represented the completely formulated programme of the Emancipation of Labor group, but had already won over to its side the majority of the revolutionary youth in Russia.

[67] Trade-unionism does not exclude "politics" altogether, as some imagine. Trade unions have always conducted some political (but not Social-Democratic) agitation and struggle. We shall deal with the difference between trade union politics and Social-Democratic politics in the next chapter.—Lenin

Hence, we had both the spontaneous awakening of the working masses, their awakening to conscious life and conscious struggle, and a revolutionary youth, armed with Social-Democratic theory and straining towards the workers. In this connection it is particularly important to state the oft-forgotten (and comparatively little-known) fact that, although the *early* Social-Democrats of that period *zealously carried on economic agitation* (being guided in this activity by the truly useful indications contained in the pamphlet *On Agitation*, [68] then still in manuscript), they did not regard this as their sole task. On the contrary, *from the very beginning* they set for Russian Social-Democracy the most far-reaching historical tasks, in general, and the task of overthrowing the autocracy, in particular. Thus, towards the end of 1895, the St. Petersburg group of Social-Democrats, which founded the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class, prepared the first issue of a newspaper called *Rabocheye Dyelo*. This issue was ready to go to press when it was seized by the gendarmes, on the night of December 8, 1895, in a raid on the house of one of the members of the group, Anatoly Alexeyevich Vaneyey, [69] so that the first edition of *Rabocheye Dyelo* was not destined to see the light of day. The leading article in this issue (which perhaps thirty years hence some *Russkaya Starina* [70] will unearth in the archives of the Department of Police) outlined the historical tasks of the working class in Russia and placed the achievement of political liberty at their head. The issue also contained an article entitled "What Are Our Ministers Thinking About?" [71] which dealt with the crushing of the elementary education committees by the police. In addition, there was some correspondence from St. Petersburg, and from other parts of Russia (e.g., a letter on the massacre of the workers in Yaroslavl Gubernia). This, "first effort", if we are not mistaken, of the Russian Social-Democrats of the nineties was not a purely local, or less still, "Economic", newspaper, but one that aimed to unite the strike movement with the revolutionary movement against the autocracy, and to win over to the side of Social-Democracy all who were oppressed by the policy of reactionary obscurantism. No one in the slightest degree acquainted with the state of the movement at that period could doubt that such a paper would have met with warm response among the workers of the capital and the revolutionary intelligentsia and would have had a wide circulation. The failure of the enterprise merely showed that the Social-Democrats of that period were unable to meet the

[68] The pamphlet On Agitation was written by A. Kremer (later an organizer of the Bund) and edited by Y. 0. Tsederbaum (Martov) in Vilno in 1894; it was at first circulated in handwritten and hectographed copies, but at the end of 1897 it was printed in Geneva and supplied with a preface and a concluding piece by P. B. Axelrod. The pamphlet summarized the experiences gained in Social-Democratic work in Vilno and exerted a great influence on Russian Social-Democrats, since it called on them to reject narrow study-circle propaganda and to go over to mass agitation among the workers on issues of their everyday needs and demands. It exaggerated the role of the purely economic struggle, however, to the detriment of political agitation on issues of general democratic demands, and was the embryo of the future "Economism". P. B. Axelrod not ed the one-sidedness of the "Vilno Economism" in his concluding piece to the Geneva edition; G. V. Plekhanov made a critical analysis of the pamphlet On Agitation in his Once More on Socialism and the Political Struggle.

[69] A. A. Vaneyev died in Eastern Siberia in 1899 from consumption, which he contracted during solitary confinement in prison prior to his banishment. That is why we considered it possible to publish the above information, the authenticity of which we guarantee, for it comes from persons who were closely and directly acquainted with A. A. Vaneyev.—Lenin

[70] Russkaya Starina (The Russian Antiquary)—a monthly magazine dealing with historical problems published in St. Petersburg from 1870 to 1918.

[71] See present edition, Vol. 2, pp. 87-92.—Ed.

immediate requirements of the time owing to their lack of revolutionary experience and practical training. This must be said, too, with regard to the *S. Peterburgsky Rabochy Listok* [72] and particularly with regard to Rabochaya Gazeta and the *Manifesto* of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, founded in the spring of 1898. Of course, we would not dream of blaming the Social Democrats of that time for this unpreparedness. But in order to profit from the experience of that movement, and to draw practical lessons from it, we must thoroughly understand the causes and significance of this or that shortcoming. It is therefore highly important to establish the fact that a part (perhaps even a majority) of the Social-Democrats, active in the period of 1895-98, justly considered it possible even then, at the very beginning of the "spontaneous" movement, to come forward with a most extensive programme and a militant tactical line. [73] Lack of training of the majority of the revolutionaries, an entirely natural phenomenon, could not have roused any particular fears. Once the tasks were correctly defined, once the energy existed for repeated attempts to fulfil them, temporary failures represented only part misfortune. Revolutionary experience and organisational skill are things that can be acquired, provided the desire is there to acquire them, provided the shortcomings are recognized, which in revolutionary activity is more than half-way towards their removal.

But what was only part misfortune becoming full misfortune when this consciousness began to grow dim (it was very much alive among the members of the groups mentioned), when there appeared people—and even Social -Democratic organs—that were prepared to regard shortcomings as virtues, that even tried to invent a *theoretical* basis for their *slavish cringing before spontaneity*. It is time to draw conclusions from this trend, the content of which is incorrectly and too narrowly characterized as Economism.

Section B: Bowing to Spontaneity. Rabochaya Mysl

Before dealing with the literary manifestation of this subservience to spontaneity, we should like to note the following characteristic fact (communicated to us from the above-mentioned source), which throws light on the conditions in which the two future conflicting trends in Russian Social-Democracy arose and grew among the comrades working in St. Petersburg. In the beginning of 1897, just prior to their banishment, A. A. Vaneyev and several of his comrades attended a private meeting

[72] S. Peterburgsky Rabochy Listok (St. Petersburg Workers' Paper)—an illegal newspaper, organ of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class. Two issues appeared: No. 1 in February 1897 (dated January and mimeographed in Russia in an edition of 300—400 copies) and No. 2 in September 1897 in Geneva.

[73] "In adopting a hostile attitude towards the activities of the Social-Democrats of the late nineties, Iskra ignores the absence at that time of conditions for any work other than the struggle for petty demands," declare the Economists in their "Letter to Russian Social-Democratic Organs" (Iskra No. 12). The facts given above show that the assertion about "absence of conditions" is diametrically opposed to the truth. Not only at the end, but even in the mid-nineties, all the conditions existed for other work, besides the struggle for petty demands — all the conditions except adequate training of leaders. Instead of frankly admitting that we, the ideologists, the leaders, lacked sufficient training — the Economists seek to shift the blame entirely upon the "absence of conditions", upon the effect of material environment that determines the road from which no ideologist will be able to divert the movement. What is this but slavish cringing before spontaneity, what but the infatuation of the "ideologists" with their own shortcomings?—Lenin

[74] at which "old" and "young" members of the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class gathered. The conversation centered chiefly about the question of organisation, particularly about the "rules for the workers' mutual benefit fund", which, in their final form, were published in *"Listok" Rabotnika*, [75] No. 9-10, p. 46. Sharp differences immediately showed themselves between the "old" members ("Decembrists", as the St. Petersburg Social Democrats jestingly called them) and several the "young" members (who subsequently took an active part in the work of *Rabochaya Mysl*), with a heated discussion ensuing. The "young" members defended the main principles of the rules in the form in which they were published. The "old" members contended that the prime necessity was not this, but the consolidation of the League of Struggle into an organisation of revolutionaries to which all the various workers' mutual benefit funds, students' propaganda circles, etc., should be subordinated. It goes without saying that the disputing sides far from realized at the time that these disagreements were the beginning of a cleavage; on the contrary, they regarded them as something isolated and casual. But this fact shows that in Russia, too, Economism did not arise and spread without a struggle against the "old" Social-Democrats (which the Economists of today are apt to forget). And if, in the main, this struggle has not left "documentary" traces behind it, it is *solely* because the membership of the circles then functioning underwent such constant change that no continuity was established and, consequently, differences in point of view were not recorded in any documents.

The founding of *Rabochaya Mysl* brought Economism to the light of day, but not at one stroke. We must picture to ourselves concretely the conditions for activity and the short-lived character of the majority of the Russian study circles (a thing that is possible only for those who have themselves experienced it) in order to understand how much there was of the fortuitous in the successes and failures of the new trend in various towns, and the length of time during which neither the advocates nor the opponents of the "new" could make up their minds — and literally had no opportunity of so doing — as to whether this really expressed a distinct trend or merely the lack of training of certain individuals. For example, the first mimeographed copies of *Rabochaya Mysl* never reached the great majority of Social-Democrats, and if we are able to refer to the leading article in the first number, it is only because it was reproduced in an article by V. I. [76] (*"Listok" Rabotnika*, No. 9-10, p. 47, et seq.), who, of course, did not fail to extol with more zeal than reason the new paper, which was so different

[74] A private meeting referred to here was held in St. Petersburg between February 14 and 17 (February 26 and March 1), 1897. It was attended by V. I. Lenin, A. A. Vaneyev, G. M. Krzhizhanovsky, and other members of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class, that is, by the "veterans" who had been released from prison for three days before being sent into exile to Siberia, as well as by the "young" leaders of the League of Struggle who had taken over the leadership of the League after Lenin's arrest in December 1895.

[75] "Listok" Rabotnika (The Workingman's Paper)—published in Geneva by the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad from 1896 to 1899; altogether there appeared 10 issues. Issues 1—8 were edited by the Emancipation of Labor group. But after the majority of the Union Abroad went over to "Economism", the Emancipation of Labor group refused to continue editing the paper. Nos. 9 and 10 were issued by a new editorial board set up by the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad.

[76] The "article by V. I."—an article by V. P. Ivanshin.

from the papers and projects for papers mentioned above.[77] It is well worth dwelling on this leading article because it brings out in bold relief *the entire spirit of Rabochaya Mysl* and Economism generally.

After stating that the arm of the "blue-coats"[78] could never halt the progress of the working-class movement, the leading article goes on to say: ". . . The virility of the working-class movement is due to the fact that the workers themselves are at last taking their fate into their own hands, and out of the hands of the leaders"; this fundamental thesis is then developed in greater detail. Actually, the leaders (i.e., the Social-Democrats, the organizers of the League of Struggle) were, one might say, torn out of the hands of the workers[79] by the police; yet it is made to appear that the workers were fighting against the leaders and liberated themselves from their yoke! Instead of sounding the call to go forward towards the consolidation of the revolutionary organisation and the expansion of political activity, the call was issued for a *retreat* to the purely trade union struggle. It was announced that "the economic basis of the movement is eclipsed by the effort never to forget the political ideal", and that the watchword for the working-class movement was "Struggle for economic conditions" (!) or, better still, "The workers for the workers". It was declared that strike funds "are more valuable to the movement than a hundred other Organisations" (compare this statement made in October 1897, with the polemic between the "Decembrists" and the young members in the beginning of 1897), etc. Catchwords like "We must concentrate, not on the 'cream' of the workers, but on the 'average', mass worker"; "Politics always obediently follows economics",[80] etc., etc., became the fashion, exercising an irresistible influence upon the masses of the youth who were attracted to the movement but who, in the majority of cases, were acquainted only with such fragments of Marxism as were expounded in legally appearing publications.

Political consciousness was completely overwhelmed by spontaneity — the spontaneity of the "Social-Democrats" who repeated Mr. V. V.'s "ideas", the spontaneity of those workers who were carried away by the arguments that a kopek added to a ruble was worth more than any socialism or politics, and that they must "fight, knowing that they are fighting, not for the sake of some future generation, but for themselves and their children" (leader in *Rabochaya Mysl*, No. 1). Phrases like these have always been a favorite weapon of the West-European bourgeois, who, in their hatred for

---

[77] It should be stated in passing that the praise of Rabochaya Mysl in November 1898, when Economism had become fully defined, especially abroad, emanated from the selfsame V. I, who very soon after became one of the editors of Rabocheye Dyelo. And yet Rabocheye Dyelo denied that there were two trends in Russian Social-Democracy, and continues to deny It to this day!—Lenin

[78] The tsarist gendarmes wore blue uniforms.—Tr.

[79] That this simile is a correct one is shown by the following characteristic fact. When, after the arrest of the "Decembrists", the news spread among the workers of the Schlüsselburg Highway that the discovery and arrest were facilitated by an agent provocateur, N. N. Mikhailov, a dentist, who had been in contact with a group associated with the "Decembrists", the workers were so enraged that they decided to kill him.—Lenin

[80] These quotations are taken from the same leading article in the first number of Rabochaya Mysl. One can judge from this the degree of theoretical training possessed by these "V. V.s of Russian Social-Democracy", who kept repeating the crude vulgarization of "economic materialism" at a time when the Marxists were carrying on a literary war against the real Mr. V. V., who had long ago been dubbed "a past master of reactionary deeds" for holding similar views on the relations between politics and economics!—*Lenin*

socialism, strove (like the German "*Sozial-Politiker*" Hirsch) to transplant English trade-unionism to their native soil and to preach to the workers that by engaging in the purely trade union struggle [81] they would be fighting for themselves and for their children, and not for some future generations with some future socialism. And now the "V. V.s of Russian Social-Democracy" have set about repeating these bourgeois phrases. It is important at this point to note three circumstances that will be useful to our further analysis of *contemporary* differences. [82]

In the first place, the overwhelming of political consciousness by spontaneity, to which we referred above, also took place *spontaneously*. This may sound like a pun, but, alas, it is the bitter truth. It did not take place as a result of an open struggle between two diametrically opposed points of view, in which one triumphed over the other; it occurred because of the fact that an increasing number of "old" revolutionaries were "torn away" by the gendarmes and increasing numbers of "young" "V. V.s of Russian Social Democracy" appeared on the scene. Everyone, who has, I shall not say participated in, but at least breathed the atmosphere of, the *present-day* Russian movement, knows perfectly well that this is precisely the case. And if, nevertheless, we insist strongly that the reader be fully clear on this generally known fact, if we cite, for explicitness, as it were, the facts of the first edition of *Rabocheye Dyelo* and of the polemic between the "old" and the "young" at the beginning of 1897, we do this because the people who vaunt their "democracy" speculate on the ignorance of these facts on the part of the broad public (or of the very young generation). We shall return to this point further on.

Secondly, in the very first literary expression of Economism we observe the exceedingly curious phenomenon — highly characteristic for an understanding of all the differences prevailing among present day Social Democrats — that the adherents of the "labor movement pure and simple", worshippers of the closest "organic" contacts (*Rabocheye Dyelo*'s term) with the proletarian struggle, opponents of any non-worker intelligentsia (even a socialist intelligentsia), are compelled, in order to defend their positions, to resort to the arguments of the *bourgeois* "pure trade-unionists". This shows that from the very outset *Rabochaya Mysl* began — unconsciously — to implement the programme of the *Credo*. This shows (something *Rabocheye Dyelo* cannot grasp) that *all* worship of the spontaneity of the working-class movement, all belittling of the role of "the conscious element", of the role of Social-Democracy, *means, quite independently of whether he who belittles that role desires it or not, a strengthening of the influence of bourgeois ideology upon the workers.* All those who talk about "overrating the importance of ideology", [83] about exaggerating the role of the conscious element, [84] etc., imagine that

[81] The Germans even have a special expression, Nur-Gewerkschaftler, which means an advocate of the "pure trade union" struggle.—Lenin

[82] We emphasize the word contemporary for the benefit of those who may pharisaically shrug their shoulders and say: It is easy enough to attack Rabochaya Mysl now, but is not all this ancient history? Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur (change the name and the tale is about you—Ed.) is our answer to such contemporary Pharisees, whose complete subjection to the ideas of Rabochaya Mysl will be proved further on. —Lenin

[83] Letter of the Economists, in Iskra, No. 12.—Lenin

[84] Rabocheye Dyelo, No. 10.—Lenin

the labor movement pure and simple can elaborate, and will elaborate, an independent ideology for itself, if only the workers "wrest their fate from the hands of the leaders". But this is a profound mistake. To supplement what has been said above, we shall quote the following profoundly true and important words of Karl. Kautsky on the new draft programme of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party:

> "Many of our revisionist critics believe that Marx asserted that economic development and the class struggle create, not only the conditions for socialist production, but also, and directly, the *consciousness* [K. K.'s italics] of its necessity. And these critics assert that England, the country most highly developed capitalistically, is more remote than any other from this consciousness Judging by the draft, one might assume that this allegedly orthodox Marxist view, which is thus refuted, was shared by the committee that drafted the Austrian programme. In the draft programme it is stated: 'The more capitalist development increases the numbers of the proletariat, the more the proletariat is compelled and becomes fit to fight against capitalism. The proletariat becomes conscious of the possibility and of the necessity for socialism.' In this connection socialist consciousness appears to be a necessary and direct result of the proletarian class struggle. But this is absolutely untrue. Of course, socialism, as a doctrine, has its roots in modern economic relationships just as the class struggle of the proletariat has, and, like the latter, emerges from the struggle against the capitalist-created poverty and misery of the masses. But socialism and the class struggle arise side by side and not one out of the other; each arises under different conditions. Modern socialist consciousness can arise only on the basis of profound scientific knowledge. Indeed, modern economic science is as much a condition for socialist production as, say, modern technology, and the proletariat can create neither the one nor the other, no matter how much it may desire to do so; both arise out of the modern social process. The vehicle of science is not the proletariat, but the *bourgeois intelligentsia* [K. K.'s italics]: it was in the minds of individual members of this stratum that modern socialism originated, and it was they who communicated it to the more intellectually developed proletarians who, in their turn, introduce it into the proletarian class struggle where conditions allow that to be done. Thus, socialist consciousness is something introduced into the proletarian class struggle from without [*von Aussen Hineingetragenes*] and not something that arose within it spontaneously [*urwüchsig*]. Accordingly, the old Hainfeld programme quite rightly stated that the task of Social-Democracy is to imbue the proletariat (literally: saturate the proletariat) with the *consciousness* of its position and the consciousness of its task. There would be no need for this if consciousness arose of itself from the class struggle. The new draft copied this proposition from the old programme, and attached it to the proposition mentioned above. But this completely broke the line of thought..."

Since there can be no talk of an independent ideology formulated by the working masses themselves in the process of their movement, [85] the only choice is — either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course (for mankind has not created a "third" ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or an above-class ideology). Hence, to belittle the socialist ideology *in any way, to turn aside from it in the slightest degree* means to strengthen bourgeois ideology. There is much talk of spontaneity. But the *spontaneous* development of the working-class movement leads to its subordination to bourgeois ideology, *to its development along the lines of the Credo programme;* for the spontaneous working-class movement is trade-unionism, is *Nur-Gewerkschaftlerei*, and trade unionism means the ideological enslavement of the workers by the bourgeoisie. Hence, our task, the task of Social-Democracy, is *to combat spontaneity, to divert* the working-class movement from this spontaneous, trade-unionist striving to come under the wing of the bourgeoisie, and to bring it under the wing of revolutionary Social Democracy. The sentence employed by the authors of the Economist letter published in *Iskra*, No. 12, that the efforts of the most inspired ideologists fail to divert the working-class movement from the path that is determined by the interaction of the material elements and the material environment is therefore *tantamount to renouncing socialism*. If these authors were capable of fearlessly, consistently, and thoroughly considering what they say, as everyone who enters the arena of literary and public activity should be, there would be nothing left for them but to "fold their useless arms over their empty breasts" and surrender the field of action to the Struves and Prokopoviches, who are dragging the working-class movement "along the line of least resistance", i.e., along the line of bourgeois trade-unionism, or to the Zubatovs, who are dragging it along the line of clerical and gendarme "ideology".

Let us recall the example of Germany. What was the historic service Lassalle rendered to the German working-class movement? It was that he *diverted* that movement from the path of progressionist trade-unionism and co-operativism towards which it had been spontaneously moving (*with the benign assistance of Schulze-Delitzsch and his like*). To fulfil such a task, it was necessary to do something quite different from talking of underrating the spontaneous element, of tactics-as-process, of the interaction between elements and environment, etc. *A fierce struggle against spontaneity* was necessary, and only after such a struggle, extending over many years, was it possible, for instance, to convert the working population of Berlin from a bulwark of the progressionist party into one of the finest strongholds of Social-Democracy. This struggle is by no means over even today (as might seem

[85] This does not mean, of course, that the workers have no part in creating such an ideology. They take part, however, not as workers, but as socialist theoreticians, as Proudhon's and Weitlings; in other words, they take part only when they are able, and to the extent that they are able, more or less, to acquire the knowledge of their age and develop that knowledge. But in order that working men may succeed in this more often, every effort must be made to raise the level of the consciousness of the workers in general; it is necessary that the workers do not confine themselves to the artificially restricted limits of "literature for workers" but that they learn to an increasing degree to master general literature. It would be even truer to say "are not confined", instead of "do not confine themselves", because the workers themselves wish to read and do read all that is written for the intelligentsia, and only a few (bad) intellectuals believe that it is enough "for workers" to be told a few things about factory conditions and to have repeated to them over and over again what has long been known. —Lenin

to those who learn the history of the German movement from Prokopovich, and its philosophy from Struve). Even now the German working class is, so to speak, split up among a number of ideologies. A section of the workers is organized in Catholic and monarchist trade unions; another section is organized in the Hirsch-Duncker [86] unions, founded by the bourgeois worshippers of English trade-unionism; the third is organized in Social-Democratic trade unions. The last-named group is immeasurably more numerous than the rest, but the Social-Democratic ideology was able to achieve this superiority, and will be able to maintain it, only in an unswerving struggle against all other ideologies.

But why, the reader will ask, does the spontaneous movement, the movement along the line of least resistance, lead to the domination of bourgeois ideology? For the simple reason that bourgeois ideology is far older in origin than socialist ideology, that it is more fully developed, and that it has at its disposal *immeasurably* more means of dissemination. [87] And the younger the socialist movement in any given country, the more vigorously it must struggle against all attempts to entrench non-socialist ideology, and the more resolutely the workers must be warned against the bad counsellors who shout against "overrating the conscious element", etc. The authors of the Economist letter, in unison with *Rabocheye Dyelo*, inveigh against the intolerance that is characteristic of the infancy of the movement. To this we reply: Yes, our movement is indeed in its infancy, and in order that it may grow up faster, it must become imbued with intolerance against those who retard its growth by their subservience to spontaneity. Nothing is so ridiculous and harmful as pretending that we are "old hands" who have long ago experienced all the decisive stages of the struggle.

Thirdly, the first issue of Rabochaya Mysl shows that the term "Economism" (which, of course, we do not propose to abandon, since, in one way or another, this designation has already established itself) does not adequately convey the real character of the new trend. *Rabochaya Mysl* does not altogether repudiate the political struggle; the rules for a workers' mutual benefit fund published in its first issue contain a reference to combating the government. *Rabochaya Mysl* believes, however, that "politics always obediently follows economics" (*Rabocheye Dyelo* varies this thesis when it asserts in its programme that "in Russia more than in any other country, the economic struggle is *inseparable* from the political struggle"). *If by politics is meant Social-Democratic politics,* then the theses of Rabochaya Mysl and *Rabocheye Dyelo* are utterly incorrect. The economic struggle of the workers is very often connected (although not inseparably) with bourgeois politics, clerical politics, etc., as we

[86] The Hirsch-Duncker Unions were established in Germany in 1868 by Hirsch and Duncker, two bourgeois liberals. They preached the "harmony of class interests", drew the workers away from the revolutionary class struggle against the bourgeoisie, and restricted the role of the trade unions to that of mutual benefit societies and educational bodies.

[87] It is often said that the working class spontaneously gravitates towards socialism. This is perfectly true in the sense that socialist theory reveals the causes of the misery of the working class more profoundly and more correctly than any other theory, and for that reason the workers are able to assimilate it so easily, provided, however, this theory does not itself yield to spontaneity, provided it subordinates spontaneity to itself. Usually this is taken for granted, but it is precisely this which Rabocheye Dyelo forgets or distorts. The working class spontaneously gravitates towards socialism; nevertheless, most widespread (and continuously and diversely revived) bourgeois ideology spontaneously imposes itself upon the working class to a still greater degree. —Lenin

have seen. *Rabocheye Dyelo*'s theses are correct, if by politics is meant trade union politics, viz., the common striving of all workers to secure from the government measures for alleviating the distress to which their condition gives rise, but which do not abolish that condition, i.e., which do not remove the subjection of labor to capital. That striving indeed is common to the English trade-unionists, who are hostile to socialism, to the Catholic workers, to the "Zubatov" workers, etc. There is politics and politics. Thus, we see that *Rabochaya Mysl* does not so much deny the political struggle, as it bows to its *spontaneity*, to its unconsciousness. While fully recognizing the political struggle (better: the political desires and demands of the workers), which arises spontaneously from the working-class movement itself, it absolutely refuses *independently to work out* a specifically *Social-Democratic politics* corresponding to the general tasks of socialism and to present-day conditions in Russia. Further on we shall show that *Rabocheye Dyelo* commits the same error.

Section C: The Self-Emancipation Group [88] and Rabocheye Dyelo

We have dealt at such length with the little-known and now almost forgotten leading article in the first issue of Rabochaya Mysl because it was the first and most striking expression of that general stream of thought which afterwards emerged into the light of day in innumerable streamlets. V. I. was perfectly right when, in praising the first issue and the leading article of *Rabochaya Mysl*, he said that the article had been written in a "sharp and fervent" manner (*"Listok" Rabotnika*, No. 9-10, p. 49). Every man with convictions who thinks he has something new to say writes "fervently" and in such a way as to make his views stand out in bold relief. Only those who are accustomed to sitting between two stools lack "fervor"; only such people are able to praise the fervor of *Rabochaya Mysl* one day and attack the "fervent polemics" of its opponents the next.

We shall not dwell on the *"Separate Supplement" to Rabochaya Mysl* (below we shall have occasion, on various points, to refer to this work, which expresses the ideas of the Economists more consistently than any other) but shall briefly mention the "Appeal of the Self-Emancipation of the Workers Group" (March 1899, reprinted in the London *Nakanune*, [89] No. 7, July 1899). The authors of the "Appeal" rightly say that "the workers of Russia are *only just awakening,* are just beginning to look about them, and are *instinctively clutching at the first available means of struggle*". Yet they draw from this the same false conclusion as that drawn by *Rabochaya Mysl*, forgetting that the instinctive is the unconscious (the spontaneous) to the aid of which socialists must come; that the "first available means of struggle" will always be, in modern society, the trade union means of struggle, and the "first available" ideology the bourgeois (trade union) ideology. Similarly, these authors do not "repudiate" politics, they merely (merely!) echo Mr. V. V. that politics is the superstructure, and

[88] The Self-Emancipation of the Workers Group—a small group of "Economists" formed in St. Petersburg in the autumn of 1898; it existed for only a few months and published a manifesto setting forth its aims [published in Nakanune (On the Eve) in London], a set of rules and several leaflets addressed to the workers.

[89] Nakanune (On the Eve)—a journal expressing Narodnik views. It was published in Russian in London from January 1899 to February 1902—altogether 37 issues. The journal was a rallying point for representatives of various petty-bourgeois parties.

therefore, "political agitation must be the superstructure to the agitation carried on in favor of the economic struggle; it must arise on the basis of this struggle and follow in its wake".

As for *Rabocheye Dyelo*, it began its activity with the "defense" of the Economists. It stated a *downright untruth* in its opening issue (No. 1, pp. 141-42) in claiming that it "does not know to which young comrades Axelrod referred" when he warned the Economists in his well-known pamphlet. [90] In the polemic that flared up with Axelrod and Plekhanov over this untruth, *Rabocheye Dyelo* had to admit that "in form of perplexity, it sought *to defend* all the younger Social-Democrats abroad from this unjust accusation" (the charge of narrowness levelled by Axelrod at the Economists). In reality this accusation was completely justified, and *Rabocheye Dyelo* knew perfectly well that, among others, it applied also to V. I., a member of its Editorial Board. Let me note in passing that in this polemic Axelrod was entirely right and *Rabocheye Dyelo* entirely wrong in their respective interpretations of my pamphlet *The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats*. [91] The pamphlet was written in 1897, before the appearance of *Rabochaya Mysl*, when I thought, rightly, that the *original tendency* of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle, which I characterized above, was dominant. And this tendency was dominant at least until the middle of 1898. Consequently, *Rabocheye Dyelo* had no right whatever, in its attempt to deny the existence and danger of Economism, to refer to a pamphlet that expressed views *forced out* by Economist views in St. Petersburg in 1897-98. [92]

But *Rabocheye Dyelo* not only "defended" the Economists, it itself constantly fell into their fundamental errors. The source of this confusion is to be found in the ambiguity of the interpretation given to the following thesis of the *Rabocheye Dyelo* programme: "We consider that the most important phenomenon of Russian life, the one that will mainly *determine the tasks* [our italics] and the character of the publication activity of the Union, is the *mass working-class movement* [*Rabocheye Dyelo*'s italics] which has arisen in recent years." That the mass movement is a most important phenomenon is a fact not to be disputed. But the crux of the matter is, how is one to understand the statement that the mass working class movement will "determine the tasks"? It may be interpreted in one of two ways. *Either* it means bowing to the spontaneity of this movement, i.e., reducing the role of Social-Democracy to mere subservience to the working-class movement as such (the interpretation of *Rabochaya Mysl*, the Self-Emancipation Group, and other Economists), or it means that the mass movement places before us new theoretical, political, and organisational tasks, far more complicated

---

[90] Present Tasks and Tactics of the Russian Social-Democracy, Geneva, 1898. Two letters to Rabochaya Gazeta, written in 1897.—Lenin

[91]] See present edition, Vol. 2, pp. 323—51.—Ed.

[92] In defending its first untruth ("we do not know to which young comrades Axelrod referred"), Rabocheye Dyelo added a second, when it wrote in its Reply: "Since the review of The Tasks was published, tendencies have arisen, or become more or less clearly defined, among certain Russian Social-Democrats, towards economic one-sidedness, which represent a step backwards from the state of our movement as described in The Tasks" (p. 9). This, in the Reply, published in 1900. But the first issue of Rabocheye Dyelo (containing the review) appeared in April 1899. Did Economism really arise only in 1899? No. The year 1899 saw the first protest of the Russian Social-Democrats against Economism (the protest against the Credo). Economism arose in 1897, as Rabocheye Dyelo very well knows, for already in November 1898, V. I. was praising Rabochaya Mysl (see "Listok" Rabotnika, No. 9-10).—Lenin

than those that might have satisfied us in the period before the rise of the mass movement. *Rabocheye Dyelo* inclined and still inclines towards the first interpretation, for it has said nothing definite about any new tasks, but has argued constantly as though the "mass movement" *relieves* us of the necessity of clearly understanding and fulfilling the tasks it sets before us. We need only point out that *Rabocheye Dyelo* considered that it was impossible to set the overthrow of the autocracy as the *first* task of the mass working-class movement, and that it degraded this task (in the name of the mass movement) to that of a struggle for immediate political demands (Reply, p. 25).

We shall pass over the article by B. Krichevsky, editor of *Rabocheye Dyelo*, entitled "The Economic and the Political Struggle in the Russian Movement", published in No. 7 of that paper, in which these very mistakes [93] are repeated, and proceed directly to *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10. We shall not, of course, enter in detail into the various objections raised by Krichevsky and Martynov against *Zarya* and *Iskra*. We are here interested solely in the basis of principles on which *Rabocheye Dyelo*, in its tenth issue, took its stand. Thus, we shall not examine the strange fact that *Rabocheye Dyelo* saw a "diametrical contradiction" between the proposition:

> "Social-Democracy does not, tie its hands, it does not restrict its activities to someone preconceived plan or method of political struggle; it recognizes all means of struggle as long as they correspond to the forces at-the disposal of the Party," etc. (*Iskra*, No. 1). [94]

and the proposition:

"Without a strong organisation skilled in waging political struggle under all circumstances and at all times, there can be no question of that systematic plan of action, illumined by firm principles and steadfastly carried out, which alone is worthy of the name of tactics" (*Iskra*, No. 4). [95]

To confound recognition, *in principle*, of all means of struggle, of all plans and methods, provided they are expedient, with the demand *at a given political moment* to be guided by a strictly

---

[93] The "stages theory", or the theory of "timid zigzags", in the political struggle is expressed, for example, in this article, in the following way: "Political demands, which in their character are common to the whole of Russia, should, however, at first (this was written in August 1900!) correspond to the experience gained by the given stratum (sic!) of workers in the economic struggle. Only [!] on the basis of this experience can and should political agitation be taken up," etc. (p. 11). On page 4, the author, protesting against what he regards as the absolutely unfounded charge of Economist heresy, pathetically exclaims: "What Social-Democrat does not know that according to the theories of Marx and Engels the economic interests of certain classes play a decisive role in history, and, consequently, that particularly the proletariat's struggle for its economic interests must be of paramount importance in its class development and struggle for emancipation?" (Our italics.) The word "consequently" is completely irrelevant. The fact that economic interests play a decisive role does not in the least imply that the economic (i.e., trade union) struggle is of prime importance; for the most essential, the "decisive" interests of classes can be satisfied only by radical political changes in general. In particular the fundamental economic interests of the proletariat can be satisfied only by a political revolution that will replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat. Krichevsky repeats the arguments of the "V. V.'s of Russian Social-Democracy" (viz., that politics follows economics, etc.) and of the Bernsteinians of German Social-Democracy (e.g., by similar arguments Woltmann sought to prove that the workers must first of all acquire "economic power" before they can think about political revolution).—Lenin

[94] See present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 370—71.—Ed.

[95] See present edition, Vol. 5, p. 18.—Ed.

observed plan is tantamount, if we are to talk of tactics, to confounding the recognition by medical science of various methods of treating diseases with the necessity for adopting a certain definite method of treatment for a given disease. The point is, however, that *Rabocheye Dyelo*, itself the victim of a disease which we have called bowing to spontaneity, refuses to recognize any "method of treatment" for that disease. Hence, it has made the remarkable discovery that "tactics-as-plan contradicts the fundamental spirit of Marxism" (No. 10, p. 18), that tactics are "*a process of growth of Party tasks, which grow together with the Party*" (p. 11, *Rabocheye Dyelo*'s italics). This remark has every chance of becoming a celebrated maxim, a permanent monument to the *Rabocheye Dyelo* "trend". To the question, whither? the leading organ replies: Movement is a process of changing the distance between the starting-point and subsequent points of the movement. This matchless example of profundity is not merely a curiosity (were it that, it would not be worth dealing with at length), but *the programme of a whole trend*, the very programme which R. M. (in the "*Separate Supplement*" to *Rabochaya Mysl*) expressed in the words: That struggle is desirable which is possible, and the struggle which is possible is that which is going on at the given moment. This is precisely the trend of unbounded opportunism, which passively adapts itself to spontaneity.

"Tactics-as-plan contradicts the essence of Marxism!" But this is a slander of Marxism; it means turning Marxism into the caricature held up by the Narodniks in their struggle against us. It means belittling the initiative and energy of class-conscious fighters, whereas Marxism, on the contrary, gives a gigantic impetus to the initiative and energy of the Social-Democrat, opens up for him the widest perspectives, and (if one may so express it) places at his disposal the mighty force of many millions of workers "spontaneously" rising for the struggle. The entire history of international Social-Democracy teems with plans advanced now by one, now by another political leader, some confirming the far-sightedness and the correct political and organisational views of their authors and others revealing their short-sightedness and their political errors. At the time when Germany was at one of the crucial turning-points in its history — the formation of the Empire, the opening of the Reichstag, and the granting of universal suffrage — Liebknecht had one plan for Social-Democratic politics and work in general, and Schweitzer had another. When the anti-socialist law came down on the heads of the German socialists, Most and Hasselmann had one plan — they were prepared then and there to call for violence and terror; Hochbert, Schramm, and (partly) Bernstein had another — they began to preach to the Social-Democrats that they themselves had provoked the enactment of the law by being unreasonably bitter and revolutionary, and must now earn forgiveness by their exemplary conduct. There was yet a third plan, proposed by those who prepared and carried out the publication of an illegal organ. It is easy, of course, with hindsight, many years after the struggle over the selection of the path to be followed, and after history has pronounced its verdict as to the expediency of the path selected, to utter profound maxims about the growth of Party tasks, which

grow together with the Party. But at a time of confusion, [96] when the Russian "Critics" and Economists are degrading Social-Democracy to the level of trade-unionism, and when the terrorists are strongly advocating the adoption of "tactics-as-plan" that repeats the old mistakes, at such a time, to confine oneself to profundities of this kind, means simply to issue to oneself a "certificate of poverty". At a time when many Russian Social-Democrats suffer from a lack of initiative and energy, from an inadequate "scope of political propaganda, agitation, and organisation," [97] from a lack of "plans" for a broader organisation of revolutionary work, at such a time, to declare that "tactics-as-plan" contradicts the essence of Marxism means not only to vulgarize Marxism in the realm of theory, but *to drag the Party backward* in practice.

Rabocheye Dyelo goes on to sermonize:

> "The task of the revolutionary Social-Democrat is only to accelerate objective development by his conscious work, not to obviate it or substitute his own subjective plans for this development. *Iskra* knows all this in theory; but the enormous importance which Marxism justly attaches to conscious revolutionary work causes it in practice, owing to its doctrinaire view of tactics, *to belittle the significance of the objective or the spontaneous element of development*" (p. 18).

Another example of the extraordinary theoretical confusion worthy of Mr. V. V. and his fraternity. We would ask our philosopher: how may a designer of subjective plans "belittle" objective development? Obviously by losing sight of the fact that this objective development creates or strengthens, destroys or weakens certain classes, strata, or groups, certain nations or groups of nations, etc., and in this way serves to determine a given international political alignment of forces, or the position adopted by revolutionary parties, etc. If the designer of plans did that, his guilt would not be that he belittled the spontaneous element, but, on the contrary, that he belittled the *conscious* element, for he would then show that he lacked the "consciousness" properly to understand objective development. Hence, the very talk of "estimating the *relative* significance" (*Rabocheye Dyelo*'s italics) of spontaneity and consciousness itself reveals a complete lack of "consciousness". If certain "spontaneous elements of development" can be grasped at all by human understanding, then an incorrect estimation of them will be tantamount to "belittling the conscious element". But if they cannot be grasped, then we do not know them, and therefore cannot speak of them. What then is Krichevsky discussing? If he thinks that *Iskra*'s "subjective plans" are erroneous (as he in fact declares them to be), he should have shown what objective facts they ignore, and only then charged *Iskra* with *lacking political consciousness* for ignoring them, with "belittling the conscious element", to use his own words. If, however, displeased with subjective plans, he can bring forward no argument other than that of "belittling the spontaneous element" (!), he merely shows: (1) that, theoretically, he

[96] "Ein Jahr der Verwirrung" ("A Year of Confusion") is the title Mehring gave to the chapter of his History of German Social-Democracy in which he describes the hesitancy and lack of determination displayed at first by the socialists in selecting the "tactics-as-plan" for the new situation.—Lenin

[97] Leading article in Iskra, No. 1. (See Collected Works, Vol. 4, p. 369 —Ed.)—Lenin

understands Marxism *a la* Kareyev and Mikhailovsky, who have been sufficiently ridiculed by Beltov; [98] and (2) that, practically, he is quite satisfied with the "spontaneous elements of development" that have drawn our legal Marxists towards Bernsteinism and our Social-Democrats towards Economism, and that he is "full of wrath" against those who have determined at all costs *to divert* Russian Social-Democracy from the path of "spontaneous" development.

Further, there follow things that are positively droll. "Just as human beings will reproduce in the old-fashioned way despite all the discoveries of natural science, so the birth of a new social order will come about, in the future too, *mainly* as a result of elemental outbursts, despite all the discoveries of social science and the increase in the number of conscious fighters" (p. 19). Just as our grandfathers in their old-fashioned wisdom used to say, anyone can bring children into the world, so today the "modern socialists" (*a la* Nartsis Tuporylov) [99] say in their wisdom, anyone can participate in the spontaneous birth of a new social order. We too hold that anyone can. All that is required for participation of that kind is *to yield* to Economism when Economism reigns and to terrorism when terrorism arises. Thus, in the spring of this year, when it was so important to utter a note of warning against infatuation with terrorism, *Rabocheye Dyelo* stood in amazement, confronted by a problem that was "new" to it. And now, six months after, when the problem has become less topical, it presents us at one and the same time with the declaration: "We think that it is not and should not be the task of Social-Democracy to counteract the rise of terroristic sentiments" (*Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, p. 23), and with the Conference resolution: "The Conference regards systematic and aggressive terror as being inopportune" (*Two Conferences*, p. 18). How beautifully clear and coherent this is! Not to counteract, but to declare inopportune, and to declare it in such a way that unsystematic and defensive terror does not come within the scope of the "resolution". It must be admitted that such a resolution is extremely safe and is fully insured against error, just as a man who talks, but says nothing, insures himself against error. All that is needed to frame such a resolution is an ability to keep *at the tail end* of the movement. When *Iskra* ridiculed *Rabocheye Dyelo* for declaring the question of terror to be new, [100] the latter angrily accused *Iskra* of "having the incredible effrontery to impose upon the Party organisation solutions of tactical questions proposed by a group of emigrant writers more than fifteen years ago" (p. 24). Effrontery. indeed, and what an overestimation of the conscious element — first to resolve questions theoretically beforehand, and then to try to convince the organisation, the Party, and the masses of the correctness of this solution! [101] How much better it would be to repeat the elements and, without "imposing" anything upon anybody, swing with every "turn" — whether in the direction of Economism or in the direction of terrorism. *Rabocheye Dyelo* even generalizes this

[98] G. V. Plekhanov published his well-known work The Development of the Monist View of History legally in St. Petersburg in 1895 under the pseudonym of N. Beltov.

[99] Nartsis Tuporylov (Narcissus Blunt-Snout) was the pseudonym under which Y. O. Martov published his satirical poem "Hymn of the Contemporary Russian Socialist" in Zarya, No. 1, April 1901. The "Hymn" ridiculed the "Economists" and their adaptations to spontaneous events.

[100] See Collected Works, Vol. 5, pp. 18-20.—Ed.

[101] Nor must it be forgotten that in solving "theoretically" the problem of terror, the Emancipation of Labor group generalized the experience of the antecedent revolutionary movement.—Lenin

great precept of worldly wisdom and accuses *Iskra* and *Zarya* of "setting up their programme against the movement, like a spirit hovering over the formless chaos" (p. 29). But what else is the function of Social-Democracy if not to be a "spirit" that not only hovers over the spontaneous movement, but also *raises* this movement *to the level of "its programme"?* Surely, it is not its function to drag at the *tail* of the movement. At best, this would be of no service to the movement; at worst, it would be exceedingly harmful. *Rabocheye Dyelo*, however, not only follows this "tactics-as-process", but elevates it to a principle, so that it would be more correct to describe its tendency not as opportunism, but as *tail-ism* (from the word *tail*). And it must be admitted that those who are determined always to follow behind the movement and be its tail are absolutely and forever guaranteed against "belittling the spontaneous element of development".

And so, we have become convinced that the fundamental error committed by the "new trend" in Russian Social-Democracy is its bowing to spontaneity and its failure to understand that the spontaneity of the masses demands a high degree of consciousness from us Social-Democrats. The greater the spontaneous upsurge of the masses and the more widespread the movement, the more rapid, incomparably so, the demand for greater consciousness in the theoretical, political and organisational work of Social-Democracy.

The spontaneous upsurge of the masses in Russia proceeded (and continues) with such rapidity that the young Social Democrats proved unprepared to meet these gigantic tasks. This unpreparedness is our common misfortune, the misfortune of *all* Russian Social-Democrats. The upsurge of the masses proceeded and spread with uninterrupted continuity; it not only continued in the places where it began, but spread to new localities and to new strata of the population (under the influence of the working-class movement, there was a renewed ferment among the student youth, among the intellectuals generally, and even among the peasantry). Revolutionaries, however, *lagged behind* this upsurge, both in their "theories" and in their activity; they failed to establish a constant and continuous organisation capable of *leading* the whole movement.

In Chapter I, we established that *Rabocheye Dyelo* belittled our theoretical tasks and that it "spontaneously" repeated the fashionable catchword "freedom of criticism"; those who repeated this catchword lacked the "consciousness" to understand that the positions of the opportunist "Critics" and those of the revolutionaries in Germany and in Russia are diametrically opposed.

In the following chapters, we shall show how this bowing to spontaneity found expression in the sphere of the political tasks and in the organisational work of Social-Democracy.

Chapter 5: "Left-Wing" Communism in Germany. The Leaders, the Party, the Class, the Masses

The German Communists we must now speak of call themselves, not "Left-wingers" but, if I am not mistaken, an "opposition on principle". [102] From what follows below it will, however, be seen that they reveal all the symptoms of the "infantile disorder of Leftism".

Published by the "local group in Frankfurt am Main", a pamphlet reflecting the point of view of this opposition, and entitled *The Split in the Communist Party of Germany* (*The Spartacus League*) sets forth the substance of this opposition's views most saliently, and with the utmost clarity and concision. A few quotations will suffice to acquaint the reader with that substance:

> "The Communist Party is the party of the most determined class struggle. . . ."
>
> ". . . Politically, the transitional period [between capitalism and socialism] is one of the proletarian dictatorship. . . ."
>
> ". . . The question arises: who is to exercise this dictatorship: *the Communist Party or the proletarian class*? . . . *Fundamentally*, should we strive for a dictatorship of the Communist Party, or for a dictatorship of the proletarian class? . . ."

(All italics as in the original)

The author of the pamphlet goes on to accuse the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany of seeking ways of achieving a *coalition with the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany*, and of raising "*the question of recognizing*, *in principle*, *all political means*" of struggle, including parliamentarianism, with the sole purpose of concealing its actual and main efforts to form a coalition with the Independents. The pamphlet goes on to say:

> "The opposition have chosen another road. They are of the opinion that the question of the rule of the Communist Party and of the dictatorship of the Party is merely one of tactics. In any

---

[102] The "opposition on principle"—a group of German Left-wing Communists advocating anarcho-syndicalist views. When the Second Congress of the Communist Party of Germany, which was held in Heidelberg in October 1919, expelled the opposition, the latter formed the so-called Communist Workers' Party of Germany, in April 1920. To facilitate the unification of all German communist forces and win over the finest proletarian elements in the C.W.P.G., the opposition was temporarily admitted into the Communist International in November 1920 with the rights of a sympathising member.

However, the Executive Committee of the Communist International still considered the United Communist Party of Germany to be the only authoritative section of the Comintern. C.W.P.G.'s representatives were admitted into the Comintern on the condition that they merged with the United Communist Party of Germany and supported all its activities. The C.W.P.G. leaders, however, failed to observe these conditions. The Third Congress of the Communist International, which was held in June–July 1921, and wanted solidarity with workers who still followed the C.W.P.G. leaders, resolved to give the C.W.P.G. two months to call a congress and settle the question of affiliation. The C.W.P.G. Leaders did not obey the Third Congress's resolution and thus placed themselves outside the Communist International. Later the C.W.P.G. degenerated into a small sectarian group without any support in the working class.

case, rule by the Communist Party is the ultimate form of any party rule. *Fundamentally*, we must work for the dictatorship of the proletarian class. And all the measures of the Party, its organisations, methods of struggle, strategy and tactics should be directed to that end. Accordingly, all compromise with other parties, all reversion to parliamentary forms of struggle which have become historically and politically obsolete, and any policy of maneuvering and compromise must be emphatically rejected." "Specifically proletarian methods of revolutionary struggle must be strongly emphasized. New forms of organisation must be created on the widest basis and with the widest scope in order to enlist the most extensive proletarian circles and strata to take part in the revolutionary struggle under the leadership of the Communist Party. A *Workers' Union*, based on factory organisations, should be the rallying point for all revolutionary elements. This should unite all workers who follow the slogan: 'Get out of the trade unions!' It is here that the militant proletariat musters its ranks for battle. Recognition of the class struggle, of the Soviet system and of the dictatorship should be sufficient for enrolment. All subsequent political education of the fighting masses and their political orientation in the struggle are the task of the Communist Party, which stands outside the Workers' Union. . . .

". . . Consequently, two Communist parties are now arrayed against each other:

"*One is a party of leaders*, which is out to organize the revolutionary struggle and to direct it from *above*, accepting compromises and parliamentarianism so as to create a situation enabling it to join a coalition government exercising a dictatorship.

"*The other is a mass party*, which expects an upsurge of the revolutionary struggle from *below*, which knows and applies a single method in this struggle—a method which clearly leads to the goal—and rejects all parliamentary and opportunist methods. That single method is the unconditional *overthrow of the bourgeoisie*, so as then to set up the proletarian class dictatorship for the accomplishment of socialism. . . .

". . . There—the dictatorship of leaders; here—the dictatorship of the masses! That is our slogan."

Such are the main features characterizing the views of the opposition in the German Communist Party.

Any Bolshevik who has consciously participated in the development of Bolshevism since 1903 or has closely observed that development will at once say, after reading these arguments, "What old and familiar rubbish! What 'Left-wing' childishness!"

But let us examine these arguments a little more closely.

The mere presentation of the question—"dictatorship of the party *or* dictatorship of the class; dictatorship (party) of the leaders, *or* dictatorship (party) of the masses?"—testifies to most incredibly

and hopelessly muddled thinking. These people want to *invent* something quite out of the ordinary, and, in their effort to be clever, make themselves ridiculous. It is common knowledge that the masses are divided into classes, that the masses can be contrasted with classes only by contrasting the vast majority in general, regardless of division according to status in the social system of production, with categories holding a definite status in the social system of production; that as a rule and in most cases—at least in present-day civilized countries—classes are led by political parties; that political parties, as a general rule, are run by more or less stable groups composed of the most authoritative, influential and experienced members, who are elected to the most responsible positions, and are called leaders. All this is elementary. All this is clear and simple. Why replace this with some kind of rigmarole, some new Volapük? On the one hand, these people seem to have got muddled when they found themselves in a predicament, when the party's abrupt transition from legality to illegality upset the customary, normal and simple relations between leaders, parties and classes. In Germany, as in other European countries, people had become too accustomed to legality, to the free and proper election of "leaders" at regular party congresses, to the convenient method of testing the class composition of parties through parliamentary elections, mass meetings the press, the sentiments of the trade unions and other associations, etc. When, instead of this customary procedure, it became necessary, because of the stormy development of the revolution and the development of the civil war, to go over rapidly from legality to illegality, to combine the two, and to adopt the "inconvenient" and "undemocratic" methods of selecting, or forming, or preserving "groups of leaders"—people lost their bearings and began to think up some unmitigated nonsense. Certain members of the Communist Party of Holland, who were unlucky enough to be born in a small country with traditions and conditions of highly privileged and highly stable legality, and who had never seen a transition from legality to illegality, probably fell into confusion, lost their heads, and helped create these absurd inventions.

On the other hand, one can see simply a thoughtless and incoherent use of the now "fashionable" terms: "masses" and "leaders". These people have heard and memorized a great many attacks on "leaders", in which the latter have been contrasted with the "masses"; however, they have proved unable to think matters out and gain a clear understanding of what it was all about.

The divergence between "leaders" and "masses" was brought out with particular clarity and sharpness in all countries at the end of the imperialist war and following it. The principal reason for this was explained many times by Marx and Engels between the years 1852 and 1892, from the example of Britain. That country's exclusive position led to the emergence, from the "masses", of a semi–petty-bourgeois, opportunist "labor aristocracy". The leaders of this labor aristocracy were constantly going over to the bourgeoisie, and were directly or indirectly on its pay roll. Marx earned the honor of incurring the hatred of these disreputable persons by openly branding them as traitors. Present-day (twentieth-century) imperialism has given a few advanced countries an exceptionally privileged position, which, everywhere in the Second International, has produced a certain type of traitor, opportunist, and social-chauvinist leaders, who champion the interests of their own craft,

their own section of the labor aristocracy. The opportunist parties have become separated from the "masses", i.e., from the broadest strata of the working people, their majority, the lowest-paid workers. The revolutionary proletariat cannot be victorious unless this evil is combated, unless the opportunist, social-traitor leaders are exposed, discredited and expelled. That is the policy the Third International has embarked on.

To go so far, in this connection, as to contrast, *in general*, the dictatorship of the masses with a dictatorship of the leaders is ridiculously absurd, and stupid. What is particularly amusing is that, in fact, instead of the old leaders, who hold generally accepted views on simple matters, *new leaders* are brought forth (under cover of the slogan "Down with the leaders!"), who talk rank stuff and nonsense. Such are Laufenberg, Wolffheim, Horner, [103] Karl Schroder, Friedrich Wendel and Karl Erler, [104] in Germany. Erler's attempts to give the question more "profundity" and to proclaim that in general political parties are unnecessary and "bourgeois" are so supremely absurd that one can only shrug one's shoulders. It all goes to drive home the truth that a minor error can always assume monstrous proportions if it is persisted in, if profound justifications are sought for it, and if it is carried to its logical conclusion.

Repudiation of the Party principle and of Party discipline—that is what the opposition has *arrived at*. And this is tantamount to completely disarming the proletariat in *the interests of the bourgeoisie*. It all adds up to that petty-bourgeois diffuseness and instability, that incapacity for sustained effort, unity and organized action, which, if encouraged, must inevitably destroy any proletarian revolutionary movement. From the standpoint of communism, repudiation of the Party principle means attempting to leap from the eve of capitalism's collapse (in Germany), not to the lower or the intermediate phase of communism, but to the higher. We in Russia (in the third year since the overthrow of the bourgeoisie) are making the first steps in the transition from capitalism to socialism or the lower stage of communism. Classes still remain, and will remain everywhere *for years after* the proletariat's conquest of power. Perhaps in Britain, where there is no peasantry (but where petty proprietors exist), this period may be shorter. The abolition of classes means, not merely ousting the landowners and the capitalists—that is something we accomplished with comparative ease; it also means *abolishing the small commodity producers*, and they *cannot be ousted*, or crushed; we

---

[103] Horner, Karl—Anton Pannekoek.

[104] Karl Erler, "The Dissolution of the Party", Kommunistische Arbeiterzeitung, Hamburg, February 7, 1920, No. 32:

"The working class cannot destroy the bourgeois state without destroying bourgeois democracy, and it cannot destroy bourgeois democracy without destroying parties."

The more muddle-headed of the syndicalists and anarchists in the Latin countries may derive "satisfaction" from the fact that solid Germans, who evidently consider themselves Marxists (by their articles in the above-mentioned paper K. Erler and K. Horner have shown most plainly that they consider themselves sound Marxists, but talk incredible nonsense in a most ridiculous manner and reveal their failure to understand the ABC of Marxism), go to the length of making utterly inept statements. Mere acceptance of Marxism does not save one from errors. We Russians know this especially well, because Marxism has been very often the "fashion" in our country.

must learn to live with them. They can (and must) be transformed and re-educated only by means of very prolonged, slow, and cautious organisational work. They surround the proletariat on every side with a petty-bourgeois atmosphere, which permeates and corrupts the proletariat, and constantly causes among the proletariat relapses into petty-bourgeois spinelessness, disunity, individualism, and alternating moods of exaltation and dejection. The strictest centralization and discipline are required within the political party of the proletariat in order to counteract this, in order that the *organisational* role of the proletariat (and that is its *principal* role) may be exercised correctly, successfully and victoriously. The dictatorship of the proletariat means a persistent struggle—bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative—against the forces and traditions of the old society. The force of habit in millions and tens of millions is a most formidable force. Without a party of iron that has been tempered in the struggle, a party enjoying the confidence of all honest people in the class in question, a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, such a struggle cannot be waged successfully. It is a thousand times easier to vanquish the centralized big bourgeoisie than to "vanquish" the millions upon millions of petty proprietors; however, through their ordinary, everyday, imperceptible, elusive and demoralizing activities, they produce the *very* results which the bourgeoisie need and which tend to *restore* the bourgeoisie. Whoever brings about even the slightest weakening of the iron discipline of the party of the proletariat (especially during its dictatorship), is actually aiding the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

Parallel with the question of the leaders—the party—the class—the masses, we must pose the question of the "reactionary" trade unions. But first I shall take the liberty of making a few concluding remarks based on the experience of our Party. There *have always been* attacks on the "dictatorship of leaders" in our Party. The first time I heard such attacks, I recall, was in 1895, when, officially, no party yet existed, but a central group was taking shape in St. Petersburg, which was to assume the leadership of the district groups. [105] At the Ninth Congress of our Party (April 1920), there was a small opposition, which also spoke against the "dictatorship of leaders", against the "oligarchy", and so on. There is therefore nothing surprising, new, or terrible in the "infantile disorder" of "Left-wing communism" among the Germans. The ailment involves no danger, and after it the organism even becomes more robust. In our case, on the other hand, the rapid alternation of legal and illegal work, which made it necessary to keep the general staff—the leaders—under cover

[105] The reference is to the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class organized by V. I. Lenin in the autumn of 1895. The League of Struggle united about twenty Marxist circles in St. Petersburg. It was headed by the Central Group including V. I. Lenin, A. A. Vaneyev, P. K. Zaporozhets, G. M. Krzhizhanovsky, N. K. Krupskaya, L. Martov, M. A. Silvin, V. V. Starkov, and others; five members headed by V. I. Lenin directed the League's activities. The organisation was divided into district groups. Progressive workers such as I. V. Babushkin, V. A. Shelgunov and others linked these groups with the factories.

The St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class was, in V. I. Lenin's words, the embryo of a revolutionary party based on the working-class movement and giving leadership to the class struggle of the proletariat.

and cloak them in the greatest secrecy, sometimes gave rise to extremely dangerous consequences. The worst of these was that in 1912 the *agent provocateur* Malinovsky got into the Bolshevik Central Committee. He betrayed scores and scores of the best and most loyal comrades, caused them to be sentenced to penal servitude, and hastened the death of many of them. That he did not cause still greater harm was due to the correct balance between legal and illegal work. As member of the Party's Central Committee and Duma deputy, Malinovsky was forced, in order to gain our confidence, to help us establish legal daily papers, which even under tsarism were able to wage a struggle against the Menshevik opportunism and to spread the fundamentals of Bolshevism in a suitably disguised form. While, with one hand, Malinovsky sent scores and scores of the finest Bolsheviks to penal servitude and death, he was obliged, with the other, to assist in the education of scores and scores of thousands of new Bolsheviks through the medium of the legal press. Those German (and also British, American, French and Italian) comrades who are faced with the task of learning how to conduct revolutionary work within the reactionary trade unions would do well to give serious thought to this fact. [106]

In many countries, including the most advanced, the bourgeoisie are undoubtedly sending *agents provocateurs* into the Communist parties and will continue to do so. A skillful combining of illegal and legal work is one of the ways to combat this danger.

Chapter 6: Should Revolutionaries Work in Reactionary Trade Unions?

The German "Lefts" consider that, as far as they are concerned, the reply to this question is an unqualified negative. In their opinion, declamations and angry outcries (such as uttered by K. Horner in a particularly "solid" and particularly stupid manner) against "reactionary" and "counter-revolutionary" trade unions are sufficient "proof" that it is unnecessary and even inexcusable for revolutionaries and Communists to work in yellow, social-chauvinist, compromising and counter-revolutionary trade unions of the Legien type.

However firmly the German "Lefts" may be convinced of the revolutionism of such tactics, the latter are in fact fundamentally wrong, and contain nothing but empty phrases.

To make this clear, I shall begin with our own experience, in keeping with the general plan of the present pamphlet, which is aimed at applying to Western Europe whatever is universally practicable, significant and relevant in the history and the present-day tactics of Bolshevism.

[106] Malinovsky was a prisoner of war in Germany. On his return to Russia when the Bolsheviks were in power, he was instantly put on trial and shot by our workers. The Mensheviks attacked us most bitterly for our mistake—the fact that an agent provocateur had become a member of the Central Committee of our Party. But when, under Kerensky, we demanded the arrest and trial of Rodzyanko, the Chairman of the Duma, because he had known, even before the war, that Malinovsky was an agent provocateur and had not informed the Trudoviks and the workers in the Duma, neither the Mensheviks nor the Socialist-Revolutionaries in the Kerensky government supported our demand, and Rodzyanko remained at large and made off unhindered to join Denikin.

In Russia today, the connection between leaders, party, class and masses, as well as the attitude of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its party to the trade unions, are concretely as follows: the dictatorship is exercised by the proletariat organized in the Soviets; the proletariat is guided by the Communist Party of Bolsheviks, which, according to the figures of the latest Party Congress (April 1920), has a membership of 611,000. The membership varied greatly both before and after the October Revolution, and used to be much smaller, even in 1918 and 1919. [107] We are apprehensive of an excessive growth of the Party, because careerists and charlatans, who deserve only to be shot, inevitably do all they can to insinuate themselves into the ranks of the ruling party. The last time we opened wide the doors of the Party—to workers and peasants only—was when (in the winter of 1919) Yudenich was within a few versts of Petrograd, and Denikin was in Orel (about 350 versts from Moscow), i.e., when the Soviet Republic was in mortal danger, and when adventurers, careerists, charlatans and unreliable persons generally could not possibly count on making a profitable career (and had more reason to expect the gallows and torture) by joining the Communists. [108] The Party, which holds annual congresses (the most recent on the basis of one delegate per 1,000 members), is directed by a Central Committee of nineteen elected at the Congress, while the current work in Moscow has to be carried on by still smaller bodies, known as the Organizing Bureau and the Political Bureau, which are elected at plenary meetings of the Central Committee, five members of the Central Committee to each bureau. This, it would appear, is a full-fledged "oligarchy". No important political or organisational question is decided by any state institution in our republic without the guidance of the Party's Central Committee.

In its work, the Party relies directly on the *trade unions*, which, according to the data of the last congress (April 1920), now have a membership of over four million and are formally *non-Party*. Actually, all the directing bodies of the vast majority of the unions, and primarily, of course, of the all-Russia general trade union centre or bureau (the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions), are made up of Communists and carry out all the directives of the Party. Thus, on the whole, we have a

[107] Between the February 1917 Revolution and 1919 inclusively, the Party's membership changed as follows: by the Seventh All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) (April 1917) the Party numbered 80,000 members, by the Sixth R.S.D.L.P.(B.) Congress in July–August 1917—about 240,000, by the Seventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) in March 1918—not less than 270,000; by the Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) in March 1919—313,766 members.

[108] The reference is to Party Week, which was held in accordance with the resolution of the Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) on building up the Party's membership. The Party Week was conducted in conditions of the bitter struggle waged by the Soviet state against the foreign intervention and domestic counterrevolution. Party Week was first held in the Petrograd organisation of the R.C.P.(B.), August 10–17, 1919 (the second Party Week was held in Petrograd in October–November 1919); between September 20 and 28 a Party Week was held in the Moscow Gubernia organisation. Summarizing the experience of the first Party Weeks, the Plenum of the Central Committee of the R.C.P.(B.), held on September 26, 1919, resolved that Party Weeks should be held in cities, the countryside and the army. At the end of September, the Central Committee addressed a circular to all Party organisations pointing out that, as the re-registration and purge of the membership had been accomplished in almost all-Party organisations, new members might be enrolled. The Central Committee stressed that during Party Weeks only industrial workers, peasants, and Red Army and Navy men should be admitted into the Party. As a result of Party Weeks, over 200,000 joined the Party in 38 gubernias of the European part of the R.S.F.S.R., more than a half of them being industrial workers. Over 25 per cent of the armed forces' strength joined the Party at the fronts.

formally non-communist, flexible and relatively wide and very powerful proletarian apparatus, by means of which the Party is closely linked up with the *class* and the *masses*, and by means of which, under the leadership of the Party, the *class dictatorship* is exercised. Without close contacts with the trade unions, and without their energetic support and devoted efforts, not only in economic, *but also in military* affairs, it would of course have been impossible for us to govern the country and to maintain the dictatorship for two and a half months, let alone two and a half years. In practice, these very close contacts naturally call for highly complex and diversified work in the form of propaganda, agitation, timely and frequent conferences, not only with the leading trade union workers, but with influential trade union workers generally; they call for a determined struggle against the Mensheviks, who still have a certain though very small following to whom they teach all kinds of counter-revolutionary machinations, ranging from an ideological defense of (*bourgeois*) democracy and the preaching that the trade unions should be "independent" (independent of proletarian state power!) to sabotage of proletarian discipline, etc., etc.

We consider that contacts with the "masses" through the trade unions are not enough. In the course of our revolution, practical activities have given rise to such institutions as *non-Party workers' and peasants' conferences*, and we strive by every means to support, develop and extend this institution in order to be able to observe the temper of the masses, come closer to them, meet their requirements, promote the best among them to state posts, etc. Under a recent decree on the transformation of the People's Commissariat of State Control into the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, non-Party conferences of this kind have been empowered to select members of the State Control to carry out various kinds of investigations, etc.

Then, of course, all the work of the Party is carried on through the Soviets, which embrace the working masses irrespective of occupation. The district congresses of Soviets are *democratic* institutions, the like of which even the best of the democratic republics of the bourgeois world have never known; through these congresses (whose proceedings the Party endeavors to follow with the closest attention), as well as by continually appointing class-conscious workers to various posts in the rural districts, the proletariat exercises its role of leader of the peasantry, gives effect to the dictatorship of the urban proletariat wages a systematic struggle against the rich, bourgeois, exploiting and profiteering peasantry, etc.

Such is the general mechanism of the proletarian state power viewed "from above", from the standpoint of the practical implementation of the dictatorship. We hope that the reader will understand why the Russian Bolshevik who has known this mechanism for twenty-five years and has seen it develop out of small, illegal and underground circles, cannot help regarding all this talk about "from above" *or* "from below", about the dictatorship of leaders *or* the dictatorship of the masses, etc., as ridiculous and childish nonsense, something like discussing whether a man's left leg or right arm is of greater use to him.

We cannot but regard as equally ridiculous and childish nonsense the pompous, very learned, and frightfully revolutionary disquisitions of the German Lefts to the effect that Communists cannot and should not work in reactionary trade unions, that it is permissible to turn down such work, that it is necessary to withdraw from the trade unions and create a brand-new and immaculate "Workers' Union" invented by very pleasant (and, probably, for the most part very youthful) Communists, etc., etc.

Capitalism inevitably leaves socialism the legacy, on the one hand, of the old trade and craft distinctions among the workers, distinctions evolved in the course of centuries; on the other hand, trade unions, which only very slowly, in the course of years and years, can and will develop into broader industrial unions with less of the craft union about them (embracing entire industries, and not only crafts, trades and occupations), and later proceed, through these industrial unions, to eliminate the division of labor among people, to educate and school people, give them *all-round development and an all-round* training, so that they *are able to do everything*. Communism is advancing and must advance towards that goal, and *will reach* it, but only after very many years. To attempt in practice, today, to anticipate this future result of a fully developed, fully stabilized and constituted, fully comprehensive and mature communism would be like trying to teach higher mathematics to a child of four.

We can (and must) begin to build socialism, not with abstract human material, or with human material specially prepared by us, but with the human material bequeathed to us by capitalism. True, that is no easy matter, but no other approach to this task is serious enough to warrant discussion.

The trade unions were a tremendous step forward for the working class in the early days of capitalist development, inasmuch as they marked a transition from the workers' disunity and helplessness to the *rudiments* of class organisation. When the *revolutionary party of the proletariat*, the *highest* form of proletarian class organisation, began to take shape (and the Party will not merit the name until it learns to weld the leaders into one indivisible whole with the class and the masses) the trade unions inevitably began to reveal *certain* reactionary features, a certain craft narrow-mindedness, a certain tendency to be non-political, a certain inertness, etc. However, the development of the proletariat did not, and could not, proceed anywhere in the world otherwise than through the trade unions, through reciprocal action between them and the party of the working class. The proletariat's conquest of political power is a gigantic step forward for the proletariat as a class, and the Party must more than ever and in a new way, not only in the old, educate and guide the trade unions, at the same time bearing in mind that they are and will long remain an indispensable "school of communism" and a preparatory school that trains proletarians to exercise their dictatorship, an indispensable organisation of the workers for the gradual transfer of the management of the whole economic life of the country to the working *class* (and not to the separate trades), and later to all the working people.

In the sense mentioned above, a *certain* "reactionism" in the trade unions is *inevitable* under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Not to understand this means a complete failure to understand the fundamental conditions of the *transition* from capitalism to socialism. It would be egregious folly to fear *this* "reactionism" or to try to *evade* or leap over it, for it would mean fearing that function of the proletarian vanguard which consists in training, educating, enlightening and drawing into the new life the most backward strata and masses of the working class and the peasantry. On the other hand, it would be a still graver error to postpone the achievement of the dictatorship of the proletariat until a time when there will not be a single worker with a narrow-minded craft outlook, or with craft and craft-union prejudices. The art of politics (and the Communist's correct understanding of his tasks) consists in correctly gauging the conditions and the moment when the vanguard of the proletariat can successfully assume power, when it is able—during and after the seizure of power—to win adequate support from sufficiently broad strata of the working class and of the non-proletarian working masses, and when it is able thereafter to maintain, consolidate and extend its rule by educating, training and attracting ever broader masses of the working people.

Further. In countries more advanced than Russia, a certain reactionism in the trade unions has been and was bound to be manifested in a far greater measure than in our country. Our Mensheviks found support in the trade unions (and to some extents still do so in a small number of unions), as a result of the latter's craft narrow-mindedness, craft selfishness and opportunism. The Mensheviks of the West have acquired a much firmer footing in the trade unions; there the *craft-union, narrow-minded, selfish, case-hardened, covetous, and petty-bourgeois "labor aristocracy", imperialist-minded, and imperialist-corrupted*, has developed into a much stronger section than in our country. That is incontestable. The struggle against the Gomperses, and against the Jouhaux, Hendersons, Merrheims, Legiens and Co. in Western Europe is much more difficult than the struggle against our Mensheviks, who are an *absolutely homogeneous* social and political type. This struggle must be waged ruthlessly, and it must unfailingly be brought—as we brought it—to a point when all the incorrigible leaders of opportunism and social-chauvinism are completely discredited and driven out of the trade unions. Political power cannot be captured (and the attempt to capture it should not be made) until the struggle has reached a *certain* stage. This "certain stage" will be *different* in different countries and in different circumstances; it can be correctly gauged only by thoughtful, experienced and knowledgeable political leaders of the proletariat in each particular country. (In Russia the elections to the Constituent Assembly in November 1917, a few days after the proletarian revolution of October 25, 1917, were one of the criteria of the success of this struggle. In these elections the Mensheviks were utterly defeated; they received 700,000 votes—1,400,000 if the vote in Transcaucasia is added—as against 9,000,000 votes polled by the Bolsheviks. See my article, "The Constituent

Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", [109] in the *Communist International* [110] No. 7–8.)

We are waging a struggle against the "labor aristocracy" in the name of the masses of the workers and in order to win them over to our side; we are waging the struggle against the opportunist and social-chauvinist leaders in order to win the working class over to our side. It would be absurd to forget this most elementary and most self-evident truth. Yet it is this very absurdity that the German "Left" Communists perpetrate when, *because* of the reactionary and counter-revolutionary character of the trade union *top leadership*, they jump to the conclusion that . . . we must withdraw from the trade unions, refuse to work in them, and create new and *artificial* forms of labor organisation! This is so unpardonable a blunder that it is tantamount to the greatest service Communists could render the bourgeoisie. Like all the opportunist, social-chauvinist, and Kautskyite trade union leaders, our Mensheviks are nothing but "agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement" (as we have always said the Mensheviks are), or "labor lieutenants of the capitalist class", to use the splendid and profoundly true expression of the followers of Daniel De Leon in America. To refuse to work in the reactionary trade unions means leaving the insufficiently developed or backward masses of workers under the influence of the reactionary leaders, the agents of the bourgeoisie, the labor aristocrats, or "workers who have become completely bourgeois" (cf. Engels's letter to Marx in 1858 about the British workers [111]).

This ridiculous "theory" that Communists should not work in reactionary trade unions reveals with the utmost clarity the frivolous attitude of the "Left" Communists towards the question of influencing the "masses", and their misuse of clamor about the "masses". If you want to help the "masses" and win the sympathy and support of the "masses", you should not fear difficulties, or pinpricks, chicanery, insults and persecution from the "leaders" (who, being opportunists and social-chauvinists, are in most cases directly or indirectly connected with the bourgeoisie and the police), but must absolutely *work wherever the masses are to be found*. You must be capable of any sacrifice, of overcoming the greatest obstacles, in order to carry on agitation and propaganda systematically, perseveringly, persistently and patiently in those institutions, societies and associations—even the most reactionary—in which proletarian or semi-proletarian masses are to be found. The trade unions

[109] See LCW, Vol. 30, pp. 253–75.

[110] The Communist International—a journal, organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. It was published in Russian, German, French, English, Spanish and Chinese, the first issue appearing on May 1, 1919.

The journal published theoretical articles and documents of the Comintern, including a number of articles by Lenin. It elucidated the fundamental questions of Marxist-Leninist theory in connection with problems confronting the international working-class and communist movement and the experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. It also waged a struggle against various anti-Leninist tendencies.

Publication of the journal ceased in June 1943 in connection with the resolution adopted by the Presidium of the Comintern's Executive Committee on May 15, 1943, on the dissolution of the Communist International.

[111] See Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Selected Correspondence, Moscow, 1965, p. 110.

and the workers' co-operatives (the latter sometimes, at least) are the very organisations in which the masses are to be found. According to figures quoted in the Swedish paper *Folkets Dagblad Politiken* of March 10, 1920, the trade union membership in Great Britain increased from 5,500,000 at the end of 1917 to 6,600,000 at the end of 1918, an increase of 19 per cent. Towards the close of 1919, the membership was estimated at 7,500,000. I have not got the corresponding figures for France and Germany to hand, but absolutely incontestable and generally known facts testify to a rapid rise in the trade union membership in these countries too.

These facts make crystal clear something that is confirmed by thousands of other symptoms, namely, that class-consciousness and the desire for organisation are growing among the proletarian masses, among the rank and file, among the backward elements. Millions of workers in Great Britain, France and Germany are *for the first time* passing from a complete lack of organisation to the elementary, lowest, simplest, and (to those still thoroughly imbued with bourgeois-democratic prejudices) most easily comprehensible form of organisation, namely, the trade unions; yet the revolutionary but imprudent Left Communists stand by, crying out "the masses", "the masses!" but *refusing to work within the trade unions*, on the pretext that they are "reactionary", and invent a brand-new, immaculate little "Workers' Union", which is guiltless of bourgeois-democratic prejudices and innocent of craft or narrow-minded craft-union sins, a union which, they claim, will be (!) a broad organisation. "Recognition of the Soviet system and the dictatorship" will be the *only* (!) condition of membership. (See the passage quoted above.)

It would be hard to imagine any greater ineptitude or greater harm to the revolution than that caused by the "Left" revolutionaries! Why, if we in Russia today, after two and a half years of unprecedented victories over the bourgeoisie of Russia and the Entente, were to make "recognition of the dictatorship" a condition of trade union membership, we would be doing a very foolish thing, damaging our influence among the masses, and helping the Mensheviks. The task devolving on Communists is to *convince* the backward elements, to work *among* them, and not to *fence themselves off* from them with artificial and childishly "Left" slogans.

There can be no doubt that the Gomperses, the Hendersons, the Jonhaux and the Legiens are very grateful to those "Left" revolutionaries who, like the German opposition "on principle" (heaven preserve us from such "principles"!), or like some of the revolutionaries in the American Industrial Workers of the World [112] advocate quitting the reactionary trade unions and refusing to work in

[112] The Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.)—a workers' trade union organisation, founded in the U.S.A. in 1905, and in the main organizing unskilled and low-paid workers of various trades. Among its founders were such working-class leaders as Daniel De Leon, Eugene Debs and William Haywood. I.W.W. organisations were also set up in Canada, Australia, Britain, Latin America and South Africa. In conditions of the mass strike movement in the U.S.A., which developed under the influence of the Russian revolution of 1905–07, the I.W.W. organized a number of successful mass strikes, waged a struggle against the policy of class collaboration conducted by reformist leaders of the American Federation of Labor and Right-wing socialists. During the First World War of 1914–18, the organisation led a number of mass anti-war actions by the American working class. Some I.W.W. Leaders, among them William Haywood, welcomed the Great October Socialist Revolution and joined the Communist Party of the U.S.A. At the same time, anarcho-

them. These men, the "leaders" of opportunism, will no doubt resort to every device of bourgeois diplomacy and to the aid of bourgeois governments, the clergy, the police and the courts, to keep Communists out of the trade unions, oust them by every means, make their work in the trade unions as unpleasant as possible, and insult, bait and persecute them. We must be able to stand up to all this, agree to make any sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to various stratagems, artifices and illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges, as long as we get into the trade unions, remain in them, and carry-on communist work within them at all costs. Under tsarism we had no "legal opportunities" whatsoever until 1905. However, when Zubatov, agent of the secret police, organized Black-Hundred workers' assemblies and workingmen's societies for the purpose of trapping revolutionaries and combating them, we sent members of our Party to these assemblies and into these societies (I personally remember one of them, Comrade Babushkin, a leading St. Petersburg factory worker, shot by order of the tsar's generals in 1906). They established contacts with the masses, were able to carry on their agitation, and succeeded in wresting workers from the influence of Zubatov's agents. [113] Of course, in Western Europe, which is imbued with most deep-rooted legalistic, constitutionalist and bourgeois-democratic prejudices, this is more difficult of achievement. However, it can and must be carried out, and systematically at that.

The Executive Committee of the Third International must, in my opinion, positively condemn, and call upon the next congress of the Communist International to condemn both the policy of refusing to work in reactionary trade unions in general (explaining in detail why such refusal is unwise, and what extreme harm it does to the cause of the proletarian revolution) and, in particular, the line of conduct of some members of the Communist Party of Holland, who—whether directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly, wholly or partly, it does not matter—have supported this erroneous policy. The Third International must break with the tactics of the Second International, it must not evade or play down points at issue, but must pose them in a straightforward fashion. The whole truth has been put squarely to the "Independents"; the whole truth must likewise be put squarely to the "Left" Communists.

Mao Zedong: Quotations from Mao Zedong

Chapter 11: The Mass Line

The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history.

---

syndicalist features showed up in I.W.W. activities: it did not recognize the proletariat's political struggle, denied the Party's leading role and the necessity of the proletarian dictatorship, and refused to carry on work among the membership of the American Federation of Labor. In 1920 the organization's anarcho-syndicalist leaders took advantage of the imprisonment of many revolutionaries and against the will of the trade union masses, rejected appeal by the Comintern's Executive Committee that they join the Communist International. As a result of the leaders' opportunist policy, the I.W.W. degenerated into a sectarian organisation, which soon lost all influence on the working-class movement.

[113] The Gomperses, Hendersons, Jouhaux and Legiens are nothing but Zubatovs, differing from our Zubatov only in their European garb and polish, and the civilized, refined and democratically suave manner of conducting their despicable policy.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 257.*

The masses are the real heroes, while we ourselves are often childish and ignorant, and without this understanding, it is impossible to acquire even the most rudimentary knowledge.

"Preface and Postscript to Rural Surveys" (March and April 1941), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 12. *

The masses have boundless creative power. They can organize themselves and concentrate on places and branches of work where they can give full play to their energy; they can concentrate on production in breadth and depth and create more and more undertakings for their own well-being.

Introductory note to "Surplus Labor Has Found a Way Out" (1955), The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside, Chinese ed., Vol. II.

The present upsurge of the peasant movement is a colossal event. In a very short time, in China's central, southern and northern provinces, several hundred million peasants will rise like a mighty storm, like a hurricane, a force so swift and violent that no power, however great, will be able to hold it back. They will smash all the trammels that bind them and rush forward along the road to liberation. They will sweep all the imperialists, warlords, corrupt officials, local tyrants and evil gentry into their graves. Every revolutionary party and every revolutionary comrade will be put to the test, to be accepted or rejected as they decide. There are three alternatives. To march at their head and lead them? To trail behind them, gesticulating and criticizing? Or to stand in their way and oppose them? Every Chinese is free to choose, but events will force you to make the choice quickly.

"Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan" (March 1927), Selected Works, Vol. I, pp. 23-24. *

The high tide of social transformation in the countryside, the high tide of co-operation, has already reached some places and will soon sweep over the whole country. It is a vast socialist revolutionary movement involving a rural population of more than 800 million, and it has extremely great and worldwide significance. We should give this movement active, enthusiastic and systematic leadership, and not drag it back by one means or another. Some errors are unavoidable in the process; this is understandable, and they will not be hard to correct. Shortcomings or mistakes found among the cadres and the peasants can be remedied or overcome provided we give them positive help.

On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation (July 31, 1955), 3rd ed., p. 1. *

The masses have a potentially inexhaustible enthusiasm for socialism. Those who can only follow the old routine in a revolutionary period are utterly incapable of seeing this enthusiasm. They are blind and all is dark ahead of them. At times they go so far as to confound right and wrong and turn things upside down. Haven't we come across enough persons of this type? Those who simply follow the old routine invariably underestimate the people's enthusiasm. Let something new appear and they always disapprove and rush to oppose it. Afterwards, they have to admit defeat and do a little self-criticism. But the next time something new appears, they go through the same process all over again. This is their pattern of behavior in regard to anything and everything new. Such people

are always passive, always fail to move forward at the critical moment, and always have to be given a shove in the back before they move a step.

Introductory note to "This Township Went Co-operative in Two Years" (1955), The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside, Chinese ed., Vol. II.

For over twenty years our Party has carried on mass work every day, and for the past dozen years it has talked about the mass line every day. We have always maintained that the revolution must rely on the masses of the people, on everybody's taking a hand, and have opposed relying merely on a few persons issuing orders. The mass line, however, is still not being thoroughly carried out in the work of some comrades; they still rely solely on a handful of people working in solitude. One reason is that, whatever they do, they are always reluctant to explain it to the people they lead and that they do not understand why or how to give play to the initiative and creative energy of those they lead. Subjectively, they too want everyone to take a hand in the work, but they do not let other people know what is to be done or how to do it. That being the case, how can everyone be expected to get moving and how can anything be done well? To solve this problem the basic thing is, of course, to carry out ideological education on the mass line, but at the same time we must teach these comrades many concrete methods of work.

"A Talk to the Editorial Staff of the Shansi-Suiyuan Daily" (April 2, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, pp. 241-42. *

Twenty-four years of experience tell us that the right task, policy and style of work invariably conform with the demands of the masses at a given time and place and invariably strengthen our ties with the masses, and the wrong task, policy and style of work invariably disagree with the demands of the masses at a given time and place and invariably alienate us from the masses. The reason why such evils as dogmatism, empiricism, commandism, tailism, sectarianism, bureaucracy and an arrogant attitude in work are definitely harmful and intolerable, and why anyone suffering from these maladies must overcome them, is that they alienate us from the masses.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 315.

To link oneself with the masses, one must act in accordance with the needs and wishes of the masses. All work done for the masses must start from their needs and not from the desire of any individual, however well-intentioned. It often happens that objectively the masses need a certain change, but subjectively they are not yet conscious of the need, not yet willing or determined to make the change. In such cases, we should wait patiently. We should not make the change until, through our work, most of the masses have become conscious of the need and are willing and determined to carry it out. Otherwise, we shall isolate ourselves from the masses. Unless they are conscious and willing, any kind of work that requires their participation will turn out to be a mere formality and will fail.... There are two principles here: one is the actual needs of the masses rather than what we fancy they need, and the other is the wishes of the masses, who must make up their own minds instead of our making up their minds for them.

"The United Front in Cultural Work" (October 30, 1944), Selected Works, Vol. III, pp. 236-37. *

Our congress should call upon the whole Party to be vigilant and to see that no comrade at any post is divorced from the masses. It should teach every comrade to love the people and listen attentively to the voice of the masses; to identify himself with the masses wherever he goes and, instead of standing above them, to immerse himself among them; and, according to their present level, to awaken them or raise their political consciousness and help them gradually to organize themselves voluntarily and to set going all essential struggles permitted by the internal and external circumstances of the given time and place.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, pp. 315-I6.

If we tried to go on the offensive when the masses are not yet awakened, that would be adventurism. If we insisted on leading the masses to do anything against their will, we would certainly fail. If we did not advance when the masses demand advance, that would be Right opportunism.

"A Talk to the Editorial Staff of the Shansi-Suiyuan Daily" (April 2, I948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 243.

Commandism is wrong in any type of work, because in overstepping the level of political consciousness of the masses and violating the principle of voluntary mass action it reflects the disease of impetuosity. Our comrades must not assume that everything they themselves understand is understood by the masses. Whether the masses understand it and are ready to take action can be discovered only by going into their midst and making investigations. If we do so, we can avoid commandism. Tailism in any type of work is also wrong, because in falling below the level of political consciousness of the masses and violating the principle of leading the masses forward it reflects the disease of dilatoriness. Our comrades must not assume that the masses have no understanding of what they do not yet understand. It often happens that the masses outstrip us and are eager to advance a step and that nevertheless our comrades fail to act as leaders of the masses and tail behind certain backward elements, reflecting their views and, moreover, mistaking them for those of the broad masses.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 316. *

Take the ideas of the masses and concentrate them, then go to the masses, persevere in the ideas and carry them through, so as to form correct ideas of leadership - such is the basic method of leadership.

"Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership" (June 1, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 120.

In all the practical work of our Party, all correct leadership is necessarily "from the masses, to the masses". This means: take the ideas of the masses (scattered and unsystematic ideas) and concentrate them (through study turn them into concentrated and systematic ideas), then go to the masses and propagate and explain these ideas until the masses embrace them as their own, hold fast to them and translate them into action, and test the correctness of these ideas in such action. Then once again concentrate ideas from the masses and once again go to the masses so that the ideas are

persevered in and carried through. And so on, over and over again in an endless spiral, with the ideas becoming more correct, more vital and richer each time. Such is the Marxist theory of knowledge.

Ibid., p. 119.

We should go to the masses and learn from them, synthesize their experience into better, articulated principles and methods, then do propaganda among the masses, and call upon them to put these principles and methods into practice so as to solve their problems and help them achieve liberation and happiness.

"Get Organized!" (November 29, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 158.

There are people in our leading organs in some places that think that it is enough for the leaders alone to know the Party's policies and that there is no need to let the masses know them. This is one of the basic reasons why some of our work cannot be done well.

"A Talk to the Editorial Staff of the Shansi-Suiyuan Daily" (April 2, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 241.

In all mass movements we must make a basic investigation and analysis of the number of active supporters, opponents and neutrals and must not decide problems subjectively and without basis.

"Methods of Work of Party Committees" (March 13, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 380.

The masses in any given place are generally composed of three parts, the relatively active, the intermediate and the relatively backward. The leaders must therefore be skilled in uniting the small number of active elements around the leadership and must rely on them to raise the level of the intermediate elements and to win over the backward elements.

"Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership" (June 1, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 118.

To be good at translating the Party's policy into action of the masses, to be good at getting not only the leading cadres but also the broad masses to understand and master every movement and every struggle we launch - this is an art of Marxist-Leninist leadership. It is also the dividing line that determines whether or not we make mistakes in our work.

"A Talk to the Editorial Staff of the Shansi-Suiyuan Daily" (April 2, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, PP 242-43.

However active the leading group may be, its activity will amount to fruitless effort by a handful of people unless combined with the activity of the masses. On the other hand, if the masses alone are active without a strong leading group to organize their activity properly, such activity cannot be sustained for long, or carried forward in the right direction, or raised to a high level.

"Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership" (June 1, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 118.

Production by the masses, the interests of the masses, the experiences and feelings of the masses - to these the leading cadres should pay constant attention.

Inscription for a production exhibition sponsored by organizations directly under the Central Committee of the Party and the General Headquarters of the Eighth Route Army, Liberation Daily of Yenan, November 24, 1943.

We should pay close attention to the wellbeing of the masses, from the problems of land and labor to those of fuel, rice, cooking oil and salt.... All such problems concerning the wellbeing of the masses should be placed on our agenda. We should discuss them, adopt and carry out decisions and check up on the results. We should help the masses to realize that we represent their interests and that our lives are intimately bound up with theirs. We should help them to proceed from these things to an understanding of the higher tasks which we have put forward, the tasks of the revolutionary war, so that they will support the revolution and spread it throughout the country, respond to our political appeals and fight to the end for victory in the revolution.

"Be Concerned with the Well-Being of the Masses, Pay Attention to Methods of Work" (January 27, 1934), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 149. *

Chapter 16. Education and the Training of Troops

Our educational policy must enable everyone who receives an education to develop morally, intellectually and physically and become a worker with both socialist consciousness and culture.

On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People (February 27, 1959), 1st pocket ed., p. 44.

As for education for cadres whether at work or in schools for cadres, a policy should be established of focusing such education on the study of the practical problems of the Chinese revolution and using the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism as the guide, and the method of studying Marxism-Leninism statically and in isolation should be discarded.

"Reform Our Study" (May 1941), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 24.

For a military school, the most important question is the selection of a director and instructors and the adoption of an educational policy.

"Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War" (December 1936), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 5. *

A school of a hundred people certainly cannot be run well if it does not have a leading group of several people, or a dozen or more, which is formed in accordance with the actual circumstances (and not thrown together artificially) and is composed of the most active, upright and alert of the teachers, the other staff and the students.

"Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership" (June 1, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, pp. 118-l9.

All officers and fighters of our army must improve their military art, march forward courageously towards certain victory in the war and resolutely, thoroughly, wholly and completely wipe out all enemies.

"Manifesto of the Chinese People's Liberation Army" (October 1947), Selected Military Writings, 2nd ed., p. 340.

Equal importance should be attached to the military and political aspects of the one-year consolidation and training program that has just begun, and the two aspects should be integrated. At the start, stress should be placed on the political aspect, on improving relations between officers and men, enhancing internal unity and arousing a high level of enthusiasm among the masses of cadres and fighters. Only thus will the military consolidation and training proceed smoothly and attain better results.

"The Tasks for 1945" (December 15, 1944).

As for the method of training, we should unfold the mass training movement in which officers teach soldiers, soldiers teach officers and the soldiers teach each other.

"Policy for Work in the Liberated Areas for 1946" (December 15, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 76.

Our slogan in training troops is "Officers teach soldiers, soldiers teach officers and soldiers teach each other". The fighters have a lot of practical combat experience. The officers should learn from the fighters, and when they have made other people's experience their own, they will become more capable.

"A Talk to the Editorial Staff of the Shansi-Suiyuan Daily" (April 2, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 243.

As for the training courses, the main objective should still be to raise the level of technique in marksmanship, bayoneting grenade-throwing and the like and the secondary objective should be to raise the level of tactics, while special emphasis should be laid on night operations.

"Policy for Work in the Liberated Areas for 1946" (December 15, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 76. *

Chapter 19: Revolutionary Heroism

This army has an indomitable spirit and is determined to vanquish all enemies and never to yield. No matter what the difficulties and hardships, so long as a single man remains, he will fight on.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 264.*

Give full play to our style of fighting - courage in battle, no fear of sacrifice, no fear of fatigue, and continuous fighting (that is, fighting successive battles in a short time without rest).

"The Present Situation and Our Tasks" (December 25, 1947), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 161.

Thousands upon thousands of martyrs have heroically laid down their lives for the people; let us hold their banner high and march ahead along the path crimson with their blood!

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 318.

Be resolute, fear no sacrifice and surmount every difficulty to win victory.

"The Foolish Old Man Who Removed the Mountains" (June 11, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 321. *

At a critical moment in the progress of the Northern Expedition, . . . the treacherous and reactionary policies of "party purge" and massacre adopted by the Kuomintang authorities wrecked

this national united front - the united front of the Kuomintang, the Communist Party and all sections of the people, which embodied the Chinese people's cause of liberation - and all its revolutionary policies.... Thereupon unity was replaced by civil war, democracy by dictatorship, and a China full of brightness by a China covered in darkness. But the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people were neither cowed nor conquered nor exterminated. They picked themselves up, wiped off the blood, buried their fallen comrades and went into battle again. Holding high the great standard of revolution, they rose in armed resistance and over a vast territory in China they set up people's governments, carried out land reform, built up a people's army - the Chinese Red Army - and preserved and expanded the revolutionary forces of the Chinese people.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 261. *

You have many good qualities and have rendered great service, but you must always remember not to become conceited. You are respected by all, and quite rightly, but this easily leads to conceit. If you become conceited, if you are not modest and cease to exert yourselves, and if you do not respect others, do not respect the cadres and the masses, then you will cease to be heroes and models. There have been such people in the past, and I hope you will not follow their example.

"We Must Learn to Do Economic Work" (January 10, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 239.

In the fight to wipe out the enemy and to restore and increase industrial and agricultural production, you have overcome many difficulties and hardships and demonstrated immense courage, wisdom and initiative. You are models for the whole Chinese nation, the backbone of the victorious advance of the people's cause in all spheres, pillars of support to the People's Government and bridges linking the People's Government with the great masses.

Message of greetings on behalf of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party to the Meeting of Representatives of National Combat Heroes and Model Workers (September 25, 1950).

We the Chinese nation have the spirit to fight the enemy to the last drop of our blood, the determination to recover our lost territory by our own efforts, and the ability to stand on our own feet in the family of nations.

"On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism" (December 27, 1935), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 170. *

Chapter 28: Communists

A Communist should have largeness of mind and he should be staunch and active, looking upon the interests of the revolution as his very life and subordinating his personal interests to those of the revolution; always and everywhere he should adhere to principle and wage a tireless struggle against all incorrect ideas and actions, so as to consolidate the collective life of the Party and strengthen the ties between the Party and the masses; he should be more concerned about the Party and the masses than about any individual, and more concerned about others than about himself. Only thus can he be considered a Communist.

"Combat Liberalism" (September 7, 1937), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 33.*

Every comrade must be brought to understand that the supreme test of the words and deeds of a Communist is whether they conform with the highest interests and enjoy the support of the overwhelming majority of the people.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 316.*

At no time and in no circumstances should a Communist place his personal interests first; he should subordinate them to the interests of the nation and of the masses. Hence, selfishness, slacking, corruption, seeking the limelight, and so on, are most contemptible, while selflessness, working with all one's energy, whole-hearted devotion to public duty, and quiet hard work will command respect.

"The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War" (October 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 198.

Communists must be ready at all times to stand up for the truth, because truth is in the interests of the people; Communists must be ready at all times to correct their mistakes, because mistakes are against the interests of the people.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 315.

Communists must always go into the why's 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 they follow blindly and encourage slavishness.

"Rectify the Party's Style of Work" (February 1, 1942), Selected Works, Vol. III, pp. 49-50.

We should encourage comrades to take the interests of the whole into account. Every Party member, every branch of work, every statement and every action must proceed from the interests of the whole Party; it is absolutely impermissible to violate this principle.

Ibid., p. 44.

Communists should set an example in being practical as well as far-sighted. For only by being practical can they fulfil the appointed tasks, and only far-sightedness can prevent them from losing their bearings in the march forward.

"The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War" (October 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 198.

Communists should be the most farsighted, the most self-sacrificing, the most resolute, and the least prejudiced in sizing up situations, and should rely on the majority of the masses and win their support.

"The Tasks of the Chinese Communist Party in the Period of Resistance to Japan" (May 3, 1937), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 274.*

Communists should set an example in study; at all times they should be pupils of the masses as well as their teachers.

"The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War" (October 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 198.*

Every Communist working in the mass movements should be a friend of the masses and not a boss over them, an indefatigable teacher and not a bureaucratic politician.

Ibid.*

Communists must never separate themselves from the majority of the people or neglect them by leading only a few progressive contingents in an isolated and rash advance, but must take care to forge close links between the progressive elements and the broad masses. This is what thinking in terms of the majority means.

Ibid., p. 201.*

We Communists are like seeds and the people are like the soil. Wherever we go, we must unite with the people, take root and blossom among them.

"On the Chungking Negotiations" (October 17, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 58.

We Communists must be able to integrate ourselves with the masses in all things. If our Party members spend their whole lives sitting indoors and never go out to face the world and brave the storm, what good will they be to the Chinese people? None at all, and we do not need such people as Party members. We Communists ought to face the world and brave the storm the great world of mass struggle and the mighty storm of mass struggle.

"Get Organized!" (November 29, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 158.

The exemplary vanguard role of the Communists is of vital importance. Communists in the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies should set an example in fighting bravely, carrying out orders, observing discipline, doing political work and fostering internal unity and solidarity.

"The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War" (October 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 197.*

A Communist must never be opinionated or domineering, thinking that he is good in everything while others are good in nothing; he must never shut himself up in his little room, or brag and boast and lord it over others.

"Speech at the Assembly of Representatives of the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region" (November 21, 1941), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 33.*

Communists must listen attentively to the views of people outside the Party and let them have their say. If what they say is right, we ought to welcome it, and we should learn from their strong points; if it is wrong, we should let them finish what they are saying and then patiently explain things to them.

Ibid.

The attitude of Communists towards any person who has made mistakes in his work should be one of persuasion in order to help him change and start afresh and not one of exclusion, unless he is incorrigible.

As for people who are politically backward, Communists should not slight or despise them, but should befriend them, unite with them, convince them and encourage them to go forward.

Ibid.

Mao Zedong: Combat Liberalism

We stand for active ideological struggle because it is the weapon for ensuring unity within the Party and the revolutionary organizations in the interest of our fight. Every Communist and revolutionary should take up this weapon.

But liberalism rejects ideological struggle and stands for unprincipled peace, thus giving rise to a decadent, Philistine attitude and bringing about political degeneration in certain units and individuals in the Party and the revolutionary organizations.

Liberalism manifests itself in various ways.

To let things slide for the sake of peace and friendship when a person has clearly gone wrong, and refrain from principled argument because he is an old acquaintance, a fellow townsman, a schoolmate, a close friend, a loved one, an old colleague or old subordinate. Or to touch on the matter lightly instead of going into it thoroughly, so as to keep on good terms. The result is that both the organization and the individual are harmed. This is one type of liberalism.

To indulge in irresponsible criticism in private instead of actively putting forward one's suggestions to the organization. To say nothing to people to their faces but to gossip behind their backs, or to say nothing at a meeting but to gossip afterwards. To show no regard at all for the principles of collective life but to follow one's own inclination. This is a second type.

To let things drift if they do not affect one personally; to say as little as possible while knowing perfectly well what is wrong, to be worldly wise and play safe and seek only to avoid blame. This is a third type.

Not to obey orders but to give pride of place to one's own opinions. To demand special consideration from the organization but to reject its discipline. This is a fourth type.

To indulge in personal attacks, pick quarrels, vent personal spite or seek revenge instead of entering into an argument and struggling against incorrect views for the sake of unity or progress or getting the work done properly. This is a fifth type.

To hear incorrect views without rebutting them and even to hear counter-revolutionary remarks without reporting them, but instead to take them calmly as if nothing had happened. This is a sixth type.

To be among the masses and fail to conduct propaganda and agitation or speak at meetings or conduct investigations and inquiries among them, and instead to be indifferent to them and show no

concern for their well-being, forgetting that one is a Communist and behaving as if one were an ordinary non-Communist. This is a seventh type.

To see someone harming the interests of the masses and yet not feel indignant, or dissuade or stop him or reason with him, but to allow him to continue. This is an eighth type.

To work half-heartedly without a definite plan or direction; to work perfunctorily and muddle along--"So long as one remains a monk, one goes on tolling the bell." This is a ninth type.

To regard oneself as having rendered great service to the revolution, to pride oneself on being a veteran, to disdain minor assignments while being quite unequal to major tasks, to be slipshod in work and slack in study. This is a tenth type.

To be aware of one's own mistakes and yet make no attempt to correct them, taking a liberal attitude towards oneself. This is an eleventh type.

We could name more. But these eleven are the principal types.

They are all manifestations of liberalism.

Liberalism is extremely harmful in a revolutionary collective. It is a corrosive which eats away unity, undermines cohesion, causes apathy and creates dissension. It robs the revolutionary ranks of compact organization and strict discipline, prevents policies from being carried through and alienates the Party organizations from the masses which the Party leads. It is an extremely bad tendency.

Liberalism stems from petty-bourgeois selfishness, it places personal interests first and the interests of the revolution second, and this gives rise to ideological, political and organizational liberalism.

People who are liberals look upon the principles of Marxism as abstract dogma. They approve of Marxism, but are not prepared to practice it or to practice it in full; they are not prepared to replace their liberalism by Marxism. These people have their Marxism, but they have their liberalism as well--they talk Marxism but practice liberalism; they apply Marxism to others but liberalism to themselves. They keep both kinds of goods in stock and find a use for each. This is how the minds of certain people work.

Liberalism is a manifestation of opportunism and conflicts fundamentally with Marxism. It is negative and objectively has the effect of helping the enemy; that is why the enemy welcomes its preservation in our midst. Such being its nature, there should be no place for it in the ranks of the revolution.

We must use Marxism, which is positive in spirit, to overcome liberalism, which is negative. A Communist should have largeness of mind and he should be staunch and active, looking upon the interests of the revolution as his very life and subordinating his personal interests to those of the revolution; always and everywhere he should adhere to principle and wage a tireless struggle against

all incorrect ideas and actions, so as to consolidate the collective life of the Party and strengthen the ties between the Party and the masses; he should be more concerned about the Party and the masses than about any private person, and more concerned about others than about himself. Only thus can he be considered a Communist.

All loyal, honest, active and upright Communists must unite to oppose the liberal tendencies shown by certain people among us, and set them on the right path. This is one of the tasks on our ideological front.

Mao Zedong: Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership

1. There are two methods which we Communists must employ in whatever work we do. One is to combine the general with the particular; the other is to combine the leadership with the masses.

2. In any task, if no general and widespread call is issued, the broad masses cannot be mobilized for action. But if persons in leading positions confine themselves to a general call--if they do not personally, in some of the organizations, go deeply and concretely into the work called for, make a break-through at some single point, gain experience and use this experience for guiding other units--then they will have no way of testing the correctness or of enriching the content of their general call, and there is the danger that nothing may come of it. In the rectification movement of 1942, for example, there were achievements wherever the method of combining the general call with particular and specific guidance was used, but there were no achievements wherever this method was not used. In the rectification movement of 1943, each bureau and sub-bureau of the Central Committee and each area and prefectural Party committee, in addition to making a general call (a rectification plan for the whole year), must do the following things, gaining experience in the process. Select two or three units (but not too many) from the organization itself and from other organizations, schools or army units in the vicinity. Make a thorough study of those units, acquire a detailed knowledge of the development of the rectification movement in them and a detailed knowledge of the political history, the ideological characteristics, the zeal in study and the strong and weak points in the work of some (again not too many) representative members of their personnel. Furthermore, give personal guidance to those in charge to find concrete solutions for the practical problems facing those units. The leaders in every organization, school or army unit must do likewise, as each of these has a number of subordinate units. Moreover, this is the method by which the leaders combine leading and learning. No one in a leading position is competent to give general guidance to all the units unless he derives concrete experience from particular individuals and events in particular subordinate units. This method must be promoted everywhere so that leading cadres at all levels learn to apply it.

a. Experience in the 1942 rectification movement also proves it is essential for the success of the rectification that a leading group should be formed in each unit in the course of the movement, made up of a small number of activists and with the heads of the given unit as its nucleus, and that this leading group should link itself closely with the masses taking part in the movement. However active

the leading group may be, its activity will amount to fruitless effort by a handful of people unless combined with the activity of the masses. On the other hand, if the masses alone are active without a strong leading group to organize their activity properly, such activity cannot be sustained for long, or carried forward in the right direction, or raised to a high level. The masses in any given place are generally composed of three parts, the relatively active, the intermediate and the relatively backward. The leaders must therefore be skilled in uniting the small number of active elements around the leadership and must rely on them to raise the level of the intermediate element and to win over the backward elements. A leading group that is genuinely united and linked with the masses can be formed only gradually in the process of mass struggle, and not in isolation from it. In the process of a great struggle, the composition of the leading group in most cases should not and cannot remain entirely unchanged throughout the initial, middle and final stages; the activists who come forward in the course of the struggle must constantly be promoted to replace those original members of the leading group who are inferior by comparison or who have degenerated. One fundamental reason why the work in many places and many organizations cannot be pushed ahead is the lack of a leading group which is united, linked with the masses and kept constantly healthy. A school of a hundred people certainly cannot be run well if it does not have a leading group of several people; or a dozen or more, which is formed in accordance with the actual circumstances (and not thrown together artificially) and is composed of the most active, upright and alert of the teachers, the other staff and the students. In every organization, school, army unit, factory or village, whether large or small, we should give effect to the ninth of Stalin's twelve conditions for the bolshevization of the Party, namely, that on the establishment of a nucleus of leadership. [114] The criteria for such a leading group should be the four which Dimitrov enumerated in his discussion of cadres policy--absolute devotion to the cause, contact with the masses, ability independently to find one's bearings and observance of discipline. [115] Whether in carrying out the central tasks--war, production, education (including rectification)--or in checking-up on work, examining the cadres' histories, or in other activities, it is necessary to adopt the method of linking the leading group with the masses, in addition to that of linking the general call with particular guidance.

4. In all the practical work of our Party, all correct leadership is necessarily "from the masses, to the masses". This means: take the ideas of the masses (scattered and unsystematic ideas) and concentrate them (through study turn them into concentrated and systematic ideas), then go to the masses and propagate and explain these ideas until the masses embrace them as their own, hold fast to them and translate them into action, and test the correctness of these ideas in such action. Then once again concentrate ideas from the masses and once again go to the masses so that the ideas are persevered in and carried through. And so on, over and over again in an endless spiral, with the

[114] See J. V. Stalin, "The Prospects of the Communist Party of Germany and the Question of Bolshevization", Works, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1954, Vol. VII, p. 39.
[115] See Georgi Dimitrov, "Unity of the Working Class Against Fascism", Selected Articles and Speeches, Eng. ed., Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1951, pp. 138-39.

ideas becoming more correct, more vital and richer each time. Such is the Marxist theory of knowledge.

5. The concept of a correct relationship between the leading group and the masses in an organization or in a struggle, the concept that correct ideas on the part of the leadership can only be "from the masses, to the masses", and the concept that the general call must be combined with particular guidance when the leadership's ideas are being put into practice--these concepts must be propagated everywhere during the present rectification movement in order to correct the mistaken viewpoints among our cadres on these questions. Many comrades do not see the importance of, or are not good at, drawing together the activists to form a nucleus of leadership, and they do not see the importance of, or are not good at, linking this nucleus of leadership closely with the masses, and so their leadership becomes bureaucratic and divorced from the masses. Many comrades do not see the importance of, or are not good at, summing up the experience of mass struggles, but fancying themselves clever, are fond of voicing their subjectivist ideas, and so their ideas become empty and impractical. Many comrades rest content with making a general call with regard to a task and do not see the importance of, or are not good at, following it up immediately with particular and concrete guidance, and so their call remains on their lips, or on paper or in the conference room, and their leadership becomes bureaucratic. In the present rectification movement, we must correct these defects and learn to use the methods of combining the leadership with the masses and the general with the particular in our study, in the check-up on work and in the examination of cadres' histories; and we must also apply these methods in all our future work.

6. Take the ideas of the masses and concentrate them, then got to the masses, persevere in the ideas and carry them through, so as to form correct ideas of leadership--such is the basic method of leadership. In the process of concentrating ideas and persevering in them, it is necessary to use the method of combining the general call with particular guidance, and this is a component part of the basic method. Formulate general ideas (general calls) out of the particular guidance given in a number of cases, and put them to the test in many different units (not only doing so yourself, but by telling others to do the same); then concentrate the new experience (sum it up) and draw up new directives for the guidance of the masses generally. Comrades should do this in the present rectification movement, and also in, every other kind of work. Better leadership comes with greater skill in doing this.

7. In relaying to subordinate units any task (whether it concerns the revolutionary war, production or education; the rectification movement, check-up on work or the examination of cadres' histories; propaganda work, organizational work or anti-espionage, or other work), a higher organization and its departments should in all cases go through the leader of the lower organization concerned so that he may assume responsibility; in this way both division of labor and unified centralized leadership are achieved. A department at a higher level should not go solely to its counterpart at the lower level (for instance, a higher department concerned with organization,

propaganda or anti-espionage should not go solely to the corresponding department at the lower level), leaving the person in over-all change of the lower organization (such as the secretary, the chairman, the director or the school principal) in ignorance or without responsibility. Both the person in over-all charge and the person with specific responsibility should be informed and given responsibility. This centralized method, combining division of labor with unified leadership, makes it possible, through the person with over-all responsibility, to mobilize a large number of cadres--on occasion even an organization's entire personnel--to carry out a particular task, and thus to overcome shortages of cadres in individual departments and turn a good number of people into active cadres for the work in hand. This, too, is a way of combining the leadership with the masses. Take, for instance, the examining of cadres' histories. If the job is done in isolation, if it is done only by the few people in the organization department in charge of such work, it certainly cannot be done well. But if it is done through the administrative head of a particular organization or school, who mobilizes many or even all of his staff, or many or even all of his students, to take part in the work, while at the same time the leading members of the organization department at the higher level give correct guidance, applying the principle of linking the leadership with the masses, then undoubtedly the task of examining the cadres' histories will be satisfactorily accomplished.

8. In any given place, there cannot be a number of central tasks at the same time. At any one time there can be only one central task, supplemented by other tasks of a second or third order of importance. Consequently, the person with over-all responsibility in the locality must take into account the history and circumstances of the struggle there and put the different tasks in their proper order; he should not act upon each instruction as it comes from the higher organization without any planning of his own, and thereby create a multitude of "central tasks" and a state of confusion and disorder. Nor should a higher organization simultaneously assign many tasks to a lower organization without indicating their relative importance and urgency or without specifying which is central, for that will lead to confusion in the steps to be taken by the lower organizations in their work and thus no definite results will be achieved. It is part of the art of leadership to take the whole situation into account and plan accordingly in the light of the historical conditions and existing circumstances of each locality, decide correctly on the centre of gravity and the sequence of the work for each period, steadfastly carry through the decision, and make sure that definite results are achieved. This is also a problem of method of leadership, and care must be taken to solve it when applying the principles of combining the leadership with the masses and the general with the particular.

9. Details concerning methods of leadership are not dealt with here; it is hoped that comrades in all localities will themselves do some hard thinking and give full play to their own creativeness on the basis of the principles here set forth. The harder the struggle, the greater the need for Communists to link their leadership closely with the demands of the vast masses, and to combine general calls closely with particular guidance, so as to smash the subjectivist and bureaucratic methods of leadership completely. All the leading comrades of our Party must at all times counterpose scientific, Marxist methods of leadership to subjectivist, bureaucratic methods of leaders ship and use the

former to overcome the latter. Subjectivists and bureaucrats do not understand the principles of combining the leadership with the masses and the general with the particular; they greatly impede the development of the work of the Party. To combat subjectivist and bureaucratic methods of leadership, we must promote scientific, Marxist methods of leadership both extensively and intensively.

Jose Carlos Mariátegui: Statutes of the CGTP

STATUTES OF THE GENERAL CONFEDERATION OF WORKERS OF PERU

PURPOSES

Art. 1.- The "General Confederation of Workers of Peru" is the unified center of the trade union organizations of the proletariat of Peru.

Art. 2.- The C.G.T.P. proposes to:

a) Bring together all wage earners in the country in the economic sphere to defend their rights, interests, and demands
b) To guide and stimulate the development of the trade union movement through oral and written propaganda, encouraging the unorganized to join their respective unions, and if these do not exist, to create them.
c) To strengthen relations of solidarity with the Latin American labor movement through the Latin American Trade Union Confederation.
d) Develop class consciousness among workers.
e) Organize conferences and proletarian education activities, collaborate in the fight against illiteracy, sponsor schools and technical education courses, and publish newspapers, magazines, and books.

CONSTITUTION

Art. 3.- The C.G.T.P. is constituted:

a) By the country's regularly constituted labor unions, in accordance with the class-based labor principle.
b) By Local and Regional Labor Federations.
c) By the National Workers' Federations of industries.
d) By the Peasant Federations or Leagues.
e) By the Federation of Indigenous Communities.

Art. 4.- Every organization affiliated with the C.G.T.P. shall be represented therein by a delegation in the following proportion:

a) Up to one hundred contributors with one delegate.
b) From one hundred to five hundred contributors with two delegates.
c) From five hundred to one thousand contributors, with three delegates.
d) From one thousand to two thousand contributors, with four delegates.
e) From two thousand contributors onwards, one additional delegate per thousand or fraction thereof.

Art. 5.- The C.G.T.P. is represented and administered:

a) By a Confederated Committee (body of delegates).
b) By an Executive Committee, composed of a Secretary General, a Foreign Secretary, a Propaganda Secretary, a Secretary for Peasant Affairs, a Secretary for Indigenous Affairs, a Secretary of Minutes, a Treasurer, and an Accountant.

Art. 6.- Decisions regarding the running of the Confederation shall be taken by the Assembly of Delegates, which shall meet once a month.

Art. 7.- Extraordinary sessions may be held when requested in writing by a member organization, expressly indicating the purpose of the session, and also when deemed necessary by the Executive Committee or agreed upon by the Assembly of Delegates.

Art. 8.- The Executive Committee shall meet ordinarily once a week and, in the event of conflict, as many times as necessary.

Art. 9.- To assist the work of the Executive Committee, the Confederal Committee may appoint all the commissions it deems necessary; the permanent commissions shall be: Propaganda, Organization, Statistics, Culture, Solidarity, Press, Economic, Youth, Women, Peasant, and Indigenous. Each commission shall work under the responsibility and direction of a member of the Executive Committee.

Art. 10.- Regional or local organizations in the Republic may delegate their representation to militant workers in the capital.

FUNDS

Art. 11.- The funds of the C.G.T.P. shall consist of:

a) Regular contributions from member institutions at a rate of two cents per month per organized worker.
b) Extraordinary contributions from the same institutions.
c) Expenditures by activists, mutual aid societies, cooperatives, etc.
d) Proceeds from the sale of confederal publications, and all funds allocated by the Economic Commission.

Art. 12.- The fee shall be paid directly by the organized workers in their respective organizations. To this end, the C.G.T.P. shall distribute monthly the number of stamps it deems necessary for each organization, which shall be attached to the payment receipt issued by each entity.

Art. 13.- Contributions must be accompanied by a statistical report detailing the number of members in the organization, the contributions made during the respective month, the unemployed, those who have left, and new members.

Art. 14.- Organizations that have exhausted their resources due to a strike are exempt from paying contributions. In such cases, the C.G.T.P. book will indicate the strike status with an H in the month in question.

CONGRESSES

Art. 15.- The C.G.T.P. shall hold an ordinary Congress every two years and an extraordinary Congress when the C.C.N. deems it necessary, or when requested by one-third of the member organizations that are up to date with their payments to the Central Fund. In extraordinary circumstances, the C.C.N. may bring forward or postpone the date of the Congress.

Art. 16.- The Agenda for Congresses shall be definitively established by the C.C.N. and communicated to the unions three months in advance.

Art. 17.- The Executive Committee shall publish the general and financial report of its activities at least eight days prior to the Congress.

Art. 18.- All organizations affiliated with the C.G.T.P. and those invited to be represented by agreement of the Executive Committee shall participate in the Congress.

Art. 19.- The special regulations of the Congress shall determine the conditions of attendance and operation.

LOCAL FEDERATIONS

Art. 20.- In any locality where three organizations affiliated with the C.G.T.P. have been established, they shall constitute, either on their own or with the assistance of the C.C.N., the corresponding Local Federation.

Art. 21.- The functions of the Local Federations are:

a) To develop active union propaganda to bring together all the workers in the locality into the unions.
b) To unify the action of local workers for the most effective defense of the dignity and interests of the working class.
c) To support in all respects the work of organization and general solidarity carried out by the C.G.T.P. throughout the country.

Art. 22.- The Local Federation, regardless of the dues that each union pays to the C.G.T.P., may set, in accordance with its own needs and in agreement with the National Confederal Committee, the dues it deems necessary to meet its own budget.

REGIONAL FEDERATIONS

Art. 23.- In all departments where there are up to seven federal organizations or three local federations, they shall constitute a Regional Federation, in the same manner and for the same purposes as the local federations within the region.

NATIONAL INDUSTRY FEDERATIONS

Art. 24.- Trade unions in a given industry existing in different locations throughout the country must be closely linked, creating in each case the respective National Industry Federation.

STRIKES AND SOLIDARITY

Art. 25.- Before declaring a major strike or one that threatens to have serious consequences or compromise other unions, every organization must inform the Executive Committee of the C.G.T.P., communicating the background and process of the conflict; once the strike has been declared, one or more delegates may participate in the Strike Committee as advisors.

Art. 26.- When a strike sustained by a particular organization has caused a conflict of solidarity in other entities, the latter must intervene in the strike committee of the former and in the orientation of the struggle in general.

Art. 27.- All requests for solidarity from the C.G.T.P. unions must be submitted through this Central. (Except in cases of manifest impossibility and of an extraordinary nature).

DISCIPLINE

Art. 28.- All unions must be governed by internal regulations that do not contradict these regulations.

Art. 29.- Unions that, without just cause, fail to pay their dues to the C.G.T.P. central fund for three consecutive months shall be deprived of their voting rights after notification by the Executive Committee and a ruling by the C.C.N.

Art.- 30.- Any delegate who misses two consecutive meetings without just cause shall be required to attend more punctually, and the third absence shall result in the termination of their functions, with this fact being communicated to their respective organization.

Art. 31.- Any member who betrays a labor movement shall be expelled from the C.G.T.P.

Art. 32.- Any disciplinary measure taken by the unions must be communicated to the Executive Committee, before which the interested party or parties may appeal; as a last resort, they may appeal to the National Confederal Committee.

REFERENDUM

Art. 33.- The Executive Committee may submit to the deliberation of the member unions all serious and extraordinary matters affecting the general interests of the organization.

Art. 34.- In all cases, the Executive Committee shall provide full information on the reasons for its decision on the issues submitted to a referendum and shall immediately communicate the result.

NEWSPAPER

Art. 35.- The C.G.T.P. shall have its own official central organ, and its editorial staff shall be the responsibility of the press commission.

CONFEDERAL LABEL

Art. 36.- Each and every organization affiliated with the C.G.T.P. must use the Confederal Label of the Central, with the initials C.G.T.P., on all its documents. In addition, in each case, the legend (Affiliated with the "General Confederation of Workers of Peru") shall be placed under the respective title.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Art. 37.- Any initiative to reform the C.G.T.P.'s charter must be submitted to the Executive Committee three months prior to the Congress. The C.C.N. shall forward any proposed amendments to the charter to the unions two months prior to the Congress for deliberation.

Art. 38.- The General Confederation of Workers of Peru shall remain indissoluble as long as there are organizations that support it.

Jose Carlos Mariátegui: Manifesto of the CGTP to the Working Class of the Country

The creation of the Central Federation of the Peruvian Proletariat ends a series of working-class attempts to give life to a United Federation of the workers' organizations. In 1913 the Maritime and Terrestrial Federation appeared, headquartered in Callao, with a subcommittee in Lima that after waging different struggles disappeared in 1915. In 1918, on the occasion of the struggle for the eight-hour workday, the "Pro Eight Hours" Committee was created and led the movement to culmination. The next year the Committee "Pro Price Reduction of Basics" was created, coming out of the committee "Regional Peruvian Federation," which convened the First Workers Congress in October 1921. In 1922, this federation was transformed to the "Local Labor Federation of Lima," an organization that, even though the name seemed directed to the laborers of Lima, was concerned with the problems of the workers in the provinces, planning protests for the workers of Huacho and peasants of Ica who showed concern for the massacre in Parcona, just as it did for massacres of Indigenous peoples in Huancané and la Mar. The anarcho-syndicalist inheritance that prevailed in the organization provided efficiency in its activities as they organized serious conflicts for ideological supremacy that culminated in the Local Labor Congress of 1926. This Congress... approved a resolution to transform the Local into the "United Peruvian Union." This resolution ... would have

produced a great advance in the union movement but could not be put into practice ... and ended the Congress and the Local Federation.... [Mariátegui follows with descriptions of struggles in Ica, Puno, and Trujillo, and a call to create a Central.] The birth of our Central is not a work of happenstance but of a whole process that the Peruvian Proletariat has followed in its efforts for vindication. The popular assemblies of April 30 and May 1, held in the local of the Lima chauffeurs, approved the following conclusions for the creation of our Central:

1. Fight for the creation of a united labor front without any distinction as to political tendencies in a United Proletariat Central.
2. Fight for the creation and continuation of a Proletarian Press.
3. Fight for the freedom of association, of assembly, of press, of the speaker's platform.
4. Defend and ensure that the laws that refer to the worker are respected, laws that today are so grossly violated by reactionary capitalist forces.

Until now, activists have spoken of an organization but only in a general sense, without workers realizing the kind of class organization that would work to defend their interests. The "General Confederation of Peruvian Workers" encompasses this problem, laying out in general terms the form of organization for which the confederation will struggle incessantly. The overall situation of the country, with incipient industrial development in the cities and feudal latifundism on the coast and in the mountains, has until now impeded the classist development of the proletariat. The artisans have gone to their mutual aid societies, seeing in them the only possible kind of labor association. But today when large concentrations of the proletarian masses are operating in the mines, ports, factories, sugar refineries, plantations, etc., this type of organization, which corresponded to the artisan stage, declines, making way for the union system. What are the advantages of union organization? In the first place, union organization allows grouping together all the workers who work in the same business, industry, without distinction as to race, age, sex, or belief, in order to cases is not a worker. Third, it brings workers to manage their interests by themselves, educating and developing their class spirit, and exiling the intermediary, who almost always turns out to be a political opportunist. And fourth, being an organization of economic fight for their economic betterment, for the defense of their class interests.

Second, union organization gets rid of the bureaucratism established by the mutualist system that puts all the management direction in the hands of the president, who in many defense, a union resolves all the workers' economic problems with the very carefully monitored formation of mutual funds, cooperatives, etc., that are nothing more than sections of the union, as is the worker sports section, culture section, that of solidarity, art, union library, etc. These are the fundamental (though not all the) advantages of union organization....

Union organization is born as a force of the proletariat itself, which has to confront and resolve multiple class problems, among which are the following:

RATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Financial capital does not find any better way of prospering than the incessant exploitation of the working class. The current system of industrial organization shows us how the bourgeoisie organizes its system of exploitation. We find this exploitation in the big companies (we mention among others Fred T. Levy and Company), which to better their development wipes the slate clean of all rights that help workers, using the piecework and "contractor" system. These intermediaries get their day's work, which is endangered by "professional" competency, by getting workers who agree to the lowest salary to work for 9 or 10 hours a day.... To combat this problem, there is nothing else to do but organize the exploited masses in solid unions....

THE CHILD LABOR PROBLEM

Until now the child labor problem has not been raised among us; moreover, many do not give it importance. But if we take a minute to study it, we see conclusively that it cannot be neglected and that the organization of youth will give us a more active force for our struggles. We have to consider the young apprentices who work in the workshops, factories, etc., and see how they are exploited by the patron[boss] from the moment they arrive.... The workday for apprentices is 10 hours in the best of cases, but there are workshops where they work until 10 or 11 in the evening, that is to say, they work 14 hours a day. The initial day's pay, if we dispense with those who work without receiving anything, is 80 cents or a sol, a daily wage that will not vary until the apprentice is official in the eyes of the boss; that is, when a young person becomes official, he can replace the operator and compete with him at a pay rate of 50 or 60 percent....

In the mines and businesses, we find that youths are exploited equally or worse than in workshops or orchards. But where the exploitation of the youth reaches new heights is undoubtedly in the very homes of the bourgeoisie. There they are found carrying out all the functions of messenger, dry-nurse, cook, laundress, that is, all the functions of "servants," working from six in the morning until ten or eleven at night.... Conscious workers, that is, those who are unionized, have to confront this problem, since the problems of the youth are the problems of all those who are exploited....

THE WOMAN PROBLEM

If the juvenile masses are so cruelly exploited, proletarian women suffer the same or worse exploitation. Until very recently proletarian women had their labor circumscribed to domestic activities in the home. With the advance of industrialization, she enters the workplace to compete with workers in the factory, workshop, business, etc., overcoming the prejudice that kept her locked in a conventional life. However, if women advance in democratic-bourgeois terms on their road to emancipation, this act supplies cheap capitalist labor that seriously competes with that of the male worker. Thus, we see women in textile and cookie factories, laundries, bottle factories, factories that manufacture containers, cardboard boxes and soap, in which they perform the same functions as

male workers, from handling a machine to the most minimal occupation, yet they earn 40 to 60 percent less than the male.... We have capitalists ... who have not been afraid to consider that if a female worker was about to be a mother it was a "crime," and a "crime" that occasions her violent sacking.... This accumulation of "calamities" that weighs on exploited women cannot be resolved if it is not done so on the basis of immediately organizing women; in the same way that the unions have to construct their youth groups, they should create women's sections where our future militants will be educated.

THE AGRICULTURAL PROLETARIAT PROBLEM

The living conditions of the great masses of agricultural workers also require more attention. In empirical treatment, this issue is confused with the peasant problem, which is something that needs to be separated so as not to commit the same errors. Who forms the agrarian proletariat? The great masses of workers who provide their efforts in haciendas, orchards, small farms, plantations, etc., the authority of the *patron* exercised by an army of foremen, stewards, supervisors, and administrators, paid by day or task, living in miserable dens-these are the agricultural laborers. These workers who from four in the morning must pass muster, who work until the sun sets ... [are paid] from 60 cents for women and youths, to 2.20 *soles* for adults, have not, with rare exceptions (the haciendas of Santa Clara, Naranjal, Puente Piedra), enjoyed organizations that watch out for their class interests. For the agricultural worker it is as though the laws of eight-hour workdays, work accidents, protection of women and child labor did not exist....

The formation of union groups made up of agricultural workers is necessary to give birth to Hacienda Committees, to the "Unions of Agricultural Workers."

THE PEASANT PROBLEM

The peasant problem has a certain objective similarity to the agricultural problem because of the task it represents; it also is identified with the Indigenous problem because it is a problem of the land, and because of this requires special treatment. Different types of peasants exist in the country: the sharecropper or coworker who works the land to share its products and harvests with the *patron*; the *yanacona* who leases the land (the majority of *hacendados* require payment in *quintales* [hundredweights] of cotton); and the owner of small parcels of land inherited from his ancestors, etc. There are different types of peasants but they have common problems to resolve. In our milieu there are peasant organizations like the one that exists in Ica, the "Federation of Peasants in Ica," and in Lima, the "General Federation of *Yanaconas*," and moreover, small societies of irrigators exist in the coast. But the great masses of peasants are disorganized; they have multiple problems to resolve. The most outstanding, most immediate are: the fall in yield from the land, a lack of freedom to plant the best seeds, equitable division of water for irrigation, rapid denigration of the land, the right to be paid for crops in national money. In order to focus and resolve these problems, it is necessary to organize and educate the masses as to their class role, and to gather them in peasant leagues and peasant communities that lead to the creation of the "National Federation of Peasant Leagues."

THE INDIGENOUS PROBLEM

If the agrarian and peasant problems require a great deal of attention, the Indigenous problem cannot be left behind. As we delve more deeply into this problem, we see the connection with agrarian, peasant, mining, and other problems. So, to deal with this problem from the union point of view, it must be done on the basis of class organization and education. The Indigenous problem is linked to the problem of the land, and its solution cannot advance if it is not based on organizing the Indigenous masses. The Indian in our mountainous regions works from 6 to 7 months of the year, the time it usually takes for planting and harvesting the products. In the remaining months, he dedicates himself to working in the mountain latifundios and mines, or one or another of the haciendas on the coast, thereby making himself an agricultural laborer. From the union point of view, this form of seasonal migration reinforces the need to pay all necessary attention to these issues. The agricultural and mining proletariat bear a heavy responsibility for the tasks imposed by the seasonal flow of these Indigenous masses, and educating them through a union, when little class awareness exists, will also be more difficult. A great effort, then, is necessary in the communities, ayllus, etc., where organizers should establish libraries, educational institutions that fight against illiteracy (it could be said that illiteracy is a social scourge for the Indigenous race), sports sections, etc. These activities should be run by prepared comrades who can develop an active teaching role that allows workers to fully comprehend their class role, explain their condition of exploitation, their rights and the means for vindication. This way, the Indian will be a militant in the union movement, that is, a soldier who fights for the social liberation of his class. The objective of communities will then be to realize the full potential of their capabilities, and to bring the federation of all the communities into a single common defense front.

THE IMMIGRATION PROBLEM

The ever-greater influx of immigrant workers demands that we do not leave this problem aside in union organization. The union organizations cannot be imbued with false nationalist prejudices, because those prejudices wholly favor capitalism; organizations will always encounter docile elements among our immigrant brothers, and use them against the "native" workers, making them carry out the work of scabs and strikebreakers. Since we group ourselves under principles that tell us “Workers of the world unite," we should proceed to make room in our unions for all the Asian, European, Latin American, or African workers, who acknowledge their condition of exploitation, see in the union their organism of representation and defense. It is necessary that the unions set up commissions of militants who, seeing commonalities with the "foreign" workers, study their living conditions and needs, and introduce them to the unions that will in turn defend the rights of these brothers and sisters, incorporating them in the statement of demands presented to the companies.

THE SOCIAL LEGISLATION PROBLEM

Up to now the Peruvian worker has not been protected by effective social laws. The 1919 decree on eight-hour workdays, the work accident law, and the protection of women and children law are weak attempts at this type of legislation. The solidarity force of the proletariat in the capital led to the eight-

hour decree in 1919. Up to now it has only been obeyed in certain sectors, in one factory or another where the workers' organizational power had prevented violations. Subsequently, however, all employers have ignored its stipulations, beginning with the small factories that exist in Lima, like bottling, cardboard boxes, shoes, soap, laundries, dressmaking, bakery branches, etc., and going to the largest businesses. With the process of the organization of industry, this farce is made even less effective. Recently, Associated Electrical Businesses adopted the contract system (and not just this company because we have seen that others also employ it), in order to establish a price scale for different kinds of work that has been presented to the most skilled and longest-serving workers, who are faced with the dilemma of accepting it or facing immediate termination of their labor. The workers who accept this rate in fact become contract workers, losing their seniority and the few benefits that the legislation provided at the same time.... The Work Accident Law is not violated any less than the eight-hour law....

Conclusions

When the fundamental problems of our organization are summarily studied, it is helpful to mention the question of the legality of the type of organization we advocate and promote. The conditions of exploitation and semi-slave regime that exist in nine-tenths of Peru make workers think of this question as they organize. Our bourgeoisie has always seen in worker organization the "ghost" that would put an end to their regime of exploitation and randomly create false stories around it. The government of Peru, as signatory to the Treaty of Versailles, has recognized the right for workers to organize into unions. Moreover, the Ministry of Development has established a section in charge of the recognition of institutions. The "General Confederation of Peruvian Workers" argues the principle that the only thing necessary for a union to exist legally and juridically is the agreement of its members.... The Confederation demands the right to legal existence and the necessary juridical personhood for labor organizations in all the industries and areas of labor in order to represent and defend proletarian interests. For the rest, the problems of the working masses cannot be resolved or even known if it is not by means of an organization, or an organism that expresses its necessities, studies the deficiencies of our social regime, that expounds and supports the claims of all the workers of Peru. The objective of the creation of a Central Federation of the Peruvian proletariat, on top of its historical justification, is that of the genuine representation of the exploited class of our country. It is not born of random caprice; it is born through the experience acquired in past struggles and as the exploited Peruvian masses' organic necessity.... Representation of the national worker corresponds to a Central Federation formed from top to bottom, that is, by organizations born in factories, workshops, mines, sea and land enterprises, by the agricultural workers and peasants, by the grand masses of exploited Indians. A Central that counts on these elements, which houses in its breast the country's labor unions, will be the only one that will have the right to speak in the name of the workers of Peru. Supported by the proletarian masses defending their interests, the "General Confederation of Peruvian Workers," meeting its stated function, specifies the immediate objectives for which it will fight:

- Respect the implementation of the eight-hour day for the worker in the city, countryside, and mine.
- A 40-hour workweek for women and minors younger than 18 years.
- Full rights of labor organization.
- Liberty of print, press, of assembly, and of workers' speaking platforms.
- Prohibition of non-paid employment for workers or apprentices.
- Equal rights to work, equal treatment and salary for all workers, adults, youth, without distinction as to nationality, race, or color, in all industries and businesses.
- The General Confederation of Peruvian Workers, having shown in its process of creation, and in the objectives for which it would fight, recommends to all the workers, to the representatives of labor organizations, that over the following days they contact this Central, providing it with their addresses, explaining problems that need to be resolved, and agreeing to join at the same time. It also recommends the discussion and vote on the regulatory project (published in No. 9 of *Labor*).

The provisional address of the Central is Calle de Cotabambas No. 389, Lima; Post Office Box 2076, Lima.

LONG LIVE THE ORGANIZATION OF CITY AND COUNTRY WORKERS!

LONG LIVE THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE, OF A SPEAKERS' PLATFORM, OF PRESS, OF ASSEMBLY! LONG LIVE THE EFFECTIVE UNION OF THE WORKERS OF PERU!

LONG LIVE THE "GENERAL CONFEDERATION OF PERUVIAN WORKERS"!

-The Executive Committee

Tien Chi-sung: The Masses Are the Makers of History

Who makes history? The heroes or the slaves? This is, a basic question underlying the long-continued struggle between the idealist and the materialist conceptions of history.

To preserve their reactionary rule, the exploiting classes have for thousands of years invariably resorted to reversing history by propagating the idealist conception of history, the conception that history is made by heroes. A few heroes belonging to the exploiting classes have been referred to by them as ”talents by natural endowment” or identified with ”god’s will” and as makers of history. On the other hand, the masses have been branded the ”mob” who can only put themselves at the mercy of the heroes, or, worse still, ”inert matter” holding back historical progress.

From this reactionary fallacy it follows that, in a society under the dictatorship of the exploiting classes, the development of history is decided by the will of a handful of rulers representing the interests of the exploiting classes, whereas the exploited and oppressed working masses must succumb to the rulers, put up with slavery and do nothing but appeal to heaven and

look forward to the advent of the "savior." This idealist conception of history is the very spiritual shackle that keeps the laboring people in bondage.

Reversing the Reversal of History

The emergence of Marxism brought to light for the first time the objective laws governing the development of mankind's history; it scientifically proved the great truth that history is made by the slaves. Reversing the history the exploiting classes have reversed, Marxism thus brought about the utter bankruptcy of the idealist conception of history and uprooted the theoretical basis of thousands of years of reactionary rule by the exploiting classes. Chairman Mao in leading the Chinese revolution has from time to time educated all Party members and cadres, the proletariat and other working people in the basic viewpoint of historical materialism, i.e., the masses are the makers of history. He has at the same time waged a protracted struggle against historical idealism of all descriptions. In addition to the mass line he has worked out for our Party, Chairman Mao's teachings that **"the masses have boundless creative power,"** that **"we must have faith in the masses and we must have faith in the Party"** and that **"the masses are the real heroes, while we ourselves are often childish and ignorant"** are all pointed criticisms of the idealist conception of history, which the slave-owner class, the landlord class and the capitalist class have long spread to deny the fact that history is made by slaves.

All exploiting classes, however, will by no means make their exit from the stage of history of their own accord. Nor will they easily give up their reactionary theories after being overthrown by the revolutionary people. That Liu Shao-chi and other political swindlers like him have used idealist apriorism as their anti-Party theoretical programme and propagated the idealist conception of history, the conception that history is made by heroes, is yet another clear reflection of the struggle between the two classes and the two lines in the course of China's socialist revolution. And when this fallacy was mercilessly exposed and forcefully repudiated by the people throughout the country, they again produced another fallacy that "history is made jointly by both heroes and slaves." Their vain attempt was to use dualist sophistry to negate the basic principle of Marxism.

In philosophy dualism postulates that spirit and matter are two independent and paralleled principles of the universe; the "theory of history being made jointly by both heroes and slaves" which Liu Shao-chi and his kind propounded regards heroes and masses as two independent and paralleled motive forces in the making of history.

But does this mean that this so-called "theory" really acknowledges the role of the masses in the making of history? Not at all. In the eyes of Liu Shao-chi and those like him, the common people are only concerned about "getting rich and leading a happy life" and that all workers want is to "work less and earn more." As they see it, the masses are just money-hungry rabble who have nothing to do with the making of history. The representatives of the exploiting classes, on the other hand, are said to be "men with foresight and prescience," and, so they say, a nation "owes its existence, its revival after decline and its rebirth after ruin to them." Comparing their praise of the

representatives of the exploiting classes and slander of the masses, one can see clearly that the preposterous theory of "history being made jointly by both heroes and slaves" is only the idealist conception of history in disguise.

If one denies that slaves or the masses are the makers of history, one inevitably acknowledges that heroes make history. But Liu Shao-chi and his like, in trumpeting the "theory of history being made jointly by both heroes and slaves," reconciled the two diametrically opposed viewpoints to each other so that there are both heroes and masses in the making of history. It sounds most impartial. Characteristic of all political swindlers, it is, however, plausible sophistry.

Ever since the dissolution of the primeval communal ownership of land, as Engels pointed out, all history has been a history of class struggle, **"of struggles between exploited and exploiting, between dominated and dominating classes at various stages of social development."** (*Manifesto of the Communist Party*, "Preface to the German Edition of 1883.") The mode of production of the social material means is the material basis for historical development. In all societies, the contradiction between the forces of production and the relations of production is the fundamental contradiction. The development of the productive forces brings about a change in the relations of production, advancing the replacement of one mode of production by another and the development of a social system from lower to higher stages.

"The greatest productive power is the revolutionary class itself." (Karl Marx: *The Poverty of Philosophy*.) In class society, the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production is manifested in the struggle between the revolutionary classes standing for the development of the social productive forces and the reactionary classes which want to preserve the old relations of production; here, the masses are the decisive force in the class struggle. All social change is the outcome of revolutionary struggles by the masses. All advanced thinking and theories are the epitome of these struggles and mirror the revolutionary will of the masses; all science and technology are the crystallization of the practical experience of the masses; all progressive culture and art stem from the life of the people which is full of struggle. Without the masses' struggle for production, a society cannot possibly exist, still less can history develop. In class society, without the class struggle of the masses, the development of history, is also out of the question. **"The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history."** [Mao.] This is an irrefutable truth.

The Role of Heroes

What, then, should be the proper approach to the role of heroes? Can it be that historical materialism negates their role in history? Absolutely not. Marxism has never denied this. On the contrary, it holds that their role is quite a big one. The crux of the matter is: What is meant by heroes? How to assess their role in its true light? And what should be the approach in handling the relationship between the role of heroes and the masses who make history? It is these questions on which we fundamentally differ from Liu Shao-chi and his ilk and where an acute struggle exists.

In class society, heroes have a nature pertaining to their own class; there is no such thing as a hero who transcends classes. Each class has its own conception of heroes. To the proletariat and other working masses, heroes are outstanding figures who can only emerge from the people's revolutionary struggles, who represent the interests of the masses, and who, in line with the direction in which history develops, help propel history forward. The emergence of such heroes is exactly a manifestation of the making of history by the masses. In contrast, the exploiting classes regard those exponents who can best preserve the interests of, their own classes and the system of exploitation as "heroes." The reactionary ruling classes certainly do not recognize the heroes of the proletariat. And the proletariat and the masses certainly do not accept the exponents of the reactionary ruling classes as heroes. For instance, in modern Chinese history, Hung Hsiu-chuan, a leader of the Revolutionary Movement of the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom who fought imperialist aggression and Ching Dynasty feudal rule, is acknowledged as a hero by the proletariat and other working people. But the reactionary ruling classes curse him, calling him a "traitor." At the same time, they laud Tseng Kuo-fan who, in collaboration with imperialism, suppressed the Revolutionary Movement of the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom, as a "hero." But the proletariat and the masses take him for what he was: a lackey, a traitor, who was dead set on preserving the reactionary rule of the landlord class.

In the opinion of the proletariat, as Chairman Mao has said: **"To die for the people is weightier than Mount Tai, but to work for the fascists and die for the exploiters and oppressors is lighter than a feather."** This fundamental opposition between conceptions about heroes is determined by the fundamental opposition of interests between the exploiting and exploited classes. An exploiting class has its periods of ebb and flow; because its place in history varies in different periods, the role in history of its exponents in different periods is also not the same.

Heroes do not come from nowhere; they are the outcome of history in progress, of class struggle. Marx pointed out: **"Every social epoch needs its great men, and when it does not find them, it invents them, as Helvetius says."** (*The Class Struggles in France 1848-1850.*) The history of mankind has fully borne out this scientific thesis. Hailed by Karl Marx as the most spectacular man in ancient history, Spartacus of ancient Rome was an ordinary slave by origin. The revolutionary storm of the slave-insurgents, however, made him a hero, who, with thousands of men under his command, made an onslaught against the slave system. At the close of the Chin Dynasty, Chen Sheng and Wu Kuang came from the ranks of ordinary peasants. But aggravated class contradictions and large-scale peasant uprisings compelled them to rise in rebellion and thus became leaders of these uprisings.

Even in bourgeois revolutions, there were quite a few outstanding persons who came from the masses. Many talented generals of the French Revolution were, before the revolution, ordinary men, or an actor, a typesetter, a barber, a dyer, a peddler, a subaltern, all of whom were looked down upon. But for the revolution, how could such people turn out to be outstanding military commanders? **"A symptom of every real revolution,"** Lenin said, **"is a rapid, tenfold and even hundredfold increase in the number of the toiling and oppressed masses … who are capable of**

waging the political struggle." (*"Left-wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder*.) This kind of thing is even more common and more obvious in a proletarian revolution. All this testifies to the fact that heroes in various periods are those who come to the fore to answer the needs of the struggles of the masses; that every time history presents a new task of struggle, heroes who lead the masses in it are bound to emerge.

Heroes Are Born of the Masses

Marxism holds that the reason why heroes can play an important part in history is that, in the last analysis, they represent the interests of the revolutionary classes and the progressive forces, because they mirror the people's demands and, therefore, have their support. Whoever he is, any hero or great man draws his strength only from the masses. He who fails to reflect the demands of the masses gets nowhere. **"It is man's social being,"** said Chairman Mao, **"that determines his thinking. Once the correct ideas characteristic of the advanced class is grasped by the masses, these ideas turn into a material force which changes society and changes the world."**

It is imperative that a hero should represent the advanced class, rightly reflect the objective demands of social development, and engage in the concrete revolutionary practice of transforming society and the world. This is at the core of the question. The fallacy that "history is made jointly by both heroes and slaves," however, denies this fundamental question of principle, the question of which class is to be represented. This is, of course, idealist sophistry vainly trying to combine the two classes, the revolutionary class and the reactionary class, into one.

Heroes of the proletariat and the revolutionary masses are founders of revolutionary ideas or their disseminators; they are also organizers of revolutionary struggles. Compared with the rank and file, they aim higher and are more far-sighted. Whether they are able to concentrate the wisdom of the masses or not and whether their leadership is correct or not have much to do with the success or failure of their struggles. As has often been the case in history, although there is every possibility of a struggle succeeding and winning victory, it fails in the end because its leaders are not good at making use of these possibilities. This shows that heroes exert a considerable influence on quickening or slowing down the making of history by the masses. However, they can only affect the tempo but not change the direction of historical progress. Heroes are born of revolutionary struggles, and can play their roles only when they are with the masses. Advanced ideas and theories are a reflection of the demand of the masses for revolution and an epitome of their experience in struggle; they will become a material force advancing history only when they are grasped by the masses.

In his article *The Bankruptcy of the Idealist Conception of History* [SW 4:457], Chairman Mao pointed out with penetrating insight: **"The reason why Marxism-Leninism has played such a great role in China since its introduction is that China's social conditions call for it, that it has been linked with the actual practice of the Chinese people's revolution and that the Chinese people have grasped it. Any ideology—even the very best, even Marxism-Leninism itself—is ineffective unless it is linked with objective realities, meets objectively existing needs and has been grasped**

by the masses of the people. We are historical materialists, opposed to historical idealism." These words have completely exploded the idealist conception of history.

There have been many heroes in history who at first made revolution and indeed became quite influential; they later became divorced from the masses and eventually suffered defeat or lapsed, only to be forsaken and forgotten by the masses.

Among the bourgeois revolutionaries, such heroes are quite many. During the French Revolution Robespierre was in the limelight for a time. The Jacobins he represented, with a view to rallying the strength of the masses for their own use, tried at the beginning of the revolution somewhat firmly to satisfy some of the popular demands (the peasants' demand for land, for instance). They were thus able to enlist popular support and, with revolutionary spirit, sent Louis XVI to the guillotine. But Robespierre was after all a bourgeois revolutionary. No sooner was the revolution won than he started to ignore the interests of the masses and, even worse, he suppressed them. The result was he lost their support and became powerless in withstanding the forces of reaction that struck back. He himself was finally sent to the guillotine by the reactionary forces. Then there was Chang Tai-yen. During the Chinese Revolution of 1911he was hunted down seven times and thrice thrown into prison, but his revolutionary will never subside. For a time he was able to play a big role in the revolution, having a strong influence among the people. But, after the revolution, he secluded himself from the times and the people, lost his revolutionary vitality and soon faded out of the memory of the majority of the people.

This characteristic of bourgeois revolutionaries is determined by their class nature. Even during the period of struggle against feudalism, although the bourgeoisie were at one, in part and temporarily, with the working masses in opposing the feudal system, the two basically opposed each other as far as their class interests were concerned. In the course of revolution, bourgeois revolutionaries, confined to their narrow class interests, are afraid of the masses; they often waver, appease the enemy and even betray the people. Their antagonism to the masses, which is fundamental, becomes obvious daily after the seizure of political power. This accounts for the fact that, although the bourgeois revolutions in the 18th and 19th centuries were led by representatives of the bourgeoisie, the masses remained the principal forces of the revolution.

If the task of the bourgeois democratic revolution is to be fulfilled relatively completely, it is necessary to rely on the masses to overcome its leaders' proneness to conciliation which is reactionary in nature; it is also necessary to rely on the masses to wage repeated struggles and frustrate the attacks and attempts at a comeback by the reactionary forces. In the course of proletarian revolution there are also many fellow-travelers who, when the revolution develops to a certain stage, draw to a halt, drop out of the revolution and even become turncoats. These people are in essence bourgeois revolutionaries. As to those reactionary ringleaders who act counter to the historical current and set themselves against the people, they are obstacles to the progress of history. The masses will have to topple them if history is to continue its advance.

All this speaks well for the fact that it is not the heroes who make history but the other way round, and that history, instead of being "made jointly by both heroes and slaves," is made by the slaves alone.

Role of Proletarian Leaders

Proletarian leaders represent mankind's most revolutionary and most advanced class. There is a difference in principle between them and the outstanding historical figures of other classes. Representing the fundamental interest of the proletariat and other working people, they consistently maintain the closest ties with the broad masses and penetratingly sum up the experience of the masses in struggle. Proficient in the laws of historical development, they have mastered the science of Marxism and applied it in revolutionary practice. They, therefore, are most far-sighted and most thoroughgoing in revolution, and do not have the kind of class limitations which the outstanding historical figures of other classes cannot overcome. Proletarian leaders, for these reasons, are able to bring into play, to the greatest extent possible, the role of the masses as the makers of history. They enjoy high prestige among the masses; prestige built up in prolonged revolutionary struggles. This big historical role of proletarian heroes makes all heroes of the past pale beside them.

Is it correct then to come to the conclusion that, in the period of proletarian revolution, "history is made jointly by both heroes and slaves"? The answer is still no. Proletarian leaders are leaders and organizers of the activities of the proletariat and the masses in the making of history. Their emergence and the establishment of their thought constitute a very important part of the process of history-making by the proletariat and the masses, and are the product of that process having developed to a certain stage, not something isolated from this process. Chairman Mao has pointed out explicitly in *On Practice* that Marxist theory of revolution was created at a time when practice in revolutionary struggle by the proletariat had developed into its second period, **"the period of conscious and organized economic and political struggles."**

The Marxist viewpoint that the masses are the motive force in the making of history has, therefore, fully confirmed the great historical role of the revolutionary leaders as representatives of the advanced class. Liu Shao-chi and his like, in propounding the fallacy that "history is made jointly by both heroes and slaves," regard "heroes" as something outside and above "the people" so as io distort and degrade the leaders of the proletariat and build up their own image. Herein lies the essential difference between the two.

Marxism holds that the masses are the makers of history. This does not imply in the least the cult of the spontaneity of mass movements. Liu Shao-chi and his like, while propagating the idealist conception of history, the conception that history is made by heroes, also propagated the fallacy that any mass movement is "naturally rational." This is a variation of the "theory of spontaneity" which Marxism strongly repudiated long ago. It has nothing in common with the historical materialist principle that history is made by the masses. Any mass struggle, without correct leadership and a correct line to follow, can neither last long nor achieve any result. The proletarian revolution is a

great earthshaking revolution aimed at wiping out the system of exploitation. No revolution in the past can be compared with this revolutionary struggle in depth and extent. Thus, it needs all the more to be armed by advanced thinking and the strong leadership of its own leaders and vanguard organization; guidance by a correct line also becomes more important. **The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything.** [Mao] the history of the Chinese revolution is a history showing how Chairman Mao's correct line has struggled against and defeated the "Left" and Right opportunist lines at different times. Without the correct line which Chairman Mao has worked out for us, there can be no victory for the Chinese revolution. To propagate the "theory of spontaneity" during the period of proletarian revolution is to oppose directly Marxist leadership over the mass movement and to deny the decisive importance of a correct ideological and political line to the success of the revolutionary cause; it is only an attempt to lead the mass movement astray.

* * *

In making history the masses have traversed a course of gradually developing from being unaware to being aware. The founding of the Marxist materialist conception of history showed the objective laws of the development of society and history, bringing the role of the masses in making history to a new stage and opening up a broad avenue for mankind to leave the realm of necessity in which man is blindly at the disposal of history and enter the realm of freedom in which man will consciously handle history. As Chairman Mao has put it, **"The epoch of world communism will be reached when all mankind voluntarily and consciously changes itself and the world."** So that this day will come the proletariat and revolutionary people still need to go through arduous and tortuous struggles, which must be led by a proletarian political party if it is to win victory. The mass line formulated by Chairman Mao for our Party requires us to have faith in the masses, to rely on them, respect their initiative, learn wholeheartedly from them and, at the same time, to indefatigably educate them in Marxism-Leninism, steadily raise their level of political consciousness and lead them to forge ahead. Lenin said: **"A party is the vanguard of a class, and its duty is to lead the masses and not merely to reflect the average political level of the masses."** (*The Extraordinary All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Peasants' Deputies.* [LCW 26:324]) Uphold the Marxist principle that the masses are the makers of history and adhere to the Party leadership—this is the only way to ensure that our revolutionary cause will continue to move ahead victoriously along the correct path.

Unit 4. Revolution.

Topics covered:

I. The revolutionary process. Power, central question of the revolution.
II. Reform and revolution.
III. The October Road and the Road of the Chinese Revolution.
IV. The national-democratic revolution.

Bibliography:

- Chen Po-ta:
  - Mao Zedong on the Chinese Revolution. Chapter III, IV, VII
- Mao Zedong:
  - The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party, Chapter II. Selected Works, Vol. II.
- Mariátegui
  - Programmatic Principles of the Socialist Party.
  - Anniversary and Balance.
- Marx-Engels-Lenin:
  - On Scientific Socialism, Chapter XI.
- Stalin:
  - The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists.
  - The International Character of the October Revolution.

Selection:

Chen Po-ta: Mao Zedong on the Chinese Revolution.

Section 3: The Chinese Revolution is Part of the World Revolution

To regard the liberation movements of the oppressed nations as part of the world proletarian-Socialist revolution is the theory of Lenin and Stalin.

In accordance with this theory of Lenin and Stalin, Comrade Mao Zedong has never regarded the Chinese revolution as an isolated problem, but has viewed it in the light of the world proletarian revolution as a whole and of the struggle against imperialism as a whole.

This is because our epoch is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, the epoch when Socialism has achieved its victory first in the Soviet Union, a new epoch of Marxism, i.e., the epoch of Leninism. This is because the Chinese revolution is, above all, a revolution against imperialism.

In denouncing Tai Chi-tao-ism of the then Kuomintang, Comrade Mao Zedong in March 1926, in an article entitled *An Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society*, made an analysis of the situation arising out of the division of the world into two big camps:

> "... The present world situation is one in which the two big forces, revolution and counter-revolution, are engaged in the final struggle. Two big banners have been raised by these two great forces: one is the big red banner of revolution held aloft by the Third International, a banner under which all the oppressed classes of the world are rallied; the other is the big white banner of counter-revolution held aloft by the League of Nations, a banner under which all the counter-revolutionary elements of the world are rallied. The intermediate class will beyond

doubt rapidly fall apart, some sections turning Left and hastening into the ranks of the revolutionaries while others turning Right and hastening into the ranks of the counter-revolutionaries; there is no room for them to remain 'independent.'"

What is meant here by Comrade Mao Zedong is quite clear. Since the October Socialist Revolution, the world has been divided into an anti-imperialist camp led by the general world proletarian-Socialist revolutionary movement, and an imperialist camp which embraces all counter-revolutionary forces. Representing the Right wing of the bourgeoisie at that time, the Tai Chi-tao clique of the Kuomintang, which actually served as spokesman in preparation for Chiang Kai-shek's betrayal of the revolution, opposed the theory of class struggle. This clique was opposed to the Kuomintang allying itself with Russia and with the Communist Party and hoped vainly for "independence" between the two big camps, and for the realization of a state under the sole rule of the bourgeoisie. Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out that their attempts were doomed to total bankruptcy. The disintegration of the inter-mediate class was inevitable. The national bourgeoisie had either to go Left, ally itself with Russia and the Communist Party, accept the leadership of the proletariat and join hands with the world. wide general struggle against imperialism; or it had to go Right, oppose Russia, the Communist Party and the proletarian revolutions and become the lackey of imperialism. Apart from these two, there was no room for "independence." As everybody knows, this was what actually happened at that time; the Right wing of the national bourgeoisie soon followed Chiang Kai-shek in his betrayal of the revolution and went over to the side of imperialism.

During the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression, the broad national united front was re-established as a result of the initiative and leadership of our Party. But the Kuomintang diehards returned once more to their rotten theme of the so-called bourgeois dictatorship. Their actual motive was to camouflage and preserve the dictatorship by the big landlords and bureaucratic capitalists as represented by Chiang Kai-shek, the "one-party dictatorship" of the Kuomintang, the kind of dictatorship described by Comrade Mao Zedong as a semi-colonial and semi-feudal dictatorship. On the other hand, there once again appeared inside our Party a form of Right opportunism which attempted to turn the proletariat into the tail of the big bourgeoisie. To lay bare the absurdities of the Kuomintang diehards, to smash the Right opportunism inside the Party, and thus enable the Chinese proletariat, the broad masses of the Chinese people and our Party not to lose their bearings in the complex situation of the new national united front, Comrade Mao Zedong wrote an important militant work, i.e., *New Democracy.*

In this militant new book, Comrade Mao Zedong developed, more concretely and most profoundly, the above-mentioned theory of Lenin and Stalin concerning the revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Comrade Mao Zedong quoted from the writings of Stalin, and on the basis of the long experiences accumulated in the Chinese revolution once again raised and dealt in detail with the basic direction of the Chinese revolution—that is, the problem of the basic line of the Chinese revolution.

Comrade Mao Zedong explained:

"... the first victorious Socialist revolution, the October Revolution, has changed the direction of the history of the whole world and marked a new era in the history of the whole world."

He continued:

"In an era when the world capitalist front has collapsed in one corner of the earth (a corner which covers one-sixth of the surface of the world) while in other corners it has fully revealed its decadence; in an era when those remnant parts of capitalism cannot survive without relying more than ever on the colonies and semi-colonies; in an era when a Socialist state has been established and has declared that it is willing to fight in support of the liberation movements of all colonies and semi-colonies; and in an era when the proletariat of the capitalist countries is freeing itself day by day from the social-imperialist influence of the Social-Democratic parties, and has also declared itself in support to the liberation movements of the colonies and semi-colonies in such an era, any revolution that takes place in a colony or semi-colony against imperialism, i.e., against the international bourgeoisie and international capitalism, no longer belongs to the old category of bourgeois-democratic world revolution, but to a new category; it is no longer part of the old bourgeois or capitalist world revolution, but part of the new world revolution, the proletarian-Socialist world revolution."

This is the basic Marxist-Leninist appraisal and analysis of the revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. From this analysis there naturally flows a very clear-cut conclusion concerning the basic direction of the Chinese revolution. This conclusion is: The Chinese revolution is part of conclusion at the same time explains the following points:

Firstly: "Such a revolution deals unrelenting blows to imperialism, and therefore it is not permitted by imperialism but opposed by it. However, it is permitted by Socialism and supported by the Socialist state and the Socialist international proletariat." "In this world all imperialism is our enemy; if China wants independence, she can never attain it apart from the aid of the Socialist state and the international proletariat. That is to say, she cannot attain it apart from the assistance of the Soviet Union, from the assistance given through the struggles against capitalism waged by the proletariat of Japan, Britain, the United States, France, Germany and Italy in their respective countries."

Secondly: "... the heroes in the colonies and semi-colonies have either to stand on the side of the imperialist front and become part of the force of world counter-revolution or to stand on the side of the anti-imperialist front and become part of the force of world revolution. They must become either one or the other, for there is no other path." "As the struggle between the Socialist Soviet Union and the imperialist powers becomes further intensified, it is inevitable that China must stand either on one side or on the other. Is it possible not to incline to either side? No, this is an illusion. All the countries in the world will be swept into one or the other of

these two camps, and from now on 'neutrality' in the world becomes merely a deceptive term."

Thirdly: "The world today is in a new era of revolutions and wars, a new era when capitalism is definitely dying and Socialism is definitely flourishing. Under such conditions is it not sheer raving as in a dream to desire to establish in China a capitalist society under bourgeois dictatorship after her victory in fighting imperialism and feudalism?" "It is certain, definite, and true that if the diehards among the Chinese bourgeoisie do not awaken, things will not go smoothly with them and their prospect is one of self-sought ruin."

Fourthly: "… with a momentum that can move mountains and make the seas heave and with the power of a mighty thunderbolt, the Communist ideological system and social system are sweeping the world and remaining wonderfully young. Since the introduction of scientific Communism into China, the Chinese people are improved in their understanding, and the Chinese revolution has changed its physiognomy. Without the guidance of Communism, the democratic revolution in China can-not succeed, let alone the later stage of revolution.... The world today depends on Communism for its salvation, and so does China." "Whoever wants to oppose Communism must prepare to be smashed to pieces."

All the above points were raised by Comrade Mao Zedong ten years ago in his work, *New Democracy*. From that time on, Comrade Mao Zedong continued to develop them in his many writings. Events in the world and in China during the past ten years testify to the truth of the above-mentioned points made by Comrade Mao Zedong.

Of course, the elucidation of these points has crushed the narrow and reactionary nationalism of the bourgeoisie. It has also liquidated the national prejudices of the petty bourgeoisie which is contented with its own small world, backward and isolated.

To study and analyze the Chinese revolution from the basic viewpoint that this is the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution and by making use of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, especially the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, thereby developing this basic viewpoint and leading the Chinese revolution forward in the correct direction-this is the victorious path of Mao Zedong's theory of the Chinese revolution.

Section 4: The Revolution of the Masses of the People Under the Leadership of the Proletariat

On the basis of the fundamental changes in world history brought about by the October Socialist Revolution, and of the fundamental changes in Chinese history brought about by the ascent of the modern Chinese proletariat to the political arena, Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out that before the changes took place, the Chinese revolution was a democratic revolution of the old category, i.e., a democratic revolution under the leadership of the bourgeoisie, and that after the changes had occurred the Chinese revolution became a democratic revolution of a new category, i.e., a democratic revolution under the leadership of the proletariat.

Ever since his opposition to Chen Tu-hsiu's Right opportunism in the first revolutionary period following the founding of the Party, Comrade Mao Zedong has consistently adhered, under all conditions, to the Leninist-Stalinist theory concerning the leadership of the proletariat and has developed this theory in a concrete manner, in accordance with the conditions in China. During the first stage of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression, Comrade Mao Zedong conducted an irreconcilable struggle against Right opportunism which had just emerged, and consistently laid special emphasis on taking warning from the criminal consequence of the defeat of the revolution in 1927 brought about by Chen Tu-hsiu's opportunism in abandoning the leadership of the proletariat. Comrade Mao Zedong constantly told the members of the Chinese Communist Party to thoroughly read that great ideological work of Lenin's *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*. Comrade Mao Zedong regarded this work of Lenin's as a powerful weapon in opposing Right opportunism.

The problem of the leadership of the proletariat in the Chinese revolution is connected with the weakness of the Chinese national bourgeoisie. In 1926, when dealing with the weakness of the big national bourgeoisie, Stalin wrote in his article, *On the Perspectives of the Chinese Revolution:*

> "... but it follows that the role of the initiator and leader of the Chinese revolution, the role of the leader of the Chinese peasantry must inevitably pass into the hands of the Chinese proletariat and its Party."

Comrade Mao Zedong said:

> "In China it is quite evident that whoever can lead the people to overthrow imperialism and the feudal forces will win the people's confidence, for the mortal enemies of the people are imperialism and the feudal forces, especially imperialism. History has proved that the Chinese bourgeoisie is unable to discharge this responsibility, and consequently the responsibility cannot but fall on the shoulders of the proletariat."[116]

Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out:

> "The historical course of the Chinese revolution must be divided into two steps: first, the democratic revolution, and secondly, the Socialist revolution." Although according to its social character, the first step, the first stage of the Chinese revolution, is basically a bourgeois-democratic revolution, "... yet it is no longer one of the old type led by the bourgeoisie with the aim of establishing a capitalist society and a state under bourgeois dictatorship; it is a new type of revolution led by the proletariat with the aim of establishing, in the first stage, a New Democratic society and a state under the joint dictatorship of all revolutionary classes." [117]

Comrade Mao Zedong defined this revolution in the following simple and clear-cut formula:

---

[116] *On New Democracy.*
[117] *Ibid.*

"The New Democratic revolution is an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution of the masses of the people under the leadership of the proletariat."

In some cases, Comrade Mao Zedong also called it a "people's democratic revolution against imperialism and feudal forces." Owing to the fact that in the course of their long-term counter-revolutionary rule, the Four Big Families, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, finally became a monopolistic clique of bureaucratic capitalists, a new element was added to the character of the revolution: opposition to bureaucratic capitalism. Comrade Mao Zedong added this new element, opposition to bureaucratic capitalism, to his formula which became: "the revolution of the masses of the people against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism under the leadership of the proletariat." Comrade Mao Zedong regarded this formula as the general line and policy in the first stage of the Chinese revolution.

What are spoken of as the masses of the people in the formula proposed by Comrade Mao Zedong are mainly the peasants. This revolution is based on the alliance of the workers and peasants and em-braces all people who are opposed to imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism. According to Comrade Mao Zedong, the Chinese proletariat, the peasants, the intellectuals and other sections of the petty bourgeoisie are the basic forces in deciding the destiny of the nation and the proletariat is the leading force.

The revolutionary democratic dictatorship established by this revolution is, of course, based upon the same class foundation. Comrade Mao Zedong called this revolutionary democratic dictatorship "the joint dictatorship of all revolutionary classes under the leadership of the proletariat" or "the people's democratic dictatorship under the leadership of the working class and based upon the alliance of the workers and peasants."

The problem of the leadership of the proletariat was regarded by Comrade Mao Zedong as the central problem in solving a series of problems of the Chinese revolution. It was also the central problem which concerned the success or failure of the Chinese revolution. In May 1937, while speaking about the problem of the Anti-Japanese National United Front, Comrade Mao Zedong said:

"Is the proletariat to follow the bourgeoisie, or is the bourgeoisie to follow the proletariat? This question of the responsibility of leadership in the Chinese revolution is the pivot upon which depends the success or failure of the revolution." [118]

In his famous work *On People's Democratic Dictatorship* published in 1949, he again pointed out:

"The entire history of revolution proves that without the leadership of the working class, a revolution will fail, but with it, a revolution will end in victory. In the era of imperialism, no other class in any country can lead any genuine revolution to victory. The proof lies in the fact

[118] *The Tasks of the Chinese Communist Party in the Period of Resistance to Japan.*

that China's petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie have led revolutions on many occasions, but all ended in failure."

At the same time, according to Comrade Mao Zedong, the peasant problem was the central problem in solving the question of the leadership of the proletariat.

In his report on the national and colonial question made at the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin proposed:

> "It would be utopian to think that proletarian parties, if indeed they can arise in such countries, could pursue Communist tactics and a Communist policy in these backward countries without establishing definite relations with the peasant movement and without effectively supporting it."

Stalin pointed out on several occasions:

"... The national question is, in its essence, a peasant question." [119]

Comrade Mao Zedong's viewpoint concerning the problem of China was precisely in line with the viewpoint of Lenin and Stalin and was a development of this viewpoint.

In bourgeois democratic revolutions, the main divergence in the disputes between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and between the proletariat and all other parties was the peasant problem. In his work, *On Coalition Government*, Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out:

> "Mobilizing all available forces, the anti-popular bloc of the Kuomintang has directed at the Communist Party of China all kinds of venomous attacks—open and secret, military and political, sanguinary and non-sanguinary.
>
> "The controversies between the two parties, viewed from their social implications, really all hinge on the issue of agrarian relations."

To assume leadership in the peasant revolution is a fundamental symbol of the leadership of the proletariat. That the bourgeoisie cannot become the leader of the bourgeois-democratic revolution is basically because it cannot lead the peasant revolution, because it fears the peasant revolution and opposes the peasant revolution. There is no doubt that only under the leadership of the proletariat, will it be possible effectively to organize the extremely broad and disorganized peasant population into an unlimited fighting force, to talk of the alliance of the workers and the peasants, to talk of uniting, on the basis of this alliance, all potential revolutionary forces and winning them over to our side, and to talk of the unity of Chinese revolutionary forces with the international revolutionary forces.

As everybody knows, during the first revolutionary period Chen Tu-hsiu maintained that

[119] *J. V. Stalin: On the National Question in Yugoslavia.*

"If the bourgeois-democratic revolution loses the assistance of the bourgeoisie, it will cease to have any class significance and social basis in the revolutionary cause."

That is to say, he regarded "the class significance and social basis" of the bourgeois-democratic revolution as pertaining to the bourgeoisie only. Chen Tu-hsiu did not take the peasant problem into account. (See Chen Tu-hsiu's article, The Bourgeois Revolution and the Revolutionary Bourgeoisie published in 1923.)

It should be pointed out that it was in connection with the peasant question that the opportunists of every description, beginning with Chen Tu-hsiu, opposed and misrepresented the leadership of the proletariat. Either they directly denied the leadership of the proletariat and acknowledged the leadership of the bourgeoisie, thus of course directly rejecting the peasant revolution, as did Chen Tu-hsiu-ism in the first revolutionary period and Right opportunism in the initial stage of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression. Or they adopted a "Left" form and actually denied the necessity of uniting with the middle peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie, thus reality denying the leadership of the proletariat, did "Left" opportunism during the period of ten in as years of civil war.

There is no doubt that it was precisely the leadership of the proletariat and the alliance of the working class and the peasantry brought about by it which made possible, on the one hand, the victory of the revolution against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism. As Comrade Mao Zedong puts it, "these two classes are the main force in overthrowing imperialism and the reactionary clique of the Kuomintang." On the other hand, they make possible the growth of the New Democratic revolution into Socialist revolution because, as Comrade Mao Zedong says,

"The transition from New Democracy to Socialism also depends primarily upon the alliance of these two classes." [120]

Of course, if we had acted along the lines of the opportunists who surrendered the leadership of the proletariat, then, as some past historical facts have indicated, we would have led the revolution to suffer defeat and reverses. In that case, the Chinese revolution could not become what it is today, nor what it will be in the future.

Section 7: Problems Regarding the Transition from Democratic Revolution to Socialist Revolution

Comrade Mao Zedong writes in his book *On Coalition Government:*

"We Communists never conceal our political stand. It is definite and beyond any doubt that our future or maximum Program is to make China advance into the realm of Socialism and Communism. Both the name of our Party and our Marxist world outlook unequivocally point to this highest ideal of the future, a future of dazzling bright-ness and unsurpassable beauty. Every one of us, ever since he joined the Party, has kept in mind two clearly defined objectives:

[120] *On People's Democratic Dictatorship.*

to struggle for the present new bourgeois-democratic revolution and for the future proletarian-Socialist revolution. We have upheld these two objectives despite the enmity, libel, slander, and ridicule that are born out of the sheer ignorance and meanness of the enemies of Communism. All such attacks we must resolutely repulse. As to well-intentioned skeptics, we shall not attack them but explain to them with good intent and much patience. All this is clear and definite. There is nothing ambiguous about it."

This paragraph expounds with complete clarity China's future—a future which, governed by the laws of world history as well as Chinese history, is absolutely inevitable.

The Right opportunists either lost sight of this future or regarded it as extremely uncertain or extremely gloomy. Regarding the bourgeoisie as leader of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, they considered that the fruit of the revolution should fall to the bourgeoisie alone. For instance, in his article *The Bourgeois Revolution and the Revolutionary Bourgeoisie*, published in 1923, Chen Tu-hsiu wrote:

"The victory of such a democratic revolution certainly means the victory of the bourgeoisie."

From the Rightist standpoint, he flatly denied the future of Socialism. Conversely, the "Left" opportunists ignored the difference between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the Socialist revolution or considered that the initial victory of the revolution in one or several provinces would mark the beginning of the transition to the realization of Socialism. Or they considered that by the time the victory of the revolution had spread to the "major parts" of China, the fundamental task would be to carry out the Socialist revolution and that the rule of the Kuomintang reactionaries and imperialists could be overthrown only on the basis of realizing Socialism. From the "Left" standpoint, "Left" impetuosity flatly denied the possibility of the victory of the democratic revolution, thus denying in essence the possibility of the victory of Socialism.

"Left" opportunism and Right opportunism are interchangeable on this question, as on many others. As has been stated above, when during the initial stage of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression our Party, under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong, was striving to prepare itself in every step of its work to turn the outcome of the War of Resistance into a victory for the people, those comrades who had committed "Left" mistakes during the period of the Second Revolutionary Civil War made a conclusion entirely to the contrary, considering the victorious "future" of the War of Resistance as belonging to Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang rather than to the people. This conclusion, obviously, denied both the victorious future of the democratic revolution and the future of Socialism.

Following 1927, Comrade Mao Zedong incessantly refuted the erroneous "Left" ideology in relation to problems concerning the nature of the revolution. He considered that the Chinese democratic revolution must be carried out to the end.

"Only by acting in this way can a Socialist future of the Chinese revolution be nursed. Misconceptions such as denying the period of revolution for the people's rights and

considering that the Chinese revolution has reached the opportune moment for a Socialist revolution are extremely detrimental to the Chinese revolution." [121]

Comrade Mao Zedong regarded as completely correct the opinion then held by the Communist International that the nature of the Chinese revolution was still that of a bourgeois-democratic revolution:

"The struggle which we have passed through verifies the truth of the opinion of the Communist International." [122]

In accordance with the concrete conditions in China, Comrade Mao Zedong developed the teachings of Lenin and Stalin regarding the transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the Socialist revolution. He said:

"We are advocates of the theory of the transition of revolution, not advocates of the Trotskyite theory of a permanent revolution. We stand for the attainment of Socialism through: all the necessary stages of the democratic republic. We are opposed to tailism, but we are also opposed to adventurism and impatience." [123]

Comrade Mao Zedong also said:

"Every Communist must know that the whole Chinese revolutionary movement led by the Chinese Communist Party is a complete revolutionary movement embracing the two revolutionary stages, democratic and Socialist, which are two revolutionary processes differing in character, and that the Socialist stage can be reached only after the democratic stage is completed. The democratic revolution is the necessary preparation for the Socialist revolution, and the Socialist revolution is the inevitable trend of the democratic revolution. And the ultimate aim of all Communists is to strive for the final achievement of Socialist society and Communist society. We can give correct leadership to the Chinese revolution only on the basis of a clear understanding of both the differences and the connections between the democratic and Socialist revolutions." [124]

Therefore, viewed from the development of the entire revolutionary movement, the period of the New-Democratic revolution

"Is a transitional stage between the termination of a colonial, semi-colonial, and semi-feudal society and the establishment of Socialist society." [125]

---

[121] *"Resolution of the Sixth Party Congress of the Red Fourth Army" drafted by Comrade Mao Zedong, December, 1928.*
[122] *Ibid.*
[123] *Strive to Win over Millions upon Millions of the Masses to the Anti-Japanese National United Front.*
[124] *The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party.*
[125] *Ibid.*

Why are such a transformation and transition possible? From the class point of view, it is because of the leadership of the proletariat; from the Party point of view, it is due to the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party. Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out with all correctness:

> "Except the Communist Party, no political party, bourgeois or petty-bourgeois, is equal to the task of leading the two great revolutions, democratic and Socialist, in China to their thorough realization. And the Chinese Communist Party, from the very day of its birth, has undertaken this twofold task upon its own shoulders." [126]

As stated above, it is entirely mistaken to mix up the period of democratic revolution and the period of Socialist revolution. On the other hand, this does not imply that the period of democratic revolution cannot include any Socialist factors. To think so is of course utterly wrong. In 1939, dealing with the outcome of the victory of the New-Democratic revolution, Comrade Mao Zedong wrote:

> "It is an inevitable result of the victory of the democratic revolution in the economically backward China that capitalism will develop to a certain degree. But this will be only one aspect of the result of the Chinese revolution, not its whole outcome. Its whole out-come will be the development of the capitalist factors on the one hand, and of the Socialist factors on the other." [127]

Comrade Mao Zedong then reached this conclusion according to the basic standpoint of the leadership of the proletariat. Both political and economic developments following the victory of our New-Democratic revolution have completely verified Comrade Mao Zedong's Marxist-Leninist conclusion.

What is the Socialist factor in the political sphere resulting from the victory of the New Democratic revolution? It is the leading position of the working class in the organs of State power and in the people's armed forces, as stipulated in *The Common Program* of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference.

What is the Socialist factor in the economic sphere resulting from the victory of the New Democratic revolution? It is the confiscation of enterprises owned by imperialists and bureaucratic capitalists and the transfer of their ownership to the People's Republic led by the working class. In the words of Comrade Mao Zedong, this

"Enables the People's Republic to take hold of the main artery of the country's economy and to turn it into the leading element of the entire people's economy. This section of the economy is an economy of a Socialist nature, not a capitalist nature."

---

[126] *Ibid.*
[127] *Ibid.*

The *Common Program*, following the teachings of Comrade Mao Zedong, has also clearly stipulated this. It is stated in The Common Program:

> "State-owned economy is an economy of a Socialist nature. All enterprises relating to the economic life of the country and exercising a dominant influence over the people's livelihood shall be under the unified operation of the State. All State-owned resources and enterprises are the public property of the people as a whole, are the main material basis on which the People's Republic will develop production and bring about economic prosperity, and are the leading force of the entire social economy."

The mutual-aid teams, the agricultural producers' cooperatives and the supply and marketing cooperatives of the laboring masses of the peasants which have been developed in the course of the New Democratic revolution also contain Socialist factors and serve as transitional forms on the way to Socialism.

It is true that we need a considerable length of time to bring about Socialist transformation throughout the country. But we possess the prerequisites. We have opened up the road. Preparations and struggles are still needed, but our progress is fully assured. As Comrade Mao Zedong has pointed out:

> "Our country will thus steadily advance and pass through war and New Democratic reform; and in the future, when the economic and cultural prosperity of the country has been achieved, when various conditions are ready, and when agreement has been reached by the people throughout the country after mature deliberations, we shall embark upon the new era of Socialism deliberately and properly." [128]

The Right opportunists attempted to make a museum piece of this great ideal of Communism, while the "Left" opportunists attempted to strip it of its rich, living flesh and blood. Comrade Mao Zedong, taking into account all the roads which Chinese history had to traverse, combined rigidity in matters of Communist principle with flexibility in matters of policy for the attainment of the objective of Communism. Thus, Communism in China is neither Utopian nor unattainable; it is entirely attainable, irresistible and full of living force.

Mao Zedong: The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party

Chapter 2: The Chinese Revolution

1. THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS IN THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS

The history of China's transformation into a semi-colony and colony by imperialism in collusion with Chinese feudalism is at the same time a history of struggle by the Chinese people against imperialism and its lackeys. The Opium War, the Movement of the Taiping Heavenly

[128] *Closing speech delivered at the Second Session of the First National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference.*

Kingdom, the Sino-French War, the Sino-Japanese War, the Reform Movement of 1898, the Yi Ho Tuan Movement, the Revolution of 1911, the May 4th Movement, the May 30th Movement, the Northern Expedition, the Agrarian Revolutionary War and the present War of Resistance Against Japan--all testify to the Chinese people's indomitable spirit in fighting imperialism and its lackeys.

Thanks to the Chinese people's unrelenting and heroic struggle during the last hundred years, imperialism has not been able to subjugate China, nor will it ever be able to do so.

The valiant Chinese people will certainly fight on, even though Japanese imperialism is now exerting its full strength in an all-out offensive and many landlord and big bourgeois elements, such as the overt and covert Wang Ching-weis, have already capitulated to the enemy or are preparing to do so. This heroic struggle will not cease until the Chinese people have driven Japanese imperialism out of China and achieved the complete liberation of the country.

The national revolutionary struggle of the Chinese people has a history of fully one hundred years counting from the Opium War of 1840, or of thirty years counting from the Revolution of 1911. It has not yet run its full course, nor has it yet performed its tasks with any signal success; therefore, the Chinese people, and above all the Communist Party, must shoulder the responsibility of resolutely fighting on

What are the targets of the revolution? What are its tasks? What are its motive forces? What is its character? And what are its perspectives? These are the questions we shall now deal with.

2. THE TARGETS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTON

From our analysis in the third section of Chapter I, we know that present-day Chinese society is a colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. Only when we grasp the nature of Chinese society will we be able clearly to understand the targets, tasks, motive forces and character of the Chinese revolution and its perspectives and future transition. A clear understanding of the nature of Chinese society, that is, of Chinese conditions, is therefore the key to a clear understanding of all the problems of the revolution.

Since the nature of present-day Chinese society is colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal, what are the chief targets or enemies at this stage of the Chinese revolution?

They are imperialism and feudalism, the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries and the landlord class of our country. For it is these two that are the chief oppressors, the chief obstacles to the progress of Chinese society at the present stage. The two collude with each other in oppressing the Chinese people, and imperialism is the foremost and most ferocious enemy of the Chinese people, because national oppression by imperialism is the more onerous.

Since Japan's armed invasion of China, the principal enemy of the revolution has been Japanese imperialism together with all the Chinese traitors and reactionaries in league with it, whether they have capitulated openly or are preparing to do so.

The Chinese bourgeoisie, which is also a victim of imperialist oppression, once led or played a principal role in revolutionary struggles such as the Revolution of 1911, and has participated in revolutionary struggles such as the Northern Expedition and the present War of Resistance Against Japan. In the long period from 1927 to 1937, however, its upper stratum, namely, the section represented by the reactionary clique within the Kuomintang, collaborated with imperialism, formed a reactionary alliance with the landlord class, betrayed the friends who had helped it--the Communist Party, the proletariat, the peasantry and other sections of the petty bourgeoisie--betrayed the Chinese revolution and brought about its defeat. At that time therefore, the revolutionary people and the revolutionary political party (the Communist Party) could not but regard these bourgeois elements as one of the targets of the revolution. In the War of Resistance, a section of the big landlord class and big bourgeoisie, represented by Wang Ching-wei, has turned traitor and deserted to the enemy. Consequently, the anti-Japanese people cannot but regard these big bourgeois elements who have betrayed our national interests as one of the targets of the revolution.

It is evident, then, that the enemies of the Chinese revolution are very powerful. They include not only powerful imperialists and powerful feudal forces, but also, at times, the bourgeois reactionaries who collaborate with the imperialist and feudal forces to oppose the people. Therefore, it is wrong to underestimate the strength of the enemies of the revolutionary Chinese people.

In the face of such enemies, the Chinese revolution cannot be other than protracted and ruthless. With such powerful enemies, the revolutionary forces cannot be built up and tempered into a power capable of crushing them except over a long period of time. With enemies who so ruthlessly suppress the Chinese revolution, the revolutionary forces cannot hold their own positions, let alone capture those of the enemy, unless they steel themselves and display their tenacity to the full. It is therefore wrong to think that the forces of the Chinese revolution can be built up in the twinkling of an eye, or that China's revolutionary struggle can triumph overnight.

In the face of such enemies, the principal means or form of the Chinese revolution must be armed struggle, not peaceful struggle. For our enemies have made peaceful activity impossible for the Chinese people and have deprived them of all political freedom and democratic rights. Stalin says, "In China the armed revolution is fighting the armed counter-revolutionary. That is one of the specific features and one of the advantages of the Chinese revolution." [129] This formulation is perfectly correct. Therefore, it is wrong to belittle armed struggle, revolutionary war, guerrilla war and army work.

In the face of such enemies, there arises the question of revolutionary base areas. Since China's key cities have long been occupied by the powerful imperialists and their reactionary Chinese allies, it is imperative for the revolutionary ranks to turn the backward villages into advanced, consolidated base areas, into great military, political, economic and cultural bastions of the revolution from which

[129] J. V. Stalin, "The Prospects of the Revolution in China", Works, Eng. ed. FLPH, Moscow, 1954, Vol. VIII, p. 379.

to fight their vicious enemies who are using the cities for attacks on the rural districts, and in this way gradually to achieve the complete victory of the revolution through protracted fighting; it is imperative for them to do so if they do not wish to compromise with imperialism and its lackeys but are determined to fight on, and if they intend to build up and temper their forces, and avoid decisive battles with a powerful enemy while their own strength is inadequate. Such being the case, victory in the Chinese revolution can be won first in the rural areas and this is possible because China's economic development is uneven (her economy not being a unified capitalist economy), because her territory is extensive (which gives the revolutionary forces room to maneuver), because the counter-revolutionary camp is disunited and full of contradictions, and because the struggle of the peasants who are the main force in the revolution is led by the Communist Party, the party of the proletariat; but on the other hand, these very circumstances make the revolution uneven and render the task of winning complete victory protracted and arduous. Clearly then the protracted revolutionary struggle in the revolutionary base areas consists mainly in peasant guerrilla warfare led by the Chinese Communist Party. Therefore, it is wrong to ignore the necessity of using rural districts as revolutionary base areas, to neglect painstaking work among the peasants, and to neglect guerrilla warfare.

However, stressing armed struggle does not mean abandoning other forms of struggle; on the contrary, armed struggle cannot succeed unless coordinated with other forms of struggle. And stressing the work in the rural base areas does not mean abandoning our work in the cities and in the other vast rural areas which are still under the enemy's rule; on the contrary, without the work in the cities and in these other rural areas, our own rural base areas would be isolated and the revolution would suffer defeat. Moreover, the final objective of the revolution is the capture of the cities, the enemy's main bases, and this objective cannot be achieved without adequate work in the cities.

It is thus clear that the revolution cannot triumph either in the rural areas or in the cities without the destruction of the enemy's army, its chief weapon against the people. Therefore, besides annihilating the enemy's troops in battle, there is the important task of disintegrating them.

It is also clear that the Communist Party must not be impetuous and adventurist in its propaganda and organizational work in the urban and rural areas which have been occupied by the enemy and dominated by the forces of reaction and darkness for a long time but that it must have well-selected cadres working underground, must accumulate strength and bide its time there. In leading the people in struggle against the enemy, the Party must adopt the tactics of advancing step by step slowly and surely, keeping to the principle of waging struggles on just grounds, to our advantage, and with restraint, and making use of such open forms of activity as are permitted by law, decree and social custom; empty clamor and reckless action can never lead to success.

3. THE TASKS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

Imperialism and the feudal landlord class being the chief enemies of the Chinese revolution at this stage, what are the present tasks of the revolution?

Unquestionably, the main tasks are to strike at these two enemies, to carry out a national revolution to overthrow foreign imperialist oppression and a democratic revolution to overthrow feudal landlord oppression, the primary and foremost task being the national revolution to overthrow imperialism.

These two great tasks are interrelated. Unless imperialist rule is overthrown, the rule of the feudal landlord class cannot be terminated, because imperialism is its main support. Conversely, unless help is given to the peasants in their struggle to overthrow the feudal landlord class, it will be impossible to build powerful revolutionary contingents to overthrow imperialist rule, because the feudal landlord class is the main social base of imperialist rule in China and the peasantry is the main force in the Chinese revolution. Therefore, the two fundamental tasks, the national revolution and the democratic revolution, are at once distinct and united.

In fact, the two revolutionary tasks are already linked, since the main immediate task of the national revolution is to resist the Japanese imperialist invaders and since the democratic revolution must be accomplished in order to win the war. It is wrong to regard the national revolution and the democratic revolution as two entirely different stages of the revolution.

4. THE MOTIVE FORCES OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

Given the nature of Chinese society and the present targets and tasks of the Chinese revolution as analyzed and defined above, what are the motive forces of the Chinese revolution?

Since Chinese society is colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal, since the targets of the revolution are mainly foreign imperialist rule and domestic feudalism, and since its tasks are to overthrow these two oppressors, which of the various classes and strata in Chinese society constitute the forces capable of fighting them? This is the question of the motive forces of the Chinese revolution at the present stage. A clear understanding of this question is indispensable to a correct solution of the problem of the basic tactics of the Chinese revolution.

What classes are there in present-day Chinese society? There are the landlord class and the bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the upper stratum of the bourgeoisie constituting the ruling classes in Chinese society. And there are the proletariat, the peasantry, and the different sections of the petty bourgeoisie other than the peasantry, all of which are still the subject classes in vast areas of China.

The attitude and the stand of these classes towards the Chinese revolution are entirely determined by their economic status in society. Thus, the motive forces as well as the targets and tasks of the revolution are determined by the nature of China's socio-economic system.

Let us now analyze the different classes in Chinese society.

1. The Landlord Class

The landlord class forms the main social base for imperialist rule in China; it is a class which uses the feudal system to exploit and oppress the peasants, obstructs China's political, economic and cultural development and plays no progressive role whatsoever.

Therefore, the landlords, as a class, are a target and not a motive force of the revolution.

In the present War of Resistance, a section of the big landlords, along with one section of the big bourgeoisie (the capitulationists), has surrendered to the Japanese aggressors and turned traitor, while another section of the big landlords, along with another section of the big bourgeoisie (the die-hards), is increasingly wavering even though it is still in the anti-Japanese camp. But a good many of the enlightened gentry who are middle and small landlords and who have some capitalist coloration display some enthusiasm for the war, and we should unite with them in the common fight against Japan,

2. The Bourgeoisie

There is a distinction between the comprador big bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

The comprador big bourgeoisie is a class which directly serves the capitalists of the imperialist countries and is nurtured by them; countless ties link it closely with the feudal forces in the countryside. Therefore, it is a target of the Chinese revolution and never in the history of the revolution has it been a motive force.

However, different sections of the comprador big bourgeoisie owe allegiance to different imperialist powers, so that when the contradictions among the latter become very acute and the revolution is directed mainly against one particular imperialist power, it becomes possible for the sections of the comprador class which serve other imperialist groupings to join the current anti-imperialist front to a certain extent and for a certain period. But they will turn against the Chinese revolution the moment their masters do.

In the present war the pro-Japanese big bourgeoisie (the capitulationists) have either surrendered or are preparing to surrender. The pro-European and pro-American big bourgeoisie (the die-hards) are wavering more and more, even though they are still in the anti-Japanese camp, and they are playing the double game of simultaneously resisting Japan and opposing the Communist Party. Our policy towards the big bourgeois capitulationists is to treat them as enemies and resolutely strike them down. Towards the big bourgeois die-hards, we employ a revolutionary dual policy; on the one hand, we unite with them because they are still anti-Japanese and we should make use of their contradictions with Japanese imperialism, but on the other hand, we firmly struggle against them because they pursue a high-handed anti-Communist, reactionary policy detrimental to resistance and unity, both of which would be jeopardized without such a struggle.

The national bourgeoisie is a class with a dual character.

On the one hand, it is oppressed by imperialism and fettered by feudalism and consequently is in contradiction with both of them. In this respect it constitutes one of the revolutionary forces. In the course of the Chinese revolution, it has displayed a certain enthusiasm for fighting imperialism and the governments of bureaucrats and warlords.

But on the other hand, it lacks the courage to oppose imperialism and feudalism thoroughly because it is economically and politically flabby and still has economic ties with imperialism and feudalism. This emerges very clearly when the people's revolutionary forces grow powerful.

It follows from the dual character of the national bourgeoisie that, at certain times and to a certain extent, it can take part in the revolution against imperialism and the governments of bureaucrats and warlords and can become a revolutionary force, but that at other times there is the danger of its following the comprador big bourgeoisie and acting as its accomplice in counter-revolution.

The national bourgeoisie in China, which is mainly the middle bourgeoisie, has never really held political power but has been restricted by the reactionary policies of the big landlord class and big bourgeoisie which are in power, although it followed them in opposing the revolution in the period from 1927 to 1931 (before the September 18th Incident). In the present war, it differs not only from the capitulationists of the big landlord class and big bourgeoisie but also from the big bourgeois die-hards, and so far, has been a fairly good any of ours. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to have a prudent policy towards the national bourgeoisie.

3. The Different Sections of the Petty Bourgeoisie Other than the Peasantry

The petty bourgeoisie, other than the peasantry, consists of the vast numbers of intellectuals, small trades men, handicraftsmen and professional people.

Their status somewhat resembles that of the middle peasants, they all suffer under the oppression of imperialism, feudalism and the big bourgeoisie, and they are being driven ever nearer to bankruptcy or destitution.

Hence these sections of the petty bourgeoisie constitute one of the motive forces of the revolution and are a reliable ally of the proletariat. Only under the leadership of the proletariat can they achieve their liberation.

Let us now analyze the different sections of the petty bourgeoisie other than the peasantry.

First, the intellectuals and student youth. They do not constitute a separate class or stratum. In present-day China most of them may be placed in the petty-bourgeois category, judging by their family origin, their living conditions and their political outlook. Their numbers have grown considerably during the past few decades. Apart from that section of the intellectuals which has associated itself with the imperialists and the big bourgeoisie and works for them against the people, most intellectuals and students are oppressed by imperialism, feudalism and the big bourgeoisie, and

live in fear of unemployment or of having to discontinue their studies. Therefore, they tend to be quite revolutionary. They are more or less equipped with bourgeois scientific knowledge, have a keen political sense and often play a vanguard role or serve as a link with the masses in the present stage of the revolution. The movement of the Chinese students abroad before the Revolution of 1911, the May 4th Movement of 1919, the May 30th Movement of 1925 and the December 9th Movement of 1935 are striking proofs of this. In particular, the large numbers of more or less impoverished intellectuals can join hands with the workers and peasants in supporting or participating in the revolution. In China, it was among the intellectuals and young students that Marxist-Leninist ideology was first widely disseminated and accepted. The revolutionary forces cannot be successfully organized and revolutionary work cannot be successfully conducted without the participation of revolutionary intellectuals. But the intellectuals often tend to be subjective and individualistic, impractical in their thinking and irresolute in action until they have thrown themselves heart and soul into mass revolutionary struggles, or made up their minds to serve the interests of the masses and become one with them. Hence although the mass of revolutionary intellectuals in China can play a vanguard role or serve as a link with the masses, not all of them will remain revolutionaries to the end. Some will drop out of the revolutionary ranks at critical moments and become passive, while a few may even become enemies of the revolution. The intellectuals can overcome their shortcomings only in mass struggles over a long period.

Second, the small tradesmen. Generally, they run small shops and employ few or no assistants. They live under the threat of bankruptcy as a result of exploitation by imperialism, the big bourgeoisie and the usurers.

Third, the handicraftsmen. They are very numerous. They possess their own means of production and hire no workers, or only one or two apprentices or helpers. Their position is similar to that of the middle peasants.

Fourth, professional people. They include doctors and men of other professions. They do not exploit other people, or do so only to a slight degree. Their position is similar to that of the handicraftsmen.

These sections of the petty bourgeoisie make up a vast multitude of people whom we must win over and whose interests we must protect because in general they can support or join the revolution and are good allies. Their weakness is that some of them are easily influenced by the bourgeoisie; consequently, we must carry on revolutionary propaganda and organizational work among them.

4. The Peasantry

The peasantry constitutes approximately 80 per cent of China's total population and is the main force in her national economy today.

A sharp process of polarization is taking place among the peasantry.

First, the rich peasants. They form about 5 per cent of the rural population (or about 10 per cent together with the landlords) and constitute the rural bourgeoisie. Most of the rich peasants in China are semi-feudal in character, since they let a part of their land, practice usury and ruthlessly exploit the farm laborers. But they generally engage in labor themselves and in this sense are part of the peasantry. The rich-peasant form of production will remain useful for a definite period. Generally speaking, they might make some contribution to the anti-imperialist struggle of the peasant masses and stay neutral in the agrarian revolutionary struggle against the landlords. Therefore, we should not regard the rich peasants as belonging to the same class as the landlords and should not prematurely adopt a policy of liquidating the rich peasantry.

Second, the middle peasants. They form about 20 per cent of China's rural population. They are economically self-supporting (they may have something to lay aside when the crops are good, and occasionally hire some labor or lend small sums of money at interest); and generally, they do not exploit others but are exploited by imperialism, the landlord class and the bourgeoisie. They have no political rights. Some of them do not have enough land, and only a section (the well-to-do middle peasants) have some surplus land. Not only can the middle peasants join the anti-imperialist revolution and the Agrarian Revolution, but they can also accept socialism. Therefore, the whole middle peasantry can be a reliable ally of the proletariat and is an important motive force of the revolution. The positive or negative attitude of the middle peasants is one of the factors determining victory or defeat in the revolution, and this is especially true after the agrarian revolution when they become the majority of the rural population.

Third, the poor peasants. The poor peasants in China, together with the farm laborers, form about 70 per cent of the rural population. They are the broad peasant masses with no land or insufficient land, the semi-proletariat of the countryside, the biggest motive force of the Chinese revolution, the natural and most reliable ally of the proletariat and the main contingent of China's revolutionary forces. Only under the leadership of the proletariat can the poor and middle peasants achieve their liberation, and only by forming a firm alliance with the poor and middle peasants can the proletariat lead the revolution to victory. Otherwise, neither is possible. The term "peasantry" refers mainly to the poor and middle peasants.

5. The Proletariat

Among the Chinese proletariat, the modern industrial workers number from 2,500,000 to 3,000,000, the workers in small-scale industry and in handicrafts and the shop assistants in the cities total about 12,000,000, and in addition there are great numbers of rural proletarians (the farm laborers) and other propertyless people in the cities and the countryside.

In addition to the basic qualities, it shares with the proletariat everywhere--its association with the most advanced form of economy, its strong sense of organization and discipline and its lack of private means of production--the Chinese proletariat has many other outstanding qualities.

What are they?

First, the Chinese proletariat is more resolute and thoroughgoing in revolutionary struggle than any other class because it is subjected to a threefold oppression (imperialist, bourgeois and feudal) which is marked by a severity and cruelty seldom found in other countries. Since there is no economic basis for social reformism in colonial and semi-colonial China as there is in Europe, the whole proletariat, with the exception of a few scabs, is most revolutionary.

Secondly, from the moment it appeared on the revolutionary scene, the Chinese proletariat came under the leadership of its own revolutionary party--the Communist Party of China--and became the most politically conscious class in Chinese society.

Thirdly, because the Chinese proletariat by origin is largely made up of bankrupted peasants, it has natural ties with the peasant masses, which facilitates its forming a close alliance with them.

Therefore, in spite of certain unavoidable weaknesses, for instance, its smallness (as compared with the peasantry), its youth (as compared with the proletariat in the capitalist countries) and its low educational level (as compared with the bourgeoisie), the Chinese proletariat is nonetheless the basic motive force of the Chinese revolution. Unless it is led by the proletariat, the Chinese revolution cannot possibly succeed. To take an example from the past, the Revolution of 1911 miscarried because the proletariat did not consciously participate in it and the Communist Party was not yet in existence. More recently, the revolution of 1924-27 achieved great success for a time because the proletariat consciously participated and exercised leadership and the Communist Party was already in existence; it ended in defeat because the big bourgeoisie betrayed its alliance with the proletariat and abandoned the common revolutionary programme, and also because the Chinese proletariat and its political party did not yet have enough revolutionary experience. Now take the present anti-Japanese war--because the proletariat and the Communist Party are exercising leadership in the Anti-Japanese National United Front, the whole nation has been united and the great War of Resistance has been launched and is being resolutely pursued.

The Chinese proletariat should understand that although it is the class with the highest political consciousness and sense of organization, it cannot win victory by its own strength alone. In order to win, it must unite, according to varying circumstances, with all classes and strata that can take part in the revolution, and must organize a revolutionary united front. Among all the classes in Chinese society, the peasantry is a firm ally of the working class, the urban petty bourgeoisie is a reliable ally, and the national bourgeoisie is an ally in certain periods and to a certain extent. This is one of the fundamental laws established by China's modern revolutionary history.

6. The Vagrants

China's status as a colony and semi-colony has given rise to a multitude of rural and urban unemployed. Denied proper means of making a living, many of them are forced to resort to illegitimate ones, hence the robbers, gangsters, beggars and prostitutes and the numerous people

who live on superstitious practices. This social stratum is unstable; while some are apt to be bought over by the reactionary forces, others may join the revolution. These people lack constructive qualities and are given to destruction rather than construction; after joining the revolution, they become a source of roving-rebel and anarchist ideology in the revolutionary ranks. Therefore, we should know how to remold them and guard against their destructiveness.

The above is our analysis of the motive forces of the Chinese revolution.

5. THE CHARACTER OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

We have now gained an understanding of the nature of Chinese society, *i.e.,* of the specific conditions in China; this understanding is the essential prerequisite for solving all China's revolutionary problems. We are also clear about the targets, the tasks and the motive forces of the Chinese revolution; these are basic issues at the present stage of the revolution and arise from the special nature of Chinese society, *i.e.,* from China's specific conditions. Understanding all this, we can now understand another basic issue of the revolution at the present stage, *i.e.,* the character of the Chinese revolution.

What, indeed, is the character of the Chinese revolution at the present stage? Is it a bourgeois-democratic or a proletarian-socialist revolution? Obviously, it is not the latter but the former.

Since Chinese society is colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal, since the principal enemies of the Chinese revolution are imperialism and feudalism, since the tasks of the revolution are to overthrow these two enemies by means of a national and democratic revolution in which the bourgeoisie sometimes takes part, and since the edge of the revolution is directed against imperialism and feudalism and not against capitalism and capitalist private property in general even if the big bourgeoisie betrays the revolution and becomes its enemy -- since all this is true, the character of the Chinese revolution at the present stage is not proletarian-socialist but bourgeois-democratic. [130]

However, in present-day China the bourgeois-democratic revolution is no longer of the old general type, which is now obsolete, but one of a new special type. We call this type the new-democratic revolution and it is developing in all other colonial and semi-colonial countries as well as in China. The new-democratic revolution is part of the world proletarian-socialist revolution, for it resolutely opposes imperialism, *i.e.*, international capitalism. Politically, it strives for the joint dictatorship of the revolutionary classes over the imperialists, traitors and reactionaries, and opposes the transformation of Chinese society into a society under bourgeois dictatorship. Economically, it aims at the nationalization of all the big enterprises and capital of the imperialists, traitors and reactionaries, and the distribution among the peasants of the land held by the landlords, while preserving private capitalist enterprise in general and not eliminating the rich-peasant economy. Thus, the new type of democratic revolution clears the way for capitalism on the one hand and

[130] See V. I. Lenin, "The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907", Collected Works, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1962, Vol. XIII, pp. 219-429.

creates the prerequisites for socialism on the other. The present stage of the Chinese revolution is a stage of transition between the abolition of the colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal society and the establishment of a socialist society, *i.e.*, it is a process of new-democratic revolution. This process, begun only after the First World War and the Russian October Revolution, started in China with the May 4th Movement of 1919. A new-democratic revolution is an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution of the broad masses of the people under the leadership of the proletariat. Chinese society can advance to socialism only through such a revolution; there is no other way.

The new-democratic revolution is vastly different from the democratic revolutions of Europe and America in that it results not in a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie but in a dictatorship of the united front of all the revolutionary classes under the leadership of the proletariat. In the present War of Resistance, the anti-Japanese democratic political power established in the base areas which are under the leadership of the Communist Party is the political power of the Anti-Japanese National United Front; this is neither a bourgeois nor a proletarian one-class dictatorship, but a joint dictatorship of the revolutionary classes under the leadership of the proletariat. All who stand for resistance to Japan and for democracy are entitled to share in this political power, regardless of their party affiliation.

The new-democratic revolution also differs from a socialist revolution in that it overthrows the rule of the imperialists, traitors and reactionaries in China but does not destroy any section of capitalism which is capable of contributing to the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal struggle.

The new-democratic revolution is basically in line with the revolution envisaged in the Three People's Principles as advocated by Dr. Sun Yat-sen in 1924. In the Manifesto of the First National Congress of the Kuomintang issued in that year, Dr. Sun stated:

The so-called democratic system in modern states is usually monopolized by the bourgeoisie and has become simply an instrument for oppressing the common people. On the other hand, the Kuomintang's Principle of Democracy means a democratic system shared by all the common people and not privately owned by the few.

He added:

Enterprises, such as banks, railways and airlines, whether Chinese-owned or foreign-owned, which are either monopolistic in character or too big for private management, shall be operated and administrated by the state, so that private capital cannot dominate the livelihood of the people: this is the main principle of the regulation of capital.

And again, in his Testament, Dr. Sun pointed out the fundamental principle for domestic and foreign policy: "We must arouse the masses of the people and unite in a common struggle with those nations of the world which treat us as equals." The Three People's Principles of the old democracy, which were adapted to the old international and domestic conditions, were thus reshaped into the Three People's Principles of New Democracy, which are adapted to the new international and

domestic conditions. The Communist Party of China was referring to the latter kind of Three People's Principles and to no other when, in its Manifesto of September 22, 1937, it declared that "the Three People's Principles being what China needs today, our Party is ready to fight for their complete realization". These Three People's Principles embody Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three Great Policies--alliance with Russia, co-operation with the Communist Party and assistance to the peasants and workers. In the new international and domestic conditions, any kind of Three People's Principles which departs from the Three Great Policies is not revolutionary. (Here we shall not deal with the fact that, while communism and the Three People's Principles agree on the basic political programme for the democratic revolution, they differ in all other respects.)

Thus, the role of the proletariat, the peasantry and the other sections of the petty bourgeoisie in China's bourgeois-democratic revolution cannot be ignored, either in the alignment of forces for the struggle (that is, in the united front) or in the organization of state power. Anyone who tries to bypass these classes will certainly be unable to solve the problem of the destiny of the Chinese nation or indeed any of China's problems. The Chinese revolution at the present stage must strive to create a democratic republic in which the workers, the peasants and the other sections of the petty bourgeoisie all occupy a definite position and play a definite role. In other words, it must be a democratic republic based on a revolutionary alliance of the workers' peasants, urban petty bourgeoisie and all others who are against imperialism and feudalism. Only under the leadership of the proletariat can such a republic be completely realized.

6. THE PERSPECTIVES OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

Now that the basic issues--the nature of Chinese society and the targets, tasks, motive forces and character of the Chinese revolution at the present stage--have been clarified, it is easy to see its perspectives, that is, to understand the relation between the bourgeois-democratic and the proletarian-socialist revolution, or between the present and future stages of the Chinese revolution.

There can be no doubt that the ultimate perspective of the Chinese revolution is not capitalism but socialism and communism, since China's bourgeois-democratic revolution at the present stage is not of the old general type but is a democratic revolution of a new special type-- a new-democratic revolution--and since it is taking place in the new international environment of the Nineteen Thirties and Forties characterized by the rise of socialism and the decline of capitalism, in the period of the Second World War and the era of revolution.

However, it is not at all surprising but entirely to be expected that a capitalist economy will develop to a certain extent within Chinese society with the sweeping away of the obstacles to the development of capitalism after the victory of the revolution, since the purpose of the Chinese revolution at the present stage is to change the existing colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal state of society, *i.e.*, to strive for the completion of the new-democratic revolution. A certain degree of capitalist development will be an inevitable result of the victory of the democratic revolution in

economically backward China. But that will be only one aspect of the outcome of the Chinese revolution and not the whole picture. The whole picture will show the development of socialist as well as capitalist factors. What will the socialist factors be? The increasing relative importance of the proletariat and the Communist Party among the political forces in the country; leadership by the proletariat and the Communist Party which the peasantry, intelligentsia and the urban petty bourgeoisie already accept or are likely to accept; and the state sector of the economy owned by the democratic republic, and the co-operative sector of the economy owned by the working people. All these will be socialist factors. With the addition of a favorable international environment, these factors render it highly probable that China's bourgeois-democratic revolution will ultimately avoid a capitalist future and enjoy a socialist future.

7. THE TWOFOLD TASK OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION AND THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

Summing up the foregoing sections of this chapter, we can see that the Chinese revolution taken as a whole involves a twofold task. That is to say, it embraces both the bourgeois-democratic revolution (the new-democratic revolution) and the proletarian-socialist revolution, *i.e.,* both the present and future stages of the revolution. The leadership in this twofold revolutionary task devolves on the Chinese Communist Party, the party of the proletariat, without whose leadership no revolution can succeed.

To complete China's bourgeois-democratic revolution (the new-democratic revolution) and to transform it into a socialist revolution when all the necessary conditions are ripe--such is the sum total of the great and glorious revolutionary task of the Chinese Communist Party. Every Party member must strive for its accomplishment and must under no circumstances give up halfway. Some immature Communists think that our task is confined to the present democratic revolution and does not include the future socialist revolution, or that the present revolution or the Agrarian Revolution is actually a socialist revolution. It must be emphatically pointed out that these views are wrong. Every Communist ought to know that, taken as a whole, the Chinese revolutionary movement led by the Communist Party embraces the two stages, *i.e.,* the democratic and the socialist revolutions, which are two essentially different revolutionary processes, and that the second process can be carried through only after the first has been completed. The democratic revolution is the necessary preparation for the socialist revolution, and the socialist revolution is the inevitable sequel to the democratic revolution. The ultimate aim for which all communists strive is to bring about a socialist and communist society. A clear understanding of both the differences and the interconnections between the democratic and the socialist revolutions is indispensable to correct leadership in the Chinese revolution.

Except for the Communist Party, no political party (bourgeois or petty-bourgeois) is equal to the task of leading China's two great revolutions, the democratic and the socialist revolutions, to

complete fulfilment. From the very day of its birth, the Communist Party has taken this twofold task on its own shoulders and for eighteen years has fought strenuously for its accomplishment.

It is a task at once glorious and arduous. And it cannot be accomplished without a bolshevized Chinese Communist Party which is national in scale and has a broad mass character, a party fully consolidated ideologically, politically and organizationally. Therefore, every Communist has the duty of playing an active part in building up such a Communist Party.

Jose Carlos Mariátegui: Programmatic Principles of the Socialist Party

In October 1928, the Organizing Committee of the Peruvian Socialist Party placed José Carlos Mariátegui in charge of drafting this program outline.

The program should be a doctrinal declaration that affirms:

1. The international character of the contemporary economy, which does not allow any country to escape the transformations flowing from the current conditions of production.

2. The international character of the revolutionary proletarian movement. The Socialist Party adapts its practice to the country's specific circumstances, but it follows a broad class vision and its national context is subordinated to the rhythm of world history. The independence revolution more than a century ago was a movement in solidarity with all peoples subjugated by Spain. The socialist revolution is a movement of all the peoples oppressed by capitalism. If the liberal revolution, nationalist in nature, could not be achieved without a close union between South American countries, it is easy to understand that the historical law in an era of stronger linkages and interdependence of nations requires that the social revolution, internationalist in its nature, operates with a much more disciplined and intense coordination of proletarian parties. Marx and Engels's Communist Manifesto condenses the first principle of the proletarian revolution in the historic phrase: "Workers of the world, unite!"

3. The sharpening of contradictions in the capitalist economy. Capitalism has emerged in semi-feudal context such as ours, and at a stage of the liberal ideologies of monopolies a and imperialism that corresponds to the stage of free competition, which has ceased to be valid. Imperialism does not allow any of these semicolonial peoples, whom it exploits as a market for capital and goods and as a source for raw materials, to have an economic program of nationalization and industrialization. This process requires specialization and monoculture (petroleum, copper, sugar, cotton in Peru). The crisis arises from this rigid determination of national production created by forces of the world capitalist market.

4. Capitalism is in its imperialist stage. It is the capitalism of monopolies, of finance capital, of imperialist wars for the plundering of markets and providing sources of raw materials. The practice of Marxist socialism in this period is that of Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism is the revolutionary method in the stage of imperialism and monopoly. The Peruvian Socialist Party takes it as its method of struggle.

5. The precapitalist economy of republican Peru, because of the absence of a strong bourgeois class and the national and international conditions that have caused the country's slow progress on the capitalist road, cannot be liberated under a bourgeois regime subjugated to imperialist interests. It colludes with gamonal and clerical feudalism, and suffers from the defects and vestiges of colonial feudalism.

The colonial fate of the country determines its process. The emancipation of the country's economy is possible only by the action of the proletarian masses in solidarity with the global anti-imperialist struggle. Only proletarian action can stimulate and then perform the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution that the bourgeois regime is incapable of developing and delivering.

6. Socialism finds the same elements of a solution to the land question in the livelihoods of communities, as it does in large agricultural enterprises. In areas where the presence of the *yanaconazgo* sharecropping system or small landholdings require keeping individual management, the solution will be the exploitation of land by small farmers, while at the same time moving toward the collective management of agriculture in areas where this type of exploitation prevails. But this, like the stimulation that freely provides for the resurgence of Indigenous peoples, the creative manifestation of its forces and native spirit, does not mean at all a romantic and anti-historical trend of reconstructing or resurrecting Inca socialism, which corresponded to historical conditions completely bypassed, and which remains only as a favorable factor in a perfectly scientific production technique, that is, the habits of cooperation and socialism of Indigenous peasants. Socialism presupposes the technique, the science, the capitalist stage. It cannot permit any setbacks in the realization of the achievements of modern civilization, but on the contrary, it must methodically accelerate the incorporation of these achievements into national life.

7. Only socialism can solve the problem of an effective democratic and egalitarian education, under which all members of society receive the education that is their right. Only the socialist education system can fully and consistently implement the principles of the school system, the work school, the school communities, and more generally all of the ideals of the contemporary revolutionary pedagogy. These are incompatible with the privileges of the capitalist school, which condemns the poor to a cultural inferiority and makes higher education a monopoly of the wealthy.

8. Completing its bourgeois-democratic phase, the revolution becomes in its objectives and in its doctrine a proletarian revolution. The proletariat party, trained in the struggle for control of power and developing its own program, at this stage performs the tasks of the organization and defense of the social order.

9. The Peruvian Socialist Party is the vanguard of the proletariat, the political force that assumes the task of guiding and leading the struggle for the realization of its class ideals.

Immediate Demands

- Recognize freedom of labor organization, assembly, and press. Recognize the right of all workers to strike.
- Abolish roadwork conscription.
- Replace the vagrancy law with the articles that specifically considered the issue of vagrancy in the draft Criminal Code introduced by the state, with the sole exception of those items that are incompatible with the spirit and criminal criteria of the special law.
- Establish state-funded social security and social welfare systems.
- Comply with the laws of worker's compensation, protection of the rights of working women and minors, and protection for the eight-hour day in agricultural tasks.
- Add malaria in the coastal valleys to the list of work-related diseases that landowners are responsible for treating.
- Establish a seven-hour day in the mines and in places that are unhealthy, dangerous, and harmful to the worker's health.
- Require mining and oil companies to permanently and fully recognize all the rights
- guaranteed to their workers by law.
- Increase wages in industry, agriculture, mining, sea and land transport, and on the guano islands, in proportion to the cost of living and the right of workers to a higher standard of living.
- Complete abolition of all forced or unpaid labor. Abolish or penalize semi-slave labor in the eastern forest region.
- Break up lands belonging to large latifundia and distribute them among the estates' workers in proportion necessary to meet their needs.
- Expropriate without payment all estates belonging to monasteries and religious congregations in order to give them to rural communities.
- Obtain legal rights for yanacona sharecroppers, tenants, etc., who work a plot for more than three consecutive years to continue to use the plots, with annual rents not to exceed 60 percent of the current standard. Discount this rent by at least 50 percent for those who remain as tenants.
- Award cooperatives and poor peasants with land put into agricultural production through irrigation projects.
- Maintain everywhere the rights granted to employees by law. Regulate pension rights with a parity commission that does not result in the slightest reduction of those rights as established by law.
- Introduce pay and minimum wage.
- Ratify freedom of religion and religious education, at a minimum following the guidelines of the constitutional article and subsequent repeal of the last decree against non-Catholic schools.
- Make education free at all levels.

We will immediately fight for these main demands of the Socialist Party. All are urgent demands for the material and intellectual emancipation of the masses. All demands have to be actively supported by the proletariat and by conscious elements of the middle class. The very act of the public establishment of this group lays claim to the rights of the freedom for the party to act lawfully and openly under the Constitution and to claim the guarantees it grants citizens to access press freedoms without restrictions and to hold congresses and debates. Closely associated groups to those that today address the public through this statement resolutely assume, through the consciousness of a duty and a historic responsibility, the mission to defend and propagate its principles and to maintain and enhance its organization, at the expense of any sacrifice. And the working masses of the city, the countryside, mining camps, and Indigenous peasants, whose interests and aspirations we represent in the political struggle, will embrace these claims and ideas, will fight persistently and vigorously for them, and will find, through each struggle, the road that leads to the final victory of socialism.

Jose Carlos Mariátegui: Anniversary and Balance Sheet

With this issue, *Amauta* reaches its second birthday. Before its first birthday it was on the verge of going under with the ninth issue. Unamuno's warning—"a magazine that gets old degenerates"—would have been the epitaph for a vibrant but ephemeral work. But *Amauta* was not born to last for only one episode, but to be and to make history. If history is the creation of men and ideas, we can face the future with hope. Our strength comes from men and ideas.

The primary objective of all work that the likes of *Amauta* have imposed is this: to last. History is endurance. The isolated cry, no matter how large its echo, is not valid; the constant, continual persistent sermon is what matters. Ideas that are perfect, absolute, abstract, indifferent to the facts, to changing and moving reality do not work; ideas that are germinal, concrete, dialectic, workable, rich in potential and capable of movement do. *Amauta* is neither a diversion nor a game of pure intellectuals; it professes a historic idea, it confesses an active, mass-based faith, it obeys a contemporary social movement. In the struggle between two systems, between two ideas, it does not occur to us to feel like spectators or to invent a third way. Extreme originality is a literary and anarchic preoccupation. On our banner, we inscribe one great, simple word: socialism. (With this slogan we affirm our absolute independence from the idea of a nationalist party, petty bourgeois and demagogic.)

We have wanted *Amauta* to have an organic, autonomous, distinct, national development. Because of this we began by looking for a title in Peruvian tradition. *Amauta* should not be a plagiarized term or a translation. We took an Inca word to create it anew. So that Indian Peru, Indigenous America might feel that this magazine was theirs. And we presented *Amauta* as the voice of a movement and of a generation. In these two years, *Amauta* has been a magazine of ideological definition that has gathered in its pages the propositions of whoever has wanted to speak with sincerity and competency in the name of this generation and this movement.

To us, the work of ideological definition seems completed. In any case, we have already heard categorical and solicited opinions being expressed. All debate is opened up for those who opine, not for those who remain silent. *Amauta*'s first act has concluded. In the second act, it does not have to call itself a magazine of the "new generation," of the "vanguard," of "the left." To be faithful to the Revolution, it is enough to be a socialist magazine.

"New generation," "new spirit," and "new sensibility" are all terms that have grown old. The same must be said of these other labels: "vanguard," "left," "renovation." They were new and good in their moment. We have made use of them to establish provisional demarcations, for reasons contingent on topography and orientation. Today they have already become too generic and dubious. Gross counterfeits enter under these labels. The new generation will not effectively be new unless it finally knows itself to be adult and creative.

In this America of small revolutions, the same word, revolution, frequently lends itself to misunderstanding. We have to reclaim it rigorously and intransigently. We have to restore its strict and exact meaning. The Latin American Revolution will be nothing more and nothing less than a stage, a phase of the world revolution. It will simply and clearly be the socialist revolution. Add all the adjectives you want to this word according to a particular case: "antiimperialist," "agrarian," "national-revolutionary." Socialism, supposes, precedes, and includes all of them.

It is only possible to effectively oppose a capitalist, plutocratic, imperialist United States with a socialist Latin or Iberian America. The epoch of free competition in the capitalist economy has ended in all fields and all aspects. We are in the age of monopolies, that is to say, empires. The Latin American countries arrived late to capitalist competition. The first positions are already definitively assigned. In the capitalist order, the destiny of these countries is that of simple colonies. The tension between languages, races, spirits have no decisive meaning. It is ridiculous to still speak of the contrast between a materialist Anglo-Saxon America and an idealist Latin America, between a blond Rome and a pallid Greece. These are all definitively discredited topics. Rodó's myth [131] no longer touches souls in a useful or productive manner, nor has it ever done so. We inexorably discard all these caricatures and semblances of ideology and do a serious, frank accounting of reality.

Socialism is certainly not an Indo-American doctrine. But no doctrine, no contemporary system is or could be. And although socialism, like capitalism, may have been born in Europe it is not specifically or particularly European. It is a worldwide movement in which none of the countries that move within the orbit of Western civilization are excluded. This civilization drives toward universality with the force and means that no other civilization possessed. Indo-America can and should have individuality and style in this new world order, but not its own culture or fate that is unique. One hundred years ago we owed our

[131] Mariátegui here refers to the theories of José Enrique Rodó, as expressed in his eulogy of Latin America's blithe spirit, Ariel. See José Enrique Rodó, Ariel (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988).

independence as nations to the rhythm of Western history, whose compass has inexorably moved us since colonization. Liberty, Democracy, Parliament, Sovereignty of the People— all the great words that our men of that time pronounced, came from the European repertoire. History, however, does not measure the greatness of these men for the originality of these ideas, but for the efficacy and genius with which they served them. And the peoples who have marched farthest in the continent are those where these ideas took root best and
most quickly. The interdependence, the solidarity of peoples and continents, however, was in that time much less than in this. Socialism, finally, is in the American tradition. The most advanced primitive communist organization that history records is that of the Incas.

We certainly do not want socialism in Latin America to be a copy or imitation. It should be a heroic creation. We have to give life to Indo-American socialism with our own reality, in our own language. Here is a mission worthy of a new generation.

In Europe, parliamentary degeneration and socialist reformism have imposed specific categories after the war. In those peoples where this phenomenon has not occurred because socialism appeared recently in the historic process, the old, great word conserves its greatness intact. It will maintain it in history, in the future, when the contingent, conventional demarcations that today separate practices and methods have disappeared.

Capitalism or Socialism. This is the problem of our epoch. We do not anticipate the syntheses, the transactions that can only operate through history. We think and feel like Gobetti [132] that history is reformist on the condition that the revolutionaries act as such. Marx, Sorel, Lenin, these are the men who make history.

It is possible that many artists and intellectuals will note that we absolutely revere the authority of masters irrevocably involved in the process of "*la trahison des clercs*." [133] We confess, without scruple, that we are in the domain of the temporal, the historic, and that we have no intention of abandoning them. We leave the spirits incapable of accepting and understanding their epoch to their sterile afflictions and tearful metaphysics. Socialist materialism encompasses all the possibilities of spiritual, ethical and philosophical ascension. And never have we felt more rabid, more efficacious and more religiously idealist than when we solidly place our ideas and our feet on that which is material.

[132] Piero Gobetti, an influential Italian writer of the day who espoused a radical liberalism.
[133] Julien Benda, *La trahison des clercs* (Paris: B. Grasset, 1927), available in English as Julien Benda, *The Treason of the Intellectuals*(New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2007). Benda was a French philosopher and novelist whose polemical work gained him notoriety for arguing that Europeans had lost the ability to reason dispassionately about political and military matters, instead becoming apologists for crass nationalism, warmongering, and racism

This oblivion of the big issues in face of the momentary interests of the day, this chase and struggle for momentary successes in disregard of later consequences, this sacrificing of the future of the movement for the present of the movement may be "sincere", but it is, and remains, rank opportunism, and "sincere" opportunism is probably the most dangerous of all.

F. Engels, Zur Kritik des sozialdemokralischcn Programmenlwurfs 1891. Marz/Engels, Werke, Bd. 22, S. 234-35

Opportunism means sacrificing fundamental interests so as to gain temporary and partial advantages. That is the gist of the matter, if we consider the theoretical definition of opportunism.

V. I. Lenin, Speech at a Meeting of Activists of the Moscow Organisation of the R.C.P.(B.), December 6, 1920. Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 440

Every opportunist is distinguished for his adaptability (but not all adaptability is opportunism).

V. I. Lenin, Purging the Parly. Collected Works, Vol. 33, p. 40

Advocacy of class collaboration; abandonment of the idea of socialist revolution and revolutionary methods of struggle; adaptation to bourgeois nationalism; losing sight of the fact that the borderlines of nationality and country arc historically transient; making a fetish of bourgeois legality; renunciation of the class viewpoint and the class struggle, for fear of repelling the "broad masses of the population" (meaning the petty bourgeoisie)—such, doubtlessly, are the ideological foundations of opportunism.

V. I. Lenin, The Position and-Tasks of the Socialist International. Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 35

Pre-Marxist socialism has been defeated. It is continuing the struggle, no longer on its own independent ground, but on the general ground of Marxism, as revisionism. Let us, then, examine the ideological content of revisionism.

In the sphere of philosophy revisionism followed in the wake of bourgeois professorial "science". The professors went "back to Kant"—and revisionism dragged along after the neo-Kantians. The professors repeated the platitudes that priests have uttered a thousand times against philosophical materialism—and the revisionists, smiling indulgently, mumbled (word for word after the latest *Handbutch)* that materialism had been "refuted" long ago. The professors treated Hegel as a "dead dog", and while themselves preaching idealism, only an idealism a thousand times pettier and more banal than Hegel's, contemptuously shrugged their shoulders at dialectics—and the revisionists floundered after them into the swamp of philosophical vulgarization of science, replacing "artful" (and revolutionary) dialectics by "simple" (and tranquil) "evolution". The professors earned their official salaries by adjusting both their idealist and their "critical" systems to the dominant medieval "philosophy" (i.e., to theology)—and the revisionists drew close to them, trying to make religion a

"private affair", not in relation to the modern state, but in relation to the party of the advanced class....

Passing to political economy, it must be noted fust of all that in this sphere the "amendments" of the revisionists were much more comprehensive and circumstantial; attempts were made to influence the public by "new data on economic development". It was said that concentration and the ousting of small-scale production by large-scale production do not occur in agriculture at all, while they proceed very slowly in commerce and industry. It was said that crises had now become rarer and weaker, and that cartels and trusts would probably enable capital to eliminate them altogether. It was said that the "theory of collapse" to which capitalism is heading was unsound, owing to the tendency of class antagonisms to become milder and less acute.

V. I. Lenin, Marxism and Revisionism. Collected Works, Vol. 15, pp. 33-34

In the sphere of politics, revisionism did really try to revise the foundation of Marxism, namely, the doctrine of the class struggle. Political freedom, democracy and universal suffrage remove the ground for the class struggle—we were told—and render untrue the old proposition of the *Communist Manifesto* that the working-men have no country. For, they said, since the "will of the majority" prevails in a democracy, one must neither regard the state as an organ of class-rule, nor reject alliances with the progressive, social-reform bourgeoisie against the reactionaries. ...

A natural complement to the economic and political tendencies of revisionism was its attitude to the ultimate aim of the socialist movement. "The movement is everything, the ultimate aim is nothing"—this catch-phrase of Bernstein's expresses the substance of revisionism belter than many long disquisitions. To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chopping and changing of petty politics, to forget the primary interests of the proletariat and the basic features of the whole capitalist system, of all capitalist evolution, to sacrifice these primary interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment—such is the policy of revisionism. And it patently follows from the very nature of this policy that it may assume an infinite variety of forms, and that every more or less "new" question, every more or less unexpected and unforeseen turn of events, even though it changes the basic line of development only to an insignificant degree and only for the briefest period, will always inevitably give rise to one variety of revisionism or another.

V. I. Lenin, Marxism and Revisionism. Collected Works, Vol. 15, pp. 36-38

The dialectics of history were such that the theoretical victory of Marxism compelled its enemies to *disguise themselves* as Marxists. Liberalism, rotten within, tried to revive itself in the form of socialist *opportunism.* They interpreted the period of preparing the forces for great battles as renunciation of these battles. Improvement of the conditions of the slaves to fight against wage-slavery they took to mean the sale by the slaves of their right to liberty for a few pence. They cravenly preached "social peace" (i.e., peace with the slave-owners), renunciation of the class struggle, etc.

V. I. Lenin, The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx. Collected Works, Vol. 18, p. 584

In reality, the opportunists' formal membership in workers' parties by no means disproves they're objectively being a political detachment of the bourgeoisie, conductors of its influence, and its agents in the labor movement.

V. I. Lenin. The Collapse of the Second International. Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 217

The problem of imperialism and of *its connection* with opportunism in the labor movement, with the betrayal of the workers' cause by labor leaders, was raised long ago, very long ago.

For a period of *forty* years, from 1852 to 1892, Marx and Engels constantly pointed to the fact that the upper stratum of the British working class was becoming increasingly *bourgeois* as a consequence of the country's peculiar economic conditions (colonies, monopoly of the world market, etc.). In the seventies of last century Marx won himself the honorable hatred of the despicable heroes of the Berne International trend of those days, of the opportunists and reformists, for branding many of the British trade union leaders as men who had sold themselves to the bourgeoisie or were in its pay for services rendered to its class *from within* the labor movement.

V. I. Lenin, The Tasks of the Third International. Collected Works, Vol. 29, p. 501

Opportunism in the upper ranks of the working-class movement is bourgeois socialism, not proletarian socialism. It has been shown in practice that working-class activists who follow the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeois themselves. Without their leadership of the workers, the bourgeoisie could not remain in power.

V. I. Lenin, The Second Congress of the Communist International. Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 231

By exposing the fact that the opportunists and social chauvinists are in reality betraying and selling the interests of the masses, that they are defending the temporary privileges of a minority of the workers, that they are the vehicles of bourgeois ideas and influences, that they are really allies and agents of the bourgeoisie, we teach the masses to appreciate their true political interests, to fight for socialism and for the revolution through all the long and painful vicissitudes of imperialist wars and imperialist armistices.

V. I. Lenin, Imperialism and the Split in Socialism. Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 120

The crisis created by the great war has torn away all coverings, swept away conventions, exposed an abscess that has long come to a head, and revealed opportunism in its true role of ally of the bourgeoisie.

V. I. Lenin, The Collapse of the Second International. Collected Works, Vol 21, p.257

The opportunists and social-chauvinists, being servants of the bourgeoisie, are real class enemies of the proletariat.

V. I. Lenin, Draft Programme of the R.C.P.(B.) Collected Works, Vol. 29, p. 10

Opportunism, or reformism, inevitably had to grow into a phenomenon of world-wide importance, *socialist imperialism,* or social-chauvinism, because imperialism brought to the fore a handful of very rich, advanced nations, engaged in plundering the whole world, and thereby enabled the bourgeoisie of those countries, out of their monopolist super profits (imperialism is monopoly capitalism), *to bribe the upper strata of the working class.*

V. I. Lenin, The Tasks of the Third International. Collected Works, Vol. 29, p. 502

The collapse of the Second International is the collapse of opportunism, which developed from the features of a new bygone (and so-called "peaceful") period of history, and in recent years has come practically to dominate the International. The opportunists have long been preparing the ground for this collapse by denying the socialist revolution and substituting bourgeois reformism in its stead; by rejecting the class struggle with its inevitable conversion at certain moments into civil war, and by' preaching class collaboration; by preaching bourgeois chauvinism under the guise of patriotism and the defense of the fatherland, and ignoring or rejecting the fundamental truth of socialism, long ago set forth in the *Communist Manifesto,* that the working-men have no country; by confining themselves, in the struggle against militarism, to a sentimental, philistine point of view, instead of recognizing the need for a revolutionary war by the proletarians of all countries', against the bourgeoisie of all countries; by making a fetish of the necessary utilization of bourgeois parliamentarism and bourgeois legality, and forgetting that illegal forms of organisation and propaganda are imperative at times of crises. The natural "appendage" to opportunism—one that is just as bourgeois and hostile to the proletarian, i.e., the Marxist, point of view—namely, the anarcho-syndicalist trend, has been marked by a no less shamefully smug reiteration of the slogans of chauvinism, during the present crisis.

The aims of socialism at the present time cannot be fulfilled, and real international unity of the workers cannot be achieved, without a decisive break with opportunism, and without explaining its inevitable fiasco to the masses

V. 1. Lenin, The War and the Hussion Social-Democracy, Collected Works, Vol. 21, pp. 31-32

The betrayal of socialism by most leaders of the Second International (1889-1914) signifies the ideological and political bankruptcy of the International. This collapse has been mainly caused by the actual prevalence in it of petty-bourgeois opportunism, the bourgeois nature and the danger of which have long been indicated by the finest representatives of the revolutionary proletariat of all countries.

V. I. Lenin, The Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War. Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 16

It is now essential that Communists of every country should quite consciously take into account both the fundamental objectives of the struggle against opportunism and "Left" doctrinairism, and the concrete features which his struggle assumes and must inevitably assume in each country, in conformity with the specific character of its economics, politics, culture, and national composition (Ireland, etc.), its colonies, religious divisions, and so on and so forth.

V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism – an Infantile Disorder. Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 91

The *whole* struggle of our Parly (and of the working-class movement in Europe generally) must be directed against opportunism. The latter is not a current of opinion, not a tendency; it (opportunism) has now become the organized tool of the bourgeoisie within the working-class movement.

V. I. Lenin, Letter to David Wijnkoop. Collected Works, Vol. 35, p. 197

One of the necessary conditions for preparing the proletariat for its victory is a long, stubborn and ruthless struggle against opportunism, reformism, social-chauvinism, and similar bourgeois influences and trends, which are inevitable, since the proletariat is operating in a capitalist environment. If there is no such struggle, if opportunism in the working-class movement is not utterly defeated beforehand, there can be no dictatorship of the proletariat. Bolshevism would not have defeated the bourgeoisie in 1917-19 if before that, in 1903-17, it had not learned to defeat the Mensheviks, i.e., the opportunists, reformists, social-chauvinists, and ruthlessly expel them from the party of the proletarian vanguard.

V. I. Lenin, The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Collected Works, Vol. 30, p. 275

Section: Social-Chauvinism as a Variety of Opportunism

By social-chauvinism we mean acceptance of the idea of the defense of the fatherland in the present imperialist war, justification of an alliance between Socialists and the bourgeoisie and the governments of their "own" countries in this war, a refusal to propagate and support proletarian revolutionary action against one's "own" bourgeoisie, etc. It is perfectly obvious that social-chauvinism's basic ideological and political content fully coincides with the foundations of opportunism. It is *one and the same* tendency. In the conditions of the war of 1914-15, opportunism leads to social-chauvinism. The idea of class collaboration is opportunism's main feature. The war has brought this idea to its logical conclusion, and has augmented its usual factors and stimuli with a number of extraordinary ones; through the operation of special threats and coercion it has compelled the philistine and disunited masses to collaborate with the bourgeoisie. This circumstance has naturally multiplied adherents of opportunism and fully explains why many radicals of yesterday have deserted Io that camp.

Opportunism means sacrificing the fundamental interests of the masses to the temporary interests of an insignificant minority of the workers or, in other words, an alliance between a section of the workers and the bourgeoisie, directed against the mass of the proletariat. The war has made such an alliance particularly conspicuous and inescapable. Opportunism was engendered in the course of decades by the special features in the period of the development of capitalism, when the comparatively peaceful and cultured life of a stratum of privileged working-men "bourgeoisified" them, gave them crumbs from the table of their national capitalists, and isolated them from the suffering, misery and revolutionary temper of the impoverished and ruined masses. The imperialist war is the direct continuation and culmination of this slate of affairs, because this is a war for the *privileges* of the Great Power nations, for the repartition of colonies, and domination over other nations. To defend and strengthen their privileged position as a petty-bourgeois "upper stratum" or

aristocracy (and bureaucracy) of the working class— such is the natural war-time continuation of petty-bourgeois opportunist hopes and the corresponding tactics, such is the economic foundation of present-day social-imperialism... . And, of course, the force of habit, the routine of relatively "peaceful" evolution, national prejudices, a fear of sharp turns and a disbelief in them—all these were additional circumstances which enhanced both opportunism and a hypocritical and a craven reconciliation with opportunism—ostensibly only for a time and only because of extraordinary causes and motives. The war has changed this opportunism, which had been fostered for decades, raised it to a higher stage, increased the number and the variety of its shades, augmented the ranks of its adherents, enriched their arguments with a multitude of new sophisms, and has merged, so to say, many new streams and rivulets with the mainstream of opportunism. However, the mainstream has not disappeared. Quite the reverse.

Social-chauvinism is an opportunism which has matured to such a degree that the *continued* existence of this bourgeois abscess within the socialist parties has become impossible....

Firstly, chauvinism and opportunism in the labor movement have the same economic basis: the alliance between a numerically small upper stratum of the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie—who get but morsels of the privileges of their "own" national capital—against the masses of the proletarians, the masses of the toilers and the oppressed in general. Secondly, the two trends have the same ideological and political content. Thirdly, the old division of socialists into an opportunist trend and a revolutionary, which was characteristic of the period of the Second International (1889-1914), *corresponds,* by and large, to the new division into chauvinists and internationalists.

V. I. Lenin, The Collapse of the Second International. Collected Works, Vol. 21, pp. 242-44

If the crisis of the whole movement is to be explained, an examination must be made, firstly, of the economic significance of the present policy; secondly, its underlying ideas; and thirdly, its connection with the history of the various trends in the socialist movement.

What is the economic substance of defencism in the war of 1914-15? The bourgeoisie of *all* the big powers are waging the war to divide and exploit the world, and oppress other nations. A few crumbs of the bourgeoisie's huge profits may come the way of the small group of labor our bureaucrats, lab our aristocrats, and petty-bourgeois fellow travelers. Social-chauvinism and opportunism have the same class basis, namely, the alliance of a small section of privileged workers with "their" national bourgeoisie *against* the working-class masses; the alliance between the lackeys of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie *against* the class the latter is exploiting.

Opportunism and social-chauvinism have the same political content, namely, class collaboration, repudiation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, repudiation of revolutionary action, unconditional acceptance of bourgeois legality, confidence in the bourgeoisie and lack of confidence in the

proletariat. *Social-chauvinism is the direct continuation and consummation of British Liberal-labor politics, of Millerandism* [134] *and Bernsteinism* [135]

V. I. Lenin, Opportunism and the Collapse of the Second International. Collected Works, Vol. 22, p. 112

By and large, if we take the trends and tendencies, we must admit that it was the opportunist wing of European socialism that betrayed socialism and deserted to chauvinism. What is the source of its strength and its seeming omnipotence within the official parties?...

The immense strength of the opportunists and the chauvinists stem from *their alliance* with the bourgeoisie, with the governments and the General Staffs.

V. I. Lenin, The Collapse of the Second International. Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 246

Social-chauvinism is opportunism in its finished form. Il is quite ripe for an open, frequently vulgar, alliance with the bourgeoisie and the General Staffs. It is this alliance that gives it great power and a monopoly of the legal press and of deceiving the masses.

V. I. Lenin, Opportunism and the Collapse of the Second International. Collected Works, Vol. 22, p. 113

Social-chauvinism is an opportunism which has matured to such a degree, grown so strong and brazen during the long period of comparatively "peaceful" capitalism, so definite in its political ideology, and so closely associated with the bourgeoisie and the governments, that the existence of *such a trend within* the Social-Democratic workers' parties *cannot* be tolerated.

V. I. Lenin, The Collapse of the Second International. Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 240

Opportunism is rotten-ripe; it has been transformed into social-chauvinism and has definitely deserted too the
bourgeois camp. It has severed its spiritual and political ties with Social-Democracy. It will also break off its

V. I. Lenin, Opportunism and the Collapse of the Second International. Collected Works, Vol. 22, p. 120

Section: Critique of Reformism

Not liberalism versus socialism, but reformism versus socialist revolution—is the formula of the modern, "advanced", educated bourgeoisie. And the higher the development of capitalism in a given country, the more unadulterated the rule of the bourgeoisie, and the greater the political

[134] Millerandism ("socialist" ministerialism)—opportunist socialist tactics of participation in reactionary bourgeois governments, called
after the French Socialist Millerand, who entered the reactionary government headed by Waldeck-Rousseau. Lenin described socialist ministerialism as revisionism and renegacy. He stressed that social-reformists who entered a bourgeois government invariably turned out to be cat's paws in the hands of the capitalists and a tool which that government used for deceiving the masses.

[135] Bernsteinism—an opportunist anti-Marxist trend in the German and international socialist movement named after Eduard Bernstein, an outspoken exponent of revisionism. Bernstein renounced the fundamental Marxist tenets on the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. He urged the Social-Democrats to renounce revolutionary struggle and fight for partial reforms within the framework of the capitalist system.

liberty, the more extensive is the application of the "most up-to-date" bourgeois slogan: reform *versus* revolution, the partial patching up of the doomed regime with the object of dividing and weakening the working class, and of maintaining the rule of the bourgeoisie, *versus* the revolutionary overthrow of that rule.

V. I. Lenin, Reformism in the Russian Social-Democratic Movement. Collected Works, Vol. 17, p. 229

Reformism, even when quite sincere, in practice becomes a weapon by means of which the bourgeoisie corrupt and weaken the workers. The experience of all countries shows that the workers who put their trust in the reformists are always fooled.

V. I. Lenin, Marxism and Reformism. Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 372

The Socialists leach that revolution is inevitable, and that the proletariat must take advantage of *all* the contradictions in society, of every weakness of its enemies or of the intermediate classes, lo prepare for a new revolutionary struggle, to repeat the revolution in a broader arena, with a more developed population. The bourgeoisie and the liberals teach that revolutions are unnecessary and even harmful to the workers, that they must not "shove" toward revolution, but, like good little boys, work modestly for reforms.

V. I. Lenin, Reformism in the Russian Social-Democratic Movement. Collected Works, Vol. 17, p. 231

Historical science tells us that the distinction between a reformist and a non-reformist change in a given political form is, generally speaking, that in the former case the old ruling class retains power, while in the latter case power is transferred from the old class to a new one.

V. I. Lenin, An Increasing Discrepancy. Collected Works, Vol. 18, p. 566

The governmental programme of the Soviet Government was not a reformist, but a revolutionary one. Reforms are concessions obtained from a ruling class that retains its rule. Revolution is the overthrow of the ruling class. Reformist programs, therefore, usually consist of many items of partial significance. Our revolutionary programme consisted properly of one general item—removal of the yoke of the landowners and capitalists, the overthrow of their power and the emancipation of the working people from those exploiters. This programme we have never changed.

V. I. Lenin, Answers to an American Journalist's Questions. Collected Works, Vol. 20, p. 515

We must increase revolutionary agitation among the masses; we must give wider scope to our full-fledged, uncurtailed slogans; we must develop them clearly—*in this way* we shall at best bring nearer the full victory of the revolution, and at worst we shall capture some half concessions (such as a Duma ministry, universal, but indirect, suffrage, etc.) and give ourselves the possibility of turning them into a weapon of the revolution. Reforms are *a by-product* of the class struggle of the revolutionary proletariat. To make it "our own" business to obtain this by-product would mean lapsing into liberal bourgeois reformism.

V. I. Lenin, How Not to Write Resolutions. Collected Works, Vol. 12, p. 239

Partial improvements can be (and always have been in history) merely a by-product of revolutionary struggle.

V. I. Lenin, What to Fight For? Collected Works, Vol. 16, p. 170

Understanding that where capitalism continues to exist reforms cannot be either enduring or far-reaching, the workers fight for better conditions and use them to intensify the fight against wage-slavery. The reformists try to divide and deceive the workers, to divert them from the class struggle by petty concessions. But the workers, having seen through the falsity of reformism, utilize reforms to develop and broaden their class struggle.

The stronger reformist influence is among the workers the weaker they are, the greater their dependence on the bourgeoisie, and the easier it is for the bourgeoisie to nullify reforms by various subterfuges. The more independent the working-class movement, the deeper and broader its aims, and the freer it is from reformist narrowness the easier it is for the workers to retain and utilize improvements.

There are reformists in all countries, for everywhere the bourgeoisie seek, in one way or another, to corrupt the workers and turn them into contented slaves who have given up all thought of doing away with slavery.

V. I. Lenin, Marxism and Reformism. Collected Works, Vol. 19, pp. 372-73

Reformism is absolutely irreconcilable with revolutionary Marxism, the duty of which is to take the utmost possible advantage of the present revolutionary situation in Europe in order openly to urge revolution, the overthrow of the bourgeois governments, the conquest of power by the armed proletariat, while at the same lime not renouncing, and not refusing to utilize reforms in developing the revolutionary struggle and in the course of that struggle.

V. I. Lenin, Bourgeois Pacifism and Socialist Pacifism. Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 191

Socialists must centre their activity on the struggle against reformism, which has always corrupted the revolutionary labor movement by injecting bourgeois ideas, and has now assumed a somewhat special form, namely: "reliance" on the reforms the bourgeoisie is supposed to carry out after the war! Reformists argue that in urging, popularizing and preparing the socialist revolution of the proletariat, we are "losing sight" of the "practical" aspect, "forfeiting" our chances to win reforms....

Only bourgeois reformism, which in *substance* is the position of Kautsky, Turati and Merrheim, poses the question thus: *either* renunciation of revolution and that means reforms, *or* no reforms at all.

Yet all the experience of world history, like the experience of the 1905 Russian revolution, teaches us the very opposite: *either* revolutionary class struggle, of which reforms arc *always* a by-product (when the revolution is not completely successful), *or* no reforms at all.

V. I. Lenin, Theses for an Appeal to the International Socialist Committee and All Socialist Parties. Collected Works, Vol. 23, pp. 212-13

Who does not know that we Social-Democrats are *not* against the struggle for reforms, that, unlike the social-patriots, unlike the opportunists and reformists, *we do not confine ourselves* to the struggle for reforms, but *subordinate* it to the struggle for revolution?

V. I. Lenin, An Open Letter to Charles Naine. Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 224.

It would be absolutely wrong to believe that immediate struggle for socialist revolution implies that we can, or should, abandon the fight for reforms. Not at all. We cannot know beforehand how soon we shall achieve success, how soon the objective conditions will make the rise of *this* revolution possible. We should support every improvement, every real economic and political improvement in the position of the masses. The difference between us and the reformists (i.e., the Gurulians [136] in Switzerland) is not that we oppose reforms while they favor them. Nothing of the kind. They confine themselves to reforms and as a result stoop—in the apt expression of one (rare!) revolutionary writer. . to the role of "hospital orderly for capitalism". We tell the workers: vote for proportional representation, etc., but don't stop at that. Make it your prime duty systematically to spread the idea of immediate socialist revolution, prepare for this revolution radically reconstruct every aspect of party activity.

V. I. Lenin, Principles Involved in the War Issue. Collected Works, Vol. 23, pp. 158-59

Reforms do not, of course, exclude revolution. But that is not the point at issue. The point is that revolutionaries must not exclude *themselves,* not give way to reformism, i.e., that socialists should not substitute reformist work for their revolutionary work.

V. I. Lenin, Bourgeois Pacifism and Socialist Pacifism. Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 103

Unlike the anarchists, the Marxists recognize struggle for reforms, i.e., for measures that improve the conditions of the working people without destroying the power of the ruling class. At the same time, however, the Marxists wage a most resolute struggle against the reformists, who, directly or indirectly, restrict the aims and activities of the working class to the winning of reforms. Reformism is bourgeois deception of the workers, who, despite individual improvements, will always remain wage-slaves, as long as there is the domination of capital.

V. I. Lenin, Marxism and Reformism. Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 372

The Marxists are working tirelessly, not missing a single "possibility" of winning and using reforms, and not condemning, but supporting, painstakingly developing every step beyond reformism in propaganda, agitation, mass economic struggle, etc.

V. I. Lenin, Marxism and Reformism. Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 374

[136] The reference is to members of the Guruli-Verein, a reformist bourgeois organisation. In 1901-16 it was part of the Swiss Social Democratic Party, but retained its organisational independence. The Union pursued a bourgeois-nationalist policy.

The reformists are betraying the working-class movement when they restrict its great scope by reformist slogans (as do our liquidators). The opponents of reformism, however, not only prove loyal to the uncurtailed slogans of the proletariat, but also turn out to be the better "practical workers", for it is precisely broad scope and uncurtailed slogans that ensure the strength which yields, as a by-product, either a concession or a reform, or an extension of bounds, or at least a temporary necessity for the upper ranks to tolerate a disagreeable increase in the activity of the lower ranks.

V. I. Lenin, Results of the Elections. Collected Works, Vol. 18, p. 517

Wherein lies, its (revisionism—Ed.) inevitability in capitalist society? Why is it more profound than the differences of national peculiarities and of degrees of capitalist development? Because in every capitalist country, side by side with the proletariat, there are always broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie, small proprietors. Capitalism arose and is constantly arising out of small production. A number of new "middle strata" are inevitably brought into existence again and again by capitalism (appendages to the factory,- work at home, small workshops scattered all over the country to meet the requirements of big industries, such as the bicycle and automobile industries, etc.). These new small producers are just as inevitably being cast again into the ranks of the proletariat. It is quite natural that the petty-bourgeois world outlook should again and again crop up in the ranks of the broad workers' parties. It is quite natural that this should be so and always will be so, right up to the changes of fortune that will take place in the proletarian revolution. For it would be a profound mistake to think that the "complete" proletarianization of the majority of the population is essential for bringing about such a revolution.

V. I. Lenin, Marxism and Revisionism. Collected Works, Vol. 15, p. 39

The intensification of the struggle of reformism against revolutionary Social-Democracy *within* the working-class movement is an absolutely inevitable result of the changes in the entire economic and political situation throughout the civilized world. The growth of the working-class movement necessarily attracts to its ranks a certain number of under the spell difficult to rid petty-bourgeois elements, people who of bourgeois ideology, who find themselves of that ideology and continually lapse back into it....

In Russia the position is fundamentally the same; only here matters are more complicated, obscured, and modified, because we are lagging behind Europe (and even behind the advanced part of Asia), and we are still passing through the era of bourgeois revolutions. Owing to this Russian reformism is distinguished by its particular stubbornness; it represents, as it were, a more pernicious malady, and it is much more harmful to the cause of the proletariat and of the revolution. In our country reformism emanates from two sources simultaneously. In the first place, Russia is much more a petty-bourgeois country than the countries of Western Europe. Our country, therefore, more frequently produces individuals, groups and trends distinguished by their contradictory, unstable, vacillating attitude to socialism (an attitude veering between "ardent love" and base treachery) characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie in general. Secondly, the petty-bourgeois masses in our country

are more prone to lose heart and to succumb to renegade moods at the failure of any one phase of our bourgeois revolution; they are more ready to renounce the aim of a complete democratic revolution which would entirely rid Russia of all survivals of medievalism and serfdom.

V. I. Lenin, Reformism in the Russian Social-Democratic Movements. Collected Works, Vol. 17, pp. 230-31

One of the most profound causes that periodically organize to differences over tactics is the very growth of the labor movement. If this movement is not measured by the criterion of some fantastic ideal, but is regarded as the practical movement of ordinary people, it will be clear that the enlistment of larger and larger numbers of new "recruits", the attraction of new sections of the working people must inevitably be accompanied by waverings in the sphere of theory and tactics, by repetitions of old mistakes, by a temporary reversion to antiquated views and antiquated methods, and so forth. The labor movement of every country periodically spends a varying amount of energy, attention and time on the "training" of recruits.

V. I. Lenin. Differences in the European Labor Movement. Collected. Works, Vol. Id, pp. 347-58

Why does England's monopoly explain the (temporary) victory of opportunism in England? Because monopoly yields *super profits*, i.e., a surplus of profits over and above the capitalist profits that are normal and customary all over the world. The capitalists *can* devote a part (and not a small one, at that!) of these super profits to bribe *their own* workers, to create something like an alliance (recall the celebrated "alliances" described by the Webbs of English trade unions and employers) between the workers of the given nation and their capitalists *against* the other countries.

V. I. Lenin, Imperialism and the Split in Socialism. Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 114

The zigzags of bourgeois tactics intensify revisionism within the labor movement and not infrequently bring the differences within the labor movement Io the point of an outright split.

V. I. Lenin, Differences in the European Labor Movement. Collected Works, Vol. 16, p. 351

Finally, an extremely important cause of differences among those taking part in the labor movement lies in changes in the tactics of the ruling classes in general and of the bourgeoisie in particular. If the tactics of the bourgeoisie were always uniform, or at least of the same kind, the working class would rapidly learn to reply to them by tactics just as uniform or of the same kind. But, as a matter of fact, in every country the bourgeoisie inevitably devises two systems of rule, two methods of fighting for its interests and of maintaining its domination, and these methods at times succeed each other and at times are interwoven in various combinations. The first of these is the method of force, the method which rejects all concessions to the labor movement, the method of supporting all the old and obsolete institutions, the method of irreconcilably rejecting reforms. Such is the nature of the conservative policy which in Western Europe is becoming less and less a policy of the landowning classes and more and more one of the varieties of bourgeois policy in general. The second is the method of "liberalism," of steps towards the development of political rights, towards reforms, concessions, and so forth.

V. I. Lenin, Differences in the European Labor Movement. Collected Works, Vol. 16, p. 350

Bourgeois ideologists, liberals and democrats, not understanding Marxism, and not understanding the modern labor movement, are constantly jumping from one futile extreme to another. At one time they explain the whole matter by asserting that evil-minded persons "incite" class against class—at another they console themselves with the idea that the workers' party is "a peaceful party of reform". Both anarcho-syndicalism and reformism must be regarded as a direct product of this bourgeois world outlook and its influence. They seize upon *one* aspect of the labor movement, elevate one-sidedness to a theory, and declare mutually exclusive those tendencies or features of this movement that are a specific peculiarity of a given period, of given conditions of working-class activity. But real life, real history, *includes* these different tendencies, just as life and development in nature include both slow evolution and rapid leaps, breaks in continuity.

The revisionists regard as phrase-mongering all arguments about "leaps" and about the working-class movement being antagonistic in principle to the whole of the old society. They regard reforms as a partial realization of socialism. The anarcho-syndicalists reject "petty work", especially the utilization of the parliamentary platform. In practice, the latter tactics amount to waiting for "great days" along with an inability to muster the forces which create great events. Both of them hinder the thing that is most important and most urgent, namely, to unite the workers in big, powerful and properly functioning organisations, capable of functioning well under *all* circumstances, permeated with the spirit of the class struggle, clearly realizing their aims and trained in the true Marxist world outlook.

V. I. Lenin, Differences in the European Labor Movement. Collected Works, Vol. 16, p. 340

Opportunism is no chance occurrence, sin, slip, or treachery on the part of individuals, but a social product of an entire period of history. . .. Opportunism has been nurtured by legalism.

V. I. Lenin, The Collapse of the Second International. Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 247

The relatively "peaceful" character of the period between 1871 and 1914 served to foster opportunism first as a *mood,* then as a *trend,* until finally it formed a *group or stratum* among the labor bureaucracy and pettybourgeois fellow-travelers.

V. I. Lenin, Opportunism and the Collapse of the Second International. Collected Works, Vol. 22, p. 111

Section: Sectarianism in the Communist Parties

I was infinitely surprised to learn that the German section No. 1 suspects the General Council of partiality for bourgeois philanthropists and sectarian or dilletante groups. The very reverse is true.

The *International* was founded in order to replace the socialist or semi-socialist sects by a real organisation of the working class for the struggle. The original Rules and the Inaugural Address show this at the first glance. On the other hand, the International could not- have maintained itself if the course of history had not already smashed the sectarian system. The development of the system of social ist sects and that of the real workers' movement are always inversely proportional to each

other. So long as the sects are (historically) justified, the working class is not yet ripe for an independent historic movement. As soon as it has attained this maturity all sects are essentially reactionary. Nevertheless, what history has shown everywhere was repeated in the history of the International. The antiquated attempts to re-establish itself and maintain its position within the newly achieved form.

And the history of the International. was a *continual struggle on the part of the General Council* against the sects and amateur experiments which tried to maintain their position within the International itself against the real movement of the working class. This struggle was conducted at the *Congresses,* but far more in the private dealings of the General Council with the individual sections.

In Paris, as the Proudhonists (Mutualists [137]) founders of the Association, they naturally had the reins in their hands there for the first few years. Later, of course, collectivist, positivist, etc., groups were formed there in opposition to them.

In Germany—the Lassalle clique. I myself went on corresponding for two years with the notorious Schweitzer and proved irrefutably to him that Lassalle's organisation is nothing but a sectarian organisation and as such hostile to the organisation of the *real* workers' movement striven for by the International. He had his "reasons" for not understanding this.

At the end of 1868 the Russian Bakunin entered the *International* with the aim of forming inside it a *second International* called the *"Alliance de la Democratic Socialiste", with himself as leader.* He—a man devoid of all theoretical knowledge—put forward the pretension of representing in this separate body the *scientific* propaganda of the International, and of making it the specialty of this *second International within the International.*

His programme was a hash superficially scraped together from right and left—Equality of Classes (!), *abolition of the right of inheritance* as the *starting-point* of the social movement (Saint-Simonistic nonsense), *atheism* as a *dogma* to be dictated to the members, etc., and as the main dogma *(Proudhonist) abstention from the political movement.*

This fable, for children found favor in (and still has a certain hold on) Italy and Spain, where the real conditions of the workers' movement are as yet little developed, and among a few vain, ambitious and empty doctrinaires in Latin Switzerland and in Belgium.

For M. Bakunin, doctrine (the assembled rubbish he has begged from Proudhon, Saint-Simon, etc.) was and is a secondary affair—merely a. means to his personal self-assertion. While he is a nonentity as a theoretician, he is in his element as an intriguer.

[137] The reference is to the Proudhonists who advanced the slogan of "mutual aid".

For years the General Council had to fight against this conspiracy (supported up io a certain point by the French Proudhonists, especially in the *south of France).* At last, by means of Conference resolutions 1, 2 and 3, IX and XVI, and XVII, it delivered its long-prepared blow.

Obviously, the General Council does not support in America what it combats in Europe. Resolutions 1, 2, 3 and IX now give the New York committee legal weapons with which to put an end to all sectarian .formations and amateur groups, and if necessary to expel them.

K. Marx's Letter to F. Bolte, November 23, 1871. Marx and Engels, Selected Works, Vol. 11, Moscow, 1962, pp. 465-66

One must not allow oneself to be misled by the cry for "unity". Those who have this word most often on their lips are the ones who sow the most dissension, just as at present the Jura Bakuninists in Switzerland, who have provoked all the splits, clamor for nothing so much as for unity. These unity fanatics are either person of limited intelligence who want to stir everything into one nondescript brew, which, the moment it is left to settle, throws up the differences again but in much sharper contrast because they will then be all in one pot (in Germany you have a fine example of this in the people who preach reconciliation of the workers and the petty bourgeoisie)—or else they are people who unconsciously (like Muehlberger, for instance) or consciously want to adulterate the movement; For this reason the biggest sectarians and the biggest brawlers and rogues at times shout loudest for unity. Nobody in our lifetime has given us more trouble and been more treacherous than the shouters for unity.

Naturally every party leadership wants-to see successes, and this is quite a good thing. But there are circumstances in which one must have the courage to sacrifice *momentary* success for more important things. Especially for a party like ours, whose ultimate success is so absolutely certain, and which has developed so enormously in-our own lifetime and before our own eyes, momentary success is by no means always and absolutely necessary. Take the International, for instance. After the Commune it had a colossal success. The bourgeois, struck all of a heap, ascribed omnipotence to it. The great mass of the membership believed things would stay like that for all eternity. We knew very well that the bubble *must* burst. All the riffraff attached themselves to it. The sectarians within it became arrogant and misused the International in the hope that the meanest and most stupid actions would be permitted them. We did not allow that. Knowing well that the bubble must burst some time our concern was not to delay the catastrophe but to take care that the International emerged from it pure and unadulterated. The bubble burst at the Hague and you know that the majority of the Congress members went home sick with disappointment. And yet nearly all these disappointed people, who imagined they would find the ideal of universal brotherhood and reconciliation in the International, had far more bitter quarrels at home than those which broke out at the Hague. Now the sectarian quarrel-mongers are preaching reconciliation and decrying us as being cantankerous and dictators! And if we had come out in a conciliatory way at the Hague, if we had hushed up the breaking out of the split—what would have been the result? The sectarians, especially the Bakuninists, would have got another year in which to perpetrate, in the name of the International

even much greater stupidities and infamies; the workers of the most developed countries would have turned away in disgust; the bubble would not have burst but, pierced by pinpricks, would have slowly collapsed, and the next congress, which would have been bound to bring the crisis anyhow, would have turned into the lowest kind of personal row, because *principles* would already have been sacrificed at the Hague. Then the International would indeed have gone to pieces—gone to pieces through "unity"! Instead of this we have now got rid of the rotten elements with honor to ourselves—the members of the Commune who were present at the last and decisive session say that no session of the Commune left such a terrible impression upon them as this session of the tribunal which passed judgement on the traitors to the European proletariat. For ten months we let them expend all their energies on lies, slander and intrigue—and where are they? They, the alleged representatives of the great majority of the International, now themselves announce that they do not dare to come to the next congress. (More details in an article which is being sent off to the *Volksstaat* with this letter.) And if we had to do it again, we should not, taking it all together, act any differently—tactical mistakes are always made, of course.

In any case, I think the efficient elements among the Lasallians will fall to you of themselves in the course of time and it would, therefore, be unwise to break off the fruit before it is ripe, as the unity crowd wants to.

F. Engels's Letter to A. Bebel, June 20, 1873. Marx and Engels, Selected Correspondence, Moscow, 1965, pp. 283-85

The history of revolutionary epochs provides many, all too many, instances of tremendous harm caused by hasty and half-baked experiments in "fighting unity" that sought to lump together the most heterogeneous elements in the committees of the revolutionary people, but managed thereby to achieve *mutual friction and bitter disappointment.*

We want to profit by this lesson of history. Marxism, which to you seems a narrow dogma, is to us the quintessence of this historical lesson and guidance. We see in the *independent,* uncompromisingly Marxist party of the revolutionary proletariat the sole pledge of socialism's victory and the road to victory that is most free from vacillations. We shall never, therefore, not even at the most revolutionary moments, forego the complete independence of the Social-Democratic Parly or the complete intransigence of our ideology.

V. I. Lenin, A Militant Agreement for the Uprising. Collected Works, Vol. 8, p. 159

Section: On Dogmatism

Marxism requires of us a strictly exact and objectively verifiable analysis of tire relations of classes and of the concrete features peculiar to each historical situation. We Bolsheviks have always tried to meet this requirement, which is absolutely essential for giving a scientific foundation to policy.

"Our theory is not a dogma, but a guide to action," Marx and Engels always said, rightly ridiculing the mere memorizing and repetition of "formulas", that at best are capable only of marking

out *general* tasks, which are necessarily modifiable by the *concrete* economic and political conditions of each particular *period* of the historical process.

V. I. Lenin, Letters on Tactics. Collected Works, Vol. 24, p. 43

Marxism is not a lifeless dogma, not a completed, readymade, immutable doctrine, but a living guide to action, ... it was bound to reflect the astonishingly abrupt change in the conditions of social life. That change was reflected in profound disintegration and disunity, in every manner of vacillation, in short, in a very serious *internal* crisis of Marxism. Resolute resistance to this disintegration, a resolute and persistent struggle to uphold the *fundamentals* of Marxism, was again placed on the order of the day. In the preceding period, extremely wide sections of the classes that cannot avoid Marxism in formulating their aims had assimilated that doctrine in an extremely one-sided and mutilated fashion. They had learnt by rote certain "slogans", certain answers to tactical questions, *without having understood* the Marxist criteria for these answers. The "revaluation of all values" in the various spheres of social life led to a "revision" of the most abstract and general philosophical fundamentals of Marxism. The influence of bourgeois philosophy in its diverse idealist shades found expression in the Machist [138] epidemic that broke out among the Marxists. The repetition of "slogans" learnt by rote but not understood and not thought out led to the widespread prevalence of empty phrase-mongering. The practical expression of this were such absolutely un-Marxist, petty-bourgeois trends as frank or shamefaced "Otzovism", [139] or the recognition of Otzovism as a "legal shade" of Marxism.

V. I. Lenin, Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism. Collected Works, Vol. 17, pp. 42-43

To accept anything on trust, to preclude critical application and development, is a grievous sin; and in order to apply and develop, "simple interpretation" is obviously not enough.

V. I. Lenin, Uncritical Criticism. Collected Works, Vol. 3, p. 630

We have no need of cramming, but we do need to develop and perfect the mind of every student with a knowledge of fundamental facts. Communism will become an empty word, a mere signboard, and a Communist a mere boaster, if all the knowledge he has acquired is not digested in

[138] Machism—a subjective idealist trend in philosophy widely current in Western Europe at the turn of the century. Its founders were the Austrian physicist and philosopher Ernst Mach and the German philosopher Richard Avenarius. Machism pretended to oppose idealism and base its stand on natural science, which tended to give it a scientific semblance. During the period of reaction in Russia which set in after the defeat of the revolution of 1905-07 a section of the Social-Democrat intellectuals fell under the influence of Machism. In his book Materialism and Empirio-Criticism Lenin exposed the reactionary essence of Machism, defended Marxist philosophy against the revisionists and developed dialectical and historical materialism in the new historical conditions

[139] Otzovism (from the word otozvat, to recall)—a Left opportunist trend among the Bolsheviks which arose in .1908. Under cover of
revolutionary phrase-mongering the otzovists demanded that the Social-Democrat deputies should be recalled from the Third Duma
and that the Social-Democrats should discontinue their work in legal organisations, insisting that only illegal work could be conducted in the conditions of reaction.

his mind. You should not merely assimilate this knowledge, but assimilate it critically, so as not to cram your mind with useless lumber, but enrich it with all those facts that are indispensable to the well-educated man of today. If a Communist took it into his head to boast about his communism because of the cut-and-dried conclusions he had acquired, without putting in a great deal of serious and hard work and without understanding facts he should examine critically, he would be a deplorable Communist indeed. Such superficiality would be decidedly fatal.

V. I. Lenin, The Tasks of the Youth Leagues. Collected Works, Vol. 31, pp. 287-88

Opportunists of all sorts like to tell us: learn from life. Unfortunately, what they mean by life is only the standing water of peaceful periods, of times of stagnation, when life makes scarcely any progress whatever. These blind people always *lag behind* the lessons of *revolutionary* life… Their dead doctrines always fall behind the stormy torrent of revolution, which expresses the most far-reaching demands of life, those involving the most vital interests of the masses.

V. I. Lenin, The Black Hundreds and the Organisation of an Uprising. Collected Works, Vol. 9, p. 202

The special feature of Russian opportunism in Marxism, i.e., of Menshevism in our time, is that it is associated with a doctrinaire simplification, vulgarization and distortion of the letter of Marxism, and a betrayal of its spirit (such was the case with both *Rabocheye Dyelo-ism* and Struvism [140]). While fighting Narodism as a wrong doctrine of *socialism,* the Mensheviks, in a doctrinaire fashion, overlooked the historically real and progressive historical *content* of Narodism as a theory of the mass, *pettybourgeois* struggle of democratic capitalism against liberal landlord capitalism, of "American" capitalism against "Prussian" capitalism. Hence their monstrous, idiotic, renegade idea... that the peasant *movement* is reactionary. ...

V. I. Lenin, Letter to I.I. Skvortsov-Stepanov. Collected Works, Vol. 16, p. 119

J. V. Stalin: The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists

Section 1: The External and Internal Setting for the October Revolution

Three circumstances of an external nature determined the comparative ease with which the proletarian revolution in Russia succeeded in breaking the chains of imperialism and thus overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie.

Firstly, the circumstance that the October Revolution began in a period of desperate struggle between the two principal imperialist groups, the Anglo-French and the Austro-German; at a time

[140] *Struvism* – a liberal bourgeois distortion of Marxism, derived its name from P. B. Struve, the leading exponent of "legal Marxism"
in Russia. "Legal Marxism" arose as a socio-political trend among Russian liberal-bourgeois intellectuals in the 1890s. The "legal
Marxists" with Struve at their head attempted to adapt Marxism to the interests of the bourgeoisie. Lenin pointed out that Struvism
accepted in Marxism all that suited the liberal bourgeoisie, renouncing the essence of Marxism, its revolutionary theory, its doctrine
of the inevitable downfall of capitalism, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

when, engaged in mortal struggle between themselves, these two groups had neither the time nor the means to devote serious attention to the struggle against the October Revolution. This circumstance was of tremendous importance for the October Revolution; for it enabled it to take advantage of the fierce conflicts within the imperialist world to strengthen and organize its own forces.

Secondly, the circumstance that the October Revolution began during the imperialist war, at a time when the laboring masses, exhausted by the war and thirsting for peace, were by the very logic of facts led up to the proletarian revolution as the only way out of the war. This circumstance was of extreme importance for the October Revolution; for it put into its hands the mighty weapon of peace, made it easier for it to link the Soviet revolution with the ending of the hated war, and thus created mass sympathy for it both in the West, among the workers, and in the East, among the oppressed peoples.

Thirdly, the existence of a powerful working-class movement in Europe and the fact that a revolutionary crisis was maturing in the West and in the East, brought on by the protracted imperialist war. This circumstance was of inestimable importance for the revolution in Russia; for it ensured the revolution faithful allies outside Russia in its struggle against world imperialism.

But in addition to circumstances of an external nature, there were also a number of favorable internal conditions which facilitated the victory of the October Revolution.

Of these conditions, the following must be regarded as the chief ones:

Firstly, the October Revolution enjoyed the most active support of the overwhelming majority of the working class in Russia.

Secondly, it enjoyed the undoubted support of the poor peasants and of the majority of the soldiers, who were thirsting for peace and land.

Thirdly, it had at its head, as its guiding force, such a tried and tested party as the Bolshevik Party, strong not only by reason of its experience and discipline acquired through the years, but also by reason of its vast connections with the laboring masses.

Fourthly, the October Revolution was confronted by enemies who were comparatively easy to overcome, such as the rather weak Russian bourgeoisie, a landlord class which was utterly demoralized by peasant "revolts," and the compromising parties (the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries), which had become completely bankrupt during the war.

Fifthly, it had at its disposal the vast expanses of the young state, in which it was able to maneuver freely, retreat when circumstances so required, enjoy a respite, gather strength, etc.

Sixthly, in its struggle against counter-revolution the October Revolution could count upon sufficient resources of food, fuel and raw materials within the country. The combination of these

external and internal circumstances created that peculiar situation which determined the comparative ease with which the October Revolution won its victory.

This does not mean, of course, that there were no unfavorable features in the external and internal setting of the October Revolution. Think of such an unfavorable feature as, for example, the isolation, to some extent, of the October Revolution, the absence near it, or bordering on it, of a Soviet country on which it could rely for support. Undoubtedly, the future revolution, for example, in Germany, will be in a more favorable situation in this respect, for it has in close proximity a powerful Soviet country like our Soviet Union. I need not mention so unfavorable a feature of the October Revolution as the absence of a proletarian majority within the country.

But these unfavorable features only emphasize the tremendous importance of the peculiar internal and external conditions of the October Revolution of which I have spoken above.

These peculiar conditions must not be lost sight of for a single moment. They must be borne in mind particularly in analyzing the events of the autumn of 1923 in Germany. Above all, they should be borne in mind by Trotsky, who draws an unfounded analogy between the October Revolution and the revolution in Germany and lashes violently at the German Communist Party for its actual and alleged mistakes.

"It was easy for Russia," says Lenin, "in the specific, historically very special situation of 1917, to start the socialist revolution, but it will be more difficult for Russia than for the European countries to continue the revolution and carry it through to the end. I had occasion to point this out already at the beginning of 1918, and our experience of the past two years has entirely confirmed the correctness of this view. Such specific conditions, as 1) the possibility of linking up the Soviet revolution with the ending, as a consequence of this revolution, of the imperialist war, which had exhausted the workers and peasants to an incredible degree; 2) the possibility of taking advantage for a certain time of the mortal conflict between two world powerful groups of imperialist robbers, who were unable to unite against their Soviet enemy; 5) the possibility of enduring a comparatively lengthy civil war, partly owing to the enormous size of the country and to the poor means of communication; 4) the existence of such a profound bourgeois-democratic revolutionary movement among the peasantry that the party of the proletariat was able to take the revolutionary demands of the peasant party (the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, the majority of the members of which were definitely hostile to Bolshevism) and realize them at once, thanks to the conquest of political power by the proletariat — such specific conditions do not exist in Western Europe at present; and a repetition of such or similar conditions will not come so easily. That, by the way, apart from a number of other causes, is why it will be more difficult for Western Europe to start a socialist revolution than it was for us." (See "*Left-Wing*" *Communism, an Infantile Disorder* .)

These words of Lenin's should not be forgotten.

Section 2: Two Specific Features of the October Revolution — or October and Trotsky's Theory of "Permanent" Revolution

There are two specific features of the October Revolution which must be understood first of all if we are to comprehend the inner meaning and the historical significance of that revolution.

What are these features?

Firstly, the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat was born in our country as a power which came into existence on the basis of an alliance between the proletariat and the laboring masses of the peasantry, the latter being led by the proletariat. Secondly, the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat became established in our country as a result of the victory of socialism in one country — a country in which capitalism was little developed — while capitalism was preserved in other countries where capitalism was more highly developed. This does not mean, of course, that the October Revolution has no other specific features. But it is precisely these two specific features that are important for us at the present moment, not only because they distinctly express the essence of the October Revolution, but also because they brilliantly reveal the opportunist nature of the theory of "permanent revolution."

Let us briefly examine these features.

The question of the laboring masses of the petty bourgeoisie, both urban and rural, the question of winning these masses to the side of the proletariat, is highly important for the proletarian revolution. Whom will the laboring people of town and country support in the struggle for power, the bourgeoisie or the proletariat; whose reserve will they become, the reserve of the bourgeoisie or the reserve of the proletariat — on this depend the fate of the revolution and the stability of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The revolutions in France in 1848 and 1871 came to grief chiefly because the peasant reserves proved to be on the side of the bourgeoisie. The October Revolution was victorious because it was able to deprive the bourgeoisie of its peasant reserves, because it was able to win these reserves to the side of the proletariat, and because in this revolution the proletariat proved to be the only guiding force for the vast masses of the laboring people of town and country.

He who has not understood this will never understand either the character of the October Revolution, or the nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the specific characteristics of the internal policy of our proletarian power.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is not simply a governmental top stratum "skillfully" "selected" by the careful hand of an "experienced strategist," and "judiciously relying" on the support of one section or another of the population. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the class alliance between the proletariat and the laboring masses of the peasantry for the purpose of overthrowing capital, for achieving the final victory of socialism, on the condition that the guiding force of this alliance is the proletariat.

Thus, it is not a question of "slightly" underestimating or "slightly" overestimating the revolutionary potentialities of the peasant movement, as certain diplomatic advocates of "permanent revolution" are now fond of expressing it. It is a question of the nature of the new proletarian state which arose as a result of the October Revolution. It is a question of the character of the proletarian power, of the foundations of the dictatorship of the proletariat itself.

> "The dictatorship of the proletariat," says Lenin, "is a special form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of working people (the petty bourgeoisie, the small proprietors, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc.), or the majority of these; it is an alliance against capital, an alliance aiming at the complete overthrow of capital, at the complete suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie and of any attempt on its part at restoration, an alliance aiming at the final establishment and consolidation of socialism." (See Foreword to the Published Speech 'On Deceiving the People with Slogans About Liberty and Equality.)
>
> And further on:
>
> "The dictatorship of the proletariat, if we translate this Latin, scientific, historical-philosophical term into simpler language, means the following:
>
> "Only a definite class, namely, the urban workers and the factory, industrial workers in general, is able to lead the whole mass of the toilers and exploited in the struggle for the overthrow of the yoke of capital, in the process of the overthrow itself, in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the victory, in the work of creating the new, socialist social system, in the whole struggle for the complete abolition of classes." (See A Great Beginning.)
>
> Such is the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat given by Lenin.

One of the specific features of the October Revolution is the fact that this revolution represents a classic application of Lenin's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Some comrades believe that this theory is a purely "Russian" theory, applicable only to Russian conditions. That is wrong. It is absolutely wrong. In speaking of the laboring masses of the non-proletarian classes which are led by the proletariat, Lenin has in mind not only the Russian peasants, but also the laboring elements of the border regions of the Soviet Union, which until recently were colonies of Russia. Lenin constantly reiterated that without an alliance with these masses of other nationalities the proletariat of Russia could not achieve victory. In his articles on the national question and in his speeches at the congresses of the Comintern, Lenin repeatedly said that the victory of the world revolution was impossible without a revolutionary alliance, a revolutionary bloc, between the proletariat of the advanced countries and the oppressed peoples of the enslaved colonies. But what are colonies if not the oppressed laboring masses, and, primarily, the laboring masses of the peasantry? Who does not know that the question of the liberation of the colonies is *essentially* a

question of the liberation of the laboring masses of the non-proletarian classes from the oppression and exploitation of finance capital?

But from this it follows that Lenin's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a purely "Russian" theory, but a theory which necessarily applies to all countries. Bolshevism is not only a Russian phenomenon. "Bolshevism," says Lenin, is "*a model of tactics for all*." (See The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky.)

Such are the characteristics of the first specific feature of the October Revolution.

How do matters stand with regard to Trotsky's theory of "permanent revolution" in the light of this specific feature of the October Revolution?

We shall not dwell at length on Trotsky's position in 1905, when he "simply" forgot all about the peasantry as a revolutionary force and advanced the slogan of "No tsar, but a workers' government," that is, the slogan of revolution without the peasantry. Even Radek, that diplomatic defender of "permanent revolution," is now obliged to admit that "permanent revolution" in 1905 meant a "leap into the air" away from reality. Now, apparently everyone admits that it is not worthwhile bothering with this "leap into the air" any more.

> Nor shall we dwell at length on Trotsky's position in the period of the war, say, in 1915, when, in his article "The Struggle for Power," proceeding from the fact that "we are living in the era of imperialism," that imperialism "sets up not the bourgeois nation in opposition to the old regime, but the proletariat in opposition to the bourgeois nation," he arrived at the conclusion that the revolutionary role of the peasantry was bound to subside, that the slogan of the confiscation of the land no longer had the same importance as formerly. It is well known that at that time, Lenin, examining this article of Trotsky's, accused him of "denying" "the role of the peasantry," and said that "Trotsky is in fact helping the liberal labor politicians in Russia who understand 'denial' of the role of the peasantry to mean *refusal* to rouse the peasants to revolution!" (See Two Lines of the Revolution.)

Let us rather pass on to the later works of Trotsky on this subject, to the works of the period when the proletarian dictatorship had already become established and when Trotsky had had the opportunity to test his theory of "permanent revolution" in the light of actual events and to correct his errors. Let us take Trotsky's "Preface" to his book *The Year 1905*, written in 1922. Here is what Trotsky says in this "Preface" concerning "permanent revolution":

"It was precisely during the interval between January 9 and the October strike of 1905 that the views on the character of the revolutionary development of Russia which came to be known as the theory of 'permanent revolution' crystallized in the author's mind. This abstruse term represented the idea that the Russian revolution, whose immediate objectives were bourgeois in nature, could not, however, stop when these objectives had been achieved. The revolution would not be able to solve its immediate bourgeois problems except by placing the proletariat in power. And the latter, upon

assuming power, would not be able to confine itself to the bourgeois limits of the revolution. On the contrary, precisely in order to ensure its victory, the proletarian vanguard would be forced in the very early stages of its rule to make deep inroads not only into feudal property but into bourgeois property as well. In this it would come into *hostile collision* not only with all the bourgeois groupings which supported the proletariat during the first stages of its revolutionary struggle, but also *with the broad masses of the peasantry* with whose assistance it came into power. The contradictions in the position of a workers' government in a backward country with an overwhelmingly peasant population could be solved only on an international scale, in the arena of the world proletarian revolution." [My italics. — *J. St.*]

That is what Trotsky says about his "permanent revolution."

One need only compare this quotation with the above quotations from Lenin's works on the dictatorship of the proletariat to perceive the great chasm that separates Lenin's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat from Trotsky's theory of "permanent revolution."

Lenin speaks of the *alliance* between the proletariat and the laboring strata of the peasantry as the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Trotsky sees a "*hostile collision* " between "the proletarian vanguard" and "the broad masses of the peasantry."

Lenin speaks of the *leadership* of the toiling and exploited masses by the proletariat. Trotsky sees "*contradictions* in the position of a workers' government in a backward country with an overwhelmingly peasant population."

According to Lenin, the revolution draws its strength primarily from among the workers and peasants of Russia itself.

According to Trotsky, the necessary strength can be found *only* "in the arena of the world proletarian revolution."

But what if the world revolution is fated to arrive with some delay? Is there any ray of hope for our revolution? Trotsky offers no ray of hope; for "the contradictions in the position of a workers' government . . . could be solved *only* . . . in the arena of the world proletarian revolution." According to this plan, there is but one prospect left for our revolution: to vegetate in its own contradictions and rot away while waiting for the world revolution.

What is the dictatorship of the proletariat according to Lenin?

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a power which rests on an alliance between the proletariat and the laboring masses of the peasantry for "the complete overthrow of capital" and for "the final establishment and consolidation of socialism."

What is the dictatorship of the proletariat according to Trotsky?

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a power which comes "into hostile collision" with "the broad masses of the peasantry" and seeks the solution of its "contradictions" *only* "in the arena of the world proletarian revolution."

What difference is there between this "theory of permanent revolution" and the well-known theory of Menshevism which repudiates the concept of dictatorship of the proletariat?

Essentially, there is no difference.

There can be no doubt at all. "Permanent revolution" is not a mere underestimation of the revolutionary potentialities of the peasant movement. "Permanent revolution" is an underestimation of the peasant movement which leads to the *repudiation* of Lenin's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Trotsky's "permanent revolution" is a variety of Menshevism.

This is how matters stand with regard to the first specific feature of the October Revolution.

What are the characteristics of the second specific feature of the October Revolution?

In his study of imperialism, especially in the period of the war, Lenin arrived at the law of the uneven, spasmodic, economic and political development of the capitalist countries. According to this law, the development of enterprises, trusts, branches of industry and individual countries proceeds not evenly — not according to an established sequence, not in such a way that one trust, one branch of industry or one country is always in advance of the others, while other trusts or countries keep consistently one behind the other — but spasmodically, with interruptions in the development of some countries and leaps ahead in the development of others. Under these circumstances the "quite legitimate" striving of the countries that have slowed down to hold their old positions, and the equally "legitimate" striving of the countries that have leapt ahead to seize new positions, lead to a situation in which armed clashes among the imperialist countries become an inescapable necessity. Such was the case, for example, with Germany, which half a century ago was a backward country in comparison with France and Britain. The same must be said of Japan as compared with Russia. It is well known, however, that by the beginning of the twentieth century Germany and Japan had leapt so far ahead that Germany had succeeded in overtaking France and had begun to press Britain hard on the world market, while Japan was pressing Russia. As is well known, it was from these contradictions that the recent imperialist war arose.

This law proceeds from the following:

1)"Capitalism has grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the vast majority of the population of the world by a handful of 'advanced' countries" (see Preface to the French edition of Lenin's *Imperialism*.);

2) "This 'booty' is shared between two or three powerful world robbers armed to the teeth (America, Britain, Japan), who involve the whole world in *their* war over the sharing of *their* booty" (*ibid.*);

3) The growth of contradictions within the world system of financial oppression and the inevitability of armed clashes lead to the world front of imperialism becoming easily vulnerable to revolution, and to a breach in this front in individual countries becoming probable;

4) This breach is most likely to occur at those points, and in those countries, where the chain of the imperialist front is weakest, that is to say, where imperialism is least consolidated, and where it is easiest for a revolution to expand;

5) In view of this, the victory of socialism in one country, even if that country is less developed in the capitalist sense, while capitalism remains in other countries, even if those countries are more highly developed in the capitalist sense — is quite possible and probable.

Such, briefly, are the foundations of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution.

What is the second specific feature of the October Revolution?

The second specific feature of the October Revolution lies in the fact that this revolution represents a model of the practical application of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution.

He who has not understood this specific feature of the October Revolution will never understand either the international nature of this revolution, or its colossal international might, or the specific features of its foreign policy.

"Uneven economic and political development," says Lenin, "is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country taken separately. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and organized its own socialist production, would stand up *against* the rest of the world, the capitalist world, attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries, raising revolts in those countries against the capitalists, and in the event of necessity coming out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states." For "the free union of nations in socialism is impossible without a more or less prolonged and stubborn struggle of the socialist republics against the backward states." (See On the Slogan for a United States of Europe.)

The opportunists of all countries assert that the proletarian revolution can begin — if it is to begin anywhere at all, according to their theory — only in industrially developed countries, and that the more highly developed these countries are industrially the more chances there are for the victory of socialism. Moreover, according to them, the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country, and one in which capitalism is little developed at that, is excluded as something absolutely improbable. As far back as the period of the war, Lenin, taking as his basis the law of the uneven

development of the imperialist states, opposed to the opportunists his theory of the proletarian revolution about the victory of socialism in one country, even if that country is one in which capitalism is less developed.

It is well known that the October Revolution fully confirmed the correctness of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution.

How do matters stand with Trotsky's "permanent revolution" in the light of Lenin's theory of the victory of the proletarian revolution in one country?

Let us take Trotsky's pamphlet *Our Revolution* (1906).

Trotsky writes:

> "Without direct state support from the European proletariat, the working class of Russia will not be able to maintain itself in power and to transform its temporary rule into a lasting socialist dictatorship. This we cannot doubt for an instant."

What does this quotation mean? It means that the victory of socialism in one country, in this case Russia, is impossible "*without* direct state support from the European proletariat," i.e., before the European proletariat has conquered power.

What is there in common between this "theory" and Lenin's thesis on the possibility of the victory of socialism "in one capitalist country taken separately"?

Clearly, there is nothing in common.

But let us assume that Trotsky's pamphlet, which was published in 1906, at a time when it was difficult to determine the character of our revolution, contains inadvertent errors and does not fully correspond to Trotsky's views at a later period. Let us examine another pamphlet written by Trotsky, his *Peace Programme*, which appeared before the October Revolution of 1917 and has now (1924) been republished in his book *The Year 1917*. In this pamphlet Trotsky criticizes Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution about the victory of socialism in one country and opposes to it the slogan of a United States of Europe. He asserts that the victory of socialism in one country is impossible, that the victory of socialism is possible only as the victory of several of the principal countries of Europe (Britain, Russia, Germany), which combine into a United States of Europe; otherwise, it is not possible at all. He says quite plainly that "a victorious revolution in Russia or in Britain is inconceivable without a revolution in Germany, and vice versa."

> "The only more or less concrete historical argument," says Trotsky, "advanced against the slogan of a United States of Europe was formulated in the Swiss *Sotsial-Demokrat* (at that time the central organ of the Bolsheviks — *J. St.*) in the following sentence: 'Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism.' From this the *Sotsial-Demokrat* draws the conclusion that the victory of socialism is possible in one country, and that therefore there

is no reason to make the dictatorship of the proletariat in each separate country contingent upon the establishment of a United States of Europe. That capitalist development in different countries is uneven is an absolutely incontrovertible argument. But this unevenness is itself extremely uneven. The capitalist level of Britain, Austria, Germany or France is not identical. But in comparison with Africa and Asia all these countries represent capitalist 'Europe,' which has grown ripe for the social revolution. That no country in its struggle must 'wait' for others, is an elementary thought which it is useful and necessary to reiterate in order that the idea of concurrent international action may not be replaced by the idea of temporizing international inaction. Without waiting for the others, we begin and continue the struggle nationally, in the full confidence that our initiative will give an impetus to the struggle in other countries; but if this should not occur, it would be hopeless to think — as historical experience and theoretical considerations testify — that, for example, a revolutionary Russia could hold out in the face of a conservative Europe, or that a socialist Germany could exist in isolation in a capitalist world."

As you see, we have before us the same theory of the simultaneous victory of socialism in the principal countries of Europe which, as a rule, excludes Lenin's theory of revolution about the victory of socialism in one country.

It goes without saying that for the *complete* victory of socialism, for a *complete* guarantee against the restoration of the old order, the united efforts of the proletarians of several countries are necessary. It goes without saying that, without the support given to our revolution by the proletariat of Europe, the proletariat of Russia could not have held out against the general onslaught, just as without the support given by the revolution in Russia to the revolutionary movement in the West the latter could not have developed at the pace at which it has begun to develop since the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia. It goes without saying that we need support. But what does support of our revolution by the West-European proletariat imply? Is not the sympathy of the European workers for our revolution, their readiness to thwart the imperialists' plans of intervention — is not all this support, real assistance? Unquestionably it is. Without such support, without such assistance, not only from the European workers but also from the colonial and dependent countries, the proletarian dictatorship in Russia would have been hard pressed. Up to now, has this sympathy and this assistance, coupled with the might of our Red Army and the readiness of the workers and peasants of Russia to defend their socialist fatherland to the last — has all this been sufficient to beat off the attacks of the imperialists and to win us the necessary conditions for the serious work of construction? Yes, it has been sufficient. Is this sympathy growing stronger, or is it waning? Unquestionably, it is growing stronger. Hence, have we favorable conditions, not only for pushing on with the organizing of socialist economy, but also, in our turn, for giving support to the West-European workers and to the oppressed peoples of the East? Yes, we have. This is eloquently proved by the seven years history of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia. Can it be denied that a mighty wave of labor enthusiasm has already risen in our country? No, it cannot be denied.

After all this, what does Trotsky's assertion that a revolutionary Russia could not hold out in the face of a conservative Europe signify?

It can signify only this: firstly, that Trotsky does not appreciate the inherent strength of our revolution; secondly, that Trotsky does not understand the inestimable importance of the moral support which is given to our revolution by the workers of the West and the peasants of the East; thirdly, that Trotsky does not perceive the internal infirmity which is consuming imperialism today.

Carried away by his criticism of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution, Trotsky unwittingly dealt himself a smashing blow in his pamphlet *Peace Programme* which appeared in 1917 and was republished in 1924.

But perhaps this pamphlet, too, has become out of date and has ceased for some reason or other to correspond to Trotsky's present views? Let us take his later works, written after the victory of the proletarian revolution in *one country*, in Russia. Let us take, for example, Trotsky's "Postscript," written in 1922, for the new edition of his pamphlet *Peace Programme*. Here is what he says in this "Postscript":

> "The assertion reiterated several times in the *Peace Programme* that a proletarian revolution cannot culminate victoriously within national bounds may perhaps seem to some readers to have been refuted by the nearly five years' experience of our Soviet Republic. But such a conclusion would be unwarranted, the fact that the workers' state has held out against the whole world in one country, and a backward country at that, testifies to the colossal might of the proletariat, which in other, more advanced, more civilized countries will be truly capable of performing miracles. But while we have held our ground as a state politically and militarily, we have not arrived, or even begun to arrive, at the creation of a socialist society. . . . As long as the bourgeoisie remains in power in the other European countries we shall be compelled, in our struggle against economic isolation, to strive for agreements with the capitalist world; at the same time it may be said with certainty that these agreements may at best help us to mitigate some of our economic ills, to take one or another step forward, but real progress of a socialist economy in Russia will become possible *only after the victory* [My italics. — *J. St.*] of the proletariat in the major European countries."

Thus speaks Trotsky, plainly sinning against reality and stubbornly trying to save his "permanent revolution" from final shipwreck.

It appears, then, that, twist and turn as you like, we not only have "not arrived," but we have "not even begun to arrive" at the creation of a socialist society. It appears that some people have been hoping for "agreements with the capitalist world," but it also appears that nothing will come of these agreements; for, twist and turn as you like, "real progress of a socialist economy" will not be possible until the proletariat has been victorious in the "major European countries."

Well, then, since there is still no victory in the West, the only "choice" that remains for the revolution in Russia is: either to rot away or to degenerate into a bourgeois state.

It is no accident that Trotsky has been talking for two years now about the "degeneration" of our Party.

It is no accident that last year Trotsky prophesied the "doom" of our country.

How can this strange "theory" be reconciled with Lenin's theory of the "victory of socialism in one country"?

How can this strange "prospect" be reconciled with Lenin's view that the New Economic Policy will enable us "to build the foundations of socialist economy"?

How can this "permanent" hopelessness be reconciled, for instance, with the following words of Lenin:

> "Socialism is no longer a matter of the distant future, or an abstract picture, or an icon. We still retain our old bad opinion of icons. We have dragged socialism into everyday life, and here we must find our way. This is the task of our day, the task of our epoch. Permit me to conclude by expressing the conviction that, difficult as this task may be, new as it may be compared with our previous task, and no matter how many difficulties it may entail, we shall all — not in one day, but in the course of several years — all of us together fulfill it whatever happens so that NEP Russia will become socialist Russia." (See Speech at a Plenary Session of the Moscow Soviet.)

How can this "permanent" gloominess of Trotsky's be reconciled, for instance, with the following words of Lenin:

> "As a matter of fact, state power over all large-scale means of production, state power in the hands of the proletariat, the alliance of this proletariat with the many millions of small and very small peasants, the assured leadership of the peasantry by the proletariat, etc. — is not this all that is necessary for building a complete socialist society from the co-operatives, from the co-operatives alone, which we formerly looked down upon as huckstering and which from a certain aspect we have the right to look down upon as such now, under NEP? Is this not all that is necessary for building a complete socialist society? This is not yet the building of socialist society, but it is all that is necessary and sufficient for this building." (See On Co-operation.)

It is plain that these two views are incompatible and cannot in any way be reconciled. Trotsky's "permanent revolution" is the repudiation of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution; and conversely, Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution is the repudiation of the theory of "permanent revolution."

Lack of faith in the strength and capacities of our revolution, lack of faith in the strength and capacity of the Russian proletariat — that is what lies at the root of the theory of "permanent revolution."

Hitherto only *one* aspect of the theory of "permanent revolution" has usually been noted — lack of faith in the revolutionary potentialities of the peasant movement. Now, in fairness, this must be supplemented by *another* aspect — lack of faith in the strength and capacity of the proletariat in Russia.

What difference is there between Trotsky's theory and the ordinary Menshevik theory that the victory of socialism in one country, and in a backward country at that, is impossible without the preliminary victory of the proletarian revolution "in the principal countries of Western Europe"?

Essentially, there is no difference.

There can be no doubt at all. Trotsky's theory of "permanent revolution" is a variety of Menshevism.

Of late rotten diplomats have appeared in our press who try to palm off the theory of "permanent revolution" as something compatible with Leninism. Of course, they say, this theory proved to be worthless in 1905; but the mistake Trotsky made was that he ran too far ahead at that time, in an attempt to apply to the situation in 1905 what could not then be applied. But later, they say, in October 1917, for example, when the revolution had had time to mature completely, Trotsky's theory proved to be quite appropriate. It is not difficult to guess that the chief of these diplomats is Radek. Here, if you please, is what he says:

> "The war created a chasm between the peasantry, which was striving to win land and peace, and the petty-bourgeois parties; the war placed the peasantry under the leadership of the working class and of its vanguard the Bolshevik Party. This rendered possible, not the dictatorship of the working class and peasantry, but the dictatorship of the working class relying on the peasantry. What Rosa Luxemburg and Trotsky advanced against Lenin in 1905 (i.e., "permanent revolution" — *J. St.*) proved, as a matter of fact, to be the second stage of the historic development."

Here every statement is a distortion.

It is not true that the war "rendered possible, not the dictatorship of the working class and peasantry, but the dictatorship of the working class relying on the peasantry." Actually, the February Revolution of 1917 was the materialization of the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, interwoven in a peculiar way with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

It is not true that the theory of "permanent revolution," which Radek bashfully refrains from mentioning, was advanced in 1905 by Rosa Luxemburg and Trotsky. Actually, this theory was advanced by Parvus and Trotsky. Now, 10 months later, Radek corrects himself and deems it

necessary to castigate Parvus for the theory of "permanent revolution." But in all fairness Radek should also castigate Parvus' partner, Trotsky.

It is not true that the theory of "permanent revolution," which was brushed aside by the Revolution of 1905, proved to be correct in the "second stage of the historic development," that is, during the October Revolution. The whole course of the October Revolution, its whole development, demonstrated and proved the utter bankruptcy of the theory of "permanent revolution" and its absolute incompatibility with the foundations of Leninism.

Honeyed speeches and rotten diplomacy cannot hide the yawning chasm which lies between the theory of "permanent revolution" and Leninism.

Section 3: Certain Specific Features of the Tactics of the Bolsheviks During the Period of Preparation for October

In order to understand the tactics pursued by the Bolsheviks during the period of preparation for October we must get a clear idea of at least some of the particularly important features of those tactics. This is all the more necessary since in numerous pamphlets on the tactics of the Bolsheviks precisely these features are frequently overlooked.

What are these features?

First specific feature. If one were to listen to Trotsky, one would think that there were only two periods in the history of the preparation for October: the period of reconnaissance and the period of uprising, and that all else comes from the evil one. What was the April demonstration of 1917? "The April demonstration, which went more to the 'Left' than it should have, was a reconnoitering sortie for the purpose of probing the disposition of the masses and the relations between them and the majority in the Soviets." And what was the July demonstration of 1917? In Trotsky's opinion, "this, too, was in fact another, more extensive, reconnaissance at a new and higher phase of the movement." Needless to say, the June demonstration of 1917, which was organized at the demand of our Party, should, according to Trotsky's idea, all the more be termed a "reconnaissance."

This would seem to imply that as early as March 1917 the Bolsheviks had ready a political army of workers and peasants, and that if they did not bring this army into action for an uprising in April, or in June, or in July, but engaged merely in "reconnaissance," it was because, and only because, "the information obtained from the reconnaissance" at the time was unfavorable.

Needless to say, this oversimplified notion of the political tactics of our Party is nothing but a confusion of ordinary military tactics with the revolutionary tactics of the Bolsheviks.

Actually, all these demonstrations were primarily the result of the spontaneous pressure of the masses, the result of the fact that the indignation of the masses against the war had boiled over and sought an outlet in the streets.

Actually, the task of the Party at that time was to shape and to guide the spontaneously arising demonstrations of the masses along the line of the revolutionary slogans of the Bolsheviks.

Actually, the Bolsheviks had no political army ready in March 1917, nor could they have had one. The Bolsheviks built up such an army (and had finally built it up by October 1917) only in the course of the struggle and conflicts of the classes between April and October 1917, through the April demonstration, the June and July demonstrations, the elections to the district and city Dumas, the struggle against the Kornilov revolt, and the winning over of the Soviets. A political army is not like a military army. A military command begins a war with an army ready to hand, whereas the Party has to create its army in the course of the struggle itself, in the course of class conflicts, as the masses themselves become convinced through their own experience of the correctness of the Party's slogans and policy.

Of course, every such demonstration at the same time threw a certain amount of light on the hidden inter-relations of the forces involved, provided certain reconnaissance information, but this reconnaissance was not the motive for the demonstration, but its natural result.

In analyzing the events preceding the uprising in October and comparing them with the events that marked the period from April to July, Lenin says:

> "The situation now is not at all what it was prior to April 20-21, June 9, July 3; for then there was *spontaneous excitement* which we, as a party, either failed to perceive (April 20) or tried to restrain and shape into a peaceful demonstration (June 9 and July 3). For at that time, we were fully aware that the Soviets were *not yet* ours, that the peasants *still* trusted the Lieber-Dan-Chernov course and not the Bolshevik course (uprising), and that, consequently, we could not have the majority of the people behind us, and hence, an uprising was premature." (See Letter to Comrades.)

It is plain that "reconnaissance" alone does not get one very far.

Obviously, it was not a question of "reconnaissance," but of the following:

1) all through the period of preparation for October the Party invariably relied in its struggle upon the spontaneous upsurge of the mass revolutionary movement;
2) while relying on the spontaneous upsurge, it maintained its own undivided leadership of the movement;
3) this leadership of the movement helped it to form the mass political army for the October uprising;
4) this policy was bound to result in the entire preparation for October proceeding under the leadership of *one* party, the Bolshevik Party;
5) this preparation for October, in its turn, brought it about that as a result of the October uprising power was concentrated in the hands of *one* party, the Bolshevik Party.

Thus, the undivided leadership of one party, the Communist Party, as the principal factor in the preparation for October — such is the characteristic feature of the October Revolution, such is the first specific feature of the tactics of the Bolsheviks in the period of preparation for October.

It scarcely needs proof that without this feature of Bolshevik tactics the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the conditions of imperialism would have been impossible.

In this the October Revolution differs favorably from the revolution of 1871 in France, where the leadership was divided between two parties, neither of which could be called a Communist Party.

Second specific feature. The preparation for October thus proceeded under the leadership of one party, the Bolshevik Party. But how did the Party carry out this leadership, along what line did the latter proceed? This leadership proceeded along the line of isolating the *compromising* parties, as the most dangerous groupings in the period of the outbreak of the revolution, the line of isolating the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks.

What is the fundamental strategic rule of Leninism?

It is the recognition of the following:

1) the *compromising* parties are the most dangerous social support of the enemies of the revolution in the period of the approaching revolutionary outbreak;
2) it is impossible to overthrow the enemy (tsarism or the bourgeoisie) unless these parties are isolated;
3) the main weapons in the period of preparation for the revolution must therefore be directed towards isolating these parties, towards winning the broad masses of the working people away from them.

In the period of the struggle against tsarism, in the period of preparation for the bourgeois-democratic revolution (1905-16), the most dangerous social support of tsarism was the liberal-monarchist party, the Cadet Party. Why? Because it was the compromising party, the party of *compromise* between tsarism and the majority of the people, i.e., the peasantry as a whole. Naturally, the Party at that time directed its main blows at the Cadets, for unless the Cadets were isolated there could be no hope of a *rupture* between the peasantry and tsarism, and unless this rupture was ensured there could be no hope of the victory of the revolution. Many people at that time did not understand this specific feature of Bolshevik strategy and accused the Bolsheviks of excessive "Cadetophobia"; they asserted that with the Bolsheviks the struggle against the Cadets "overshadowed" the struggle against the principal enemy — tsarism. But these accusations, for which there was no justification, revealed an utter failure to understand the Bolshevik strategy, which called for the isolation of the compromising party *in order* to facilitate, to hasten the victory over the principal enemy.

It scarcely needs proof that without this strategy the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution would have been impossible.

In the period of preparation for October the center of gravity of the conflicting forces shifted to another plane. The tsar was gone. The Cadet Party had been transformed from a compromising force into a governing force, into the ruling force of imperialism. Now the fight was no longer between tsarism and the people, but between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In this period the petty-bourgeois democratic parties, the parties of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, were the most dangerous social support of imperialism. Why? Because these parties were then the compromising parties, the parties of *compromise* between imperialism and the laboring masses. Naturally, the Bolsheviks at that time directed their main blows at these parties; for unless these parties were isolated there could be no hope of a *rupture* between the laboring masses and imperialism, and unless this rupture was ensured there could be no hope of the victory of the Soviet revolution. Many people at that time did not understand this specific feature of the Bolshevik tactics and accused the Bolsheviks of displaying "excessive hatred" towards the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, and of "forgetting" the principal goal. But the entire period of preparation for October eloquently testifies to the fact that only by pursuing these tactics could the Bolsheviks ensure the victory of the October Revolution.

The characteristic feature of this period was the further revolutionization of the laboring masses of the peasantry, their disillusionment with the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, their defection from these parties, their turn towards rallying directly around the proletariat as the only consistently revolutionary force, capable of leading the country to peace. The history of this period is the history of the struggle between the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, on the one hand, and the Bolsheviks, on the other, for the laboring masses of the peasantry, for winning over these masses. The outcome of this struggle was decided by the coalition period, the Kerensky period, the refusal of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks to confiscate the landlords' land, the fight of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks to continue the war, the June offensive at the front, the introduction of capital punishment for soldiers, the Kornilov revolt. And they decided the issue of this struggle entirely in favor of the Bolshevik strategy; for had not the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks been isolated it would have been impossible to overthrow the government of the imperialists, and had this government not been overthrown it would have been impossible to break away from the war. The policy of isolating the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks proved to be the only correct policy.

Thus, isolation of the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary parties as the main line in directing the preparations for October — such was the second specific feature of the tactics of the Bolsheviks.

It scarcely needs proof that without this feature of the tactics of the Bolsheviks, the alliance of the working class and the laboring masses of the peasantry would have been left hanging in the air.

It is characteristic that in his *The Lessons of October* Trotsky says nothing, or next to nothing, about this specific feature of the Bolshevik tactics.

Third specific feature. Thus, the Party, in directing the preparations for October, pursued the line of isolating the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties, of winning the broad masses of the workers and peasants away from them. But how, concretely, was this isolation effected by the Party — in what form, under what slogan? It was affected in the form of the revolutionary mass movement for the power of the Soviets, under the slogan "All power to the Soviets!", by means of the struggle to convert the Soviets from organs for mobilizing the masses into organs of the uprising, into organs of power, into the apparatus of a new proletarian state power.

Why was it precisely the Soviets that the Bolsheviks seized upon as the principal organizational lever that could facilitate the task of isolating the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, that was capable of advancing the cause of the proletarian revolution, and that was destined to lead the millions of laboring masses to the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat?

What are the Soviets?

"The Soviets," said Lenin as early as September 1917, "are a new state apparatus, which, in the first place, provides an armed force of workers and peasants; and this force is not divorced from the people, as was the old standing army, but is most closely bound up with the people. From the military standpoint, this force is incomparably more powerful than previous forces; from the revolutionary standpoint, it cannot be replaced by anything else. Secondly, this apparatus provides a bond with the masses, with the majority of the people, so intimate, so indissoluble, so readily controllable and renewable, that there was nothing even remotely like it in the previous state apparatus. Thirdly, this apparatus, by virtue of the fact that its personnel is elected and subject to recall at the will of the people without any bureaucratic formalities, is far more democratic than any previous apparatus. Fourthly, it provides a close contact with the most diverse professions, thus facilitating the adoption of the most varied and most profound reforms without bureaucracy. Fifthly, it provides a form of organization of the vanguard, i.e., of the most politically conscious, most energetic and most progressive section of the *oppressed* classes, the workers and peasants, and thus constitutes an apparatus by means of which the vanguard of the oppressed classes can elevate, train, educate, and lead *the entire vast mass* of these classes, which has hitherto stood quite remote from political life, from history. Sixthly, it makes it possible to combine the advantages of parliamentarism with the advantages of immediate and direct democracy, i.e., to unite in the persons of the elected representatives of the people both legislative and executive functions. Compared with bourgeois parliamentarism, this represents an advance in the development of democracy which is of world-wide historic significance. . . .

"Had not the creative spirit of the revolutionary classes of the people given rise to the Soviets, the proletarian revolution in Russia would be a hopeless affair; for the proletariat undoubtedly could

not retain power with the old state apparatus, and it is impossible to create a new apparatus immediately."

That is why the Bolsheviks seized upon the Soviets as the principal organizational link that could facilitate the task of organizing the October Revolution and the creation of a new, powerful apparatus of the proletarian state power.

From the point of view of its internal development, the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" passed through two stages: the first (up to the July defeat of the Bolsheviks, during the period of dual power), and the second (after the defeat of the Kornilov revolt).

During the first stage this slogan meant breaking the bloc of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries with the Cadets, the formation of a Soviet Government consisting of Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries (for at that time the Soviets were Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik), the right of free agitation for the opposition (i.e., for the Bolsheviks), and the free struggle of parties within the Soviets, in the expectation that by means of such a struggle the Bolsheviks would succeed in capturing the Soviets and changing the composition of the Soviet Government in the course of a peaceful development of the revolution. This plan, of course, did not signify the dictatorship of the proletariat. But it undoubtedly facilitated the preparation of the conditions required for ensuring the dictatorship; for, by putting the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries in power and compelling them to carry out in practice their anti-revolutionary platform, it hastened the exposure of the true nature of these parties, hastened their isolation, their divorce from the masses. The July defeat of the Bolsheviks, however, interrupted this development; for it gave preponderance to the generals' and Cadets' counter-revolution and threw the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks into the arms of that counter-revolution. This compelled the Party temporarily to withdraw the slogan "All power to the Soviets!", only to put it forward again in the conditions of a fresh revolutionary upsurge.

The defeat of the Kornilov revolt ushered in the second stage. The slogan "All power to the Soviets!" became again the immediate slogan. But now this slogan had a different meaning from that in the first stage. Its content had radically changed. Now this slogan meant a complete rupture with imperialism and the passing of power to the Bolsheviks, for the majority of the Soviets were already Bolshevik. Now this slogan meant the revolution's direct approach towards the dictatorship of the proletariat by means of an uprising. More than that, this slogan now meant the organization of the dictatorship of the proletariat and giving it a state form.

The inestimable significance of the tactics of transforming the Soviets into organs of state power lay in the fact that they caused millions of working people to break away from imperialism, exposed the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary parties as the tools of imperialism, and brought the masses by a direct route, as it were, to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Thus, the policy of transforming the Soviets into organs of state power, as the most important condition for isolating the compromising parties and for the victory of the dictatorship of the

proletariat — such is the third specific feature of the tactics of the Bolsheviks in the period of preparation for October.

Fourth specific feature. The picture would not be complete if we did not deal with the question of how and why the Bolsheviks were able to transform their Party slogans into slogans for the vast masses, into slogans which pushed the revolution forward; how and why they succeeded in convincing not only the vanguard, and not only the majority of the working class, but also the majority of the people, of the correctness of their policy.

The point is that for the victory of the revolution, if it is really a people's revolution embracing the masses in their millions, correct Party slogans alone are not enough. For the victory of the revolution one more necessary condition is required, namely, that the masses themselves become convinced through their own experience of the correctness of these slogans. Only then do the slogans of the Party become the slogans of the masses themselves. Only then does the revolution really become a people's revolution. One of the specific features of the tactics of the Bolsheviks in the period of preparation for October was that they correctly determined the paths and turns which would naturally lead the masses to the Party's slogans — to the very threshold of the revolution, so to speak — thus helping them to feel, to test, to realize by their own experience the correctness of these slogans. In other words, one of the specific features of the tactics of the Bolsheviks is that they do not confuse leadership of the Party with leadership of the masses; that they clearly see the difference between the first sort of leadership and the second; that they, therefore, represent the science, not only of leadership of the Party, but of leadership of the vast masses of the working people.

A graphic example of the manifestation of this feature of Bolshevik tactics was provided by the experience of convening and dispersing the Constituent Assembly.

It is well known that the Bolsheviks advanced the slogan of a Republic of Soviets as early as April 1917. It is well known that the Constituent Assembly was a bourgeois parliament, fundamentally opposed to the principles of a Republic of Soviets. How could it happen that the Bolsheviks, who were advancing towards a Republic of Soviets, at the same time demanded that the Provisional Government should immediately convene the Constituent Assembly? How could it happen that the Bolsheviks not only took part in the elections, but themselves convened the Constituent Assembly? How could it happen that a month before the uprising, in the transition from the old to the new, the Bolsheviks considered a temporary combination of a Republic of Soviets with the Constituent Assembly possible?

This "happened" because:

1) the idea of a Constituent Assembly was one of the most popular ideas among the broad masses of the population;
2) the slogan of the immediate convocation of the Constituent Assembly helped to expose the counter-revolutionary nature of the Provisional Government;

3) in order to discredit the idea of a Constituent Assembly in the eyes of the masses, it was necessary to lead the masses to the walls of the Constituent Assembly with their demands for land, for peace, for the power of the Soviets, thus bringing them face to face with the actual, live Constituent Assembly;
4) only this could help the masses to become convinced through their own experience of the counter-revolutionary nature of the Constituent Assembly and of the necessity of dispersing it;
5) all this naturally presupposed the possibility of a temporary combination of the Republic of Soviets with the Constituent Assembly, as one of the means for eliminating the Constituent Assembly;
    a. such a combination, if brought about *under* the condition that all power was transferred to the Soviets, could only signify the subordination of the Constituent Assembly to the Soviets, its conversion into an appendage of the Soviets, its painless extinction.

It scarcely needs proof that had the Bolsheviks not adopted such a policy the dispersion of the Constituent Assembly would not have taken place so smoothly, and the subsequent actions of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks under the slogan "All power to the Constituent Assembly!" would not have failed so signally.

> "We took part," says Lenin, "in the elections to the Russian bourgeois parliament, the Constituent Assembly, in September-November 1917. Were our tactics correct or not? . . . Did not we, the Russian Bolsheviks, have more right in September-November 1917 than any Western Communists to consider that parliamentarism was politically obsolete in Russia? Of course we had; for the point is not whether bourgeois parliaments have existed for a long or a short time, but how far the broad masses of the working people are *prepared* (ideologically, politically and practically) to accept the Soviet system and to disperse the bourgeois-democratic parliament (or allow it to be dispersed). That, owing to a number of special conditions, the working class of the towns and the soldiers and peasants of Russia were in September-November 1917 exceptionally well prepared to accept the Soviet system and to disperse the most democratic of bourgeois parliaments, is an absolutely incontestable and fully established historical fact. Nevertheless, the Bolsheviks did *not* boycott the Constituent Assembly, but took part in the elections both before the proletariat conquered political power and *after*." (See "*Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder*.)
>
> Why then did they not boycott the Constituent Assembly?
>
> Because, says Lenin, "participation in a bourgeois-democratic parliament even a few weeks before the victory of a Soviet Republic, and even after such a victory, not only does not harm the revolutionary proletariat, but actually helps it to prove to the backward masses why such parliaments deserve to be dispersed; it helps their successful dispersal, and helps to make bourgeois parliamentarism 'politically obsolete.'" (See "*Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder*)

It is characteristic that Trotsky does not understand this feature of Bolshevik tactics and snorts at the "theory" of combining the Constituent Assembly with the Soviets, qualifying it as Hilferdingism.

He does not understand that to permit such a combination, accompanied by the slogan of an uprising and the probable victory of the Soviets, in connection with the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, was the only revolutionary tactics, which had nothing in common with the Hilferding tactics of converting the Soviets into an appendage of the Constituent Assembly; he does not understand that the mistake committed by some comrades in *this* question gives him no grounds for disparaging the absolutely correct position taken by Lenin and the Party on the "combined type of state power" *under* certain conditions. (Cf. "Letter to Comrades")

He does not understand that if the Bolsheviks had not adopted this special policy towards the Constituent Assembly they would not have succeeded in winning over to their side the vast masses of the people; and if they had not won over these masses they could not have transformed the October uprising into a profound people's revolution.

It is interesting to note that Trotsky even snorts at the words "people," "revolutionary democracy," etc., occurring in articles by Bolsheviks, and considers them improper for a Marxist to use.

Trotsky has evidently forgotten that even in September 1917, a month before the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin, that unquestionable Marxist, wrote of "the necessity of the immediate transfer of the whole power to *the revolutionary democracy headed by the revolutionary proletariat*." (See Marxism and Insurrection.)

Trotsky has evidently forgotten that Lenin, that unquestionable Marxist, quoting the well-known letter of Marx to Kugelmann (April 1871) to the effect that the smashing of the bureaucratic-military state machine is the preliminary condition for every real *people's* revolution on the continent, writes in black and white the following lines:

"Particular attention should be paid to Marx's extremely profound remark that the destruction of the bureaucratic-military state machine is 'the preliminary condition for every real *people's* revolution.' This concept of a 'people's' revolution seems strange coming from Marx, and the Russian Plekhanovites and Mensheviks, those followers of Struve who wish to be regarded as Marxists, might possibly declare such an expression to be a 'slip of the pen' on Marx's part. They have reduced Marxism to such a state of wretchedly liberal distortion that nothing exists for them beyond the antithesis between bourgeois revolution and proletarian revolution — and even this antithesis they interpret in an extremely lifeless way. . . .

> "In Europe, in 1871, there was not a single country on the continent in which the proletariat constituted the majority of the people. A 'people's' revolution, one that actually brought the majority into movement, could be such only if it embraced both the proletariat and the peasantry. These two classes then constituted the 'people.' These two classes are united by the

fact that the 'bureaucratic-military state machine' oppresses, crushes, exploits them. To *break up* this machine, to *smash* it — this is truly in the interest of the 'people,' of the majority, of the workers and most of the peasants, this is 'the preliminary condition' for a free alliance between the poor peasants and the proletarians, whereas without such an alliance democracy is unstable and socialist transformation is impossible." (See *The State and Revolution*.)

These words of Lenin's should not be forgotten.

Thus, ability to convince the masses of the correctness of the Party slogans on the basis of their own experience, by bringing them to the revolutionary positions, as the most important condition for the winning over of the millions of working people to the side of the Party — such is the fourth specific feature of the tactics of the Bolsheviks in the period of preparation for October.

I think that what I have said is quite sufficient to get a clear idea of the characteristic features of these tactics.

Section 4: The October Revolution as the Beginning of and the Precondition for the World Revolution

There can be no doubt that the universal theory of a simultaneous victory of the revolution in the principal countries of Europe, the theory that the victory of socialism in one country is impossible, has proved to be an artificial and untenable theory. The seven years' history of the proletarian revolution in Russia speaks not for but against this theory. This theory is unacceptable not only as a scheme of development of the world revolution, for it contradicts obvious facts. It is still less acceptable as a slogan; for it fetters, rather than releases, the initiative of individual countries which, by reason of certain historical conditions, obtain the opportunity to break through the front of capital independently; for it does not stimulate an active onslaught on capital in individual countries, but encourages passive waiting for the moment of the "universal denouement"; for it cultivates among the proletarians of the different countries not the spirit of revolutionary determination, but the mood of Hamlet-like doubt over the question, "What if the others fail to back us up?" Lenin was absolutely right in saying that the victory of the proletariat in one country is the "typical case," that "a simultaneous revolution in a number of countries" can only be a "rare exception." (See The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky.)

But, as is well known, Lenin's theory of revolution is not limited only to this side of the question. It is also the theory of the development of the world revolution [See the Foundations of Leninism -J. V. Stalin]. The victory of socialism in one country is not a self-sufficient task. The revolution which has been victorious in one country must regard itself not as a self-sufficient entity, but as an aid, as a means *for* hastening the victory of the proletariat in all countries. For the victory of the revolution in one country, in the present case Russia, is not only the product of the uneven development and progressive decay of imperialism; it is at the same time the beginning of and the precondition for the world revolution.

Undoubtedly, the paths of development of the world revolution are not as plain as it may have seemed previously, before the victory of the revolution in one country, before the appearance of developed imperialism, which is "the eve of the socialist revolution." For a new factor has arisen — the law of the uneven development of the capitalist countries, which operates under the conditions of developed imperialism, and which implies the inevitability of armed collisions, the general weakening of the world front of capital, and the possibility of the victory of socialism in individual countries. For a new factor has arisen — the vast Soviet country, lying between the West and the East, between the center of the financial exploitation of the world and the arena of colonial oppression, a country which by its very existence is revolutionizing the whole world.

All these are factors (not to mention other less important ones) which cannot be left out of account in studying the paths of development of the world revolution.

Formerly, it was commonly thought that the revolution would develop through the even "maturing" of the elements of socialism, primarily in the more developed, the "advanced," countries. Now this view must be considerably modified.

"The system of international relationships," says Lenin, "has now taken a form in which one of the states of Europe, viz., Germany, has been enslaved by the victor countries. Furthermore, a number of states, which are, moreover, the oldest states in the West, find themselves in a position, as the result of their victory, to utilize this victory to make a number of insignificant concessions to their oppressed classes — concessions which nevertheless retard the revolutionary movement in those countries and create some semblance of 'social peace.'

> "At the same time, precisely as a result of the last imperialist war, a number of countries — the East, India, China, etc. — have been completely dislodged from their groove. Their development has definitely shifted to the general European capitalist lines. The general European ferment has begun to affect them, and it is now clear to the whole world that they have been drawn into a process of development that cannot but lead to a crisis in the whole of world capitalism."

In view of this fact, and in connection with it, "the West-European capitalist countries will consummate their development towards socialism . . . not as we formerly expected. They are consummating it not by the even 'maturing' of socialism in them, but by the exploitation of some countries by others, by the exploitation of the first of the countries to be vanquished in the imperialist war combined with the exploitation of the whole of the East. On the other hand, precisely as a result of the first imperialist war, the East has definitely come into the revolutionary movement, has been definitely drawn into the general maelstrom of the world revolutionary movement." (See Better Fewer, But Better.)

If we add to this the fact that not only the defeated countries and colonies are being exploited by the victorious countries, but that some of the victorious countries are falling into the orbit of

financial exploitation at the hands of the most powerful of the victorious countries, America and Britain; that the contradictions among all these countries are an extremely important factor in the disintegration of world imperialism; that, in addition to these contradictions, very profound contradictions exist and are developing within each of these countries; that all these contradictions are becoming more profound and more acute because of the existence, alongside these countries, of the great Republic of Soviets — if all this is taken into consideration, then the picture of the special character of the international situation will become more or less complete.

Most probably, the world revolution will develop by the breaking away of a number of new countries from the system of the imperialist states as a result of revolution, while the proletarians of these countries will be supported by the proletariat of the imperialist states. We see that the first country to break away, the first victorious country, is already being supported by the workers and the laboring masses of other countries. Without this support it could not hold out. Undoubtedly, this support will increase and grow. But there can also be no doubt that the very development of the world revolution, the very process of the breaking away from imperialism of a number of new countries will be the more rapid and thorough, the more thoroughly socialism becomes consolidated in the first victorious country, the faster this country is transformed into a base for the further unfolding of the world revolution, into a lever for the further disintegration of imperialism.

While it is true that the *final* victory of socialism in the first country to emancipate itself is impossible without the combined efforts of the proletarians of several countries, it is equally true that the unfolding of the world revolution will be the more rapid and thorough, the more effective the assistance rendered by the first socialist country to the workers and laboring masses of all other countries.

In what should this assistance be expressed?

It should be expressed, firstly, in the victorious country achieving "the utmost possible in one country *f o r* the development, support and awakening of the revolution *in all countries*. (See The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky.)

> It should be expressed, secondly, in that the "victorious proletariat" of one country, "having expropriated the capitalists and organized its own socialist production, would stand up . . . against the rest of the world, the capitalist world, attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries, raising revolts in those countries against the capitalists, and in the event of necessity coming out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states." (See On the Slogan for a United States of Europe.)

The characteristic feature of the assistance given by the victorious country is not only that it hastens the victory of the proletarians of other countries, but also that, by facilitating this victory, it ensures the final victory of socialism in the first victorious country.

Most probably, in the course of development of the world revolution, side by side with the centers of imperialism in individual capitalist countries and with the system of these countries throughout the world, centers of socialism will be created in individual Soviet countries and a system of these centers throughout the world, and the struggle between these two systems will fill the history of the unfolding of the world revolution.

> For, says Lenin, "the free union of nations in socialism is impossible without a more or less prolonged and stubborn struggle of the socialist republics against the backward states." (See On the Slogan for a United States of Europe.)

The world significance of the October Revolution lies not only in the fact that it constitutes a great beginning made by one country in causing a breach in the system of imperialism and that it is the first center of socialism in the ocean of imperialist countries, but also in that it constitutes the first stage of the world revolution and a mighty base for its further development.

Therefore, not only those are wrong who forget the international character of the October Revolution and declare the victory of socialism in one country to be a purely national, and only a national, phenomenon, but also those who, although they bear in mind the international character of the October Revolution, are inclined to regard this revolution as something passive, merely destined to accept help from without. Actually, not only does the October Revolution need support from the revolution in other countries, but the revolution in those countries needs the support of the October Revolution, in order to accelerate and advance the cause of overthrowing world imperialism.

J. V. Stalin: The International Character of the October Revolution

The October Revolution cannot be regarded merely as a revolution "within national bounds." It is, primarily, a revolution of an international, world order, for it signifies a radical turn in the world history of mankind, a turn from the old, capitalist world to the new, socialist world.

Revolutions in the past usually ended by one group of exploiters at the helm of government being replaced by another group of exploiters. The exploiters changed, exploitation remained. Such was the case during the liberation movements of the slaves. Such was the case during the period of the uprisings of the serfs. Such was the case during the period of the well-known "great" revolutions in England, France and Germany. I am not speaking of the Paris Commune, which was the first glorious, heroic, yet unsuccessful attempt on the part of the proletariat to turn history against capitalism.

The October Revolution differs from these revolutions *in principle*. Its aim is not to replace one form of exploitation by another form of exploitation, one group of exploiters by another group of exploiters, but to abolish all exploitation of man by man, to abolish all groups of exploiters, to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, to establish the power of the most revolutionary class of all the oppressed classes that have ever existed, to organize a new, classless, socialist society.

It is precisely for this reason that the *victory* of the October Revolution signifies a radical change in the history of mankind, a radical change in the historical destiny of world capitalism, a radical change in the liberation movement of the world proletariat, a radical change in the methods of struggle and the forms of organisation, in the manner of life and traditions, in the culture and ideology of the exploited masses throughout the world.

That is the basic reason why the October Revolution is a revolution of an international, world order.

That also is the source of the profound sympathy which the oppressed classes in all countries entertain for the October Revolution, which they regard as a pledge of their own emancipation.

A number of fundamental issues could be noted on which the October Revolution influences the development of the revolutionary movement throughout the world.

1. The October Revolution is noteworthy primarily for having breached the front of world imperialism, for having overthrown the imperialist bourgeoisie in one of the biggest capitalist countries and put the socialist proletariat in power.

The class of wage-workers, the class of the persecuted, the class of the oppressed and exploited has for the first time in the history of mankind risen to the position of the *ruling* class, setting a contagious example to the proletarians of all countries.

This means that the October Revolution *has ushered in* a new era, the era of *proletarian* revolutions in the countries of *imperialism*.

> It took the instruments and means of production from the landlords and capitalists and converted them into public property, thus counterposing socialist property to bourgeois property. It thereby exposed the lie of the capitalists that bourgeois property is inviolable, sacred, eternal.

It wrested power from the bourgeoisie, deprived the bourgeoisie of political rights, destroyed the bourgeois state apparatus and transferred power to the Soviets, thus counter-posing the socialist rule of the Soviets, as proletarian democracy, to bourgeois parliamentarism, as *capitalist* democracy. Lafargue was right when he said, as far back as 1887, that on the morrow of the revolution "all former capitalists will be disfranchised." [141]

The October Revolution thereby exposed the lie of the Social-Democrats that at the present time a peaceful transition to socialism is possible through bourgeois parliamentarism.

But the October Revolution did not and could not stop there. Having destroyed the old, bourgeois order, it began to build the new, socialist order. The 10 years of the October Revolution

[141] Paul Lafargue, On the Morrow of the Revolution (see Works, Russ. ed., Vol. I, 1925, pp. 329-30).

have been 10 years of building the Party, trade unions, Soviets, co-operatives, cultural organisations, transport, industry, the Red Army. The indubitable successes of socialism in the U.S.S.R. on the front of construction have clearly shown that the proletariat *can* successfully govern the country *without* the bourgeoisie and *against* the bourgeoisie, that it *can* successfully build industry *without* the bourgeoisie and *against* the bourgeoisie, that it *can* successfully direct the whole of the national economy *without* the bourgeoisie and *against* the bourgeoisie, that it *can* successfully build socialism in spite of the capitalist encirclement.

Menenius Agrippa, the famous Roman senator of ancient times, was not the only one to uphold the old "theory" that the exploited cannot do without the exploiters any more than the head and other parts of the body can do without the stomach. This "theory" is now the corner-stone of the political "philosophy" of Social-Democracy in general, and of the Social-Democratic policy of *coalition* with the imperialist bourgeoisie in particular. This "theory," which has acquired the character of a prejudice, is now one of the most serious obstacles in the path towards the revolutionization of the proletariat in the capitalist countries. One of the most important results of the October Revolution is that it dealt this false "theory" a mortal blow.

Is there any further need to prove that these and similar results of the October Revolution could not and cannot fail to exert an important influence on the revolutionary movement of the working class in the capitalist countries?

Such generally known facts as the progressive growth of communism in the capitalist countries, the growing sympathy of the proletarians of all countries for the working class of the U.S.S.R. and, finally, the many workers' delegations that come to the Land of Soviets, prove beyond doubt that the seeds sown by the October Revolution are already beginning to bear fruit.

2. The October Revolution has shaken imperialism not only in the centers of its domination, not only in the "metropolises." It has also struck at the rear of imperialism, its periphery, having undermined the rule of imperialism in the colonial and dependent countries.

Having overthrown the landlords and the capitalists, the October Revolution broke the chains of national and colonial oppression and freed from it, without exception, all the oppressed peoples of a vast state. The proletariat cannot emancipate itself unless it emancipates the oppressed peoples. It is a characteristic feature of the October Revolution that it accomplished these national-colonial revolutions in the U.S.S.R. not under the flag of national enmity and conflicts among nations, but under the flag of mutual confidence and fraternal rapprochement of the workers and peasants of the various peoples in the U.S.S.R., not in the name of *nationalism,* but in the name of *internationalism.*

It is precisely because the national-colonial revolutions took place in our country under the leadership of the proletariat and under the banner of internationalism that pariah peoples, slave peoples, have for the first time in the history of mankind risen to the position of peoples that are *really*

free and *really* equal, thereby setting a contagious example to the oppressed nations of the whole world.

This means that the October Revolution *has ushered in* new era, the era of *colonial* revolutions which are being carried out *in the oppressed countries* of the world *in alliance* with the proletariat and *under the leadership* of the proletariat.

It was formerly the "accepted" idea that the world has been divided from time immemorial into inferior and superior races, into blacks and whites, of whom the former are unfit for civilization and are doomed to be objects of exploitation, while the latter are the only bearers of civilization, whose mission it is to exploit the former.

That legend must now be regarded as shattered and discarded. One of the most important results of the October Revolution is that it dealt that legend a mortal blow, by demonstrating in practice that the liberated non-European peoples, drawn into the channel of Soviet development, are not one whit less capable of promoting a *really* progressive culture and a *really* progressive civilization than are the European peoples.

It was formerly the "accepted" idea that the only method of liberating the oppressed peoples is the method of *bourgeois nationalism,* the method of nations drawing apart from one another, the method of disuniting nations, the method of intensifying national enmity among the laboring masses of the various nations.

That legend must now be regarded as refuted. One of the most important results of the October Revolution is that it dealt that legend a mortal blow, by demonstrating in practice the possibility and expediency of the *proletarian, internationalist* method of liberating the oppressed peoples, as the only correct method; by demonstrating in practice the possibility and expediency of a *fraternal union* of the workers and peasants of the most diverse nations based on the principles of *voluntariness* and *internationalism.* The existence of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is the prototype of the future integration of the working people of all countries into a single world economic system, cannot but serve as direct proof of this.

It need hardly be said that these and similar results of the October Revolution could not and cannot fail to exert an important influence on the revolutionary movement in the colonial and dependent countries. Such facts as the growth of the revolutionary movement of the oppressed peoples in China, Indonesia, India, etc., and the growing sympathy of these peoples for the U.S.S.R., unquestionably bear this out.

The era of tranquil exploitation and oppression of the colonies and dependent countries *has passed away.*

The era of liberating revolutions in the colonies and dependent countries, the era of the awakening of the *proletariat* in those countries, the era of its *hegemony* in the revolution, *has begun*.

3. Having sown the seeds of revolution both in the centers of imperialism and in its rear, having weakened the might of imperialism in the "metropolises" and having shaken its domination in the colonies, the October Revolution has thereby put in jeopardy the very existence of world capitalism *as a whole.*

While the spontaneous development of capitalism in the conditions of imperialism has passed—owing to its unevenness, owing to the inevitability of conflicts and armed collisions, owing, finally, to the unprecedented imperialist slaughter—into the process of the decay and the dying of capitalism, the October Revolution and the resultant dropping out of a vast country from the world system of capitalism could not but accelerate this process, undermining, bit by bit, the very foundations of world imperialism.

More than that. While shaking imperialism, the October Revolution has at the same time created—in the shape of the first proletarian dictatorship—a powerful and open base for the world revolutionary movement, a base such as the latter *never possessed* before and on which it now can rely for support. It has created a powerful and open *centre* of the world revolutionary movement, such as the latter *never possessed* before and around which it can now rally, organizing a *united revolutionary front of the proletarians and of the oppressed peoples of all countries against imperialism.*

This means, firstly, that the October Revolution inflicted a mortal wound on world capitalism from which the latter will never recover. For that very reason capitalism will never recover the "equilibrium" and "stability" that it possessed before October.

Capitalism may become partly stabilized, it may rationalize its production, turn over the administration of the country to fascism, temporarily hold down the working class; but it will never recover the "tranquility," the "assurance," the "equilibrium" and the "stability" that it flaunted before; for the crisis of world capitalism has reached the stage of development when the flames of revolution must inevitably break out, now in the centers of imperialism, now in the periphery, reducing to naught the capitalist patch-work and daily bringing nearer the fall of capitalism. Exactly as in the well-known fable, "when it pulled its tail out of the mud, its beak got stuck; when it pulled its beak out, its tail got stuck."

This means, secondly, that the October Revolution has raised to such a height the strength and importance, the courage and the fighting preparedness of the oppressed classes of the whole world as to compel the ruling classes to reckon with them as a *new,* important factor. Now the laboring masses of the world can no longer be regarded as a "blind mob," groping in the dark and devoid of prospects; for the October Revolution has created a beacon which illumines their path and opens up prospects for them. Whereas formerly there was no *world-wide* open forum from which the aspirations and strivings of the oppressed classes could be expounded and formulated, now such a forum exists in the shape of the first proletarian dictatorship.

There is hardly room for doubt that the destruction of this forum would for a long time cast the gloom of unbridled, black reaction over the social and political life of the "advanced countries." It cannot be denied that the very existence of a "Bolshevik state" puts a curb upon the dark forces of reaction, thus helping the oppressed classes in their struggle for liberation. It is this that explains the savage hatred which the exploiters of all countries entertain for the Bolsheviks.

History repeats itself, though on a new basis. Just as formerly, during the period of the downfall of *feudalism,* the word "Jacobin" evoked dread and abhorrence among the aristocrats of all countries, so now, in the period of the down fall of *capitalism,* the word "Bolshevik" evokes dread and abhorrence among the bourgeois in all countries. And conversely, just as formerly Paris was the refuge and school for the revolutionary representatives of the rising *bourgeoisie,* so now Moscow is the refuge and school for the revolutionary representatives of the rising *proletariat.* Hatred of the Jacobins did not save feudalism from collapse. Can there be any doubt that hatred of the Bolsheviks will not save capitalism from its inevitable downfall?

The era of the "stability" of capitalism *has passed away,* carrying away with it the legend of the indestructibility of the bourgeois order.

The era of the collapse of capitalism *has begun.*

4. The October Revolution cannot be regarded merely as a revolution in the sphere of economic and social-political relations. It is at the same time a revolution in the minds, a revolution in the ideology, of the working class. The October Revolution was born and gained strength under the banner of Marxism, under the banner of the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, under the banner of Leninism, which is Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Hence it marks the victory of Marxism over reformism, the victory of Leninism over Social-Democratism, the victory of the Third International over the Second International.

The October Revolution has brought into being an impassable chasm between Marxism and Social-Democratism, between the policy of Leninism and the policy of Social-Democratism.

Formerly, *before the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat*, Social-Democracy, while refraining from openly repudiating the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat but doing nothing, absolutely nothing, to bring nearer the realization of this idea, could flaunt the banner of Marxism, and it is obvious that this behavior of Social-Democracy created no danger whatever for capitalism. Then, in that period, Social-Democracy was formally identified, or almost completely identified, with Marxism.

Now, *after the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat,* when everybody has seen for himself to what Marxism leads and what its victory may signify, Social-Democracy is no longer able to flaunt the banner of Marxism, can no longer coquet with the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat without creating a certain danger for capitalism. Having long ago broken with the spirit of Marxism, it has found itself compelled to discard also the banner of Marxism; it has openly and unambiguously

taken a stand against the offspring of Marxism, against the October Revolution, against the first dictatorship of the proletariat in the world.

Now it has had to dissociate itself from Marxism, and has actually done so; for under present conditions one cannot call oneself a Marxist unless one openly and devotedly supports the first proletarian dictatorship in the world, unless one wages a revolutionary struggle against one's own bourgeoisie, unless one creates the conditions for the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one's own country.

A chasm has opened between Social-Democracy and Marxism. Henceforth, the only bearer and bulwark of Marxism is Leninism, communism.

But matters did not end there. The October Revolution went further than drawing a demarcation line between Social Democracy and Marxism; it relegated Social-Democracy to the camp of the direct defenders of capitalism against the first proletarian dictatorship in the world. When Messieurs the Adlers and Bauers, the Welses and Levis, the Longuets and Blums abuse the "Soviet regime" and extol parliamentary "democracy," these gentlemen mean that they are fighting and will continue to fight *for* the restoration of the capitalist order in the U.S.S.R., *for* the preservation of capitalist slavery in the "civilized" states.

Present-day Social-Democratism is an *ideological support* of capitalism. Lenin was a thousand times right when he said that the present-day Social-Democratic politicians are "real *agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class* movement, the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class," that in the "civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie" they would inevitably range themselves "on the side of the 'Versaillese' against the 'Communards.'" [142]

It is impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to Social-Democratism in the labor movement. That is why the era of dying capitalism is also the era of dying Social-Democratism in the labor movement.

The great significance of the October Revolution consists, among other things, in the fact that it marks the inevitable victory of Leninism over Social-Democratism in the world labor movement.

The era of the domination of the Second International and of Social-Democratism in the labor movement *has ended.*

The era of the domination of Leninism and of the Third International *has begun.*

Unit 5. The United Front.

Topics covered:

I. The United Front as political detachment of the revolution.

[142] V. I. Lenin, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism (see Works, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 22, p. 182).

II. The worker-peasant alliance.
III. Unity and struggle in the Front.
IV. Deviations in politics of the United Front.

Bibliography:

- Chen Po-ta:
  - Mao Tse-tung on the Chinese Revolution. Chapter VI.
- Dimitrov:
  - The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle of the Working Class against Fascism.
- Lin Piao:
  - Long Live the Victory of the People's War! Correctly Apply the Line and Policy of the United Front.
- Mao Zedong:
  - The Question of Independence and Initiative Within the United Front. Selected Works, Vol. II.
  - Current Problems of Tactics in the Anti-Japanese United Front. Selected Works, Vol. II.
  - Introducing "The Communist". Selected Works, Vol. II.
- Mariátegui:
  - The First of May and the United Front.
  - Collective Letter of the Lima Group.

Selection:

Chen Po-ta: Mao Zedong on the Chinese Revolution.

Section 6: A Broad United Front of Both Unity and Struggle

China was formerly an agricultural country, and in more recent times, as the result of the aggression of the various imperialists, she became an extremely turbulent, semi-colonial country, the focus of the many contradictions in the East, as previously mentioned. Thus, it was possible for the Chinese New Democratic Revolution against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism to make full use of the various contradictions and concentrate all possible forces to defeat the enemies of the people one by one.

In connection with this question, two kinds of mistakes occurred in the history of the Communist Party of China. One kind was Right opportunism: for instance, Chen Tu-hsiu-ism in the revolutionary period from 1924 to 1927 and the Right opportunist mistake committed by some comrades in the early period of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression. The Right opportunists advocated an unprincipled united front, attempting to transform the proletariat into an appendage of the bourgeoisie. Comrade Mao Zedong called this mistake of Right opportunism "all unity and no struggle." Another kind of mistake was that of "Left" opportunism which occurred on three

occasions in the ten-year civil war period. It denied any united front, attempting to place the proletariat, the farm laborers and the poor peasants in an isolated position. Comrade Mao Zedong called this mistake of "Left" opportunism "all struggle and no unity."

Obviously, it was a great mistake to deny the possibility of a broad united front in the Chinese revolution and the necessity of such a broad united front under certain conditions. In August, 1927, when refuting the Trotskyites in relation to the Chinese problem, Stalin pointed out that the basic starting point of Leninism in solving revolutionary problems in the colonial and dependent countries is to distinguish strictly between the revolution in imperialist countries and the revolution in countries that are oppressed by the imperialist countries. The bourgeoisie in the former countries is different from the national bourgeoisie in the latter. The difference is that the bourgeoisie in imperialist countries is the oppressor of the people of other countries,

"Opposed to revolution in every stage of the revolution," while the national bourgeoisie in countries oppressed by imperialism "will be able to support the revolutionary movement of its own country against imperialism at a certain stage and for a certain period." [143]

In other words, it is possible for the proletariat in the colonial and semi-colonial countries to establish a revolutionary united front with the national bourgeoisie under certain historical conditions.

Of course, in this united front, the proletariat must not obscure its own independent face and must absolutely maintain the independent character of the proletarian movement. The proletariat must build up its own leading position in the united front. This principle was also laid down by Lenin and Stalin.

In accordance with the experience of the Chinese revolution, especially the experiences of the united front set up between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang, Comrade Mao Zedong developed these viewpoints of Lenin and Stalin and created a set of complete and correct policies concerning the united front in the Chinese revolution.

Comrade Mao Zedong called the policy of the united front of the Chinese Communist Party with the bourgeoisie, especially the policy towards the Kuomintang big bourgeoisie in the period of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression a policy of both unity and struggle. The reason why it called for both unity and struggle were that the Chinese bourgeoisie possessed a dual character. The closed-doorism of the "Left" did not realize the dual character of the Chinese bourgeoisie and therefore denied the possibility and necessity of unity; the Right opportunists also did not realize the dual character of the Chinese bourgeoisie and therefore denied the necessity for struggle. The correct

[143] *J. V. Stalin's speech delivered on August 1, 1927 at a joint plenary session of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.*

policy of Comrade Mao Zedong was to carry out a resolute and serious struggle on two fronts against both Right and "Left" opportunism.

The dangerous character of these two forms of opportunism was different in various periods. The history of the Chinese revolution proves that before the united front with the bourgeoisie was formed, "Left" closed-doorism was the main danger to the Party; but after the united front was already formed, Right capitulationism was often the main danger to the Party. For instance, during the period of the Second Revolutionary Civil War in China, from 1927 to 1936, the "Left" opportunists even denied the possibility and necessity of a united front with the petty bourgeoisie in general, and regarded as the most dangerous enemies of the revolution some small parties of the petty bourgeoisie and some sections of the national bourgeoisie that were not in power. In 1931, the invasion of Northeast China by Japanese imperialism gave rise to new changes in the political relations of classes in China, but there was still no change in the views of the "Left" opportunists. This "Left" opportunism was the main danger at that time because it hindered the Party from linking itself with the broad masses and hindered the Party from having the possibility of fully utilizing all contradictions to facilitate the revolution. But in 1937 after the Anti-Japanese National United Front was formed, some comrades who had committed "Left" opportunist mistakes, as represented by Comrade Chen Shao-yu, began to commit Right opportunist mistakes instead. These Right opportunist mistakes were the main danger at that time because they hindered the Party from struggling against reactionary forces and reactionary trends in the united front and exposed the proletariat to the danger of losing its independence.

During the period of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression the united front even included that clique of the Kuomintang which was in power, with Chiang Kai-shek as its representative, the clique of the pro-Anglo-American big landlords and big bourgeoisie which had carried on cruel warfare against the Communist Party for ten years. It was necessary to include this clique in the united front because at that time it commanded large military forces, and at that time, American imperialism and Japanese imperialism were in conflict, fighting for supremacy in the Far East. After this broad anti-Japanese united front was formed, Comrade Mao Zedong, using the method of class analysis, pointed out that within this united front, there existed a left, middle and right group and proposed the policy of enlarging and consolidating the left-wing group, of urging the middle group to progress and change and of isolating the right-wing group, i.e., a policy "of developing the progressive forces, of winning over the middle forces and of isolating the diehard forces." But comrades who committed Right opportunist mistakes opposed the policy of Comrade Mao Zedong and ignored the class distinctions in the united front. In opposition to the policy of Comrade Mao Zedong, they proposed to make "no distinction between left, middle and right," denied the existence of fascism in China and even ignored the class distinction between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang. They regarded both the Kuomintang and the Communist Party as "the confluence of most of the excellent, progressive Chinese youth." (See Key to Saving the

Present Situation by Comrade Chen Shao-yu, published in December, 1937.) This viewpoint of the Right opportunists was in fact protecting the diehard elements of Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang.

Comrades committing this Right opportunist mistake denied the principle of "independence and autonomy in the united front" as proposed by Comrade Mao Zedong in the period of the War of Resistance, and in fact advocated that everything must be decided by Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang government. Militarily, comrades committing this Right opportunist mistake advocated "unifying the command, organisation, arms, discipline, war plans and war operations." As a matter of fact, this would have meant merging the people's army led by the Communist Party into the army of the Kuomintang and letting Chiang Kai-shek swallow it as he pleased. This coincided perfectly with the counter-revolutionary demand for the so-called "unification of military and administrative orders" later proposed by Chiang Kai-shek. Just as Comrade Mao Zedong said, these comrades

> "... made concessions to the Kuomintang's policies against the people; had greater trust in the Kuomintang than in the masses; lacked the courage to launch mass struggles with a free hand or to expand the Liberated Areas and the people's army in the Japanese-occupied areas; and, in fine, surrendered the leading role in the Anti-Japanese War to the Kuomintang." [144]

When explaining the principle of "independence and autonomy in the united front," Comrade Mao Zedong said:

"What then is our purpose in doing so? In one respect, it is to maintain the foothold that we have already gained. This foothold is the take-off base in our strategy; once it is lost, then nothing further can be said. But the chief purpose lies in another aspect, namely, to expand one foothold to realize the positive aim of 'mobilizing millions upon millions of the masses to join the Anti-Japanese National United Front and overthrow Japanese imperialism.'" [145]

The political principles and the principles on war strategy laid down by Comrade Mao Zedong and the series of policies formulated in accordance with these principles were to lead to the great general aim of turning the outcome of the War of Resistance into a victorious outcome for the people. These problems of principle and policy were decisive in bringing about such an outcome.

However, as the Right opportunist viewpoint and policy, first of all, abandoned the positions that had been taken, there was nothing to speak of expanding those positions. Consequently, the Right opportunist mistakes committed by some comrades could not but lead to a conclusion directly opposite to Comrade Mao Zedong's. For instance, at that time, in his article *Key to Saving the Present Situation*, Comrade Chen Shao-yu made the following estimate of the perspective of the War of Resistance:

---

[144] *The Present Situation and Our Task.*

[145] *The Situation and Tasks in the Anti-Japanese War After the Fall of Shanghai and Taiyuan.*

"The actual situation in China is: If the Kuomintang and the Communist Party of China, through their cooperation, can drive out the Japanese invaders and gain victory, then the Kuomintang will in fact prove itself the biggest political party fighting for the national existence of the Chinese people, and the leader of the Kuomintang Mr. Chiang and other persons who firmly lead the War of Resistance will become immortal national heroes of China. When that time comes, who will be able to violate the will of the Chinese people by carrying on a struggle to overthrow the Kuomintang?

"Therefore, it can be said that those who believe in the rumor that 'after the victory of the War of Resistance, China will belong to the Communist Soviet' are not only unfamiliar with the actual situation in China but also have no confidence in the fighting strength and brilliant perspective of the Chinese Kuomintang. Obviously, this is a very harmful thing."

This opinion meant that after the victory in the War of Resistance, China would still have to be the China of the most reactionary Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang and could not be the China of People's Democracy led by the Communist Party. This was the inevitable logical conclusion derived from the series of Right opportunist viewpoints and the incorrect policy of the Right opportunists at that time. This was precisely the ignominious conclusion which was very harmful to the fighting strength and brilliant perspectives of the Chinese people. The fighting life of the Chinese people, however, has long since overthrown this ignominious conclusion. Entirely contrary to Comrade Chen Shao-yu's estimate, Chiang Kai-shek turned out to be a traitor "whom every person in the country considers worthy of death," while the genuine immortal national heroes, those who will perpetually light up the way along which the Chinese people advance are the innumerable Communist Party members and people's warriors who have won our praise and respect. Thus, it can be said that it was none other than the Right opportunists who were themselves most unfamiliar with and wholly ignorant of the actual situation in China. The comrades who committed Right opportunist mis-takes desired to maintain unity with Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang by one-sided and passive concessions. This was utterly wrong. Comrade Mao Zedong, contrary to the Right opportunist comrades, advocated the adoption of a policy of active struggle as a means to unite all the anti-Japanese forces. Comrade Mao Zedong said:

"In the period of the anti-Japanese united front, struggles are the means to solidarity and solidarity is the end of struggles. Solidarity exists when sought through struggles and disappears when sought through concessions." [146]

The events that took place in the country throughout the period of the War of Resistance testified perfectly to this truth stated by Comrade Mao Zedong. With regard to the united front, our Party, in accordance with the policy of Comrade Mao Zedong, resolutely adopted a revolutionary twofold policy of unity and struggle to cope with the double-dealing policy of the Kuomintang big

[146] *Problems of Tactics in the Present Anti-Japanese United Front.*

bourgeoisie of resisting Japan and at the same time preparing to surrender, and of uniting with the Communist Party while at the same time opposing it. As a result, our Party unrestrainedly mobilized the broad masses, united all possible forces that were against Japan, stabilized the vacillating elements, isolated the diehard clique, repulsed Chiang Kai-shek's repeated anti-Communist campaigns, and consequently persisted in the War of Resistance and maintained the anti-Japanese united front to the very end.

On the one hand, the Right opportunists completely failed to understand that our united front with Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang during the period of the War of Resistance was based on the people's armed forces. Chiang Kai-shek was compelled to join the united front. If there had been no people's armed forces, Chiang Kai-shek would certainly not have established any kind of united front with us. On the other hand, the Right opportunists completely failed to understand that after Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang had been compelled to establish a united front with us, he was constantly attempting, relying on his counter-revolutionary armed forces, to use every means and every chance to attack us and to eliminate the Communist Party and the people's armed forces. This was the reason why we had to rely on the armed forces of the people in order to carry out justified, advantageous and restrained struggles against such counter-revolutionary attacks by Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang. Comrade Mao Zedong criticized the mistakes of the Right opportunists on these two basic points, pointing out that this union against Japan was mainly a union of armed forces, that struggle within the united front was inevitable, and that should Chiang Kai-shek, in co-ordination with the Japanese aggressors, launch armed attacks upon the people's armed forces and the anti-Japanese bases, we must not let him run wild but must carry on such just and necessary armed struggles in self-defense as are justified, advantageous and restrained. As a matter of fact, when, in co-ordination with the Japanese aggressors, Chiang Kai-shek launched armed attacks against the Communist Party on three occasions, the Communist Party of China was by no means daunted by these counter-revolutionary assaults but, on the contrary, resolutely repulsed them and thus safeguarded the people's armed forces and anti-Japanese bases and won victory in the War of Resistance.

Concerning the struggle against the diehard clique of the Kuomintang in the anti-Japanese united front, in addition to the Right opportunist viewpoint that the struggle would split the united front, there was the "Left" opportunist viewpoint that the struggle could be carried on without any limits, as well as that which adopted an incorrect policy towards the middle-of-the-road forces. Comrade Mao Zedong criticized not only the Right opportunist viewpoint but also the "Left" opportunist viewpoint. In order to prevent the possibility of any "Left" opportunist mistake at the time, Comrade Mao Zedong raised his three well-known principles in the struggle against the diehard clique of the Kuomintang. The principles were "justified," "advantageous" and "restrained." By "restrained" is meant that a struggle should stop at an appropriate stage. Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out:

"Persisting in such justified, advantageous and restrained struggle, we can develop the progressive forces, win over the middle-of-the-road forces, isolate the diehard forces, and make the diehards wary of heedlessly attacking us, or heedlessly compromising with the enemy, or heedlessly starting a large-scale civil war." [147]

The policy of unity with the bourgeois diehards as well as struggle against them in the national united front was the realization of

"The consistency of the national struggle with the class struggle" [148]

as once explained by Comrade Mao Zedong. This is the art of revolution which Comrade Mao Zedong has very successfully practiced. This is the Marxist-Leninist art of revolution. During the War of Resistance, this policy of Mao Zedong, a policy of unity as well as struggle isolated the diehard forces to the greatest extent, won over the middle-of-the-road forces, developed the progressive forces and fully pre-pared the Communist Party and the people ideologically, politically, organizationally and militarily. Consequently, after the surrender of Japan, the Communist Party of China was able to lead the people in two or three years to steadily and unhurriedly smash the counter-revolutionary war against the Chinese people which was launched by American imperialism and its faithful lackey Chiang Kai-shek, overthrow the last counter-revolutionary dynasty in China head-ed by Chiang Kai-shek and achieve the victory for which the Chinese people had striven for a hundred years.

During the period of the War of Resistance, the national bourgeoisie, the middle class, formed a middle force between the workers, peasants and other petty-bourgeois elements on the one hand and the big landlords, and big bourgeoisie represented by Chiang Kai-shek on the other. The Communist Party of China adopted a policy of winning over the middle force. At that time, Comrade Mao Zedong explained the situation:

"Although there are class contradictions between it and the workers and it does not approve of the independence of the working class, yet, as it is oppressed by Japanese imperialism in the enemy-occupied areas and restricted by the big landlord class and the big bourgeoisie under Kuomintang rule, it still wants to resist Japan and win political power for itself. On the question of resistance to Japan, it favors solidarity in resistance; and on the question of winning political power, it favors the movement for constitutional government and attempts to achieve its objective by exploiting the contradictions between the progressives and the diehards. It is a stratum that we must win over." [149]

A policy of unity was adopted towards the revolutionary potentialities of the national bourgeoisie and a policy of criticism was adopted towards its wavering and compromising character, the policy of criticism being another form of struggle. This policy of criticism was different from the

[147] *Ibid.*
[148] *Problems of Independence and Autonomy within the United Front.*
[149] *Problems of Tactics in the Present Anti-Japanese United Front.*

form of struggle against the diehard clique in the Kuomintang, because the national bourgeoisie was not in power. It was, however, also a kind of combined policy of unity and struggle. This policy aimed at stiffening the attitude of the national bourgeoisie in the struggle against imperialism.

After the War of Resistance had come to an end the national bourgeoisie continued to suffer from the restriction and oppression of the big landlords and bureaucratic bourgeoisie (the big bourgeoisie) represented by Chiang Kai-shek. And after the Japanese oppression was overthrown, American oppression came in its stead, which also harmed the interests of the national bourgeoisie. Thus, there existed the possibility of the continuation of the united front between the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie. The question remained much the same: to adopt a policy of unity towards its revolutionary potentialities and to adopt a policy of criticism and struggle towards its wavering and compromising character.

Comrade Mao Zedong also pointed out that because of the backwardness of China's economy, it would still be necessary after the victory of the revolution to carry on an economic united front with the national bourgeoisie.

Of course, as explained by Comrade Mao Zedong, the economic united front must conform to the twofold policy of both unity and struggle. A policy of unity should be adopted towards the enthusiasm of the bourgeoisie to develop industrial production; while a policy of struggle should be adopted towards speculation, manipulation and monopoly by the bourgeoisie, and its violation of Government laws, decrees and economic plans.

The events of the last few years have consistently proved the correctness of Comrade Mao Zedong's policy:

> "In order to offset imperialist pressure and to push her backward economy a step forward, China must utilize all elements of urban and rural capitalism which are beneficial and not harmful to the national economy and the people's livelihood. She must unite with the national bourgeoisie in the common struggle."

Its correctness can be discerned in the various financial and economic achievements of the People's Republic of China; and also, in such massive people's movements as the Resist-American-Aggression and Aid-Korea Movement, the suppression of the counter-revolutionaries and the agrarian reform.

The events of recent years have continuously proved that Right opportunism was wrong because it attempted to sacrifice the independence, autonomy, and leading position of the proletariat in the united front and therefore inevitably sacrificed the victory of the people. Likewise, these events have continuously proved that "Left" opportunism was also wrong because, at the time when it was necessary and possible to isolate the enemies of the revolution to the greatest extent, it tended to isolate ourselves and thereby benefited the enemy.

Chapter 1: Fascism and the Working Class

Comrades, as early as the Sixth Congress [1928], the Communist International warned the world proletariat that a new fascist offensive was under way and called for a struggle against it. The Congress pointed out that 'in a more or less developed form, fascist tendencies and the germs of a fascist movement are to be found almost everywhere.'

With the development of the very deep economic crisis, with the general crisis of capitalism becoming sharply accentuated and the mass of working people becoming revolutionized, fascism has embarked upon a wide offensive. The ruling bourgeoisie more and more seeks salvation in fascism, with the object of taking exceptional predatory measures against the working people, preparing for an imperialist war of plunder, attacking the Soviet Union, enslaving and partitioning China, and by all these means preventing revolution.

The imperialist circles are trying to shift the *whole* burden of the crisis onto the shoulders of the working people. *That is why they need fascism.*

They are trying to solve the problem of markets by enslaving the weak nations, by intensifying colonial oppression and repartitioning the world anew by means of war. *That is why they need fascism.*

They are striving to *forestall* the growth of the forces of revolution by smashing the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants and by undertaking a military attack against the Soviet Union -- the bulwark of the world proletariat. *That is why they need fascism.*

In a number of countries, Germany in particular, these imperialist circles have succeeded, *before* the masses had decisively turned towards revolution, in inflicting defeat on the proletariat, and establishing a fascist dictatorship.

But it is characteristic of the victory of fascism that this victory, on the one hand, bears witness to the weakness of the proletariat, disorganized and paralyzed by the disruptive Social-Democratic policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and, on the other, expresses the weakness of the bourgeoisie itself, afraid of the realization of a united struggle of the working class, afraid of revolution, and no longer in a position to maintain its dictatorship over the masses by the old methods of bourgeois democracy and parliamentarism.

Section: The Class Character of Fascism

Comrades, fascism in power was correctly described by the Thirteenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International *as the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital.*

The most reactionary variety of fascism is the *German type* of fascism. It has the effrontery to call itself National Socialism, though it has nothing in common with socialism. German fascism is not

only bourgeois nationalism; it is fiendish chauvinism. It is a government system of political gangsterism, a system of provocation and torture practiced upon the working class and the revolutionary elements of the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia. It is medieval barbarity and bestiality; it is unbridled aggression in relation to other nations.

German fascism is acting *as the spearhead of international counter-revolution, as the chief instigator of imperialist war, as the initiator of a crusade against the Soviet Union, the great fatherland of the working people of the whole world.*

Fascism is not a form of state power "standing above both classes -- the proletariat and the bourgeoisie," as Otto Bauer, for instance, has asserted. It is not "the revolt of the petty bourgeoisie which has captured the machinery of the state," as the British Socialist Brailsford declares. No, fascism is not a power standing above class, nor government of the petty bourgeoisie or the *lumpen-proletariat* over finance capital. Fascism is the power of finance capital itself. It is the organization of terrorist vengeance against the working class and the revolutionary section of the peasantry and intelligentsia. In foreign policy, fascism is jingoism in its most brutal form, fomenting bestial hatred of other nations.

This, the true character of fascism, must be particularly stressed because in a number of countries, under cover of social demagogy, fascism has managed to gain the following of the mass of the petty bourgeoisie that has been dislocated by the crisis, and even of certain sections of the most backward strata of the proletariat. These would never have supported fascism if they had understood its real character and its true nature.

The development of fascism, and the fascist dictatorship itself, assume *different forms* in different countries, according to historical, social and economic conditions and to the national peculiarities, and the international position of the given country. In certain countries, principally those in which fascism has no broad mass basis and in which the struggle of the various groups within the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie itself is rather acute, fascism does not immediately venture to abolish parliament, but allows the other bourgeois parties, as well as the Social-Democratic Parties, to retain a modicum of legality. In other countries, where the ruling bourgeoisie fears an *early* outbreak of revolution, fascism establishes its unrestricted political monopoly, either immediately or by intensifying its reign of terror against and persecution of all rival parties and groups. This does not prevent fascism, when its position becomes *particularly* acute, from trying to extend its basis and, without altering its class nature, trying *to combine* open terrorist dictatorship with a crude sham of parliamentarism.

The accession to power of fascism is not an *ordinary succession* of one bourgeois government by another, but a *substitution* of one state form of class domination of the bourgeoisie -- bourgeois democracy -- by another form -- open terrorist dictatorship. It would be a serious mistake to ignore this distinction, a mistake liable to prevent the revolutionary proletariat from mobilizing the widest strata of the working people of town and country for the struggle against the menace of the seizure of

power by the fascists, and from taking advantage of the contradictions which exist in the camp of the bourgeoisie itself. But it is a mistake, no less serious and dangerous, to *underrate* the importance, for the establishment of fascist dictatorship, of the *reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie at present increasingly developing in bourgeois-democratic* countries -- measures which suppress the democratic liberties of the working people, falsify and curtail the rights of parliament and intensify the repression of the revolutionary movement.

Comrades, the accession to power of fascism must not be conceived of in so simplified and smooth a form, as though some committee or other of finance capital decided on a certain date to set up a fascist dictatorship. In reality, fascism usually comes to power in the course of a mutual, and at times severe, struggle against the old bourgeois parties, or a definite section of these parties, in the course of a struggle even within the fascist camp itself -- a struggle which at times leads to armed clashes, as we have witnessed in the case of Germany, Austria and other countries. All this, however, does not make less important the fact that, before the establishment of a fascist dictatorship, bourgeois governments usually pass through a number of preliminary stages and adopt a number of reactionary measures which directly facilitate the accession to power of fascism. Whoever does not fight the reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie and the growth of fascism at these preparatory stages *is not in a position to prevent the victory of fascism, but, on the contrary, facilitates that victory.*

The Social-Democratic leaders glossed over and concealed from the masses the true class nature of fascism, and did not call them to the struggle against the increasingly reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie. They bear great *historical responsibility* for the fact that, at the decisive moment of the fascist offensive, a large section of the working people of Germany and of a number of other fascist countries failed to recognize in fascism the most bloodthirsty monster of finance capital, their most vicious enemy, and that these masses were not prepared to resist it.

What is the source of the influence of fascism over the masses? Fascism is able to attract the masses because it demagogically appeals to their *most urgent needs and demands.* Fascism not only inflames prejudices that are deeply ingrained in the masses, but also plays on the better sentiments of the masses, on their sense of justice and sometimes even on their revolutionary traditions. Why do the German fascists, those lackeys of the bourgeoisie and mortal enemies of socialism, represent themselves to the masses as "Socialists," and depict their accession to power as a "revolution"? Because they try to exploit the faith in revolution and the urge towards socialism that lives in the hearts of the mass of working people in Germany.

Fascism acts in the interests of the extreme imperialists, but it presents itself to the masses in the guise of champion of an ill-treated nation, and appeals to outraged national sentiments, as German fascism did, for instance, when it won the support of the masses of the petty bourgeoisie by the slogan "Down with the Versailles Treaty."

Fascism aims at the most unbridled exploitation of the masses but it approaches them with the most artful anti-capitalist demagogy, taking advantage of the deep hatred of the working people against the plundering bourgeoisie, the banks, trusts and financial magnates, and advancing those slogans which at the given moment are most alluring to the politically immature masses. In Germany -- "The general welfare is higher than the welfare of the individual," in Italy -- "Our state is not a capitalist, but a corporate state," in Japan -- "For Japan without exploitation," in the United States -- "Share the wealth," and so forth.

Fascism delivers up the people to be devoured by the most corrupt and venal elements, but comes before them with the demand for "an honest and incorruptible government." Speculating on the profound disillusionment of the masses in bourgeois-democratic governments, fascism hypocritically denounces corruption.

It is in the interests of the most reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie that fascism intercepts the disappointed masses who desert the old bourgeois parties. But it impresses these masses by the *vehemence of its attacks* on the bourgeois governments and its irreconcilable attitude to the old bourgeois parties.

Surpassing in its cynicism and hypocrisy all other varieties of bourgeois reaction, fascism *adapts* its demagogy to the national *peculiarities* of each country, and even to the peculiarities of the various social strata in one and the same country. And the mass of the petty bourgeoisie and even a section of the workers, reduced to despair by want, unemployment and the insecurity of their existence, fall victim to the social and chauvinist demagogy of fascism.

Fascism comes to power as a *party of attack* on the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, on the mass of the people who are in a state of unrest; yet it stages its accession to power as a "revolutionary" movement against the bourgeoisie on behalf of "the whole nation" and for the "salvation" of the nation. One recalls Mussolini's "march" on Rome, Pilsudski's "march" on Warsaw, Hitler's National-Socialist "revolution" in Germany, and so forth.

But whatever the masks that fascism adopts, whatever the forms in which it presents itself, whatever the ways by which it comes to power

- *Fascism is a most ferocious attack by capital on the mass of the working people;*
- *Fascism is unbridled chauvinism and predatory war;*
- *Fascism is rabid reaction and counter-revolution;*
- *Fascism is the most vicious enemy of the working class and of all working people.*

Section: What Does Fascist Victory Bring to the Masses?

Fascism promised the workers "a fair wage," but actually it has brought them an even lower, a pauper, standard of living. It promised work for the unemployed, but actually it has brought them

even more painful torments of starvation and forced servile labor. In practice it converts the workers and unemployed into pariahs of capitalist society stripped of rights; destroys their trade unions; deprives them of the right to strike and to have their working-class press, forces them into fascist organizations, plunders their social insurance funds and transforms the mills and factories into barracks where the unbridled arbitrary rule of the capitalist reigns.

Fascism promised the working youth a broad highway to a brilliant future. But actually, it has brought wholesale dismissals of young workers, labor camps and incessant military drilling for a war of conquest.

Fascism promised to guarantee *office workers, petty officials* and *intellectuals* security of existence, to destroy the omnipotence of the trusts and wipe out profiteering by bank capital. But actually, it has brought them an ever-greater degree of despair and uncertainty as to the morrow; it is subjecting them to a new bureaucracy made up of the most submissive of its followers, it is setting up an intolerable dictatorship of the trusts and spreading corruption and degeneration to an unprecedented extent.

Fascism promised the ruined and impoverished peasants to put an end to debt bondage, to abolish rent and even to expropriate the landed estates without compensation, in the interests of the landless and ruined peasants. But actually, it is placing the laboring peasants in a state of unprecedented servitude to the trusts and the fascist state apparatus, and pushes to the utmost limit the exploitation of the great mass of the peasantry by the big landowners, the banks and the usurers.

"Germany will be a peasant country, or will not be at all," Hitler solemnly declared. And what did the peasants of Germany get under Hitler? The moratorium, [150] which has already been cancelled? Or the law on the inheritance of peasant property, which leads to millions of sons and daughters of peasants being squeezed out of the villages and reduced to paupers? Farm laborers have been transformed into semi-serfs, deprived even of the elementary right of free movement. The working peasants have been deprived of the opportunity of selling the product of their farms in the market.

And in Poland?

The Polish peasant, says the Polish newspaper *Czas*, employs methods and means Which were used perhaps only in the Middle Ages; he nurses the fire in his stove and lends it to his neighbor; he splits matches into several parts; he lends dirty soap water to others; he boils herring barrels in order to obtain salt water. This is not a fable, but the actual state of affairs in the countryside, of the truth of which anybody may convince himself.

And it is not Communists who write this, Comrades, but a Polish reactionary newspaper.

[150] Moratorium -- A deferment, or suspension of payment, usually under extraordinary circumstances, such as war pestilence, natural calamities, etc. Hitler, to win over the middle and small peasant masses, proclaimed a moratorium of their debts to the state at the very beginning of his rule, but failed to fulfil his promise.

But this is by no means all.

Every day, in the concentration camps of fascist Germany, in the cellars of the Gestapo (German secret police), in the torture chambers of Poland, in the cells of the Bulgarian and Finnish secret police, in the *Glavnyacha* in Belgrade, in the Rumanian *Siguranza* and on the Italian islands, the best sons of the working class, revolutionary peasants, fighters for the splendid future of mankind, are being subjected to revolting tortures and indignities, before which pale the most abominable acts of the tsarist *Okhranka*. [151] The blackguardly German fascists beat husbands to a bloody pulp in the presence of their wives, and send the ashes of murdered sons by parcel post to their mothers. Sterilization has been made a method of political warfare. In the torture chambers, imprisoned anti-fascists are given injections of poison, their arms are broken, their eyes gouged out; they are strung up and have water pumped into them; the fascist swastika is carved in their living flesh.

I have before me a statistical summary drawn up by the International Red Aid *[international organization of that time for aid to revolutionary fighters]* regarding the number of killed, wounded, arrested, maimed and tortured to death in Germany, Poland, Italy, Austria, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. In Germany alone, since the National-Socialists came to power, over 4,200 anti-fascist workers, peasants, employees, intellectuals -- Communists, Social Democrats and members of opposition Christian organizations -- have been murdered, 317,800 arrested, 218,600 injured and subjected to torture. In Austria, since the battles of February last year the "Christian" fascist government has murdered 1,900 revolutionary workers, maimed and injured 10,000 and arrested 40,000. And this summary, comrades is far from complete.

Words fail me in describing the indignation which seizes us at the thought of the torments which the working people are now undergoing in a number of fascist countries. The facts and figures we quote do not reflect *one hundredth part of the true picture* of the exploitation and tortures inflicted by the White terror and forming part of the daily life of the working class in many capitalist countries. Volumes cannot give a just picture of the countless brutalities inflicted by fascism on the working people.

With feelings of profound emotion and hatred for the fascist butchers, we dip the banners of the Communist International before the unforgettable memory of John Scheer, Fiete Schulze and Luttgens in Germany, Koloman Wallisch and Munichreiter in Austria, Sallai and Furst in Hungary, Kofardjiev, Lyutibrodski and Voykov in Bulgaria -- before the memory of thousands and thousands of Communists, Social-Democrats and non-party workers, peasants and representatives of the progressive intelligentsia who have laid down their lives in the struggle against fascism.

From this platform we greet the leader of the German proletariat and the honorary chairman of our Congress -- Comrade Thaelmann. We greet Comrades Rakosi, Gramsci, Antikainen. We greet

[151] Tsarist Okhrana -- Gendarme institution in Tsarist Russia, set up at the Police Department in 1881 to combat the revolutionary movement, dissolved during the February Bourgeois Democratic Revolution in 1917.

Tom Mooney, who has been languishing in prison for eighteen years, and the thousands of other prisoners of capitalism and fascism, and we say to them: "Brothers in the fight, brothers in arms, you are not forgotten. We are with you. We shall give every hour of our lives, every drop of our blood, for your liberation, and for the liberation of all working people from the shameful regime of fascism."

Comrades, it was Lenin who warned us that the bourgeoisie may succeed in overwhelming the working people by savage terror, in checking the growing forces of revolution for brief periods of time, but that, nevertheless, this would not save it from its doom.

> Life will assert itself -- Lenin wrote -- Let the bourgeoisie rave, work itself into a frenzy, overdo things, commit stupidities, take vengeance on the Bolsheviks in advance and endeavor to kill off (in India, Hungary, Germany, etc.) hundreds, thousands and hundreds of thousands more of yesterday's and tomorrow's Bolsheviks. Acting thus, the bourgeoisie acts as all classes doomed by history have acted. Communists should know that the future, at any rate, belongs to them; therefore, we can and must combine the most intense passion in the great revolutionary struggle with the coolest and most sober evaluation of the mad ravings of the bourgeoisie. *[V. I. Lenin,* ***"Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder,*** *New York (1949), pp. 81-82;* ***Collected Works*** *31:101]*

Ay, if we and the proletariat of the whole world firmly follow the path indicated by Lenin, the bourgeoisie will perish in spite of everything.

Section: Is the Victory of Fascism Inevitable?

Why was it that fascism could triumph, and how? Fascism is the most vicious enemy of the working class and working people, who constitute nine-tenths of the German people, nine-tenths of the Austrian people, nine-tenths of the people in other fascist countries. How, in what way, could this vicious enemy triumph?

Fascism was able to come to power *primarily* because the working class, owing to the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie pursued by the Social-Democratic leaders, *proved to be split, politically and organizationally disarmed*, in face of the onslaught of the bourgeoisie. And the Communist Parties, on the other hand, apart from and in opposition to the Social-Democrats, *were not strong enough* to rouse the masses and to lead them in a decisive struggle against fascism.

And, indeed, let the millions of Social-Democratic workers, who together with their Communist brothers are now experiencing the horrors of fascist barbarism, seriously reflect on the following: If, in 1918, when revolution broke out in Germany and Austria, the Austrian and German proletariat had not followed the Social Democratic leadership of Otto Bauer, Friedrich Adler and Karl Renner in Austria and Ebert and Scheidemann in Germany, but had followed the road of the Russian Bolsheviks, the road of Lenin, there would now be no fascism in Austria or Germany, in Italy or Hungary, in Poland or in the Balkans. Not the bourgeoisie, but the working class would long ago have been the master of the situation in Europe.

Take, for example, the *Austrian* Social-Democratic Party. The revolution of 1918 raised it to a tremendous height. It held the power in its hands; it held strong positions in the army and in the state apparatus. Relying on these positions, it could have nipped fascism in the bud. But it surrendered one position of the working class after another without resistance. It allowed the bourgeoisie to strengthen its power, annul the constitution, purge the state apparatus, army and police force of Social-Democratic functionaries, and take the arsenals away from the workers. It allowed the fascist bandits to murder Social-Democratic workers with impunity and accepted the terms of the Hüttenberg Pact, [152] which gave the fascist elements entry to the factories. At the same time the Social-Democratic leaders fooled the workers with the Linz program, [153] which contained the alternative possibility of using armed force against the bourgeoisie and establishing the proletarian dictatorship, assuring them that in the event of the ruling class using force against the working class, the Party would reply by a call for general strike and for armed struggle. As though the whole policy of preparation for a fascist attack on the working class were not one chain of acts of violence against the working class masked by constitutional forms. Even on the eve and in the course of the February battles the Austrian Social Democratic leaders left the heroically fighting Schutzbund [154] isolated from the broad masses, and doomed the Austrian proletariat to defeat.

Was the victory of fascism inevitable in *Germany?* No, the German working class could have prevented it.

But in order to do so, it should have achieved a united anti-fascist proletarian front, and forced the Social-Democratic leaders to discontinue their campaign against the Communists and to accept the repeated proposals of the Communist Party for united action against fascism.

When fascism was on the offensive and the bourgeois-democratic liberties were being progressively abolished by the bourgeoisie, it should not have contented itself with the verbal resolutions of the Social-Democrats, but should have replied by a genuine mass struggle, which would have made the fulfilment of the fascist plans of the German bourgeoisie more difficult.

It should not have allowed the prohibition of the League of Red Front Fighters by the government of Braun and Severing, [155] and should have established fighting contact between the

---

[152] In the autumn of 1922, the reactionary government of Seipel, President of the Christian-Social Party and agent of big business, the landowners and the Vatican, concluded a pact with the German National Party for the establishment of a government of the so-called anti-Marxist front, which would comprise all the reactionary forces in the struggle against the workers' movement.

[153] Referring to the program adopted by the Congress of the Social-Democratic Party in Linz.

[154] Schutzbund -- Social-Democratic para-military organization in Austria.

[155] The Social-Democratic Government of Braun and Severing ruled Prussia from 1920 to 1932, pursuing a policy inimical to the Communist Party and the working masses, suppressing the Red Front mass organization, using police force to smash every action of the proletariat and forming an armed force of the bourgeoisie. When von Papen organized a coup d'état in Prussia in July 1932, overthrowing the Social-Democratic Government, Braun and Severing, although they had armed forces at their disposal, ignominiously capitulated together with the other leaders of the German Social-Democratic party.

League and the Reichsbanner, [156] with its nearly one million members, and should have compelled Braun and Severing to arm both these organizations in order to resist and smash the fascist bands.

It should have compelled the Social-Democratic leaders who headed the Prussian government to adopt measures of defense against fascism, arrest the fascist leaders, close down their press, confiscate their material resources and the resources of the capitalists who were financing the fascist movement, dissolve the fascist organizations, deprive them of their weapons, and so forth.

Furthermore, it should have secured the re-establishment and extension of all forms of social assistance and the introduction of a moratorium and crisis benefits for the peasants -- who were being ruined under the impact of crisis -- by taxing the banks and the trusts, in this way winning the support of the working peasants. It was the fault of the Social-Democrats of Germany that this was not done, and that is why fascism was able to triumph.

Was it inevitable that the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy should have triumphed in Spain, a country where the forces of proletarian revolt are so advantageously combined with a peasant war?

The Spanish Socialists were in the government from the first days of the revolution. Did they establish fighting contact between the working-class organizations of every political opinion, including the Communists and the Anarchists, and did they weld the working class into a united trade union organization? Did they demand the confiscation of all lands of the landlords, the church and the monasteries in favor of the peasants in order to win over the latter to the side of the revolution? Did they attempt to fight for national self-determination for the Catalonians and the Basques, and for the liberation of Morocco? Did they purge the army of monarchist and fascist elements and prepare it for passing over to the side of the workers and peasants? Did they dissolve the Civil Guard, so detested by the people, the executioner of every movement of the people? Did they strike at the fascist party of Gil Robles and at the might of the Catholic church? No, they did none of these things. They rejected the frequent proposals of the Communists for united action against the offensive of the bourgeois-landlord reaction and fascism; they passed election laws which enabled the reactionaries to gain a majority in the Cortes (parliament), laws which penalized the popular movement, laws under which the heroic miners of Asturias are now being tried. They had peasants who were fighting for land shot by the Civil Guard, and so on.

This is the way in which the Social-Democrats, by disorganizing and splitting the ranks of the working class, cleared the path to power for fascism in Germany, Austria and Spain.

Comrades, fascism also attained power for the reason that the proletariat found itself isolated from its natural allies. Fascism attained power because it was able to win over *large masses of the peasantry*, owing to the fact that the Social-Democrats in the name of the working class pursued what was in fact an anti-peasant policy. The peasant saw in power a number of Social-Democratic

[156] Reichsbanner -- 'Union of the Imperial Banner', para-military Social-Democratic mass organization in Germany.

governments, which in his eyes were an embodiment of the power of the working class; but not one of them put an end to peasant want, none of them gave land to the peasantry. In Germany, the Social-Democrats did not touch the landlords; they combated the strikes of the farm laborers, with the result that long before Hitler came to power the farm laborers of Germany were deserting the reformist trade unions and in the majority of cases were going over to the Stahlhelm and to the National Socialists.

Fascism also attained power for the reason that it was able to penetrate into the ranks of the youth, whereas the Social-Democrats diverted the working-class youth from the class struggle, while the revolutionary proletariat did not develop the necessary educational work among the youth and did not pay enough attention to the struggle for its specific interests and demands. Fascism grasped the very acute need of the youth for militant activity, and enticed a considerable section of the youth into its fighting detachments. The new generation of young men and women has not experienced the horrors of war. They have felt the full weight of the economic crisis, unemployment and the disintegration of bourgeois democracy. But, seeing no prospects for the future, large sections of the youth proved to be particularly receptive to fascist demagogy, which depicted for them an alluring future should fascism succeed.

In this connection, we cannot avoid referring also to a number of *mistakes made by the Communist Parties*, mistakes that hampered our struggle against fascism.

In our ranks there was an impermissible underestimation of the fascist danger, a tendency which to this day has not everywhere been overcome. A case in point is the opinion formerly to be met with in our Parties that "Germany is not Italy," meaning that fascism may have succeeded in Italy, but that its success in Germany was out of the question, because the latter is an industrially and culturally highly developed country, with forty years of traditions of the working-class movement, in which fascism was impossible. Or the kind of opinion which is to be met with nowadays, to the effect that in countries of "classical" bourgeois democracy the soil for fascism does not exist. Such opinions have served and may serve to relax vigilance towards the fascist danger, and to render the mobilization of the proletariat in the struggle against fascism more difficult.

One might also cite quite a few instances where Communists were taken unawares by the fascist coup. Remember Bulgaria, where the leadership of our Party, took up a "neutral," but in fact opportunist, position with regard to the *coup d'état* of June 9, 1923; Poland, where in May 1926 the leadership of the Communist Party, making a wrong estimate of the motive forces of the Polish revolution, did not realize the fascist nature of Pilsudski's *coup*, and trailed in the rear of events; Finland, where our Party based itself on a false conception of slow and gradual fascization and overlooked the fascist coup which was being prepared by the leading group of the bourgeoisie and which took the Party and the working class unawares.

When National Socialism had already become a menacing mass movement in Germany, there were comrades who regarded the Bruening government as already a government of fascist dictatorship, and who boastfully declared: "If Hitler's Third Reich ever comes about, it will be six feet underground, and above it will be the victorious power of the workers."

Our comrades in Germany for a long time failed to fully reckon with the wounded national sentiments and the indignation of the masses against the Versailles Treaty; they treated as of little account the waverings of the peasantry and petty bourgeoisie; they were late in drawing up their program of social and national emancipation, and when they did put it forward they were unable to adapt it to the concrete demands and to the level of the masses. They were even unable to popularize it widely among the masses.

In a number of countries, the necessary development of a mass fight against fascism was replaced by barren debates on the nature of fascism "in general" and by a narrow sectarian attitude in formulating and solving the immediate political tasks of the Party.

Comrades, it is not simply because we want to dig up the past that we speak of the causes of the victory of fascism, that we point to the historical responsibility of the Social Democrats for the defeat of the working class, and that we also point out our own mistakes in the fight against fascism. We are not historians divorced from living reality; we, active fighters of the working class, are obliged to answer the question that is tormenting millions of workers: *Can the victory of fascism be prevented, and how?* And we reply to these millions of workers: Yes, comrades, the road to fascism can be blocked. It is quite possible. It depends on ourselves--on the workers, the peasants and all working people.

Whether the victory of fascism can be prevented depends *first and foremost* on the militant activity of the working class itself, on whether its forces are welded into a single militant army combating the offensive of capitalism and fascism. By establishing its fighting unity, the proletariat would paralyze the influence of fascism over the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the youth and the intelligentsia, and would be able to neutralize one section of them and win over the other section.

Second, it depends on the existence of a strong revolutionary party, correctly leading the struggle of the working people against fascism. A party which systematically calls on the workers to retreat in the face of fascism and permits the fascist bourgeoisie to strengthen its positions is doomed to lead the workers to defeat.

Third, it depends on a correct policy of the working class towards the peasantry and the petty-bourgeois masses of the towns. These masses must be taken as they are, and not as we should like to have them. It is in the process of the struggle that they will overcome their doubts and waverings. It is only by a patient attitude towards their inevitable waverings, it is only by the political help of the proletariat, that they will be able to rise to a higher level of revolutionary consciousness and activity.

Fourth, it depends on the vigilance and timely action of the revolutionary proletariat. The latter must not allow fascism to take it unawares, it must not surrender the initiative to fascism, but must inflict decisive blows on it before it can gather its forces, it must not allow fascism to consolidate its position, it must repel fascism wherever and whenever it rears its head, it must not allow fascism to gain new positions. This is what the French proletariat is so successfully trying to do.

These are the main conditions for preventing the growth of fascism and its accession to power.

Section: Fascism -- a Ferocious but Unstable Power

The fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is a ferocious power, but an unstable one.

What are the chief causes of the instability of fascist dictatorship?

Fascism undertakes to overcome the differences and antagonisms within the bourgeois camp, but it makes these antagonisms even more acute.

Fascism tries to establish its political monopoly by violently destroying other political parties. But the existence of the capitalist system, the existence of various classes and the accentuation of class contradictions inevitably tend to undermine and explode the political monopoly of fascism. In a fascist country the party of the fascists cannot set itself the aim of abolishing classes and class contradictions. It puts an end to the legal existence of bourgeois parties. But a number of them continue to maintain an illegal existence, while the Communist Party even in conditions of illegality continues to make progress, becomes steeled and tempered and leads the struggle of the proletariat against the fascist dictatorship. Hence, under the blows of class contradictions, the political monopoly of fascism is bound to explode.

Another reason for the instability of the fascist dictatorship is that the contrast between the anti-capitalist demagogy of fascism and its policy of enriching the monopolist bourgeoisie in the most piratical fashion makes it easier to expose the class nature of fascism and tends to shake and narrow its mass basis.

Furthermore, the victory of fascism arouses the deep hatred and indignation of the masses, helps to revolutionize them, and provides a powerful stimulus for a united front of the proletariat against fascism.

By conducting a policy of economic nationalism (autarchy) and by seizing the greater part of the national income for the purpose of preparing for war, fascism undermines the whole economic life of the country and accentuates the economic war between the capitalist states. To the conflicts that arise among the bourgeoisie it lends the character of sharp and at times bloody collisions that undermine the stability of the fascist state power in the eyes of the people. A government which murders its own followers, as happened in Germany on June 30 [157] of last year, a fascist government

[157] On the pretext that a 'second revolution' for the overthrow of Hitler was being prepared, on the eve of June 30, 1934, the entire leadership of the SA organization of storm troops was arrested and its chief commanders, including Minister

against which another section of the fascist bourgeoisie is conducting an armed fight (the National-Socialist *putsch* in Austria and the violent attacks of individual fascist groups on the fascist government in Poland, Bulgaria, Finland and other countries) -- a government of this character cannot for long maintain its authority in the eyes of the broad mass of the petty bourgeoisie.

The working class must be able to take advantage of the antagonisms and conflicts within the bourgeois camp, but it must not cherish the illusion that fascism will exhaust itself of its own accord. Fascism will not collapse automatically. Only the revolutionary activity of the working class can help to take advantage of the conflicts which inevitably arise within the bourgeois camp in order to undermine the fascist dictatorship and to overthrow it.

By destroying the relics of bourgeois democracy, by elevating open violence to a system of government, fascism shakes democratic illusions and undermines the authority of the law in the eyes of the working people. This is particularly true in countries such as Austria and Spain, where the workers have taken up arms against fascism. In Austria, the heroic struggle of the Schutzbund and the Communists in spite of its defeat, shook the stability of the fascist dictatorship from the very outset.

In Spain, the bourgeoisie did not succeed in putting the fascist muzzle on the working people. The armed struggles in Austria and Spain have resulted in ever wider masses of the working class coming to realize the necessity for a revolutionary class struggle.

Only such monstrous philistines, such lackeys of the bourgeoisie, as the superannuated theoretician of the Second International, Karl Kautsky, are capable of casting reproaches at the workers, to the effect that they should not have taken up arms in Austria and Spain. What would the working-class movement in Austria and Spain look like today if the working class of these countries were guided by the treacherous counsels of the Kautskys? The working class would be experiencing profound demoralization in its ranks.

> The school of civil war -- Lenin says -- does not leave the people unaffected. It is a harsh school, and its complete curriculum *inevitably* includes the victories of the counterrevolution, the debaucheries of enraged reactionaries, savage punishments meted out by the old governments to the rebels, etc. But only downright pedants and mentally decrepit mummies can grieve over the fact that nations are entering this painful school; this school teaches the oppressed classes how to conduct civil war; it teaches how to bring about a victorious revolution; it concentrates in the masses of present-day slaves that hatred which is always harbored by the downtrodden, dull, ignorant slaves, and which leads those slaves who have

Röhm, who headed the SA, were shot on the spot. The operation was conducted under the personal direction of Hitler in Münich and of Göring in Berlin. Several thousand commanders were arrested, and the SA was temporarily dissolved, to be radically purged and reorganized. Hitler was forced to this measure under the direct pressure of big business, so as to put an end to the demagogic propaganda of a 'second revolution' and to destroy its petty bourgeois advocates among the SA.

become conscious of the shame of their slavery to the greatest historic exploits.
[V. I. Lenin, Collected Works 15:183]

The triumph of fascism in Germany has, as we know, been followed by a new wave of the fascist offensive, which in Austria led to the provocation by Dollfuss, in Spain to the new onslaughts of counter-revolution on the revolutionary conquests of the masses, in Poland to the fascist reform of the constitution, while in France it spurred the armed detachments of the fascists to attempt a coup d'état in February 1934. But this victory, and the frenzy of the fascist dictatorship, called forth a countermovement for a united proletarian front against fascism on an international scale.

The burning of the Reichstag, which served as a signal for the general attack of fascism on the working class, the seizure and spoliation of the trade unions and the other working class organizations, the groans of the tortured anti-fascists rising from the vaults of the fascist barracks and concentration camps, are making clear to the masses what has been the outcome of the reactionary, disruptive role played by the German Social-Democratic leaders, who rejected the proposal made by the Communists for a joint struggle against advancing fascism. These things are convincing the masses of the necessity of uniting all forces of the working class for the overthrow of fascism.

Hitler's victory also provided a decisive stimulus for the creation of a united front of the working class against fascism in France. Hitler's victory not only aroused in the workers a fear of the fate that befell the German workers, not only kindled hatred for the executioners of their German class brothers, but also strengthened in them the determination never in any circumstances to allow in their country what happened to the working class in Germany.

The powerful urge towards a united front in all the capitalist countries shows that the lessons of defeat have not been in vain. The working class is beginning to act in a *new way.* The initiative shown by the Communist Parties in the organization of a united front and the supreme self-sacrifice displayed by the Communists, by the revolutionary workers in the struggle against fascism, have resulted in an unprecedented increase in the prestige of the Communist International. At the same time, the Second International is undergoing a profound crisis, a crisis which is particularly noticeable and has particularly accentuated since the bankruptcy of German Social-Democracy. With ever greater ease the Social-Democratic workers are able to convince themselves that fascist Germany, with all its horrors and barbarities, is in the final analysis *the result of the Social-Democratic policy of class collaboration* with the bourgeoisie. These masses are coming ever more clearly to realize that the path along which the German Social-Democratic leaders led the proletariat must not be traversed again. Never has there been such ideological dissension in the camp of the Second International as at the present time. A process of differentiation is taking place in all Social-Democratic Parties. Within their ranks *two principal camps* are forming: side by side with the existing camp of reactionary elements, who are trying in every way to preserve the bloc between the Social-Democrats and the bourgeoisie, and who rabidly reject a united front with the Communists, *there is beginning to emerge a camp of revolutionary elements who entertain doubts as to the correctness of the policy of*

class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, who are in favor of the creation of a united front with the Communists, and who are increasingly coming to adopt the position of the revolutionary class struggle.

Thus fascism, which appeared as the result of the decline of the capitalist system, in the long run acts as a factor in its *further disintegration.* Thus fascism, which has undertaken to bury Marxism, the revolutionary movement of the working class, is, as a result of the dialectics of life and the class struggle, itself leading to the further *development of the forces* that are bound to serve as its grave-diggers, the grave-diggers of capitalism.

Chapter 2: United Front of the Working Class Against Fascism

Comrades, millions of workers and working people of the capitalist countries are asking the question: How can fascism be prevented from coming to power and how can fascism be overthrown after it has attained power? To this the Communist International replies: *The first thing that must be done, the thing with which to begin, is to form a united front, to establish unity of action of the workers in every factory, in every district, in every region, in every country, all over the world. Unity of action of the proletariat on a national and international scale is the mighty weapon which renders the working class capable not only of successful defense but also of successful counterattack against fascism, against the class enemy.*

Section: Significance of the United Front

Is it not clear that joint action by the supporters of the parties and organizations of the two Internationals, the Communist and the Second International, would make it easier for the masses to repulse the fascist onslaught, and would heighten the political importance of the working class?

Joint action by the parties of both internationals against fascism, however, would not be confined in its effects to influencing their present adherents, the Communists and Social-Democrats; it would also exert a powerful impact on the ranks of the *Catholic, Anarchist and unorganized workers, even upon those who have temporarily become the victims of fascist demagogy.*

Moreover, a powerful united front of the proletariat would exert tremendous influence on *all other strata of the working people*, on the peasantry, on the urban petty bourgeoisie, on the intelligentsia. A united front would inspire the wavering groups with faith in the strength of the working class.

But even this is not all. The proletariat of the imperialist countries has possible allies not only in the working people of its own countries, but also in the *oppressed nations of the colonies and semi-colonies.* Inasmuch as the proletariat is split both nationally and internationally, inasmuch as one of its parts supports the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie, in particular its system of oppression in the colonies and semi-colonies, a barrier is put between the working class and the oppressed peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies, and the world anti-imperialist front is weakened. Every step by the proletariat of the imperialist countries on the road to unity of action in the direction of supporting the struggle for the liberation of the colonial peoples means transforming the colonies and semi-colonies into one of the most important reserves of the world proletariat.

If, finally, we bear in mind that international unity of action by the proletariat relies on the steadily growing strength of the proletarian state, the land of socialism, the Soviet Union, we see what broad perspectives are revealed by the realization of proletarian unity of action on a national and international scale.

The establishment of unity of action by all sections of the working class, irrespective of the party or organization to which they belong, is necessary *even before the majority of the working class is united in the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the victory of the proletarian revolution.*

Is it possible to realize this unity of action of the proletariat in the individual countries and throughout the whole world? Yes, it is. And it is possible at this very moment. The Communist International *puts no conditions for unity of action except one, and at that an elementary condition acceptable to all workers, viz., that the unity of action be directed against fascism, against the offensive of capital, against the threat of war, against the class enemy.* This is our condition.

Section: The Chief Arguments of the Opponents of the United Front

What objections can the opponents of the united front have, and what objections do they voice?

Some say: **"The Communists use the slogan of the united front merely as a maneuver."** But if this is the case, we reply, why don't you expose this "Communist maneuver" by your honest participation in the united front? We declare frankly: We want unity of action by the working class so that the proletariat may grow strong in its struggle against the bourgeoisie, in order that while defending today its current interests against attacking capital, against fascism, the proletariat may reach a position tomorrow to create the preliminary conditions for its final emancipation.

"The Communists attack us," say others. But listen, we have repeatedly declared: We shall not attack anyone, whether persons, organizations or parties, standing for the united front of the working class against the class enemy. But at the same time, it is our duty, in the interests of the proletariat and its cause, to criticize those persons, organizations and parties that hinder unity of action by the workers.

"We cannot form a united front with the Communists, since they have a different program," says a third group. But you yourselves say that your program differs from the program of the bourgeois parties, and yet this did not and does not prevent you from entering into coalitions with these parties.

"The bourgeois-democratic parties are better allies against fascism that the Communists," say the opponents of the united front and the advocates of coalition with the bourgeoisie. But what does Germany's experience teach? Did not the Social-Democrats form a bloc with those "better" allies? And what were the results?

"If we establish a united front with the Communists, the petty bourgeoisie will take fright at the 'Red danger' and will desert to the fascists," we hear it said quite frequently. But does the united front represent a threat to the peasants, small traders, artisans, working intellectuals? No, the united

front is a threat to the big bourgeoisie, the financial magnates, the junkers and other exploiters, whose regime brings complete ruin to all these strata.

"Social-Democracy is for democracy, the Communists are for dictatorship; therefore, we cannot form a united front with the Communists," say some of the Social-Democratic leaders. But are we offering you now a united front for the purpose of proclaiming the dictatorship of the proletariat? We make no such proposal now.

"Let the Communists recognize democracy, let them come out in its defense; then we shall be ready for a united front." To this we reply: We are the adherents of Soviet democracy, the democracy of the working people, the most consistent democracy in the world. But in the capitalist countries we defend and shall continue to defend every inch of bourgeois-democratic liberties, which are being attacked by fascism and bourgeois reaction, because the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat so dictate.

"But can the tiny Communist Parties contribute anything by participating in the united front brought about by the labor Party," say, for instance, the labor leaders of Great Britain. Remember how the Austrian Social-Democratic leaders said the same thing with reference to the small Austrian Communist Party. And what have events shown? It was not the Austrian Social-Democratic Party headed by Otto Bauer and Renner that proved right, but the small Austrian Communist Party which signaled the fascist danger in Austria at the right moment and called upon the workers to struggle. The whole experience of the labor movement has shown that the Communists with all their relative insignificance in numbers, are the motive power of the militant activity of the proletariat. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the Communist Parties of Austria or Great Britain are not only the tens of thousands of workers who are adherents of the Party, but are parts of the world Communist movement, are Sections of the Communist International, whose leading Party is the Party of a proletariat which has already achieved victory and rules over one-sixth of the globe.

"But the united front did not prevent fascism from being victorious in the Saar," is another objection advanced by the opponents of the united front. Strange is the logic of these gentlemen. First, they leave no stone unturned to ensure the victory of fascism and then they rejoice with malicious glee because the united front which they entered into only at the last moment did not lead to the victory of the workers.

"If we were to form a united front with the Communists, we should have to withdraw from the coalition, and reactionary and fascist parties would enter the government," say the Social-Democratic leaders holding cabinet posts in various countries. Very well. Was not the German Social-Democratic Party in a coalition government? It was. Was not the Austrian Social-Democratic Party in office? Were not the Spanish Socialists in the same government as the bourgeoisie? They were. Did the participation of the Social-Democratic Parties in the bourgeois coalition governments in these countries prevent fascism from attacking the proletariat? It did not. Consequently, it is as clear as

daylight that participation of Social-Democratic ministers in bourgeois governments is *not* a barrier to fascism.

"The Communists act like dictators; they want to prescribe and dictate everything to us." No. We prescribe nothing and dictate nothing. We only put forward our proposals, being convinced that if realized they will meet the interests of the working people. This is not only the right but the duty of all those acting in the name of the workers. You are afraid of the 'dictatorship' of the Communists? Let us jointly submit to the workers all proposals, both yours and ours, jointly discuss them together with all the workers, and choose those proposals which are most useful to the cause of the working class.

Thus, all these arguments against a united front *will not stand the slightest criticism.* They are rather the flimsy excuses of the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy, who prefer their united front with the bourgeoisie to the united front of the proletariat.

No. These excuses will not hold water. The international proletariat has experienced the suffering caused by the split in the working class, and becomes more and more convinced that *the united front, the unity of action of the proletariat on a national and international scale, is at once necessary and perfectly possible.*

Section: Content and Forms of the United Front

What is and ought to be the basic content of the united front at the present stage? The defense of the immediate economic and political interests of the working class, the defense of the working class against fascism, must form the *starting point* and *main content* of the united front in all capitalist countries.

We must not confine ourselves to bare appeals to struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. We must find and advance those slogans and forms of struggle which arise from the vital needs of the masses, from the level of their fighting capacity at the present stage of development.

We must point out to the masses what they must do *today* to defend themselves against capitalist spoliation and fascist barbarity.

We must strive to establish the widest united front with the aid of joint action by workers' organizations of different trends for the defense of the vital interests of the laboring masses. This means:

- *First*, joint struggle really to shift the burden of the consequences of the crisis onto the shoulders of the ruling classes, the shoulders of the capitalists and landlords -- in a word, onto the shoulders of the rich.
- *Second*, joint struggle against all forms of the fascist offensive, in defense of the gains and the rights of the working people, against the abolition of bourgeois-democratic liberties.

- *Third*, joint struggle against the approaching danger of an imperialist war, a struggle that will make the preparation of such a war more difficult.

We must tirelessly prepare the working class for a *rapid change in forms and methods of struggle* when there is a change in the situation. As the movement grows and the unity of the working class strengthens, we must go further, and prepare the transition *from the defensive to the offensive against capital*, steering towards the *organization of a mass political strike.* It must be an absolute condition of such a strike to draw into it the main trade unions of the countries concerned.

Communists, of course, cannot and must not for a moment abandon their own *independent work* of Communist education, organization and mobilization of the masses. However, to ensure that the workers find the road of unity of action, it is necessary to strive at the same time both for short-term and for long-term agreements that provide for *joint action with Social Democratic Parties, reformist trade unions and other organizations of the working people* against the class enemies of the proletariat. The chief stress in all this must be laid on developing *mass action*, locally, *to be carried out by the local organizations* through local agreements. While loyally carrying out the conditions of all agreements made with them, we shall mercilessly expose all sabotage of joint action on the part of persons and organizations participating in the united front. To any attempt to wreck the agreements -- and such attempts may possibly be made -- we shall reply by appealing to the masses while continuing untiringly to struggle for restoration of the broken unity of action.

It goes without saying that the practical realization of a united front will take *various* forms in various countries, depending upon the condition and character of the workers' organizations and their political level, upon the situation in the particular country, upon the changes in progress in the international labor movement, etc.

These forms may include, for instance: coordinated joint action of the workers to be agreed upon *from case to case* on definite occasions, on individual demands or on the basis of a common platform; coordinated actions in *individual enterprises or by whole industries;* coordinated actions on a *local, regional, national* or *international scale*, coordinated actions for the organization of the *economic* struggle of the workers, for carrying out mass *political* actions, for the organization of joint *self-defense* against fascist attacks, coordinated actions in rendering *aid to political prisoners and their families*, in the field of struggle against *social reaction;* joint actions in the defense of the *interests of the youth and women*, in the field of the *cooperative movement, cultural activity, sport*, etc.

It would be insufficient to rest content with the conclusion of a pact providing for joint action and the formation of contact committees from the parties and organizations participating in the united front, like those we have in France, for instance. That is only the first step. The pact is an auxiliary means for obtaining joint action, but by itself it does not constitute a united front. A contact commission between the leaders of the Communist and Socialist Parties is necessary to facilitate the

carrying out of joint action, but by itself it is far from adequate for a real development of the united front, for drawing the widest masses into the struggle against fascism.

The Communists and all revolutionary workers must strive for the formation of elected (and in the countries of fascist dictatorship -- selected from among the most authoritative participants in the united front movement) *nonparty class bodies of the united front*, at the *factories*, among the *unemployed*, in the *working class districts*, among the small *towns-folk* and in the *villages.* Only such bodies will be able to include also the vast masses of unorganized working people in the united front movement, and will be able to assist in developing mass initiative in the struggle against the capitalist offensive, against fascism and reaction, and on this basis create the necessary *broad active rank-and-file of the united front* and train hundreds and thousands of non-Party Bolsheviks in the capitalist countries.

Joint action of the *organized* workers is the beginning, the foundation. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the unorganized masses constitute the vast majority of workers. Thus, in *France* the number of organized workers -- Communists, Socialists, trade union members of various trends -- is altogether *about one million*, while the total number of workers is eleven million. In *Great Britain* there are approximately *five million* members of trade unions and parties of various trends. At the same time the total number of workers is *fourteen million.* In the *United States of America* about *five million* workers are organized, while altogether there are *thirty-eight million* workers in that country. About the same ratio holds good for a number of other countries. In "normal" times this mass in the main does not participate in political life. But now this gigantic mass is getting into motion more and more, is being brought into political life, comes out onto the political arena.

The creation of nonpartisan class bodies is the *best form* for carrying out, extending and strengthening a united front among the rank-and-file of the masses. These bodies will likewise be the best bulwark against any attempt of the opponents of the united front to disrupt the growing unity of action of the working class.

Section: The Anti-fascist People's Front

In mobilizing the mass of working people for the struggle against fascism, the formation of a *wide anti-fascist People's Front* on the basis of the *proletarian united front* is a particularly important task. The success of the whole struggle of the proletariat is closely bound up with the establishment of a fighting alliance between the proletariat, on the one hand, and the laboring peasantry and basic mass of the urban petty bourgeoisie who together form the majority of the population even in industrially developed countries, on the other.

In its agitation, fascism, desirous of winning these masses to its own side, tries to set the mass of the working people in town and countryside against the revolutionary proletariat, frightening the petty bourgeoisie with the bogey of the "Red peril." We must *turn this weapon against those who wield it* and show the working peasants, artisans and intellectuals whence the real danger threatens. We must show concretely who it is that piles the burden of taxes and imposts onto the peasant and squeezes

usurious interest out of him; who it is that, while owning the best land and every form of wealth, drives the peasant and his family from their plot of land and dooms them to unemployment and poverty. We must explain concretely, patiently and persistently who it is that ruins the artisans and handicraftsmen with taxes, imposts, high rents and competition impossible for them to withstand; who it is that throws into the street and deprives of employment the wide masses of the working intelligentsia.

But this is *not enough.*

The fundamental, the most decisive thing in establishing an anti-fascist People's Front is *resolute action of the revolutionary proletariat* in defense of the demands of these sections of the people, particularly the working peasantry -- demands in line with the basic interests of the proletariat -- and in the process of struggle combining the demands of the working class with these demands.

In forming an anti-fascist People's Front, a correct approach to those organizations and parties whose membership comprises a considerable number of the working peasantry and the mass of the urban petty bourgeoisie is of great importance.

In the capitalist countries the majority of these parties and organizations, political as well as economic, are still under the influence of the bourgeoisie and follow it. The social composition of these parties and organizations is heterogeneous. They include rich peasants side by side with landless peasants, big businessmen alongside petty shopkeepers; but control is in the hands of the former, the agents of big capital. This obliges us to *approach the different organizations in different ways*, remembering that often the bulk of the membership ignores the real political character of its leadership. Under certain conditions we can and must try to draw these parties and organizations or certain sections of them to the side of the anti-fascist People's Front, despite their bourgeois leadership. Such, for instance, is today the situation in France with the Radical party, in the United States with various farmers' organizations, in Poland with the "Stronnictwo Ludowe," [158] in Yugoslavia with the Croatian Peasants' Party, in Bulgaria with the Agrarian Union, in Greece with the Agrarians, etc. But regardless of whether or not there is any chance of attracting these parties and organizations as a whole to the People's Front, our tactics must *under all circumstances* be directed towards drawing the small peasants, artisans, handicraftsmen, etc., among their members into an anti-fascist People's Front.

Hence, you see that in this field we must all along the line put an end to what has not infrequently occurred in our work--neglect or contempt of the various organizations and parties of the peasants, artisans and the mass of petty bourgeoisie in the towns.

[158] Stronnictwo Ludowe (People's Party) -- A democratic agrarian party in Poland, defending the interests mainly of the well-to-do peasants, headed the general strike of the peasant masses in August 1937 under the pressure of the local peasants' organizations.

Section: Key Questions of the United Front in Individual Countries

In every country there are certain *key questions*, which at the present stage are agitating vast masses of the population and around which the struggle for the establishment of a united front must be developed. If these key points, or key questions, are properly grasped it will ensure and accelerate the establishment of a united front.

The United States of America

Let us take, for example, so important a country in the capitalist world as *the United States of America.* There millions of people have been set into motion by the crisis. The program for the recovery of capitalism has collapsed. Vast masses are beginning to abandon the bourgeois parties and are at present at the crossroads.

Embryo American fascism is trying to direct the disillusionment and discontent of these masses into reactionary fascist channels. It is a peculiarity of the development of American fascism that at the present stage it comes forward principally in the guise of an opposition to fascism, which it accuses of being an "un-American" trend imported from abroad. In contradistinction to German fascism, which acts under anti-constitutional slogans, American fascism tries to portray itself as the custodian of the Constitution and "American democracy." It does not as yet represent a directly menacing force. But if it succeeds in penetrating the wide masses who have become disillusioned with the old bourgeois parties, it may become a serious menace in the very near future.

And what would the victory of fascism in the United States involve? For the mass of working people it would of course, involve the unprecedented strengthening of the regime of exploitation and the destruction of the working-class movement. And what would be the international significance of this victory of fascism? As we known, the United States is not Hungary, nor Finland, nor Bulgaria, nor Latvia. The victory of fascism in the United States would vitally change the whole international situation.

Under these circumstances, can the American proletariat content itself with organizing only its class-conscious vanguard, which is prepared to follow the revolutionary path? No.

It is perfectly obvious that the interests of the American proletariat demand that all its forces dissociate themselves from the capitalist parties without delay. It must find in good time ways and suitable forms to prevent fascism from winning over the wide mass of discontented working people. And here it must be said that under American conditions the creation of a mass party of the working people, a *Workers' and Farmers' Party*, might serve as such a suitable form. *Such a party would be a specific form of the mass People's Front in America* and should be put in opposition to the parties of the trusts and the banks, and likewise to growing fascism. Such a party, of course, will be *neither* Socialist *nor* Communist. But it *must be* an anti-fascist party and *must not be* an anti-Communist party. The program of this party must be directed against the banks, trusts and monopolies, against the principal enemies of the people, who are gambling on the woes of the latter. Such a party will justify its name only if it defends the urgent demands of the working class; only if it fights for genuine social

legislation, for unemployment insurance; only if it fights for land for the white and Black sharecroppers and for their liberation from debt burdens; only if it tries to secure the cancellation of the farmers' indebtedness; only if it fights for an equal status for Negroes; only if it defends the demands of the war veterans and the interests of members of the liberal professions, small businessmen and artisans. And so on.

It goes without saying that such a party will fight for the election of its own candidates to local government, to the state legislatures, to the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Our comrades in the United States acted rightly in taking the initiative in the setting up of such a party. But they still have to take effective measures in order to make the creation of such a party the cause of the masses themselves. The questions of forming a Workers' and Farmers' Party, and its program should be discussed at mass meetings of the people. We should develop the most widespread movement for the creation of such a party, and take the lead in it. In no case must the initiative of organizing the party be allowed to pass to elements desirous of utilizing the discontent of the millions who have become disillusioned in both the bourgeois parties, Democratic and Republican, in order to create a "third party" in the United States as an anti-Communist party, a party directed against the revolutionary movement.

Great Britain

In *Great Britain*, as a result of the mass action of the British workers, Mosley's fascist organization has for the time being been pushed into the background. But we must not close our eyes to the fact that the so-called "National Government" is passing a number of reactionary measures directed against the working class, as a result of which conditions are being created in Great Britain, too, which will make it easier for the bourgeoisie, if necessary, to pass to a fascist regime.

At the present stage, fighting the fascist danger in Great Britain means primarily fighting the "National Government" and its reactionary measures, fighting the offensive of capital, fighting for the demands of the unemployed, fighting against wage cuts and for the repeal of all those laws with the help of which the British bourgeoisie is lowering the standard of living of the masses.

But the growing hatred of the working class for the "National Government" is uniting increasingly large numbers under the slogan of the formation of a *new Labor Government* in Great Britain. Can the Communists ignore this frame of mind of the masses, who still retain faith in a Labor Government? No, Comrades. We must find a way of approaching these masses. We tell them openly, as did the Thirteenth Congress of the British Communist Party, that we Communists are in favor of a soviet government *["soviet" meant a workers' and peasants' council, or people's council, in a system that nationalized the major resources and means of production]* as the only form of government capable of emancipating the workers from the yoke of the capital. But you want a Labor Government? Very well. We have been and are fighting hand in hand with you for the defeat of the "National Government." We are prepared to support your fight for the formation of a new Labor government,

in spite of the fact that both the previous Labor governments failed to fulfil the promises made to the working class by the labor Party. We do not expect this government to carry out socialist measures. But *we shall present it with the demand*, in the name of millions of workers, that it defends the most essential economic and political interests of the working class and of all working people. Let us jointly discuss a common program of such demands, and let us achieve that unity of action which the proletariat requires in order to repel the reactionary offensive of the "National Government," the attack of capital and fascism and the preparations for a new war. On this basis, the British comrades are prepared at the forthcoming parliamentary elections to cooperate with branches of the labor Party against the "National Government," and also against Lloyd George who is trying in his own way in the interests of the British bourgeoisie to lure the masses into following him against the cause of the working class.

The position of the British Communists is a correct one. It will help them to set up a militant united front with the millions of members of the British trade unions and labor Party. While always remaining in the front ranks of the fighting proletariat, and pointing out to the masses the only right path -- the path of struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of a soviet government -- the Communists, in defining their immediate political aims, must not attempt to leap over those necessary stages of the mass movement in the course of which the working class by its own experience outlives its illusions and passes over to Communism.

France

France, as we know, is a country in which the working class is setting an example to the whole international proletariat of how to fight fascism. The French Communist Party is setting an example to all the sections of the Comintern of how the tactics of the united front should be applied; the Socialist workers are setting an example of what the Social-Democratic workers of other capitalist countries should now be doing in the fight against fascism.

The significance of the anti-fascist demonstration attended by half a million people in Paris on July 14 of this year, and of the numerous demonstrations in other French cities, is tremendous.

This is not merely a United Front movement of the workers; it is the beginning of a wide general front of the people against fascism in France. This united front movement enhances the confidence of the working class in its own forces; it strengthens its consciousness of the leading role it is playing in relation to the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, and the intelligentsia; it extends the influence of the Communist Party among the mass of the working class and therefore makes the proletariat stronger in the fight against fascism. It is arousing in good time the vigilance of the masses in regard to the fascist danger. And it will serve as a contagious example for the development of the anti-fascist struggle in other capitalist countries, and will exercise a heartening influence on the proletarians of Germany, oppressed by the fascist dictatorship.

The victory, needless to say, is a big one; but still, it does not decide the issue of the anti-fascist struggle. The overwhelming majority of the French people are undoubtedly opposed to fascism. But the bourgeoisie is able by armed force to violate the popular will. The fascist movement is continuing to develop absolutely freely, with the active support of monopoly capital, the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie, the general staff of the French army, and the reactionary leaders of the Catholic Church -- that stronghold of all reaction. The most powerful fascist organization, the *Croix de Feu*, now commands 300,000 armed men, the backbone of which consists of 60,000 officers of the reserve. It holds strong positions in the police, the gendarmerie, the army, the air force and in all government offices. The recent municipal elections have shown that in France it is not only the revolutionary forces that are growing, but also the forces of fascism. If fascism succeeds in penetrating widely among the peasantry and in securing the support of one section of the army, while the other section remains neutral, the masses of the French working people will not be able to prevent the fascists from coming to power. Comrades, do not forget the organizational weakness of the French labor movement which facilitates a fascist offensive. The working class and all anti-fascists in France have no grounds for resting content with the results achieved so far.

What are the tasks facing the working class in France? *First*, to establish a united front not only in the political sphere, but also in the economic sphere, in order to organize the struggle against the capitalist offensive, and by its pressure to smash the resistance offered to the united front by the leaders of the reformist Confederation of Labor.

Second, to achieve trade union unity in France -- united trade unions based on the class struggle.

Third, to enlist the broad mass of the peasants and petty bourgeoisie in the anti-fascist movement, devoting special attention to their urgent demands in the program of the anti-fascist People's Front.

Fourth, to strengthen organizationally and extend further the anti-fascist movement which has already developed, by the widespread creation of nonpartisan elected bodies of the anti-fascist People's Front, whose influence will extend to wider masses than those in the present parties and organizations of the working people in France.

Fifth, to force the disbanding and disarming of the fascist organizations, as being organizations of conspirators against the republic and agents of Hitler in France.

Sixth, to secure that the state apparatus, army and police shall be purged of the conspirators who are preparing a fascist coup.

Seventh, to develop the struggle against the leaders of the reactionary cliques of the Catholic Church, one of the most important strongholds of French fascism.

Eighth, to link up the army with the anti-fascist movement by creating in its ranks committees for the defense of the republic and the constitution, directed against those who want to utilize the army for an anti-constitutional coup d'état; to prevent the reactionary forces in France from wrecking the Franco-Soviet pact, which defends the cause of peace against the aggression of German fascism.

And if in France the anti-fascist movement leads to the formation of a government which will carry on a real struggle against French fascism -- not in words but in deeds -- and which will carry out the program of demands of the anti-fascist People's Front, the Communists, while remaining the irreconcilable foes of every bourgeois government and supporters of a soviet government, will nevertheless, in face of the growing fascist danger, be prepared to support such a government.

Section: The United Front and the Fascist Mass Organizations

Comrades, the fight for the establishment of a united front in countries where the fascists are in power is perhaps the most important problem facing us. In such countries, of course, the fight is carried on under far more difficult conditions than in countries with a legal labor movement. Nevertheless, all the conditions exist in fascist countries for the development of a real anti-fascist People's Front in the struggle against the fascist dictatorship since the Social-Democratic, Catholic and other workers, in Germany for instance, are able to realize more directly the need for a joint struggle with the Communists against the fascist dictatorship. Wide strata of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, having already tasted the bitter fruits of fascist rule, are growing increasingly discontented and disillusioned which makes it easier to enlist them in the antifascist People's Front.

The principal task in fascist countries, particularly in Germany and Italy, where fascism has managed to gain a mass basis and has forced the workers and other working people into its organizations, consists in skillfully combining the fight against the fascist dictatorship from without with the undermining of it from within, inside the fascist mass organizations and bodies. Special methods and means of approach, suited to the concrete conditions prevailing in these countries, must be learned, mastered and applied, so as to facilitate the rapid disintegration of the mass base of fascism and to prepare the way for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship. We must learn, master and apply this, and not only shout "Down with Hitler" and "Down with Mussolini." Yes, learn, master and apply.

This is a difficult and complex task. It is all the more difficult in that our experience in successfully combating a fascist dictatorship is extremely limited. Our Italian comrades, for instance, have already been fighting under the conditions of a fascist dictatorship for about thirteen years. Nevertheless, they have not yet succeeded in developing a real mass struggle against fascism, and therefore they have unfortunately been little able in this respect to help the Communist Parties in other fascist countries by their positive experience.

The Germany and Italian Communists, and the Communists in other fascist countries, as well as the Communist youth, have displayed prodigious valor; they have made and are daily making

tremendous sacrifices. We all bow our heads in honor of such heroism and sacrifices. But heroism alone is not enough. Heroism must be combined with day-to-day work among the masses, with concrete struggle against fascism, so as to achieve the most tangible results in this sphere. In our struggle against fascist dictatorship, it is particularly dangerous to confuse the wish with fact. We must base ourselves on the facts, on the actual concrete situation.

What is now the actual situation in Germany, for instance?

The masses are becoming increasingly restless and disillusioned with the policy of the fascist dictatorship, and this even assumes the form of partial strikes and other actions. In spite of all its efforts, fascism has failed to win over politically the basic masses of the workers; it is losing even its former supporters, and will lose them more and more in the future. Nevertheless, we must realize that the workers who are convinced of the possibility of overthrowing the fascist dictatorship, and who are already prepared to fight for it actively, are still in the minority -- they consist of us, the Communists, and the revolutionary section of the Social-Democratic workers. But the majority of the working people have not yet become aware of the real, concrete possibilities and methods of overthrowing this dictatorship, and still adopt a waiting attitude. This we must bear in mind when we outline our tasks in the struggle against fascism in Germany, and when we seek, study and apply special methods of approach for the undermining and overthrow of the fascist dictatorship in Germany.

In order to be able to strike a telling blow at the fascist dictatorship, we must first find out what is its most vulnerable point. What is the Achilles' heel of the fascist dictatorship? Its social basis. The latter is extremely heterogeneous. It is made up of various strata of society. Fascism has proclaimed itself the sole representative of all classes and strata of the population: the manufacturer and the worker, the millionaire and the unemployed, the Junker and the small peasant, the big businessman and the artisan. It pretends to defend the interests of all these strata, the interests of the nation. But since it is a dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie, fascism must inevitably come into conflict with its mass social basis, all the more since, under the fascist dictatorship, the class contradictions between the pack of financial magnates and the overwhelming majority of the people are brought out in greatest relief.

We can lead the masses to a decisive struggle for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship only by getting the workers who have been forced into the fascist organizations, or have joined them through ignorance, to take part in the most elementary movements for the defense of their economic, political and cultural interests. It is for this reason that the Communists must work in these organizations, as the best champions of the day-to-day interests of the mass of members, bearing in mind that as the workers belonging to these organizations begin more and more frequently to demand their rights and defend their interests, they inevitably come into conflict with the fascist dictatorship.

In defending the urgent and at first the most elementary interests of the working people in town and countryside it is comparatively easier to find a common language not only with the conscious anti-fascists, but also with those of the working people who are still supporters of fascism, but are disillusioned and dissatisfied with its policy and are grumbling and seeking an occasion for expressing their discontent. In general, we must realize that all our tactics in countries with a fascist dictatorship must be of such a character as not to repulse the rank-and-file followers of fascism drawn from the working sections of society.

We need not be dismayed, comrades, if the people mobilized around these day-to-day interests consider themselves either indifferent to politics or even followers of fascism. The important thing for us is to draw them into the movement, which, although it may not at first proceed openly under the slogans of the struggle against fascism, is already objectively an anti-fascist movement putting these masses into opposition to the fascist dictatorship.

Experience teaches us that the view that it is generally impossible, in countries with a fascist dictatorship, to come out legally or semi-legally, is harmful and incorrect. To insist on this point of view means to fall into passivity, and to renounce real mass work altogether. True, under the conditions of a fascist dictatorship, to find forms and methods of legal or semi-legal action is a difficult and complex problem. But, as in many other questions, the path is indicated by life itself and by the initiative of the masses themselves, who have already provided us with a number of examples that must be generalized and applied in an organized and effective manner.

We must very resolutely put an end to the tendency to underestimate work in the fascist mass organizations. In Italy, in Germany and in a number of other fascist countries, our comrades tried to conceal their passivity, and frequently even their direct refusal to work in the fascist mass organizations, by putting forward work in the factories as against work in the fascist mass organizations. In reality however, it was just this mechanical distinction which led to work being conducted very feebly, and sometimes not at all, both in the fascist mass organizations and in the factories.

Yet it is particularly important that Communists in the fascist countries should be wherever the masses are to be found. Fascism has deprived the workers of their own legal organizations. It has forced the fascist organizations upon them, and it is *there that the masses are* -- by compulsion, or to some extent voluntarily. These mass fascist organizations can and must be made our legal or semi-legal field of action where we can meet the masses. They can and must be made our legal or semi-legal starting point for the defense of the day-to-day interests of the masses. To utilize these possibilities, Communists must win elected positions in the fascist mass organizations, for contact with the masses, and must rid themselves once and for all of the prejudice that such activity is unseemly and unworthy of a revolutionary worker.

In Germany, for instance, there is a system of so-called "shop stewards." But where is it stated that we must leave the fascists a monopoly in these organizations? Cannot we try to unite the Communist, Social-Democratic, Catholic and other anti-fascist workers in the factories so that when the list of "shop stewards" is voted upon, the known agents of the employers may be struck off and other candidates, enjoying the confidence of the workers, inserted in their stead? Practice has already shown that this is possible.

And does not practice also go to show that it is possible jointly with the Social-Democratic and other discontented workers, to demand that the "shop stewards" really defend the interests of the workers?

Take the "Labor Front" in Germany, or the fascist trade unions in Italy. Is it not possible to demand that the functionaries of the Labor Front be elected, and not appointed, to insist that the leading bodies of the local groups report to meetings of the members of the organizations; to address these demands, following a decision by the group, to the employer, to the "labor trustee," to higher bodies of the Labor Front? This is possible, provided the revolutionary workers actually work within the Labor Front and try to obtain posts in it.

Similar methods of work are possible and essential in other mass fascist organizations also -- in the Hitler Youth Leagues, in the sports organizations, in the *Kraft durch Freude* [159] organizations, in the *Dopo lavoro* [160] in Italy, in the cooperatives and so forth.

Comrades, you recall the ancient legend about the capture of Troy. Troy was inaccessible to the armies attacking her, thanks to her impregnable walls. And the attacking army, after suffering heavy casualties, was unable to achieve victory until with the aid of the famous Trojan horse it managed to penetrate to the very heart of the enemy's Camp.

We revolutionary workers, it appears to me, should not be shy about using the same tactics with regard to our fascist foe, who is defending himself against the people with the help of a living wall of his cutthroats.

He who fails to understand the necessity of using such tactics in the case of fascism, he who regards such an approach as "humiliating," may be a most excellent comrade, but if you will allow me to say so, he is a windbag and not a revolutionary, he will be unable to lead the masses to the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.

The mass movement for a united front, starting with the defense of the most elementary needs, and changing its forms and watchwords of struggle as the latter extends and grows, is growing up outside and inside the fascist organizations in Germany, Italy, and the other countries in which

[159] Kraft durch Freude (Strength through Joy) -- A mass fascist organization in Nazi Germany, aimed at the fascization of workers and their training for future soldiers.
[160] Dopo lavoro -- 'After work' -- organization in Italy similar to Kraft durch Freude.

fascism has a mass basis. It will be the battering ram which will shatter the fortress of the fascist dictatorship that at present seems impregnable to many.

Section: The United Front in Countries Where the Social Democrats Are in Office

The struggle for the establishment of a united front raises another very important problem, the problem of a united front in Countries where Social-Democratic governments, or coalition governments in which Socialists participate, are in power, as, for instance, in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Czechoslovakia and Belgium.

Our attitude of absolute opposition to Social-Democratic governments, which are governments of compromise with the bourgeoisie, is well known. But this notwithstanding, we do not regard the existence of a *Social-Democratic government* or of a government coalition with bourgeois parties as an *insurmountable* obstacle to establishing a united front with the Social-Democrats on certain issues.

We believe that in such a case, too, a united front in defense of the vital interests of the working people and in the struggle against fascism is quite *possible* and *necessary.* It stands to reason that in countries where representatives of Social-Democratic parties take part in the government the Social-Democratic leadership offers the strongest *resistance* to the proletarian united front. This is quite comprehensible. After all, they want to show the bourgeoisie that they, better and more skillfully than anyone else, can keep the discontented working masses under control and prevent them from falling under the influence of Communism.

The fact, however, that Social-Democratic ministers are opposed to the proletarian united front can by no means justify a situation in which *the Communists do nothing to establish a united front of the proletariat.*

Our comrades in the Scandinavian countries often follow the line of least resistance, *confining themselves to propaganda exposing the Social-Democratic governments.* This is a mistake. In ***Denmark***, for example, the Social-Democratic leaders have been in the government for the past ten years, and for ten years, day in and day out, the Communists have been reiterating that it is a bourgeois capitalist government. We have to assume that the Danish workers are acquainted with this propaganda. The fact that a considerable majority nevertheless vote for the Social-Democratic government party only goes to show that the Communists' exposure of the government by means of propaganda is *insufficient.* It does *not* prove, however, that these hundreds of thousands of workers are satisfied with all the government measures of the Social-Democratic ministers. No, they are *not satisfied* with the fact that by its so-called crisis 'agreement' the Social-Democratic government assists *the big capitalists and landlords* and not the workers and poor peasants. They are not satisfied with the decree issued by the government in January 1933, which deprived the workers of the *right to strike.* They are not satisfied with the project of the Social Democratic leadership for a dangerous *anti-democratic electoral reform* (which would considerably reduce the number of deputies). I shall hardly be in error, comrades, if I state that 99 per cent of the Danish workers *do not approve* of these political steps taken by the Social-Democratic leaders and ministers.

Is it not possible for the Communists to call upon the trade unions and Social-Democratic organizations of Denmark to discuss some of these burning issues, to express their opinions on them and come out jointly for a proletarian united front with the object of obtaining the workers' demands? In October of last year, when our Danish comrades appealed to the trade unions to act against the reduction of unemployment relief and for the democratic rights of the trade unions, about 100 local trade union organizations joined the united front.

In ***Sweden*** a Social-Democratic government is in power for the third time, but the Swedish Communists have for a long time abstained from applying the united front tactics in practice. Why? Was it because they were opposed to the united front? Of course not; they were in principle for a united front, for a united front in general, but they failed to understand in what circumstances, on what questions, in defense of what demands a proletarian united front could be successfully established, where and how to "hook on." A few months before the formation of the Social democratic government, the Social Democratic Party advanced during the elections a platform containing a number of demands which would have been the very thing to include in the platform of the proletarian united front. For example, the slogans *Against custom duties, Against militarization, Put an end to the policy of delay in the question of unemployment insurance, Grant adequate old age pensions, Prohibit organizations like the "Munch" corps* (a fascist organization), *Down with class legislation against the unions demanded by the bourgeois parties.*

Over a million of the working people of Sweden voted in 1932 for these demands advanced by the Social-Democrats, and welcomed in 1933 the formation of a Social-Democratic government in the hope that now these demands would be realized. What could have been more natural in such a situation and what would have been better suited the mass of the workers than an appeal of the Communist Party to all Social-Democratic and trade union organizations to take joint action to secure these demands advanced by the Social-Democratic Party?

If we had succeeded in really mobilizing wide masses and in welding the Social-Democratic and Communist workers' organizations into a united front to secure these demands of the Social-Democrats themselves, there is no doubt that the working class of Sweden would have gained thereby. The Social-Democratic ministers of Sweden, of course, would not have been very happy over it, for in that case the government would have been compelled to meet at least some of these demands. At any rate, what has happened now, when the government instead of abolishing has raised some of the duties, instead of restricting militarism has enlarged the military budget, and instead of rejecting all legislation directed against the trade unions has itself introduced such a bill in Parliament, would not have happened. True, on the last issue the Communist party of Sweden carried through a good mass campaign in the spirit of the proletarian united front, with the result that in the end even the Social-Democratic parliamentary faction felt constrained to vote against the government bill, and for the time being it has been voted down.

The ***Norwegian*** Communists were right in calling upon the organizations of the Labor Party to organize joint May Day demonstrations and in putting forward a number of demands which in the main coincided with the demands contained in the election platform of the Norwegian Labor Party. Although this step in favor of a united front was poorly prepared and the leadership of the Norwegian Labor Party opposed it, united front demonstrations took place in thirty localities.

Formerly many Communists used to be afraid it would be opportunism on their part if they did not counter every partial demand of the Social-Democrats by demands of their own which were twice as radical. That was a naive mistake. If Social-Democrats, for instance, demanded the dissolution of the fascist organizations, there was no reason why we should add: "and the disbanding of the state police" (a demand which would be expedient under different circumstances). We should rather tell the Social-Democratic workers: We are ready to accept these demands of your Party as demands of the proletarian united front and are ready to fight to the end for their realization. Let us join hands for the battle.

In ***Czechoslovakia*** also certain demands advanced by the Czech and German Social-Democrats, and by the reformist trade unions, can and should be utilized for establishing a united front of the working class. When the Social-Democrats, for instance, demand work for the unemployed or the abolition of the laws restricting municipal self-government, as they have done ever since 1927, these demands should be made concrete in each locality, in each district, and a fight should be carried on hand in hand with the Social-Democratic organizations for their actual realization. Or, when the Social-Democratic Parties thunder "in general terms" against the agents of fascism in the state apparatus, the proper thing to do is in each particular district to drag into the light of day *the particular* local fascist spokesmen, and together with the Social Democratic workers demand their removal from government employ.

In ***Belgium*** the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party, with Emile Vandervelde at their head, have entered a coalition government. This "success" they achieved thanks to their lengthy and extensive campaigns for two main demands: 1) *abolition of the emergency decrees*, and 2) *realization of the de Man [161] Plan*. The first issue is very important. The preceding government issued 150 reactionary emergency decrees, which are an extremely heavy burden on the working people. They were expected to be repealed at once. This was the demand of the Socialist Party. But have many of these emergency decrees been repealed by the new government? It has not repealed a single one. It has only mollified somewhat a few of the emergency decrees in order to make a sort of "token payment" in settlement of the generous promises of the Belgian Socialist leaders (like that "token dollar" which some European powers proffered the USA in payment of the millions due as war debts).

[161] De Man -- One of the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party in Belgium, on whose orders he drafted in 1933 the so-called 'Plan of de Man', envisaging a 'peaceful transition to socialism', which was adopted as the official party program at the end of 1933.

As regards the realization of the widely advertised de Man Plan, the matter has taken a turn quite unexpected by the Social Democratic masses. The Socialist ministers announced that *the economic crisis must be overcome first* and only those provisions of the de Man Plan should be carried into effect which improve the position of the industrial capitalists and the banks; only afterwards would it be possible to adopt measures to improve the condition of the workers. But *how long* must the workers wait for their *share* in the "benefits" promised them in the de Man Plan? The Belgian bankers have already had their veritable *shower of gold.* The Belgian franc has been devalued 28 per cent; by this manipulation the bankers were able to pocket 4,500 million francs as their spoils at the expense of the wage earners and the savings of the small depositors. But how does this tally with the contents of the de Man Plan? Why, if we are to believe the letter of the plan, it promises to "*prosecute* monopolist abuses and speculative manipulations."

On the basis of the de Man Plan, the government has appointed a commission to supervise the banks. But the commission *consists of bankers* who can now gaily and lightheartedly supervise themselves.

The de Man Plan also promises a number of other good things, such as a *shorter working day, standardization of wages, a minimum wage, organization of an all-embracing system* of *social insurance*, "greater convenience in living conditions through new *housing construction,*" and so forth. These are all demands which we Communists can support. We should go to the labor organizations of Belgium and say to them: The capitalists have already received enough and even too much. Let us demand that the Social-Democratic ministers now carry out the promises they made to the workers. Let us get together in a *united front for the successful defense* of our interests. Minister Vandervelde, we support the demands on behalf of the workers contained in *your* platform; but we tell you frankly that we take these demands *seriously*, that we want action and not empty words, and therefore are rallying hundreds of thousands of workers to *struggle* for these demands.

Thus, in countries having Social-Democratic governments, the Communists, by utilizing appropriate individual demands taken from the platforms of the Social-Democratic ministers as a starting point for achieving joint action with the Social-Democratic Parties and organizations, can afterwards more easily develop a campaign for the establishment of a united front on the basis of other mass demands in the struggle against the capitalist offensive, against fascism and the threat of war.

It must further be borne in mind that, in general, joint action with the Social-Democratic Parties and organizations requires from Communists serious and substantiated criticism of Social Democracy as the ideology and practice of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and untiring, comradely explanation to the Social-Democratic workers of the program and slogans of Communism. In countries having Social-Democratic governments this task is of particular importance in the struggle for a united front.

Comrades, a most important stage in the consolidation of the united front must be the establishment of national and international trade union unity.

As you know, the splitting tactics of the reformist leaders were applied most virulently in the trade unions. The reason for this is clear. Here their policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie found its practical culmination directly in the factories, to the detriment of the vital interests of the working class. This, of course, gave rise to sharp criticism and resistance on the part of the revolutionary workers under the leadership of the Communists. That is why the struggle between communism and reformism raged most fiercely in the trade unions.

The more difficult and complicated the situation became for capitalism, the more reactionary was the policy of the leaders of the Amsterdam trade unions, *[The International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU), based in Amsterdam]* and the more aggressive their measures against all opposition elements within the trade unions. Even the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany and the intensified capitalist offensive in all capitalist countries failed to diminish this aggressiveness. Is it not a characteristic fact that in 1933 alone, most disgraceful circulars were issued for the expulsion of Communists and revolutionary workers from the trade unions in Great Britain, Holland, Belgium and Sweden?

In Great Britain a circular was issued in 1933 prohibiting the local branches of the trade unions from joining anti-war or other revolutionary organizations. That was a prelude to the notorious "Black Circular" of the Trade Union Congress General Council, which outlawed any trade councils admitting delegates "directly or indirectly associated with Communist organizations." What is there left to be said of the leadership of the German trade unions, which applied unprecedented repressive measures against the revolutionary elements in the trade unions?

Yet we must base our tactics, not on the behavior of individual leaders of the Amsterdam unions, no matter what difficulties their behavior may cause the class struggle, but primarily on the question of *where the masses of workers are to be found.* And here we must openly declare that work in the trade unions is the most vital question in the work of all the Communist Parties. We must bring about a real change for the better in trade union work and make the question of struggle for trade union unity the central issue.

Ignoring the urge of the workers to join the trade unions, and faced with the difficulties of working within the Amsterdam unions, many of our comrades decided to pass by this complicated task. They invariably spoke of an organizational crisis in the Amsterdam unions, of the workers deserting the unions, but failed to notice that after some decline at the beginning of the world economic crisis, these unions later began to grow again. A peculiarity of the trade union movement has been precisely the fact that the attacks of the bourgeoisie on trade union rights, the attempts in a number of countries to "coordinate" the trade unions (Poland, Hungary, etc.), the curtailment of social

insurance, and the cutting of wages forced the workers, notwithstanding the lack of resistance on the part of the reformist trade union leaders, to rally still more closely around these unions, because the workers wanted and still want to see in the trade unions the militant champions of their vital class interests. This explains the fact that most of the Amsterdam unions -- in France, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Sweden, etc. -- have grown in membership during the last few years. The American Federation of Labor has also considerably increased its membership in the past two years.

Had the German comrades better understood the problem of trade union work of which Comrade Thaelmann spoke on many occasions, there would undoubtedly have been a better situation in the trade unions than was the case at the time the fascist dictatorship was established. At the end of 1932 only about ten percent of the Party members belonged to the free trade unions. This in spite of the fact that after the Sixth Congress of the Comintern the Communists took the lead in quite a number of strikes. Our comrades used to write in the press of the need to assign 90 per cent of our forces to work in the trade unions, but in reality, activity was concentrated exclusively around the revolutionary trade union opposition, which actually sought to replace the trade unions. And how about the period after Hitler's seizure of power? For two years many of our comrades stubbornly and systematically opposed the correct slogan of fighting for the re-establishment of the free unions.

I could cite similar examples about almost every other capitalist country.

But we already have the first serious achievements to our credit in the struggle for trade union unity in European countries. I have in mind little Austria, where on the initiative of the Communist Party a basis has been created for an illegal trade union movement. After the February battles the Social-Democrats, with Otto Bauer at their head, issued the watchword: "The free unions can be re-established only after the downfall of fascism." The Communists applied themselves to the *task of reestablishing the trade unions.* Every phase of that work was a bit of the living united front of the Austrian proletariat. The successful re-establishment of the free trade unions in underground conditions was a serious blow to fascism. The Social-Democrats were at the parting of the ways. Some of them tried to negotiate with the government. Others, seeing our successes, created their own parallel illegal trade unions. But there could be only one road: *either capitulation to fascism, or towards trade union unity through joint struggle against fascism.* Under mass pressure, the wavering leadership of the parallel unions created by the former trade union leaders decided to agree to amalgamation. The basis of this amalgamation is irreconcilable struggle against the offensive of capitalism and fascism and the guarantee of trade union democracy. We welcome this fact of the amalgamation of the trade unions, which is the first of its kind since the formal split of the trade unions after the war and which is therefore of *international importance.*

In *France* the united front has unquestionably served as a mighty impetus for achieving trade union unity. The leaders of the General Confederation of Labor have hampered and still hamper in every way the realization of unity, countering the main issue of the class policy of the trade unions by

raising issues of a subordinate and secondary or formal character. An unquestionable success in the struggle for trade union unity has been the establishment of *single unions* on a local scale embracing, in the case of the railroad workers, for instance, approximately three-quarters of the membership of both trade unions.

We are definitely for the re-establishment of *trade union unity in every country and on an international scale.*

We are for one union in every industry. We are for one federation of trade unions in every country

We are for single international federations of trade unions organized by industries.

We stand for one international of trade unions based on the class struggle.

We are for united class trade unions as one of the major bulwarks of the working class against the offensive of capital and fascism. Our only condition for uniting the trade unions is: *Struggle against capital, against fascism and for internal trade union democracy.*

Time does not wait. To us the question of trade union unity on a national as well as international scale is a question of the great task of uniting our class in mighty single trade union organizations against the class enemy. We welcome the fact that on the eve of May Day of this year the Red International of Labor Unions approached the Amsterdam International with the proposal to consider jointly the question of the terms, methods and forms of uniting the world trade union movement. The leaders of the Amsterdam International rejected that proposal, using the outworn pretext that unity in the trade union movement is possible only within the Amsterdam International, which, by the way, includes trade unions in only a part of the European countries.

But the communists working in the trade unions must continue to struggle tirelessly for the unity of the trade union movement. The task of the Red Trade Unions and the R.I.L.U. is to do all in their power to hasten the achievement of a joint struggle of all trade unions against the offensive of capital and fascism, and to bring about unity in the trade union movement, despite the stubborn resistance of the reactionary leaders of the Amsterdam International. The Red Trade Unions and the R.I.L.U must receive our unstinted support along this line.

In countries where small Red trade unions exist, we recommend working for their inclusion in the big reformist unions, but demanding the right to defend their views and the reinstatement of expelled members. But in countries where big Red trade unions exist parallel with big reformist trade unions, we must work for the convening of *unity congresses* on the basis of a platform of struggle against the capitalist offensive and the guarantee of *trade union democracy.*

It should be stated categorically that any Communist worker, any revolutionary worker who does not belong to the mass trade union of his industry, who does not fight to transform the reformist trade union into a real class trade union organization, who does not fight for trade union unity on the

basis of the class struggle, such a Communist worker, such a revolutionary worker, does not discharge his elementary proletarian duty.

Section: The United Front and the Youth

Comrades, I have already pointed out the role played in the victory of fascism by the enlistment of the youth in the fascist organizations. In speaking of the youth, we must state frankly that we have neglected our task of drawing the masses of the working youth into the struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the danger of war; we have neglected this task in a number of countries. We have underestimated the enormous importance of the youth in the fight against fascism. We have not always taken into account the special economic, political and cultural interests of the youth. We have likewise not paid proper attention to the revolutionary education of the youth.

All this has been utilized very cleverly by fascism, which in some countries, particularly in Germany, has inveigled large sections of the youth onto the anti-proletarian road. It should be borne in mind that it is not only by the glamor of militarism that fascism entices the youth. It feeds and clothes some of them in its detachments, gives work to others, and even sets up so-called cultural institutions for the youth, trying in this way to imbue them with the idea that it really can and wants to feed, clothe, teach and provide work for the mass of the working youth.

In a number of capitalist countries our Young Communist Leagues are still mainly sectarian organizations divorced from the masses. Their fundamental weakness is that they still try to copy the Communist Parties, to copy their forms and methods of work, forgetting that the YCL is *not a Communist party of the youth.* They do not take sufficient account of the fact that it is an organization with its own special tasks. Its methods and forms of work, education and struggle must be adapted to the actual level and needs of the youth.

Our Young Communists have shown memorable examples of heroism in the fight against fascist violence and bourgeois reaction. But they still lack the ability to win the masses of the youth away from hostile influences by dint of stubborn concrete work, as is evident from the fact that they have not yet overcome their opposition to work in the fascist mass organizations, and that their approach to the Socialist youth and other non-Communist youth is not always correct.

A great part of the responsibility for all this must be borne, of course, by the Communist parties as well, for they ought to lead and support the YCL in its work. For the problem of the youth is not only a YCL problem. *It is a problem for the whole Communist movement.* In the struggle for the youth, the Communist Parties and the YCL organizations must effect a genuine decisive change. The main task of the Communist youth movement in capitalist countries is to advance boldly in the direction of bringing about a *united* front along the path of organizing and rallying the young generation of working people. The tremendous influence that even the first steps taken in this direction exert on the revolutionary movement of the youth is shown by the examples of *France* and

the *United States* during the recent past. It was sufficient in these countries to proceed to apply the united front for considerable successes to be immediately achieved. In the sphere of the international united front, the successful initiative of the committee against war and fascism in Paris in bringing about the international cooperation of all *non-fascist* youth organizations is also worthy of note in this connection.

These recent successful steps in the united front movement of the youth also show that the forms which the united front of the youth should assume must not be stereotyped, nor necessarily be the same as those met with in the practice of the Communist parties. The Young Communist Leagues must strive in every way to unite the forces of all non-fascist mass organizations of the youth, including the formation of various kinds of common organizations for the struggle against fascism, against the unprecedented manner in which the youth is being stripped of every right, against the militarization of the youth and for the economic and cultural rights of the young generation, in order to draw these young workers over to the side of the anti-fascist front, no matter where they may be -- in the factories, the forced labor camps, the labor exchanges, the army barracks and the fleet, the schools, or in the various sports, cultural or other organizations.

In developing and strengthening the YCL, our YCL members must work for the formation of anti-fascist associations of the Communist and Socialist Youth Leagues on a platform of class struggle.

Section: The United Front and Women

Comrades, work among working women -- among women workers, unemployed women, peasant women and housewives -- has been underestimated no less than work among the youth. While fascism exacts most of all from youth, it enslaves women with particular ruthlessness and cynicism, playing on the innermost feelings of the mother, housewife, the single working woman, uncertain of the morrow. Fascism, posing as a benefactor, throws the starving family a few beggarly scraps, trying in this way to stifle the bitterness aroused, particularly among the working women by the unprecedented slavery which fascism brings them. It drives working women out of industry, forcibly sends needy girls into the country, dooming them to the position of unpaid servants of rich farmers and landlords. While promising women a happy home and family life, it drives women to prostitution more than any other capitalist regime.

Communists, above all our women Communists, must remember that there cannot be a successful fight against fascism and war unless the wide masses of women are drawn into the struggle. Agitation alone will not accomplish this. Taking into account the concrete situation in each instance, we must find a way of mobilizing the mass of women by work around their vital interests and demands--in a fight for their demands against high prices, for higher wages on the basis of the principle of equal pay for equal work, against mass dismissals, against every manifestation of inequality in the status of women and against fascist enslavement.

In endeavoring to draw women who work into the revolutionary movement, we must not be afraid of forming separate women's organizations for this purpose, wherever necessary. The preconceived notion that the women's organizations under Communist party leadership in the capitalist countries should be abolished as part of the struggle against 'women's separatism' in the labor movement, has often done great harm.

The simplest and most flexible forms should be sought to establish contact and a joint struggle between the revolutionary, Social-Democratic and progressive antiwar and anti-fascist women's organizations. We must spare no pains to see that the women workers and working women in general fight shoulder to shoulder with their class brothers in the ranks of the united working-class front and the anti-fascist People's Front.

Section: The Anti-imperialist United Front

The changed international and internal situation lends exceptional importance to the question of *the anti-imperialist united front* in all colonial and semi-colonial countries.

In forming a broad anti-imperialist united front of struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies it is necessary above all to recognize the variety of conditions in which the anti-imperialist struggle of the masses is proceeding, the varying degree of maturity of the national liberation movement, the role of the proletariat within it and the influence of the Communist party over the masses.

In Brazil the problem differs from that in India, China and other countries.

In *Brazil* the Communist Party, having laid a correct foundation for the development of the united anti-imperialist front by the establishment of the National Liberation Alliance, [162] must make every effort to extend this front by drawing into it first and foremost the many millions of the peasantry, leading up to the formation of units of a people's revolutionary army, completely devoted to the revolution and to the establishment of a government of the National Liberation Alliance.

In *India* the Communists must support, extend and participate in all anti-imperialist mass activities, not excluding those which are under national reformist leadership. While maintaining their political organizational independence, they must carry on active work inside the organizations which take part in the Indian National Congress, facilitating the process of crystallization of a national revolutionary wing among them, for the purpose of further developing the national liberation movement of the Indian peoples against British imperialism.

In *China*, where the people's movement has already led to the formation of soviet districts over a considerable territory of the country and to the organization of a powerful Red Army, the predatory offensive of Japanese imperialism and the treason of the Nanking government have brought into

[162] The National-Liberation Alliance -- A mass antifascist organization formed at the beginning of 1935 in Brazil by progressive political parties and organizations headed by the Communist Party, defeated in an armed struggle against reaction in November 1935.

jeopardy the national existence of the great Chinese people. The Chinese soviets act as a unifying center in the struggle against the enslavement and partition of China by the imperialists, as a unifying center which will rally all anti-imperialist forces for the national defense of the Chinese people.

We therefore approve the initiative taken by our courageous brother Party of China in the creation of a most extensive anti-imperialist united front against Japanese imperialism and its Chinese agents, jointly with all those organized forces existing on the territory of China which are ready to wage a real struggle for the salvation of their country and their people. I am sure that I express the sentiments and thoughts of our entire Congress in saying that we send our warmest fraternal greetings, in the name of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world, to all the soviets in China, to the Chinese revolutionary people. We send our ardent fraternal greetings to the heroic Red Army of China, tried in a thousand battles. And we assure the Chinese people of our firm resolve to support its struggle for its complete liberation from all imperialist robbers and their Chinese henchmen.

Section: A United Front Government

Comrades, we have taken a bold, resolute course towards the united front of the working class, and are ready to carry it out with full consistency.

If we Communists are asked whether we advocate the united front *only* in the fight for partial demands, or whether we are prepared to share the responsibility even when it will be a question of forming a government on the basis of the united front, then we say with a full sense of our responsibility: Yes, we recognize that a situation may arise in which the formation of a *government of the proletarian united front*, or of an *anti-fascist People's Front*, will become not only possible but necessary. And in that case, we shall advocate for the formation of such a government without the slightest hesitation.

I am not speaking here of a government which may be formed *after* the victory of the proletarian revolution. It is not impossible, of course, that in some country, immediately after the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie, there may be formed a government on the basis of a government bloc of the Communist party with a certain party (or its Left wing) participating in the revolution. After the October Revolution the victorious party of the Russian Bolsheviks, as we know, included representatives of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries in the Soviet Government. This was a specific feature of the first Soviet government after the victory of the October Revolution.

I am not speaking of such a case, but of the possible formation of a united front government on the eve of and before the victory of the revolution.

What kind of government is this? And in what situation could there be any question of such a government?

It is primarily a *government of struggle against fascism and reaction.* It must be a government arising as the result of the united front movement and in no way restricting the activity of the Communist party and the mass organizations of the working class, but on the contrary, taking resolute measures against the counterrevolutionary financial magnates and their fascist agents.

At a suitable moment, relying on the growing united front movement, the Communist Party of a given country will advocate the formation of such a government on the basis of a definite anti-fascist platform.

Under what objective conditions will it be possible to form such a government? In the most general terms, one can reply to this question as follows: under conditions of a *political crisis*, when the ruling classes are no longer able to cope with the powerful rise of the mass anti-fascist movement. But this is only a general perspective, without which it will scarcely be possible in practice to form a united front government. Only the existence of certain *special prerequisites* can put on the agenda the question of forming such government as a politically essential task. It seems to me that the following prerequisites deserve the greatest attention in this connection:

First, the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie must already be sufficiently *disorganized and paralyzed*, so that the bourgeoisie cannot prevent the formation of a government of struggle against reaction and fascism.

Second, the widest masses of working people, particularly the mass trade unions, must be in a state of vehement revolt *against fascism and reaction*, though *not ready* to rise in insurrection so as to *fight under Communist Party leadership for the establishment of a fully socialist government.*

Third, the differentiation and radicalization in the ranks of Social-Democracy and other parties participating in the united front must already have reached the point where a considerable proportion of them demand *ruthless measures against the fascists and other reactionaries*, fight together with the Communists against fascism and openly oppose the reactionary section of their own party which is hostile to Communism.

When and in what countries a situation will actually arise in which these prerequisites will be present in a sufficient degree, it is impossible to state in advance. But as such a possibility *is not to be ruled out in any of the capitalist countries*, we must reckon with it, and not only so orient and prepare ourselves, but also orient the working class accordingly.

The fact that we are bringing up this question for discussion at all today is, of course, connected with our estimate of the situation and immediate prospects, as well as with the actual growth of the united front movement in a number of countries during the recent past. For more than ten years the situation in the capitalist countries was such that it was not necessary for the Communist International to discuss a question of this kind.

You remember, Comrades, that at our Fourth Congress in 1922, and again at the Fifth Congress in 1924, the question of the slogan of a *workers', or a workers' and peasants' government* was under discussion. Originally the issue turned essentially upon a question was almost comparable to the one we are discussing today. The debates that took place at that time in the Communist International around this question, and in particular the political *errors* which were committed in connection with it, have to this day retained their importance for *sharpening our vigilance against the danger of deviations to the "Right" or "Left"* from *the Bolshevik line* on this question. Therefore, I shall briefly point out a few of these errors, in order to draw from them the lessons necessary for the present policy of our Parties.

The first series of mistakes arose from the fact that the question of a workers' government was not clearly and firmly bound up with the existence of a political crisis. Owing to this, the Right opportunists were able to interpret matters as though we should strive for the formation of a workers' government, supported by the Communist party, in any, so to speak, "normal" situation. The ultra-Lefts, on the other hand, recognized only a workers' government formed by an armed insurrection after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Both views were wrong. In order, therefore, to avoid a repetition of such mistakes, we now *lay great stress on the exact consideration* of the specific, concrete circumstances of the political crisis and the upsurge of the mass movement, in which the formation of a united front government may prove possible and politically necessary.

The second series of errors arose from the fact that the question of a workers' government was not bound up with the development of a militant mass *united front movement of the proletariat.* Thus, the Right opportunists were able to distort the question, reducing it to the unprincipled tactics of forming blocs with Social-Democratic Parties on the basis of purely parliamentary combinations.

The ultra-Lefts, on the contrary, shrieked: "No coalitions with counter-revolutionary Social-Democrats!" -- considering all Social-Democrats as essentially counterrevolutionary.

Both were wrong, and we now emphasize, on the one hand, that we are not in the least anxious for a "workers government" that would be nothing more nor less than an enlarged Social-Democratic government. We even prefer not to use the term "workers' government," and *speak of a united front government*, which in political character is something absolutely different, *different in principle*, from all the Social-Democratic governments which usually call themselves "workers' (or labor) government." While the Social-Democratic government is an instrument of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie in the interests of the preservation of the capitalist order, a united front government is an instrument of the collaboration of the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat with other anti-fascist parties, in the interests of the entire working population, a government of struggle against fascism and reaction. Obviously, there is a *radical difference* between these two things.

On the other hand, we stress the need to see *the difference between the two different camps of Social-Democracy.* As I have already pointed out, there is a reactionary camp of Social-Democracy, but

alongside with it there exists and is growing the camp of the Left Social-Democrats (without quotation marks), of workers who are becoming revolutionary. In practice the decisive difference between them consists in their attitude towards the united front of the working class. The reactionary Social-Democrats are *against* the united front; they slander the united front movement, they sabotage and disintegrate it, as it undermines their policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie. The Left Social-Democrats are *for the united front;* they defend, develop and strengthen the united front movement. Inasmuch as this united front movement is a militant movement against fascism and reaction, it will be a constant driving force, impelling the united front government to struggle against the reactionary bourgeoisie. The more powerful this mass movement, the greater the force with which it can back the government in combating the reactionaries. And the better this mass movement will be organized *from below*, the wider the network of *non-party class organs of the united front in the factories*, among *the unemployed*, in *the workers' districts*, among *the people of town and country*, the greater will be the guarantee against a possible degeneration of the policy of the united front government.

The third series of mistaken views which came to light during our former debates touched precisely on the practical policy of the "workers' government." The right opportunists considered that a "workers' government" ought to keep "within the framework of bourgeois democracy," and consequently ought not to take any steps going beyond this framework. The ultra-Lefts, on the other hand, in practice refused to make any attempt to form a united front government.

In 1923 Saxony and Thuringia presented a clear picture of a Right opportunist "workers' government" in action. The entry of the Communists into the Workers' Government of Saxony jointly with the Left Social-Democrats (Ziegner group) was no mistake in itself; on the contrary, the revolutionary situation in Germany fully justified this step. But in taking part in the government, the Communists should have used their positions primarily *for the purpose of arming the proletariat.* This they did not do. They did not even requisition a single apartment of the rich, although the housing shortage among the workers was so great that many of them with their wives and children were still without a roof over their heads. They also did *nothing* to organize the revolutionary mass movement of the workers. They behaved in general like *ordinary* parliamentary ministers "within the framework of bourgeois democracy." As you know, this was the result of the opportunist policy of Brandler and his adherents. The result was such bankruptcy that to this day we have to refer to the government of Saxony as the classical example of how revolutionaries *should not behave* when in office.

Comrades, we demand an entirely different policy from a united front government. We demand that it should carry out *definite and fundamental revolutionary demands* required by the situation. For instance, control of production, control of the banks, disbanding of the police and its replacement by an armed workers' militia, etc.

Fifteen years ago, Lenin called upon us to focus all our attention on "searching out forms of *transition* or *approach* to the proletariat revolution." It may be that in a number of countries *the united front government* will prove to be *one* of the most important transitional forms.

"Left" doctrinaires have always avoided this precept of Lenin's. Like the narrow-minded propagandists that they were, they spoke only of aims, without ever worrying about "forms of transition." The Right Opportunists, on the other hand, have tried to establish a *special democratic intermediate stage* lying between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the purpose of instilling into the workers the illusion of a peaceful parliamentary passage from the one dictatorship to the other. This fictitious "intermediate stage" they have also called "transitional form," and even quoted Lenin's words. But this piece of swindling was not difficult to expose: for Lenin spoke of the form of transition and approach to *the proletarian revolution*, that is, to the overthrow of the bourgeois dictatorship, and not of some transitional form *between* the bourgeois and the proletarian dictatorship.

Why did Lenin attach such exceptionally great importance to the form of transition to the proletarian revolution? Because he had in mind *the fundamental law of all great revolutions*, the law that for the masses propaganda and agitation alone cannot take the place of *their own political experience*, when it is a question of attracting really broad masses of the working people to the side of the revolutionary vanguard, without which a victorious struggle for power is impossible. It is a common mistake of a Leftist character to imagine that as soon as a political (or revolutionary) crisis arises, it is enough for the Communist leaders to put forth the slogan of revolutionary insurrection, and the broad masses will follow them. No, even in such a crisis the masses are by no means always ready to do so. We saw this in the case of Spain. To help *the millions* to master as rapidly as possible, through their own experience, what they have to do, where to find a radical solution, and what Party is worthy of their confidence -- these among others are the purposes for which both transitional slogans and special "forms of *transition or approach* to the proletarian revolution" are necessary. Otherwise, the great mass of the people, who are under the influence of petty bourgeois democratic illusions and traditions, may waver even when there is a revolutionary situation, may procrastinate and stray, without finding the road to revolution -- and then come under the ax of the fascist executioners.

That is why we indicate the possibility of forming an anti-fascist united front government in the conditions of a political crisis. In so far as such a government will really prosecute the struggle against the enemies of the people, and give a free hand to the working class and the Communist party, we Communists shall accord it our unstinted support, and as soldiers of the revolution shall take our place *in the first line of fire.* But we state frankly to the masses:

Final salvation this government cannot bring. It is not in a position to overthrow the class rule of the exploiters, and for this reason cannot finally remove the danger of fascist counter-revolution. Consequently, *it is necessary to prepare for the socialist revolution.*

In estimating the present development of the world situation, we see that *a political crisis* is maturing in quite a number of countries. This makes a firm decision by our Congress on the question of a united front government a matter of great urgency and importance.

If our parties are able to utilize in a Bolshevik fashion the opportunity of forming a united front government and of waging the struggle for the formation and maintenance in power of such a government, *for the revolutionary training of the masses*, this will be *the best political justification* in our policy in favor of the formation of united front governments.

Section: The Ideological Struggle Against Fascism

One of the weakest aspects of the anti-fascist struggle of our Parties is that *they react inadequately and too slowly to the demagogy of fascism*, and to this day continue to neglect the problems of the struggle against fascist ideology. Many comrades did not believe that so reactionary a brand of bourgeois ideology as the ideology of fascism, which in its stupidity frequently reaches the point of lunacy, would be able to gain any mass influence. This was a serious mistake. The putrefaction of capitalism penetrates to the innermost core of its ideology and culture, while the desperate situation of wide masses of the people renders certain sections of them susceptible to infection from the ideological refuse of this putrefaction.

Under no circumstances must we underrate fascism's power of ideological infection. On the contrary, we for our part must develop an extensive ideological struggle based on clear, popular arguments and a correct, well thought out approach to the peculiarities of the national psychology of the masses of the people.

The fascists are rummaging through the entire *history* of every nation so as to be able to pose as the heirs and continuators of all that was exalted and heroic in its past, while all that was degrading or offensive to the national sentiments of the people, they make use of as weapons against the enemies of fascism. Hundreds of books are being published in Germany with only one aim -- to falsify the history of the German people and give it a fascist complexion. The new-baked National Socialist historians try to depict the history of Germany as if for the past two thousand years, by virtue of some historical law, a certain line of development had run through it like a red thread, leading to the appearance on the historical scene of a national 'savior', a 'Messiah' of the German people, a certain 'Corporal' of Austrian extraction. In these books the greatest figures of the German people of the past are represented as having been fascists, while the great peasant movements are set down as the direct precursors of the fascist movement.

Mussolini does his utmost to make capital for himself out of the heroic figure of Garibaldi. The French fascists bring to the fore as their heroine Joan of Arc. The American fascists appeal to the traditions of the American War of Independence, the traditions of Washington and Lincoln. The Bulgarian fascists make use of the national-liberation movement of the seventies and its heroes beloved by the people, Vassil Levsky, Stephan Karaj and others.

Communists who suppose that all this has nothing to do with the cause of the working class, who do nothing to enlighten the masses on the past of their people in a historically correct fashion, in a genuinely Marxist-Leninist spirit, who do nothing *to link up the present struggle with the people's*

revolutionary traditions and past -- voluntarily hand over to the fascist falsifiers all that is valuable in the historical past of the nation, so that the fascists may fool the masses.

No, Comrades, *we are concerned with every important question, not only of the present and the future, but also of the past of our own peoples.* We Communists do not pursue a narrow policy based on the craft interests of the workers. We are not narrow-minded trade union functionaries, or leaders of medieval guilds of handicraftsmen and journeymen. We are the representatives of the class interests of the most important, the greatest class of modern society-the working class, to whose destiny it falls to free mankind from the sufferings of the capitalist system, the class which in one-sixth of the world has already cast off the yoke of capitalism and constitutes the ruling class. We defend the vital interests of all the exploited, toiling strata, that is, of the overwhelming majority in any capitalist country.

We Communists are the *irreconcilable opponents, in principle*, of bourgeois nationalism in all its forms. But *we are not supporters of national nihilism*, and should never act as such. The task of educating the workers and all working people in the spirit of proletarian internationalism is one of the fundamental tasks of every Communist Party. But anyone who thinks that this permits him, or even compels him, to sneer at all the national sentiments of the broad masses of working people is far from being a genuine Bolshevik, and has understood nothing of the teaching of Lenin on the national question.

Lenin, who always fought bourgeois nationalism resolutely and consistently, gave us an example of the correct approach to the problem of national sentiments in his article "On the National Pride of the Great Russians" written in 1914. He wrote:

> Are we class-conscious Great-Russian proletarians impervious to the feeling of national pride? Certainly not. We love our language and our motherland; we, more than any other group, are working to raise its laboring masses (i.e., nine-tenths of its population) to the level of intelligent democrats and socialists. We, more than anybody is grieved to see and feel to what violence, oppression and mockery our beautiful motherland is being subjected by the tsarist hangmen, the nobles and the capitalists. We are proud of the fact that those acts of violence met with resistance in our midst, in the midst of the Great Russians; that this midst brought forth Radischev, the Decembrists, the intellectual revolutionaries of the seventies; that in 1905 the Great-Russian working class created a powerful revolutionary party of the masses. .
>
> We are filled with national pride because of the knowledge that the Great-Russian nation, *too*, has created a revolutionary class, that it, too, has proved capable of giving humanity great examples of struggle for freedom and for socialism; that its contribution is not confined solely to great pogroms, numerous scaffolds, torture chambers, severe famines and abject servility before the priests, the tsars, the landowners and the capitalists.

We are filled with national pride, and therefore we *particularly* hate *our* slavish past... and our slavish present, in which the same landowners, aided by the capitalists, lead us into war to stifle Poland and the Ukraine, to throttle the democratic movement in Persia and in China, to strengthen the gang of Romanovs, Bobrinskis, Puriskeviches that cover with shame our Great-Russian national dignity.
[V. I. Lenin, Collected Works 21:103-4]

This is what Lenin wrote on national pride.

I think, comrades, that when at the Reichstag Fire Trial the fascists tried to slander the Bulgarians as a barbarous people, I was not wrong in taking up the defense of the national honor of the working masses of the Bulgarian people, who are struggling heroically against the fascist usurpers, the real barbarians and savages, nor was I wrong in declaring that I had no cause to be ashamed of being a Bulgarian, but that, on the contrary, I was proud of being a son of the heroic Bulgarian working class.

Comrades, proletarian internationalism must, so to speak, "acclimatize itself" in each country in order to strike deep roots in its native land. *National forms* of the proletarian class struggle and of the labor movement in the individual countries are in no contradiction to proletarian internationalism; on the contrary, it is precisely in these forms that *the international interests of the proletariat* can be successfully defended.

It goes without saying that it is necessary *everywhere and, on all occasions,* to expose before the masses and prove to them concretely that the fascist bourgeoisie, on the pretext of defending general national interests, is conducting its selfish policy of oppressing and exploiting its own people, as well as robbing and enslaving other nations. But *we must not confine ourselves to this.* We must at the same time prove by the very struggle of the working class and the actions of the Communist Parties that the proletariat, in rising against every manner of bondage and national oppression, is the *only* true fighter for national freedom and the independence of the people.

The interests of the class struggle of the proletariat against its native exploiters and oppressors are not in contradiction to the interests of a free and happy future of the nation. On the contrary, the socialist revolution will signify *the salvation of the nation* and will open up to it the road to loftier heights. By the *very fact* of building at the present time its class organizations and consolidating its positions, by the very fact of defending democratic rights and liberties against fascism, by the *very fact* of fighting for the overthrow of capitalism, the working class is fighting for the future of the nation.

The revolutionary proletariat is fighting to save the culture of the people, to liberate it from the shackles of decaying monopoly capitalism, from barbarous fascism, which is laying violent hands on it. *Only* the proletarian revolution can avert the destruction of culture and raise it to its highest flowering as a truly national culture -- *national in form and socialist in content* -- which is being realized in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics before our very eyes.

Proletarian internationalism not only is not in contradiction to this struggle of the working people of the individual countries for national, social and cultural freedom, but, thanks to international proletarian solidarity and fighting unity, assures *the support* that is necessary for victory in this struggle. The working class in the capitalist countries can triumph *only in the closest alliance* with the victorious proletariat of the great Soviet Union. *Only* by struggling hand in hand with the proletariat of the imperialist countries can the colonial peoples and oppressed national minorities achieve their freedom. The *sole* road to victory for the proletarian revolution in the imperialist countries lies through the revolutionary alliance of the working class of the imperialist countries with the national-liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries, because, as *Marx* taught us, "no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations."

Communists belonging to an oppressed, dependent nation cannot combat chauvinism successfully among the people of their own nation if they do not *at the same time show* in practice, in the mass movement, that they actually struggle for the liberation of their nation from the alien yoke. And again, on the other hand, the Communists of an oppressing nation cannot do what is necessary to educate the working masses of their nation in the spirit of internationalism *without waging* a resolute struggle against the oppressor policy of their "own" bourgeoisie, for the right of complete self-determination for the nations kept in bondage by it. If they do not do this, they likewise do not make it easier for the working people of the oppressed nation to overcome their nationalist prejudices.

If we act in this spirit, if in all our mass work we prove convincingly that we are free of both national nihilism and bourgeois nationalism, then and only then shall we be able to wage a really successful struggle against the jingo demagogy of the fascists.

That is the reason why a correct and practical application of the Leninist national policy is of such paramount importance. It is *unquestionably an essential* preliminary condition for a successful struggle against chauvinism -- this main instrument of ideological influence of the fascists upon the masses.

Chapter 3: Consolidation of the Communist Parties and the Struggle for Political Unity of the Proletariat

Comrades, in the struggle to establish a united front the importance of the leading role of the Communist Party increases extraordinarily. Only the Communist Party is at bottom the initiator, the organizer and the driving force of the united front of the working class.

The Communist Parties can ensure the mobilization of the broadest masses of working people for a united struggle against fascism and the offensive of capital *only if they strengthen their own ranks in every respect*, if they develop their initiative, pursue a Marxist-Leninist policy and apply correct, flexible tactics which take into account the actual situation and alignment of class forces.

In the period between the Sixth and Seventh Congress, our Parties in the capitalist countries have undoubtedly *grown in stature and have been considerably steeled.* But it would be a most dangerous mistake to rest content with this achievement. The more the united front of the working class extends, the more will new, complex problems arise before us and the more will it be necessary for us to work on the political and organizational consolidation of our Parties. The united front of the proletariat brings to the fore an army of workers who will be able to carry out their mission if this army is headed by a leading force that will point out its aims and paths. This leading force can *only be a strong proletarian, revolutionary party.*

If we Communists exert every effort to establish a united front, we do this not for the narrow purpose of recruiting new members for the Communist Parties. But we must strengthen the Communist Parties in every way and increase their membership for the very reason that we seriously want to strengthen the united front. The strengthening of the Communist Parties is not a narrow Party concern but the concern of the entire working class.

The unity, revolutionary solidarity and fighting preparedness of the Communist Parties constitute a most valuable capital which belongs not only to us but to the whole working class. We have combined and shall continue to combine our readiness to march jointly with the Social-Democratic Parties and organizations to the struggle against fascism with an irreconcilable struggle against Social-Democracy as the ideology and practice of compromise with the bourgeoisie, and consequently also against any penetration of this ideology into our own ranks.

In boldly and resolutely carrying out the policy of the united front, we meet in our own ranks with obstacles which we must remove at all costs in the shortest possible time.

After the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, a successful struggle was waged in all Communist Parties of the capitalist countries against any tendency towards an opportunist adaptation to the conditions of capitalist stabilization and against any infection with reformist and legalist illusions. Our Parties purged their ranks of various kinds of Right opportunists, thus strengthening their Bolshevik unity and fighting capacity. Less successful, and frequently entirely lacking, was the fight against sectarianism. Sectarianism no longer manifested itself in primitive, open forms, as in the first years of the existence of the Communist International, but, under cover of a formal recognition of the Bolshevik theses, hindered the development of a Bolshevik mass policy. In our day this is often no longer an "infantile disorder," as Lenin wrote, but a *deeply rooted vice*, which must be shaken off or it will be impossible to solve the problem of establishing the united front of the proletariat and of leading the masses from the positions of reformism to the side of revolution.

In the present situation sectarianism, *self-satisfied* sectarianism, as we designate it in the draft resolution, more than anything else impedes our struggle for the realization of the united front: sectarianism, satisfied with its *doctrinaire narrowness*, its divorce from the real life of the masses, satisfied with its *simplified methods* of solving the most complex problems of the working class

movement on the basis of stereotyped schemes; sectarianism which professes to know all and considers it superfluous to learn from the masses, from the lessons of the labor movement; in short, sectarianism, to which as they say, mountains are mere stepping-stones.

Self-satisfied sectarianism *will not and cannot* understand that the leadership of the working class by the Communist Party does not come of itself. The leading role of the Communist Party in the struggles of the working class must be won. For this purpose, it is necessary, not to rant about the leading role of the Communists, but *to earn and win the confidence of the working masses* by everyday mass work and a correct policy. This will be possible only if in our political work we Communists seriously take into account the actual level of the class consciousness of the masses, the degree to which they have become revolutionized, if we soberly appraise the actual situation, not on the basis of our wishes but on the basis of the actual state of affairs. Patiently, step by step, we must make it easier for the broad masses to come over to the Communist position. We ought never to forget the words of Lenin, who warns us as strongly as possible:

> ... This is the whole point -- we must not regard that which is obsolete for us, as obsolete for the class, as obsolete for the masses. *[V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder, New York (1940), pp. 42; Collected Works 31:58]*

Is it not a fact, comrades, that in our ranks there are still quite a few such doctrinaire elements, who at all times and places sense nothing but danger in the policy of the united front? For such comrades the whole united front is one unrelieved peril. But this sectarian "sticking to principle" is nothing but political helplessness in face of the difficulties of directly leading the struggle of the masses.

Sectarianism finds expression *particularly* in overestimating the revolutionization of the masses, in overestimating the speed at which they are abandoning the positions of reformism, and in attempting to leap over difficult stages and the complicated tasks of the movement. In practice, methods of leading the masses have frequently been replaced by the methods of leading a narrow party group. The strength of the traditional tie-up between the masses and their organizations and leaders was underestimated, and when the masses did not break off these connections, immediately the attitude taken toward them was just as harsh as that adopted toward their reactionary leaders. Tactics and slogans have tended to become stereotyped for all countries, the special features of the actual situation in each individual country being left out of account. The necessity of stubborn struggle in the very midst of the masses themselves to win their confidence has been ignored, the struggle for the partial demands of the workers and work in the reformist trade unions and fascist mass organizations have been neglected. The policy of the united front has frequently been replaced by bare appeals and abstract propaganda.

In no less a degree has sectarian views hindered the correct selection of people, the training and developing of *cadres connected* with the masses, *enjoying* the confidence of the masses, cadres

whose revolutionary mettle has been tried and tested in class battles, cadres capable of combining *the practical experience of mass* work with a *Bolshevik staunchness of principle.*

Thus, sectarianism has to a considerable extent retarded the growth of the Communist Parties, made it difficult to carry out a real mass policy, prevented our taking advantage of the difficulties of the class enemy to strengthen the positions of the revolutionary movement, and hindered the winning over of the broad masses of the proletariat to the side of the Communist Parties.

While fighting most resolutely to overcome and exterminate the last remnants of self-satisfied sectarianism, we must increase in every way our vigilance toward Right opportunism and the struggle against it and against every one of its concrete manifestations, bearing in mind that the danger of Right opportunism will increase in proportion as the broad united front develops. Already there are tendencies to reduce the role of the Communist Party in the ranks of the united front and to effect a reconciliation with Social-Democratic ideology. Nor must we lose sight of the fact that the tactics of the united front are a method of clearly convincing the Social-Democratic workers of the correctness of the Communist policy and the incorrectness of the reformist policy, and that they are *not a reconciliation with Social-Democratic ideology and practice.* A successful struggle to establish the united front imperatively demands constant struggle in our ranks against tendencies to *depreciate the role of the Party*, against *legalist illusions*, against reliance on spontaneity and *automatism*, both in liquidating fascism and in implementing the united front against *the slightest vacillation at the moment of decisive action.*

Section: Political Unity of the Working Class

Comrades, the development of the united front of joint struggle of the Communist and Social-Democratic workers against fascism and the offensive of capital also brings to the fore the question of *political unity*, of a *single political mass party of the working class.* The Social Democratic workers are becoming more and more convinced by experience that the struggle against the class enemy demands unity of political leadership, inasmuch as *duality in leadership* impedes the further development and reinforcement of the joint struggle of the working class.

The interests of the class struggle of the proletariat and the success of the proletarian revolution make it imperative that there be *a single party of the proletariat* in each country. Of course, it is not so easy or simple to achieve this. It requires stubborn work and struggle and is bound to be a more or less lengthy process. The Communist Parties, basing themselves on the growing urge of the workers for a unification of the Social-Democratic Parties or of individual organizations with the Communist Parties, must firmly and confidently take the initiative in this unification. The cause of amalgamating the forces of the working class in a single revolutionary proletarian party at the time when the international labor movement is entering the period of closing the split in its ranks, *is our cause.*

But while it is sufficient for the establishment of the united front of the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties to have an agreement to fight against fascism, the offensive of capital and war, the

achievement of political unity is possible only on the basis of a number of certain conditions involving principles.

This unification is possible only on the following conditions:

- *First, complete independence from the bourgeoisie and dissolution of the bloc of Social-Democracy with the bourgeoisie;*
- *Second*, preliminary unity of action;
- *Third*, recognition of *the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie* and the establishment of the dictatorship *of the proletariat in the form of soviets* a sine qua non;
- *Fourth*, refusal to support one's own bourgeoisie in an *imperialist war;*
- *Fifth*, building up the Party on the basis of *democratic centralism*, which ensures unity of purpose and action, and which has been tested by the *experience of the Russian Bolsheviks.*

We must explain to the Social-Democratic workers, patiently and in comradely fashion, why political unity of the working class is impossible without these conditions. We must discuss together with them the sense and significance of these conditions.

Why is it necessary for the realization of the political unity of the proletariat that there be complete independence from the bourgeoisie and a rupture of the bloc of Social-Democrats with the bourgeoisie?

Because the whole experience of the labor movement, particularly the experience of the fifteen years of coalition policy in Germany, has shown that the policy of class collaboration, the policy of dependence on the bourgeoisie, leads to the defeat of the working class and to the victory of fascism. And the only true road to victory is the road of irreconcilable class struggle against the bourgeoisie, the road of the Bolsheviks.

Why must unity of action be first established as a preliminary condition of political unity?

Because unity of action to repel the offensive of capital and of fascism is possible and necessary even before the majority of the workers are united on a common political platform for the overthrow of capitalism, while the working out of unity of views on the main lines and aims of the struggle of the proletariat, without which a unification of the parties is impossible, requires a more or less extended period of time. And unity of views is worked out best of all in joint struggle against the class enemy already today. To propose to unite at once instead of forming a united front means to place the cart before the horse and to imagine that the cart will then move ahead. Precisely for the reason that for us the question of political unity is not a maneuver, as it is for many Social-Democratic leaders, we insist on the realization of unity of action as one of the most important stages in the struggle for political unity.

Why is it necessary to recognize the necessity of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the setting up of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of soviet power?

Because the experience of the victory of the great October Revolution, on the one hand and, on the other, the bitter lessons learned in Germany, Austria and Spain during the entire postwar period have confirmed once more that the victory of the proletariat is possible only by means of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie, and that the bourgeoisie would rather drown the labor movement in a sea of blood than allow the proletariat to establish socialism by peaceful means. The experience of the October Revolution has demonstrated patently that the basic content of the proletarian revolution is the question of the proletarian dictatorship, which is called upon to crush the resistance of the overthrown exploiters, to arm the revolution for the struggle against imperialism and to lead the revolution to the complete victory of socialism. To achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat as the dictatorship of the vast majority over an insignificant minority, over the exploiters -- and only as such can it be brought about -- for this soviets are needed embracing all sections of the working class, the basic masses of the peasantry and the rest of the working people, without whose awakening, without whose inclusion in the front of the revolutionary struggle, the victory of the proletariat cannot be consolidated.

Why is the refusal of support to the bourgeoisie in an imperialist war a condition of political unity?

Because the bourgeoisie wages imperialist wars for its predatory purposes, against the interests of the vast majority of the peoples, under whatever guise this war may be waged. Because all imperialists combine their feverish preparations for war with extremely intensified exploitation and oppression of the working people in their own country. Support of the bourgeoisie in such a war means treason to the country and the international working class.

Why, finally, is the building of the Party on the basis of democratic centralism a condition of unity?

Because only a party built on the basis of democratic centralism can ensure unity of purpose and action, can lead the proletariat to victory over the bourgeoisie, which has at its disposal so powerful a weapon as the centralized state apparatus. The application of the principle of democratic centralism has stood the splendid historical test of the experience of the Russian Bolshevik Party, the Party of Lenin.

This explains why it is necessary to strive for political unity on the basis of the conditions indicated.

We are for the political unity of the working class. Therefore, we are ready to collaborate most closely with all Social-Democrats who are for the united front and sincerely support unity on the above-mentioned principles.

But precisely because we are for unity, we shall struggle resolutely against all "Left" demagogues who try to make use of the disillusionment of the Social Democratic workers to create new Socialist Parties or Internationals directed against the Communist movement, and thus keep deepening the split in the working class.

We welcome the growing efforts among Social-Democratic workers for a united front with the Communists. In this fact we see a growth of their revolutionary consciousness and a beginning of the healing of the split in the working class. Being of the opinion that unity of action is a pressing necessity and the truest road to the establishment of the political unity of the proletariat as well, we declare that the Communist International and its sections are ready to enter into negotiations with the Second International and its sections for the establishment of the unity of the working class in the struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the menace of an imperialist war.

Section: Conclusion

Comrades, I am concluding my report. As you see, taking into account the change in the situation since the Sixth Congress and the lessons of our struggle, and relying on the degree of consolidation already achieved, we are raising a number of questions today in a new way, primarily the question of the united front and of the approach to Social-Democracy, the reformist trade unions and other mass organizations.

There are wiseacres who will sense in all this a digression from our basic positions, some sort of turn to the Right from the straight line of Bolshevism. Well, in my country, Bulgaria, they say that a hungry hen always dreams of millet. Let those political chickens think so.

This interests us little. For it is important that our own Parties and the broad masses throughout the world should correctly understand what we are striving for.

We would not be revolutionary Marxists, Leninists, worthy pupils of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, if we did not suitably *reconstruct* our policies and tactics in accordance with the changing situation and the changes occurring in the world labor movement.

We would not be real revolutionaries if we did not learn from our own experience and the experience of the masses.

We want our Parties in the capitalist countries to come out and act as *real political parties of the working class*, to become in actual fact a *political factor* in the life of their countries, to pursue at all times *an active Bolshevik mass policy and not confine themselves to propaganda and criticism, and bare appeals to struggle for a proletarian dictatorship.*

We are *enemies of all cut-and-dried schemes.* We want to take into account the concrete situation at each moment, in each place, and not act according to *a fixed, stereotyped form* anywhere and everywhere, not to forget that in *varying* circumstances the position of the Communists cannot be *identical.*

We want soberly to take into account all stages in the development of the class struggle and in the growth of the class consciousness of the masses themselves, to be able to locate and solve at each stage the *concrete* problems of the revolutionary movement corresponding to this stage.

We want to find a *common language* with the broadest masses for the purpose of struggling against the class enemy, to find ways of finally overcoming *the isolation of the revolutionary vanguard* from the masses of the proletariat and all other working people, as well as of overcoming the fatal *isolation of the working class itself from* its natural allies in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, against fascism.

We want to draw increasingly wide masses into the revolutionary class struggle and lead them to the proletarian revolution *proceeding from their vital interests and needs as the starting point, and their own experience as the basis.*

Following the example of our glorious Russian Bolsheviks, the example of the leading party of the Communist International, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we want to combine *the revolutionary heroism* of the German, the Spanish, the Austrian and other Communists with *genuine revolutionary realism*, and put an end to the last remnants of scholastic tinkering with serious political questions.

We want to equip our Parties from every angle for the solution of the highly complex political problems confronting them. For this purpose, we want to raise ever higher their *theoretical level*, to train them in the spirit of living Marxism-Leninism and not fossilized doctrinairism.

We want to eradicate from our ranks all *self-satisfied sectarianism*, which above all blocks our road to the masses and impedes the carrying out of a truly Bolshevik mass policy.

We want to intensify in every way the struggle against concrete manifestations of Right opportunism, bearing in mind that the danger from this side will arise precisely in the course of carrying out our mass policy and struggle.

We want the Communists of every country promptly to draw and apply *all the lessons* that can be drawn from their own experience as the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat. We want them *as quickly as possible to learn how to sail on the turbulent waters of the class struggle*, and not to remain on the shore as observers and registrars of the surging waves in the expectation of fine weather.

This is what we want.

And we want all this because only in this way will the working class at the head of all the working people, welded into a million-strong revolutionary army, led by the Communist International, be able to fulfil its historical mission with certainty -- to sweep fascism off the face of the earth and, together with it, capitalism!

(At the close of the report all delegates joined in a lengthy ovation, cheering enthusiastically and singing the revolutionary songs of their countries.)

In order to win a people's war, it is imperative to build the broadest possible united front and formulate a series of policies which will ensure the fullest mobilization of the basic masses as well as the unity of all the forces that can be united.

The Anti-Japanese National United Front embraced all the anti-Japanese classes and strata. These classes and strata shared a common interest in fighting Japan, an interest which formed the basis of their unity. But they differed in the degree of their firmness in resisting Japan, and there were class contradictions and conflicts of interest among them. Hence the inevitable class struggle within the united front.

In formulating the Party's line of the Anti-Japanese National United Front, Comrade Mao Zedong made the following class analysis of Chinese society.

The workers, the peasants, and the urban petty bourgeoisie firmly demanded that the War of Resistance should be carried through to the end; they were the main force in the fight against Japanese aggression and constituted the basic masses who demanded unity and progress.

The bourgeoisie was divided into the national and the comprador bourgeoisie. The national bourgeoisie formed the majority of the bourgeoisie; it was rather flabby, often vacillated and had contradictions with the workers, but it also had a certain degree of readiness to oppose imperialism and was one of our allies in the War of Resistance. The comprador bourgeoisie was the bureaucratic-capitalist class, which was very small in number but occupied the ruling position in China. Its members attached themselves to different imperialist powers, some of them being pro-Japanese and others pro-British and pro-American. The pro-Japanese section of the comprador bourgeoisie were the capitulators, the overt and covert traitors. The pro-British and pro-American section of this class favored resistance to Japan to a certain extent, but they were not firm in their resistance and very much wished to compromise with Japan, and by their nature they were opposed to the Communist Party and the people.

The landlords fell into different categories; there were the big, the middle and the small landlords. Some of the big landlords became traitors, while others favored resistance but vacillated a great deal. Many of the middle and small landlords had the desire to resist, but there were contradictions between them and the peasants.

In the face of these complicated class relationships, our Party's policy regarding work within the united front was one of both alliance and struggle. That is to say, its policy was to unite with all the anti-Japanese classes and strata, try to win over even those who could be only vacillating and temporary allies, and adopt appropriate policies to adjust the relations among these classes and strata so that they all served the general cause of resisting Japan. At the same time, we had to maintain our Party's principle of independence and initiative, make the bold arousing of the masses and expansion

[163] Released before the exposure of Lin Bao as a secret enemy of the people, this article was nonetheless prepared under the personal direction of Chairman Mao and represents his line.

of the people's forces the centre of gravity in our work, and wage the necessary struggles against all activities harmful to resistance, unity and progress.

Our Party's Anti-Japanese National United Front policy was different both from Chen Duxiu's Right opportunist policy of all alliance and no struggle, and from Wang Ming's "Left" opportunist policy of all struggle and no alliance. Our Party summed up the lessons of the Right and "Left" opportunist errors and formulated the policy of both alliance and struggle.

Our Party made a series of adjustments in its policies in order to unite all the anti-Japanese parties and groups, including the Kuomintang, and all the anti-Japanese strata in a joint fight against the foe. We pledged ourselves to fight for the complete realization of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary Three People's Principles. The government of the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia revolutionary base area was renamed the Government of the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Special Region of the Republic of China. Our Workers' and Peasants' Red Army were redesignated the Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army of the National Revolutionary Army. Our land policy, the policy of confiscating the land of the landlords, was changed to one of reducing rent and interest. In our own base areas, we carried out the "three thirds system"[164] in our organs of political power, drawing in those representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, the national bourgeoisie and the enlightened gentry and those members of the Kuomintang who stood for resistance to Japan and did not oppose the Communist Party. In accordance with the principles of the Anti-Japanese National United Front, we also made necessary and appropriate changes in our policies relating to the economy, taxation, labor and wages, anti-espionage, people's rights, culture and education, etc.

While making these policy adjustments, we maintained the independence of the Communist Party, the people's army and the base areas. We also insisted that the Kuomintang should institute a general mobilization, reform the government apparatus, introduce democracy, improve the people's livelihood, arm the people, and carry out a total war of resistance. We waged a resolute struggle against the Kuomintang's passive resistance to Japan and active opposition to the Communist Party, against its suppression of the people's resistance movement and its treacherous activities for compromise and capitulation.

Past experience has taught us that "Left" errors were liable to crop up after our Party had corrected Right errors, and that Right errors were liable to crop up after it had corrected "Left" errors. "Left" errors were liable to occur when we broke with the Kuomintang ruling clique, and Right errors were liable to occur when we united with it.

After the overcoming of "Left" opportunism and the formation of the Anti-Japanese National United Front, the main danger in our Party was Right opportunism or capitulationism.

Wang Ming, the exponent of "Left" opportunism during the Second Revolutionary Civil War, went to the other extreme in the early days of the War of Resistance Against Japan and became the exponent of Right opportunism, i.e., capitulationism. He countered Comrade Mao Zedong's correct line and policies with an out-and-out capitulationist line of his own and a series of ultra-Right policies. He voluntarily abandoned proletarian leadership in the Anti-Japanese National United Front

[164] The "three thirds system" refers to the organs of the political power which were established according to the principle of the Anti-Japanese National United Front and in which the members of the Communist Party, non-Party progressives and the middle elements each occupied one-third of the places.

and willingly handed leadership to the Kuomintang. By his advocacy of "everything through the united front" or "everything to be submitted to the united front," he was in effect advocating that everything should go through or be submitted to Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang. He opposed the bold mobilization of the masses, the carrying out of democratic reforms and the improvement of the livelihood of the workers and peasants, and wanted to undermine the worker-peasant alliance which was the foundation of the united front. He did not want the Communist-led base areas of the people's revolutionary forces but wanted to cut off the people's revolutionary forces from their roots. He rejected the people's army led by the Communist Party and wanted to hand over the people's armed forces to Chiang Kai-shek, which would have meant handing over everything the people had. He did not want the leadership of the Party and advocated an alliance between the youth of the Kuomintang and that of the Communist Party to suit Chiang Kai-shek's design of corroding the Communist Party. He decked himself out and presented himself to Chiang Kai-shek, hoping to be given some official appointment. All this was revisionism, pure and simple. If we had acted on Wang Ming's revisionist line and his set of policies, the Chinese people would have been unable to win the War of Resistance Against Japan, still less subsequent nationwide victory.

For a time during the War of Resistance, Wang Ming's revisionist line caused harm to the Chinese people's revolutionary cause. But the leading role of Comrade Mao Zedong had already been established in the Central Committee of our Party. Under his leadership, all the Marxist-Leninists in the Party carried out a resolute struggle against Wang Ming's errors and rectified them in time. It was this struggle that prevented Wang Ming's erroneous line from doing greater and more lasting damage to the cause of the Party.

Chiang Kai-shek, our teacher by negative example, helped us to correct Wang Ming's mistakes. He repeatedly lectured us with cannons and machine-guns. The gravest lesson was the Southern Anhui Incident which took place in January 1941. Because some leaders of the New Fourth Army disobeyed the directives of the Central Committee of the Party and followed Wang Ming's revisionist line, its units in southern Anhui suffered disastrous losses in the surprise attack launched by Chiang Kai-shek and many heroic revolutionary fighters were slaughtered by the Kuomintang revolutionaries. The lessons learned at the cost of blood helped to sober many of our comrades and increase their ability to distinguish the correct from the erroneous line.

Comrade Mao Zedong constantly summed up the experience gained by the whole Party in implementing the line of the Anti-Japanese National United Front and worked out a whole set of policies in good time. They were mainly as follows:

1. All people favoring resistance (that is, all the anti-Japanese workers, peasants, soldiers, students and intellectuals, and businessmen) were to unite and form the Anti-Japanese National United Front.

2. Within the united front, our policy was to be one of independence and initiative, i.e., both unity and independence were necessary.

3. As far as military strategy was concerned, our policy was to be guerrilla warfare waged independently and with the initiative in our own hands, within the framework of a unified strategy; guerrilla warfare was to be basic, but no chance of waging mobile warfare was to be lost when the conditions were favorable.

4. In the struggle against the anti-Communist die-hards headed by Chiang Kai-shek, our policy was to make use of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few and destroy our enemies one by one, and to wage struggles on just grounds, to our advantage, and with restraint.

5. In the Japanese-occupied with Kuomintang areas our policy was, on the one hand, to develop the united front to the greatest possible extent and, on the other, to have selected cadres working underground. With regard to the forms of organization and struggle, our policy was to assign selected cadres to work under cover for a long period, so as to accumulate strength and bide our time.

6. As regards the alignment of the various classes within the country, our basic policy was to develop the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the anti-Communist die-hard forces.

7. As for the anti-Communist die-hards, we followed a revolutionary dual policy of uniting with them, in so far as they were still capable of bringing themselves to resist Japan, and of struggling against and isolating them, in so far as they were determined to oppose the Communist Party.

8. With respect to the landlords and the bourgeoisie - even the big landlords and big bourgeoisie - it was necessary to analyze each case and draw distinctions. On the basis of these distinctions, we were to formulate different policies so as to achieve our aim of uniting with all the forces that could be united.

The line and the various policies of the Anti-Japanese National United Front formulated by Comrade Mao Zedong stood the test of the War of Resistance and proved to be entirely correct.

History shows that when confronted by ruthless imperialist aggression, a Communist Party must hold aloft the national banner and, using the weapon of the united front, rally around itself the masses and the patriotic and anti-imperialist people who form more than 90 percent of a country's population, so as to mobilize all positive factors, unite with all the forces that can be united and isolate to the maximum the common enemy of the whole nation. If we abandon the national banner, adopt a line of "closed-doorism" and thus isolate ourselves, it is out of the question to exercise leadership and develop the people's revolutionary cause, and this in reality amounts to helping the enemy and bringing defeat on ourselves.

History shows that within the united front the Communist Party must maintain its ideological, political and organizational independence, adhere to the principle of independence and initiative, and insist on its leading role. Since there are class differences among the various classes in the united front, the Party must have a correct policy in order to develop the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and oppose the die-hard forces. The Party's work must centre on developing the progressive forces and expanding the people's revolutionary forces. This is the only way to maintain and strengthen the united front. "If unity is sought through struggle, it will live; if unity is sought

through yielding, it will perish."[165] This is the chief experience gained in our struggle against the die-hard forces.

History shows that during the national-democratic revolution there must be two kinds of alliance within this united front, first, the worker-peasant alliance and, second, the alliance of the working people with the bourgeoisie and other non-working people. The worker-peasant alliance is an alliance of the working class with the peasants and all other working people in town and country. It is the foundation of the united front. Whether the working class can gain leadership of the national-democratic revolution depends on whether it can lead the broad masses of the peasants in struggle and rally them around itself. Only when the working class gains leadership of the peasants, and only on the basis of worker-peasant alliance, is it possible to establish the second alliance, form a broad united front and wage a people's war victoriously. Otherwise, everything that is done is unreliable, like castles in the air or so much empty talk.

Mao Zedong: The Question of Independence and Initiative Within the United Front

[*This is part of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's concluding speech at the Sixth Plenary Session of the Sixth Central Committee of the Party. At the time, the issue of independence and initiative within the united front was one of the outstanding questions concerning the anti-Japanese united front, a question on which there were differences of opinion between Comrade Mao Tse-tung and Chen Shao-yu. In essence what was involved was proletarian leadership in the united front. In his report of December 1947 ("The Present Situation and Our Tasks") Comrade Mao Tse-tung briefly summed up these differences:*

During the War of Resistance, our Party combated ideas similar to those of the capitulationists [referring to Chen Tu-hsiu's capitulationism in the period of the First Revolutionary Civil War], that is, such ideas as making concessions to the Kuomintang's anti-popular policies, having more confidence in the Kuomintang than in the masses, not daring to arouse and give full rein to mass struggles, not daring to expand the Liberated Areas and the people's armies in the Japanese-occupied areas, and handing over the leadership in the War of Resistance to the Kuomintang. Our Party waged a resolute struggle against such impotent and degenerate ideas, which run counter to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, resolutely carried out its political line of "developing the progressive forces, winning over the middle forces and isolating the die-hard forces", and resolutely expanded the Liberated Areas and the People's Liberation Army. Not only did this ensure our Party's ability to defeat Japanese imperialism in the period of its aggression, but also in the period after the Japanese surrender when Chiang Kai-shek launched his counter-revolutionary war, it ensured our Party's ability to switch smoothly and without loss to the course of Opposing Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolutionary war with a people's revolutionary war and to win great victories in a short time. All Party comrades must keep these lessons of history firmly in mind.]

Section: Help and Concessions Should Be Positive, Not Negative

All political parties and groups in the united front must help each other and make mutual concessions for the sake of long-term cooperation, but such help and concessions should be positive, not negative. We must consolidate and expand our own Party and army, and at the same time should assist friendly parties and armies to consolidate and expand; the people want the government to satisfy their political and economic demands, and at the same time give the government every possible help to prosecute the War of Resistance; the factory workers demand better conditions from the owners, and at the same time work hard in the interests of resistance; for the sake of unity against foreign aggression, the landlords should reduce rent and interest, and at the same time the peasants should pay rent and interest. All these principles and policies of mutual assistance are positive, not negative or one-sided. The same should be true of mutual concessions. Each side should refrain from undermining the other and from organizing secret party branches within the other's party,

[165] Mao Zedong, "Current Problems of Tactics in the Anti-Japanese United Front," *Selected Works,* Eng. Ed., FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. II, p. 422.

government and army. For our part we organize no secret party branches inside the Kuomintang and its government or army, and so set the Kuomintang's mind at rest, to the advantage of the War of Resistance. The saying, "Refrain from doing some things in order to be able to do other things", [166] exactly meets the case. A national war of resistance would have been impossible without the reorganization of the Red Army, the change in the administrative system in the Red areas, and the abandonment of the policy of armed insurrection. By giving way on the latter, we have achieved the former; negative measures have yielded positive results. "To fall back the better to leap forward" [167] -- that is Leninism. To regard concessions as something purely negative is contrary to Marxism-Leninism. There are indeed instances of purely negative concessions--the Second International's doctrine of collaboration between labor and capital [168] resulted in the betrayal of a whole class and a whole revolution. In China, Chen Tu-hsiu and then Chang Kuo-tao were both capitulators; capitulationism must be strenuously opposed. When we make concessions, fall back, turn to the defensive or halt our advance in our relations with either allies or enemies, we should always see these actions as part of our whole revolutionary policy, as an indispensable link in the general revolutionary line, as one turn in a zigzag course. In a word, they are positive.

Section: The Identity Between the National and the Class Struggle

To sustain a long war by long-term co-operation or, in other words, to subordinate the class struggle to the present national struggle against Japan--such is the fundamental principle of the united front. Subject to this principle, the independent character of the parties and classes and their independence and initiative within the united front should be preserved, and their essential rights should not be sacrificed to co-operation and unity, but on the contrary must be firmly upheld within certain limits. Only thus can co-operation be promoted, indeed only thus can there be any co-operation at all. Otherwise, co-operation will turn into amalgamation and the united front will inevitably be sacrificed. In a struggle that is national in character, the class struggle takes the form of national struggle, which demonstrates the identity between the two. On the one hand, for a given historical period the political and economic demands of the various classes must not be such as to disrupt co-operation; on the other hand, the demands of the national struggle (the need to resist Japan) should be the point of departure for all class struggle. Thus, there is identity in the united front between unity and independence and between the national struggle and the class struggle.

Section: "Everything Through the United Front" is Wrong

The Kuomintang is the party in power, and so far, has not allowed the united front to assume an organizational form. Behind the enemy lines, the idea of "everything through" is impossible, for there we have to act independently and with the initiative in our own hands while keeping to the agreements which the Kuomintang has approved (for instance, the Programme of Armed Resistance and National Reconstruction). Or we may act first and report afterwards, anticipating what the Kuomintang might agree to. For instance, the appointment of administrative commissioners and the

---

[166] A quotation from Mencius.

[167] V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book Lectures on the History of Philosophy", Collected Works, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1958, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 275.

[168] "The doctrine of collaboration between labor and capital" is the reactionary doctrine of the Second International, which advocates such collaboration in the capitalist countries and opposes the revolutionary overthrow of bourgeois rule and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

dispatch of troops to Shantung Province would never have occurred if we had tried to get these things done "through the united front". It is said that the French Communist Party once put forward a similar slogan, but that was probably because in France, where a joint committee of the parties already existed and the Socialist Party was unwilling to act in accordance with the jointly agreed programme and wanted to have its own way, the Communist Party had to put forward such a slogan in order to restrain the Socialist Party, and certainly it did not do so to shackle itself. In the case of China, the Kuomintang has deprived all other political parties of equal rights and is trying to compel them to take its orders. If this slogan is meant to be a demand that everything done by the Kuomintang must go through us, it is both ridiculous and impossible. If we have to secure the Kuomintang's consent beforehand for everything we do, what if the Kuomintang does not consent? Since the policy of the Kuomintang is to restrict our growth, there is no reason whatever for us to propose such a slogan, which simply binds us hand and foot. At present there are things for which we should secure prior consent from the Kuomintang, such as the expansion of our three divisions into three army corps--this is to report first and act afterwards. There are other things which the Kuomintang can be told after they have become accomplished facts, such as the expansion of our forces to over 200,000 men--this is to act first and report afterwards. There are also things, such as the convening of the Border Region assembly, which we shall do without reporting for the time being, knowing that the Kuomintang will not agree. There are still other things which, for the time being, we shall neither do nor report, for they are likely to jeopardize the whole situation. In short, we must not split the united front, but neither should we allow ourselves to be bound hand and foot, and hence the slogan of "everything through the united front" should not be put forward. If "everything must be submitted to the united front" is interpreted as "everything must be submitted to" Chiang Kai-shek and Yen Hsi-shan, then that slogan, too, is wrong. Our policy is one of independence and initiative within the united front, a policy both of unity and of independence.

Mao Zedong: Introducing the Communist

The Central Committee has long planned to publish an internal Party journal, and now at last the plan has materialized. Such a journal is necessary for building up a bolshevized Chinese Communist Party, a party which is national in scale and has a broad mass character, a party which is fully consolidated ideologically, politically and organizationally. This necessity is all the more obvious in the present situation, which has special features: on the one hand, the danger of capitulation, of a split and of retrogression within the Anti-Japanese National United Front is increasing daily, while on the other, our Party has stepped out of its narrow confines and become a major national party. The duty of the Party is to mobilize the masses to overcome the dangers of capitulation, a split and retrogression and prepare against all possible eventualities so that in case they occur, the Party and the revolution will not suffer unexpected losses. An internal Party journal is indeed most necessary at a time like this.

This internal Party journal is called *The Communist.* What is its purpose? What will it deal with? In what way will it differ from other Party publications?

Its purpose is to help build a bolshevized Chinese Communist Party which is national in scale, has a broad mass character, and is fully consolidated ideologically, politically and organizationally. The building of such a party is imperative for the victory of the Chinese revolution and on the whole

the subjective and objective conditions for it are present; indeed, this great undertaking is now in progress. A special Party periodical is needed to help achieve this great task, which is beyond the capability of an ordinary Party publication, and this is why *The Communist* is now being published.

To a certain extent our Party is already national in scale and has a broad mass character: and it is already a bolshevized party, consolidated ideologically, politically and organizationally, so far as its core of leadership, a part of its membership and its general line and revolutionary work are concerned.

That being so, why set a new task?

The reason is that we now have many new branches, which have a great many new members but which cannot yet be considered as having a broad mass character, as being ideologically, politically and organizationally consolidated, or as being bolshevized. At the same time, there is the problem of raising the political level of the older Party members and of making further progress in bolshevizing the older branches and consolidating them ideologically, politically and organizationally. The circumstances in which the Party now finds itself and the responsibilities it is shouldering are quite unlike those in the revolutionary civil war period; the circumstances are much more complex and the responsibilities much heavier.

This is the period of the national united front, and we have formed a united front with the bourgeoisie; this is the period of the War of Resistance Against Japan, and the armed forces of our Party are at the front, fighting a ruthless war against the enemy in co-ordination with the friendly armies; this is the period when our Party has become a major national party and is therefore no longer what it was before. If we take all these factors together, we shall understand how glorious and momentous is the task we have set ourselves, the task of "building up a bolshevized Chinese Communist Party, a party which is national in scale and has a broad mass character, a party fully consolidated ideologically, politically and organizationally".

It is this kind of party that we now want to build, but how shall we go about it? We cannot answer this question without going into the history of our Party and of its eighteen years of struggle.

It is fully eighteen years since our First National Congress in 1921. In these eighteen years our Party has gone through many great struggles. And the members of the Party, its cadres and organizations, have all tempered themselves in these great struggles. They have had the experience both of splendid victories and grave defeats in the revolution. The Party established a national united front with the bourgeoisie and, with the break-up of this united front, engaged in a bitter armed struggle with the big bourgeoisie and its allies. During the last three years, it has again entered into a period of a national united front with the bourgeoisie. It is through this kind of complex relationship with the Chinese bourgeoisie that the Chinese revolution and the Communist Party of China have progressed in their development. This is a special historical feature, a feature peculiar to the revolution in colonial and semi-colonial countries and not to be found in the revolutionary history of

any capitalist country. Moreover, since China is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, since her political, economic and cultural development is uneven, since her economy is predominantly semi-feudal and since her territory is vast, it follows that the character of the Chinese revolution in its present stage is bourgeois-democratic, that its principal targets are imperialism and feudalism and that its basic motive forces are the proletariat, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie, with the national bourgeoisie taking part at certain times and to a certain extent; it also follows that the principal form of struggle in the Chinese revolution is armed struggle. Indeed, the history of our Party may be called a history of armed struggle. Comrade Stalin has said, "In China the armed revolution is fighting the armed counter-revolution. That is one of the specific features and one of the advantages of the Chinese revolution." [169] This is perfectly true. The specific feature peculiar to semi-colonial China is not present, or is not present in the same way, in the history of the revolutions led by Communist Parties in the capitalist countries. Thus, there are two basic specific features in the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution: (1) the proletariat either establishes a revolutionary national united front with the bourgeoisie, or is forced to break it up; and (2) armed struggle is the principal form of the revolution. Here we do not describe the Party's relations with the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie as a basic specific feature, first, because these relations are in principle the same as those which confront Communist Parties all over the world, and secondly, because armed struggle in China is, in essence, peasant war and the Party's relations with the peasantry and its close relations with the peasant war are one and the same thing.

It is because of these two basic specific features, in fact precisely because of them, that the building up and bolshevization of our Party are proceeding in special circumstances. The Party's failures or successes, its retreats or advances, its contraction or expansion, its development and consolidation are inevitably linked up with its relations with the bourgeoisie and with armed struggle. When the Party takes a correct political line on the question of forming a united front with the bourgeoisie or of breaking it up when forced to do so, our Party moves a step forward in its development, consolidation and bolshevization; but when it takes an incorrect line on its relations with the bourgeoisie, then our Party moves a step backward. Similarly, when our Party handles the question of revolutionary armed struggle correctly, it moves a step forward in its development, consolidation and bolshevization; but when it handles the question incorrectly, it moves a step backward. Thus, for eighteen years, the building and bolshevization of the Party have been closely linked with its political line, with the correct or incorrect handling of the questions of the united front and armed struggle. This conclusion is clearly confirmed by the eighteen years of our Party's history. Or conversely, the more bolshevized the Party, the more correctly can it decide upon its political line and handle the questions of the united front and armed struggle. This conclusion, too, is clearly confirmed by the eighteen years of our Party's history.

[169] J. V. Stalin, "The Prospects of the Revolution in China", Works, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1954, Vol. VIII, p. 379.

Therefore, the united front, armed struggle and Party building are the three fundamental questions for our Party in the Chinese revolution. Having a correct grasp of these three questions and their interrelations is tantamount to giving correct leadership to the whole Chinese revolution. We are now able to draw correct conclusions concerning these three questions by virtue of our abundant experience in the eighteen years of our Party's history, our rich and profound experience of failures and successes, retreats and advances, contraction and expansion. This means that we are now able to handle the questions of the united front, of armed struggle and of Party building in a correct way. It also means that our eighteen years of experience have taught us that the united front, armed struggle and Party building are the Chinese Communist Party's three "magic weapons", its three principal magic weapons for defeating the enemy in the Chinese revolution. This is a great achievement of the Chinese Communist Party and of the Chinese revolution.

Here let us briefly discuss each of the three magic weapons, each of the three questions.

In the last eighteen years, the united front of the Chinese proletariat with the bourgeoisie and other classes has developed under three different sets of circumstances or through three different stages: the First Great Revolution from 1924 to 1927, the War of Agrarian Revolution from 1927 to 1937, and the present War of Resistance Against Japan. The history of the three stages has confirmed the following laws**:**

(1) The Chinese national bourgeoisie will take part in the struggle against imperialism and the feudal warlords at certain times and to a certain extent, because foreign oppression is the greatest oppression to which China is subjected. Therefore, at such times, the proletariat should form a united front with the national bourgeoisie and maintain it as far as possible. (2) In other historical circumstances, the Chinese national bourgeoisie will vacillate and defect because of its economic and political flabbiness. Therefore, the composition of China's revolutionary united front will not remain constant at all times, but is liable to change. At one time the national bourgeoisie may take part in it, at another it may not. (3) The Chinese big bourgeoisie, which is comprador in character, is a class which directly serves imperialism and is fostered by it. Hence the comprador Chinese big bourgeoisie has always been a target of the revolution. However, different groups within this big bourgeoisie are backed by different imperialist powers, so that when contradictions among these powers become sharper and when the edge of the revolution is mainly directed against a particular power, the big bourgeois groups dependent upon the other powers may join the struggle against that particular imperialist power to a certain extent and for a certain time. At such times, in order to weaken the enemy and add to its own reserves, the Chinese proletariat may form a united front with these groups and should maintain it as far as possible, provided it is advantageous to the revolution. (4) The comprador big bourgeoisie continues to be most reactionary even when it joins the united front alongside the proletariat in struggling against the common enemy. It stubbornly opposes any ideological, political and organizational development of the

proletariat and the proletarian party, tries to impose restrictions on them and employs disruptive tactics such as deception, blandishments, "corrosion" and savage attacks against them; moreover, it does all this to prepare for capitulating to the enemy and splitting the united front. (5) The peasantry is the firm ally of the proletariat. (6) The urban petty bourgeoisie is a reliable ally.

The validity of these laws was confirmed during the First Great Revolution and the Agrarian Revolution, and it is being confirmed again in the present War of Resistance. Therefore, in forming a united front with the bourgeoisie (and especially with the big bourgeoisie), the party of the proletariat must carry on a stern and resolute struggle on two fronts. On the one hand, it is necessary to combat the error of neglecting the possibility that the bourgeoisie may join in the revolutionary struggle at certain times and to a certain extent. It is an error of "Left" closed-doorism to regard the bourgeoisie in China as being the same as in the capitalist countries, and consequently to neglect the policy of forming a united front with the bourgeoisie and maintaining it for as long as possible. On the other hand, it is also necessary to combat the error of identifying the programme, policy ideology, practice, etc. of the proletariat with those of the bourgeoisie, and neglecting the differences in principle between them. The error here consists in neglecting the fact that the bourgeoisie (and especially the big bourgeoisie) not only exerts an influence on the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, but does its utmost to influence the proletariat and the Communist Party in a strenuous effort to destroy their ideological, political and organizational independence, turn them into an appendage of the bourgeoisie and its political party, and ensure that it will reap the fruits of the revolution for itself or its political party alone; this error also consists in neglecting the fact that the bourgeoisie (and especially the big bourgeoisie) betrays the revolution whenever the revolution conflicts with its own selfish interests or with those of its own political party. To neglect all this is Right opportunism. The characteristic feature of Chen Tu-hsiu's Right opportunism was that it led the proletariat to accommodate itself to the selfish interests of the bourgeoisie and its political party, and this was the subjective cause of the failure of the First Great Revolution. The dual character of the Chinese bourgeoisie in the bourgeois-democratic revolution exerts a great effect on our political line and our Party building, and without grasping this dual character we cannot have a good grasp of our political line or of Party building. One important component of the political line of the Chinese Communist Party is the policy both of unity with the bourgeoisie and of struggle against it. In fact, the development and tempering of the Party through its unity and struggle with the bourgeoisie are an important component of Party building. Unity here means the united front with the bourgeoisie. Struggle here means the "peaceful" and "bloodless" struggle, ideological, political and organizational, which goes on when we are united with the bourgeoisie and which turns into armed struggle when we are forced to break with it. If our Party does not understand that it must unite with the bourgeoisie in certain periods, it cannot advance and the revolution cannot develop; if our Party does not understand that it must wage a stern and resolute "peaceful" struggle against the bourgeoisie while uniting with it, then our Party will disintegrate ideologically, politically and organizationally

and the revolution will fail; and if our Party does not wage a stern and resolute armed struggle against the bourgeoisie when forced to break with it, our Party will likewise disintegrate and the revolution will likewise fail. The truth of all this has been confirmed by the events of the past eighteen years.

Armed struggle by the Chinese Communist Party takes the form of peasant war under proletarian leadership. The history of this armed struggle, too, falls into three stages. The first was the stage in which we took part in the Northern Expedition. Our Party had already begun to realize the importance of armed struggle, but did not understand it fully, it did not understand that armed struggle was the principal form of struggle in the Chinese revolution. The second stage was the War of the Agrarian Revolution. By that time our Party had already built up its own independent armed forces, learned the art of fighting independently, and established people's political power and base areas. Our Party was already able to achieve direct or indirect co-ordination of armed struggle, the principal form of struggle, with many other necessary forms, that is, to co-ordinate it on a national scale with the workers' struggle, the peasants' struggle (which was the main thing), the struggle of the youth, the women and all other sections of the people, the struggle for political power, the struggles on the economic, the anti-espionage and the ideological fronts, and other forms of struggle. And this armed struggle was the peasant agrarian revolution under the leadership of the proletariat. The third stage is the present stage, the War of Resistance. In this stage we are able to turn to good account our experience of armed struggle in the first and especially the second stage, and our experience of coordinating armed struggle with all other necessary forms of struggle. In general, armed struggle at the present time means guerrilla warfare. [170] What is guerrilla warfare? It is the indispensable and therefore the best form of struggle for the people's armed forces to employ over a long period in a backward country, a large semi-colonial country, in order to inflict defeats on the armed enemy and build up their own bases. So far both our political line and our Party building have been closely linked with this form of struggle. It is impossible to have a good understanding of our

[170] In saying that in general, armed struggle in the Chinese revolution means guerrilla warfare, Comrade Mao Tse-tung is summing up China's experience of revolutionary war from the Second Revolutionary Civil War to the early days of the War of Resistance Against Japan. During the long period of the Second Revolutionary Civil War, all the armed struggles led by the Chinese Communist Party took the form of guerrilla warfare. In the latter phase of that period, as the strength of the Red Army grew, guerrilla warfare changed into mobile warfare of a guerrilla character which, as Comrade Mao Tse-tung defines it, is guerrilla warfare on a higher level. But in the War of Resistance Against Japan, with a different enemy and in different circumstances, there was a shift back to guerrilla warfare. In the early days of the anti-Japanese war, those Party comrades who committed the error of Right opportunism belittled the guerrilla warfare led by the Party and pinned their hopes on the operations of the Kuomintang army. Comrade Mao Tse-tung refuted their views in his "Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War Against Japan", "On Protracted War" and "Problems of War and Strategy", and in the present article he gave a theoretical summing-up of the experience gained in waging the prolonged armed struggle of the Chinese revolution which took the form of guerrilla warfare. In the latter stage of the anti-Japanese war, and more particularly in the period of the Third Revolutionary Civil War (1945--49), guerrilla warfare changed into regular warfare as the main form of armed struggle under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, and this was due to the further growth of the revolutionary forces and the changes in the enemy's circumstances. The latter stage of the Third Revolutionary Civil war witnessed a further development, when operations were conducted by huge formations, which, equipped with heavy arms, were able to storm strongly fortified enemy positions.

political line and, consequently, of our Party building in isolation from armed struggle, from guerrilla warfare. Armed struggle is an important component of our political line. For eighteen years our Party has gradually learned to wage armed struggle and has persisted in it. We have learned that without armed struggle neither the proletariat, nor the people, nor the Communist Party would have any standing at all in China and that it would be impossible for the revolution to triumph. In these years the development, consolidation and bolshevization of our Party have proceeded in the midst of revolutionary wars; without armed struggle the Communist Party would assuredly not be what it is today. Comrades throughout the Party must never forget this experience for which we have paid in blood.

Similarly, there have been three distinct stages in the building up of the Party, its development, consolidation and bolshevization.

> The first stage was the Party's infancy. In the early and middle phases of this stage the Party's line was correct and the revolutionary zeal both of the rank and file and of the cadres was exceedingly high; hence the victories in the First Great Revolution. But after all, ours was then still an infant Party, it lacked experience concerning the three basic problems of the united front, armed struggle and Party building, it did not have much knowledge of Chinese history and Chinese society or of the specific features and laws of the Chinese revolution, and it lacked a comprehensive understanding of the unity between the theory of Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the Chinese revolution. Hence in the last phase of this stage, or at the critical juncture of this stage, those occupying a dominant position in the Party's leading body failed to lead the Party in consolidating the victories of the revolution and, as a result, they were deceived by the bourgeoisie and brought the revolution to defeat. The Party organizations expanded in this stage but they were not consolidated, and they failed to help Party members and cadres become firm and stable ideologically and politically. There were plenty of new members but they were not given the necessary Marxist-Leninist education. There was also abundant experience in work, but it was not summed up properly. Many careerists sneaked into the Party, but they were not combed out. The Party was caught in a maze of schemes and intrigues both of enemies and of allies, but it lacked vigilance. Within the Party, activists came forward in great numbers, but they were not turned into the mainstay of the Party in good time. The Party had some revolutionary armed units under its command, but it was unable to keep a tight grip on them. The reasons for all this were inexperience, insufficient depth of revolutionary understanding, and ineptitude in integrating the theory of Marxism-Leninism with the practice of the Chinese revolution. Such was the first stage of Party building.

The second stage was the War of the Agrarian Revolution. Our Party was able to wage a successful agrarian revolutionary struggle for ten years because of the experience it had gained in the first stage, because of its better understanding of Chinese history and society and of the specific features and laws of the Chinese revolution, and because its cadres had a better grasp of the theory of

Marxism-Leninism and were better able to integrate it with the practice of the Chinese revolution. Although the bourgeoisie had turned traitor, our Party was able to rely firmly on the peasantry. The Party organization not only grew afresh but also became consolidated. Day in day out the enemy tried to sabotage our Party, but the Party drove out the saboteurs. Once again large numbers of cadres came forward in the Party, and this time they became its mainstay. The Party blazed the trail of people's political power and thus learned the art of government. The Party created strong armed forces and thus learned the art of war. These were momentous advances and achievements. Nevertheless, in the course of these great struggles some of our comrades sank into the quagmire of opportunism, or did so at least for a time, and again the reasons were that they did not learn modestly from the experience of the past, did not acquire an understanding of Chinese history and society and of the specific features and laws of the Chinese revolution, and did not have an understanding of the unity between the theory of Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the Chinese revolution. Hence throughout this stage certain people who held leading positions in the Party failed to adhere to correct political and organizational lines. At one time the Party and the revolution were damaged by Comrade Li Li-san's "Left" opportunism, at another by "Left" opportunism in the revolutionary war and in the work in the White areas. Not until the Tsunyi Meeting (the meeting of the Political Bureau at Tsunyi, Kweichow, in January 1935) did the Party definitively take the road of bolshevization and lay the foundations for its subsequent victory over Chang Kuo-tao's Right opportunism and for the establishment of an anti-Japanese national united front. This was the second stage in the Party's development.

The third stage is that of the Anti-Japanese National United Front. We have been in this stage for three years now and these years of struggle are extremely important. Drawing on its experience in the two preceding revolutionary stages, on its organizational strength and the strength of its armed forces, on its high political prestige among the people of the whole country, and on its deeper understanding of the unity between the theory of Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the Chinese revolution, our Party has not only established the Anti-Japanese National United Front but has also been conducting the great War of Resistance Against Japan. Organizationally, it has stepped out of its narrow confines and become a major national party. Its armed forces are again growing and are becoming still stronger in the struggle against the Japanese aggressors. Its influence among the whole people is becoming more extensive. These are all great achievements. However, many of our new Party members have not yet been given education, many of the new organizations have not yet been consolidated, and there is still a vast difference between them and the older members and organizations. Many of the new Party members and cadres have not yet had sufficient revolutionary experience. They still know little or nothing about Chinese history and society or about the specific features and laws of the Chinese revolution. Their understanding of the unity between the theory of Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the Chinese revolution is far from being comprehensive. During the expansion of the Party's organizations, a good many careerists and enemy saboteurs did succeed in sneaking in despite the fact that the Central Committee stressed the slogan "Expand the

Party boldly, but do not let a single undesirable in". Although the united front was formed and has been maintained for three years now, the bourgeoisie, and especially the big bourgeoisie, has constantly been trying to destroy our Party, the big bourgeois capitulators and die-hards have been instigating serious friction throughout the country, and the anti-Communist clamor is incessant. All this is being used by the big bourgeois capitulators and die-hards to prepare the way for capitulating to Japanese imperialism, breaking up the united front and dragging China backwards. Ideologically, the big bourgeoisie is trying to "corrode" communism, whilst politically and organizationally it is trying to liquidate the Communist Party, the Border Region and the Party's armed forces. In these circumstances it is undoubtedly our task to overcome the dangers of capitulation, a split and retrogression, to maintain the national united front and Kuomintang-Communist co-operation as far as possible, to work for continued resistance to Japan and continued unity and progress, and at the same time to prepare against all possible eventualities so that in case they occur, the Party and the revolution will not suffer unexpected losses. To this end, we must strengthen the Party's organization and its armed forces, and mobilize the whole people for resolute struggle against capitulation, a split and retrogression. The accomplishment of this task depends upon the efforts of the whole Party, upon the unrelenting and persistent struggle of all Party members, cadres and organizations everywhere and at every level. We are confident that the Chinese Communist Party with its eighteen years of experience will be able to achieve these objectives by the joint efforts of its experienced older members and cadres and its vigorous and youthful newer members and cadres, by the joint efforts of its well-tried bolshevized Central Committee and its local organizations, and by the joint efforts of its powerful armed forces and the progressive masses.

We have set out the principal experiences and principal problems of our Party in its eighteen years of history.

Our eighteen years of experience show that the united front and armed struggle are the two basic weapons for defeating the enemy. The united front is a united front for carrying on armed struggle. And the Party is the heroic warrior wielding the two weapons, the united front and the armed struggle, to storm and shatter the enemy's positions. That is how the three are related to each other.

How are we to build up our Party today? How can we build up "a bolshevized Chinese Communist Party, a party which is national in scale and has a broad mass character, a party which is fully consolidated ideologically, politically and organizationally"? The answer can be found by studying the Party's history, by studying Party building in Connection with the united front and armed struggle, in connection with the problem of both uniting and struggling with the bourgeoisie, and with that of persistence in guerrilla warfare against Japan by the Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies and the establishment of anti-Japanese base areas.

To sum up our eighteen years of experience and our current new, experience on the basis of our understanding of the unity between the theory of Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the

Chinese revolution, and to spread this experience throughout the Party, so that our Party becomes as solid as steel and avoids repeating past mistakes-- such is our task.

Jose Carlos Mariátegui: May Day and the United Front

The First of May is a day of revolutionary proletarian unity all over the world, a date that binds all organized workers in an immense international united front. On this day the unanimously obeyed and respected words of Karl Marx resound: ―Workers of the world, unite.‖ On this day all the barriers that differentiate and separate the political vanguard into different groups and different schools come down.

May Day does not belong to one International: it is the date for all Internationals. Today, socialists, communists, anarchists of all stripes merge and mix in one army that marches toward the final struggle.

In sum, this date is an affirmation and an answer that the united proletarian front is possible and practicable and that there is no present interest or exigency that would stand in its way.

This international day invites many reflections. But for the Peruvian workers the most pressing, the timeliest, is that which concerns the need and the possibility of a united front. Recently there have been some secessionist attempts. And it is important to understand, in order to stop these attempts from prospering, to make sure they do not betray and undermine the nascent proletarian vanguard in Peru.

My attitude, since my incorporation into this vanguard, always has been that of a convinced supporter, that of a fervent advocate for the united front. I remember having declared it in one of my first conferences in my course on the world crisis.

Responding to the first signs of resistance and apprehension from some old and hierarchical anarchists, more worried about dogmatic rigidity than the efficacy and fruitfulness of the action, I said from the speaker‘s stand at the Popular University: ―We are still too few to divide ourselves. We should not worry about labels or titles.

After that I have repeated these or analogous words. And I will not tire of reiterating them. The classist movement, between us, is still incipient, too limited for us to think of fractionizing it and splitting it. Before the perhaps inevitable hour of a division, it is up to us to complete much common work, much shared labor. We have to set off on many long days of work together. It is up to us, for example, to be the cause of class consciousness and class feeling in the majority of the Peruvian proletariat. This task belongs equally to socialists and syndicalists/unionists, to communists and anarchists. We all have the obligation to sow the seeds of renovation and to spread classist ideas. We all have the obligation of distancing the proletariat from the yellow assemblies and the false ―representative institutions.‖ We all have to fight against reactionary attacks and repression. We all have to defend the speaker‘s platform, the press, and proletarian organization. We all have the

obligation of sustaining the vindications of the enslaved and oppressed Indigenous race. In accomplishing these historic tasks, these elementary obligations, we can be sure that our way and our paths will merge together, whatever our ultimate goal.

The united front does not annul the personality, does not annul any of those who make it up. It does not signify confusing or amalgamating all of the doctrines into a single doctrine. It is a contingent, concrete, practical action. The program of the united front only considers the immediate reality, outside of any abstraction and of any utopia. Recommending the united front is not, then, recommending any ideological confusion. Inside the united front everyone should keep his own affiliation and his own ideology. Everyone should work for his own credo. But all should feel united by class solidarity, bound together by the struggle against the common adversary, tied by the same revolutionary will, and the same renovating passion. To form a united front is to have an attitude of solidarity before a concrete problem, before an urgent necessity. It is not to renounce the doctrine that each one follows or the position that each one occupies in the vanguard. The variety of tendencies and the diversity of ideological shades are inevitable in this immense human legion that is called the proletariat. The existence of tendencies and precise, defined groups is not something bad; on the contrary, it is the sign of an advanced period in the revolutionary process. What is important is that these groups and tendencies know how to understand each other before the concrete reality of the day. They are not mired in byzantine reciprocal confessions and excommunications. They do not distance themselves from the masses of the revolution by pursuing meaningless complaints. They do not use their weapons or squander their time in wounding one another, but rather to combat the social order, its institutions, its injustices, and its crimes.

We try to feel the historic tie that unites all of us in the vanguard, to all those who reinvigorate the process. The examples that come to us from the outside each day are innumerable and magnificent. The most recent and moving is that of Germaine Berthon. Germaine Berthon, an anarchist, accurately shot her revolver at an organizer and leader of the white terror to avenge the assassination of the socialist Jean Juarès. In this way, the notably elevated and sincere spirits of the revolution perceive and respect, beyond any theoretical barrier, the historical solidarity of their efforts and actions. They belong to the base, horizon-less, wingless/earthbound spirits, to the dogmatic mentalities that want to petrify and immobilize life in a rigid formula of incomprehension and egoistic sectarianism.

Fortunately for us, the proletarian united front is a decision and an evident longing by the proletariat. The masses call for unity. The masses want faith. And because of this their souls reject the corrosive, thin, pessimistic voice of those who deny, of those who doubt, and instead seek the optimistic, cordial, youthful, and fruitful voice of those who affirm and those who believe.

Jose Carlos Mariátegui: Collective Letter of the Lima Group

Comrades:

We consider it necessary to inform you briefly of our views regarding the principles and methods of action adopted by the group of Peruvian deportees working in Mexico, which, without an explicit statement from us, would be taken as positively accepted by us, who constitute the core group responsible for our work here.

We are sure that you yourselves realize the need for the APRA's actions in Peru not to be decided by a committee established in Mexico, but rather to be broadly and maturely deliberated with the main involvement of those acting in the country. Those who place themselves on Marxist ground know that action must correspond directly and exactly to reality. Its norms, therefore, cannot be determined by those who do not act under its pressure and inspiration.

The definition of the character and tactics of the APRA seems to us, on the other hand, fundamental to the existence of organic discipline. We believe that, in accordance with the idea that originally inspired it, and which its very name expresses, the APRA should be, or is in fact, an alliance, a united front, and not a party. A common and immediate program of action does not eliminate differences or nuances of class and doctrine. And those of us who, since our initiation into the social and ideological movement of which the Apra is a part, claim to be socialists, have an obligation to prevent future misunderstandings and confusion. As socialists, we can collaborate within the Apra, or alliance or united front, with more or less reformist or social-democratic elements—without forgetting the vagueness of these designations in our America—with the bourgeois and liberal left, truly willing to fight against the remnants of feudalism and imperialist penetration; but we cannot, by virtue of the very meaning of our cooperation, understand the Apra as a party, that is, as an organic and doctrinally homogeneous faction.

We openly profess the concept that it is up to us to create Indo-American socialism, that nothing is as absurd as literally copying European formulas, that our praxis must correspond to the reality before us. But this principle does not advise us to hastily adopt formulas that, for the moment, may be absolutely precise in the minds of those who conceive them as a tactical means but that tomorrow, under the pressure of more indoctrinated proselytism and the influence of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois mentality fatally incorporated into the movement, may lend themselves to infinite confusion. The experience of the Kuo Min Tang is invaluable to the anti-imperialist movement in Indo-America, provided that it is fully exploited. Moving away from European forms should not lead us to an exaggerated estimation of Asian formulas and their possible effectiveness in our environment. We must not forget that, in any case, European formulas are more intelligible to us, reaching us directly through the languages and peoples in which they are expressed, while we have only the European version of Chinese formulas. Nor can we forget the influence and role of Western ideas in the ideology of the Chinese nationalist movement. The Kuo Min Tang is finally in crisis, largely because it has not been explicitly and functionally an alliance, a united front. Its course was subordinated to the predominance of its right, center, and left elements, which corresponded to their respective class sentiments and interests. The latest deliberations of the Kuo Min Tang, according to

Internacionale Presse Correspondenz and other recent publications, entail a total rectification of its main points of view concerning the proletariat and class organizations. The Kuo Min Tang was Sun Yat Sen, but it is also Chang Kai Shek. Furthermore, the Kuo Min Tang developed not continentally but nationally, which is where the Apra necessarily differs from that movement.

The collaboration of the bourgeoisie, and even of many feudal elements, in the Chinese anti-imperialist struggle can be explained by reasons of race and national civilization, which do not exist among us. The Chinese nobleman or bourgeois feels deeply Chinese. The white man's contempt for his stratified and decrepit culture is matched by the Chinese man's contempt and pride in his millennial tradition. Anti-imperialism in China can therefore rest fundamentally on sentiment and the nationalist factor. In Indo-America, the circumstances are not the same. The Creole aristocracy and bourgeoisie do not feel solidarity with the people through the bond of a common history and culture. In Peru, the white aristocrat and bourgeoisie despise the popular, the national. They feel, above all, white. The mestizo petty bourgeoisie imitates this example. The Lima bourgeoisie fraternizes with Yankee capitalists, and even with their ordinary employees, at the Country Club, on the tennis courts, and in the streets. The Yankee marries the Creole girl without any qualms about race or religion, and she has no scruples about nationality or culture in preferring marriage to an individual of the invading race. Nor does the middle-class girl have such scruples. The huachafita who can snag a Yankee employed by Grace or the Foundation does so with the satisfaction of someone who feels her social status rising. For these objective reasons, which surely none of you are unaware of, the nationalist factor is neither decisive nor fundamental in the anti-imperialist struggle in our midst. Only in countries such as Argentina, where there is a large and wealthy bourgeoisie, proud of the wealth and power of their homeland, and where the national personality has, for many reasons, clearer and sharper contours than in these backward countries, can anti-imperialism easily penetrate the bourgeois elements, but for reasons of capitalist expansion and growth and not for reasons of social justice and socialist doctrine, as is our case.

These considerations lead us to submit the following conclusions to you:

1) The APRA must be officially and categorically defined and constituted as an alliance or united front and not as a party;
2) The leftist elements in Peru who are participating in its formation constitute, in fact—and will formally organize—a group or Socialist Party, with a defined affiliation and anti-orientation, which, collaborating within the movement with liberal or revolutionary elements of the petty bourgeoisie and even the bourgeoisie who accept our views, will work to lead the masses toward socialist ideas.

It is clear that these conclusions do not allow us to cooperate in the creation of the Nationalist Party, which some comrades, and even the official cell, have announced as a decision of the Mexico group. That party can be founded within the APRA, but in addition to the fact that we believe its natural biology requires that its opportunity and necessity be decided in Peru and not from Mexico,

its organization in any case involves elements of the petty bourgeoisie who want to give life to their own party, but not us, who are loyal to the principles that undoubtedly constitute our greatest moral strength, and we do not assume either the responsibility or the task of organizing it. We disapprove of any campaign that is not based on truth. The practice of systematic bluffing will discredit our cause. We therefore refuse to use it. The news spread about Haya's candidacy does not have the effect you suppose it will have on public opinion. People—far from any electoral concerns—receive it with perplexity and irony.

We recommend that the cell, in all matters of action, use official and centralized correspondence. Private letters from comrades should not contain individual initiatives or instructions. For our part, we commit ourselves to the same procedure.

With feelings of solidarity and affection, which no disagreement—we hope temporary—of criteria can diminish, we cordially greet you.

Unit 6. People's War.

Topics covered:

V. On war.
VI. People's war.
VII. Guerrilla warfare.
VIII. Strategy and politics.
IX. People's army.

Bibliography:

- Chen Po-ta:
  - Mao Tse-tung on the Chinese Revolution. Chapter V
- Lenin:
  - Socialism and War, Chapter I.
  - Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution
- Lin Piao:
  - Long Live the Victory of the People's War!, Rely on the Peasants and Establish Rural Base Areas; Build a People's Army of a New Type.
- Mao Zedong:
  - Problems of War and Strategy. Selected Works, Vol. II.
  - Problems of Strategy in Guerilla War Against Japan. Selected Works, Vol. II.
  - On Protracted War: Statement of the Problem; Why a Protracted War?; The Three Stages of the Protracted War; Fighting for Perpetual Peace; Man's Dynamic Role in War; War and Politics.
  - Quotations, Chapter V, VIII, IX.

- On the Coalition Government. Selected Works, Vol. III, Chapter III

Selection:

Chen Po-ta: Mao Zedong on the Chinese Revolution.

From Revolutionary Bases in the Countryside to the Nationwide Victory of the Revolution

As everybody knows, the Chinese revolution won victory after going through a long-drawn-out and bitter struggle and after successively capturing one fighting position after another. After 1927, the capture of fighting positions did not start from the cities but from the countryside. After 1927, the Communist Party of China, represented by Comrade Mao Zedong, shifted the centre of gravity of its work to the countryside in order to build up strength there, in order to encircle the cities from the countryside so as to capture them. This was the line of work which Comrade Mao Zedong insisted upon. Facts have long proved that this line was completely victorious because it was a correct line and the only correct line.

This line was based upon a sound Marxist-Leninist scientific analysis of the conditions in China.

The enemies of the Chinese revolution were numerous and powerful. As early as May, 1927, Stalin said,

"Because, in the first instance, the enemies of the Chinese revolution, both domestic (Chang Tso-lin, Chiang Kai-shek, the big bourgeoisie, the gentry, the landlords, etc.) and external enemies (the imperialists) are far too numerous and powerful...." [171]

In analyzing the conditions of the enemy of the revolution, who included not only powerful imperialists but also powerful feudal forces and the big bourgeoisie which was linked with imperialism and the feudal forces and was hostile to the people, Comrade Mao Zedong raised a series of problems as follows:

> "Confronted with such enemies the Chinese revolution becomes long drawn-out and bitter. Since the enemies are extremely powerful, the revolutionary forces, unless allowed a long period of time, cannot be massed and steeled into a power that will finally crush them. Since the enemy's suppression of the Chinese revolution is exceedingly ruthless, the revolutionary forces cannot hold their own positions steadily and take over those of the enemy unless they steel themselves and develop their tenacity in the course of steeling themselves. The view that the forces of the Chinese revolution can be built up in a twinkling and the Chinese revolutionary struggle can triumph in a moment is therefore incorrect.
>
> "With the presence of such enemies, it becomes certain that the principal means, the principal form of the Chinese revolution cannot be a peaceful, but must be an armed one. This is because

[171] *Stalin: Talk with Students of the Sun Yat-sen University.*

our enemy allows to the Chinese people, who possess no political freedoms and rights whatsoever, no possibility of peaceful activities. Stalin said, 'In China, armed revolution is fighting against armed counter-revolution. This is one of the peculiarities and one of the advantages of the Chinese revolution.' This is a perfectly correct formulation. That view which belittles armed struggle, revolutionary war, guerrilla war, and army work is therefore incorrect.

"With the presence of such enemies, the question of revolutionary base areas also arises. Since the powerful imperialism and its allies, the reactionary forces in China, have occupied China's key cities for a long time, if the revolutionary forces do not wish to compromise with imperialism and its jackals but want to persist in the struggle, and if they intend to accumulate strength and steel themselves, and avoid decisive battles with the powerful enemy before they have mustered enough strength, then they must build the backward villages into advanced, consolidated base areas, into great military, political, economic, and cultural revolutionary positions, so that they can fight the fierce enemy who utilizes the cities to attack the rural districts, and gradually win a complete victory for the revolution through protracted fighting." [172]

To establish revolutionary bases by armed force was the starting point of the road along which Comrade Mao Zedong led the revolution to nationwide victory. Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out that it was necessary to establish revolutionary bases even if they were only several small pieces of territory at the beginning; and that if this course was persisted in, then a spark might start a prairie fire.

"Only thus can we win the confidence of the revolutionary masses throughout the country, just as the Soviet Union has done throughout the world. Only thus can we create tremendous difficulties for the reactionary ruling classes, shake their very foundations, and precipitate their internal disintegration. And only thus can we really create a Red Army that will be the chief weapon in the coming great revolution. In short, only thus can we accelerate the revolutionary upsurge." [173]

Why was there the possibility of establishing bases which could exist for a long time and why could this possibility be transformed into reality? Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out the following conditions existing in old China:

"The unevenness of political and economic development in China—the coexistence of a frail capitalist economy and a preponderant semi-feudal economy; the coexistence of a few modern industrial and commercial cities and the boundless expanses of stagnant rural districts; the coexistence of several million industrial workers on the one hand and, on the other, hundreds

[172] *The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party.*
[173] *A Single Spark Can Start a Prairie Fire*

of millions of peasants and handicraftsmen under the old regime; the coexistence of big warlords controlling the central government and small warlords controlling the provinces; the coexistence of two kinds of reactionary armies, i.e., the so-called central army under Chiang Kai-shek and the troops of miscellaneous brands under the warlords in the provinces; and the coexistence of a few railway and steamship lines and motor roads on the one hand and, on the other, the vast number of wheelbarrow paths and trails for pedestrians only, many of which are even difficult for the pedestrians.

"China is a semi-colonial country the disunity among the imperialist countries has caused the disunity among the various ruling blocs in China. A semi-colonial state controlled by several countries is different from a colony controlled by a single country.

"China is a vast country where when the east is still dark, the west is lit up; when night falls in the south, the day breaks in the north; and one need not worry about whether there is room enough to move round.

"China has gone through a great revolution which has prepared the seeds of the Red Army, the Chinese Communist Party which leads the Red Army, and the masses who have participated in a revolution." [174]

Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out with special emphasis the split and war within the comprador and feudal ruling circles which were controlled from behind the scenes by imperialism. He pointed out:

"Because of the prolonged splits and wars within the White regime, a condition is provided for one or several small Red areas under the leadership of the Communist Party to emerge and hold out amid the encirclement of the White political power on all sides."

"If we but realize that splits and wars are incessant within the White regime in China, we shall have no doubt about the emergence, existence, and daily growth of the Red political power." [175]

It can be seen from the foregoing that Comrade Mao Zedong applied to semi-colonial China the theory of the law governing the uneven political and economic development of capitalism in various countries as expounded by Lenin and Stalin; and after concrete analysis of the actual situation, worked out a series of complete conclusions: that the political and economic development of China was extremely uneven, thus giving rise to the extreme unevenness of the development of the revolution; that it was possible for the revolution to take advantage of the weakness of the enemy to achieve victory first in the countryside, and that it was possible to establish long-term revolutionary bases there.

[174] *Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War.*
[175] *Why Can China's Red Political Power Exist?*

Obviously, after the defeat of the revolution in 1927, this series of conclusions of Comrade Mao Zedong was of enormous significance for the revolution. Comrade Mao Zedong recalled in 1936:

> "We had Hunan-Kiangsi border area) during the period from the winter of 1927 to the spring of 1928, soon after pointed this out (at the first Party conference of the guerrilla warfare was started in China, when some comrades in the Hunan-Kiangsi border area—the Chingkang mountains—raised the question: 'How long can the Red flag be kept flying?' For this was a most fundamental question: without answering the question whether China's revolutionary base areas and the Chinese Red Army could exist and develop, we could not advance a single step." [176]

It constituted an extremely heroic attack against the counter-revolution of Chiang Kai-shek and Wang Ching-wei when Comrade Mao Zedong led the revolutionary forces to march to the Chingkang mountain. This attack gave birth to the first revolutionary base. Precisely at the time when the people were suffering most, this revolutionary base inspired the whole nation with hope, and in its wake many other revolutionary bases were established.

After the defeat of the revolution in 1927, the Chen Tu-hsiu capitulationist clique immediately lost all hope in the revolution and became liquidators. They opposed Comrade Mao Zedong's line and the heroic march he led to attack the counter-revolution. Their former denial of the peasant revolution already constituted the basis for their merging with the Trotskyite clique. Not long afterwards, they became linked with the Trotskyite clique and for this reason they were expelled from the Party. The Trotskyite Chen Tu-hsiu clique tried their best to praise the reactionary rule of Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang and the strength of the Kuomintang reactionaries. They even became so shameless as to laud Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolutionary war as a "war of unification" and openly declared themselves to be "at one with the reaction." They used the most venomous words to insult and curse Comrade Mao Zedong and the revolution. This small bunch that degenerated into the most despicable counter-revolutionary trash carried out the basest work of imperialism and counter-revolution from start to finish.

On the other hand, some comrades inside our Party committed the mistake of petty-bourgeois revolutionary impetuousness. They bitterly hated the Kuomintang's policy of massacre and were enraged by Chen Tu-hsiu's capitulationism. However, they lacked the patience to carry on protracted, arduous and exacting revolutionary struggle and were impatient with the task of persistently preserving the revolutionary bases in the countryside for a long period of time. As a result, the theory that the revolution could gain a quick victory arose. These comrades actually denied the political and economic unevenness of China; they denied the unevenness of the development of the revolution and harbored the illusion that the revolution could gain complete victory overnight or capture many cities overnight. This kind of "Left" adventurism gained

[176] *Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War.*

temporary ascendancy inside the Party on three occasions, opposed the correct line of Comrade Mao Zedong and, as a result, caused losses to the revolution. Particularly after the adventurism represented by Comrade Li Li-san, the third adventurism represented by Comrade Wang Ming (Chen Shao-yu) and Comrade Po Ku (Chin Pang-hsien) caused the greatest losses to the revolution. However, it was again the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong that saved the critical situation created by such adventurism.

It was through armed struggles that the revolutionary bases were established and preserved. Therefore, the problem of the revolutionary bases was connected with the strategic problems of the revolutionary war. Hence, the controversy over viewpoints concerning the revolutionary bases was actually a controversy over the strategic problems of the revolutionary war.

One of the greatest contributions made by Comrade Mao Zedong to military science was that, in the course of the long-term development of the Chinese revolution, he placed the guerilla warfare of the Chinese revolution in an extremely important strategic position and studied it in this light. Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out:

> "... the protracted revolutionary struggle conducted in such revolutionary bases is chiefly a peasant guerrilla war led by the Chinese Communist Party. The view which neglects building up. revolutionary bases in the rural districts, the view which neglects performing arduous work among the peasants, and the view which neglects guerrilla war are therefore all incorrect." [177]

"Left" opportunists who in the ten-year civil war period ignored the problem of persisting in the bases in the countryside for a long time inevitably ignored guerilla warfare and the line of achieving great victories by accumulating small ones. They did not admit that guerilla warfare and mobile warfare of a guerilla nature were the main forms of the war but harbored the illusion of fighting decisive battles of positional warfare in conditions when the enemy's strength and ours were at great variance. The disastrous results brought about by this erroneous strategy led to the loss of the bases. Then, when their theory of gaining a quick victory was not realized but, on the contrary, many bases were lost, they sank into pessimism and turned to the Right. In the period of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression, they also adopted the viewpoint of quick victory in the question of strategy. They had no interest in the policy of persisting in the anti-Japanese bases in the countryside and the anti-Japanese guerilla warfare and in extending them vigorously and on a large scale. With regard to the policy of people's war they wanted nothing short of "regular warfare," disregarding the circumstance that the enemy's strength and ours were at great variance at the initial stages of the war. All this was similar to what they had advocated during the ten-year civil war period. What was different was that, in the period of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression, they completely demonstrated that they had lost confidence in the strength of the people. They

[177] *The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party.*

pinned their hopes of victory in the anti-Japanese war mainly on the "regular warfare" adopted by the Kuomintang army and failed to see the great role and future of the people's armed forces.

The method of conducting guerilla warfare as expounded by Comrade Mao Zedong was, in certain cases, "to break up the whole into parts" and "to divide up the forces in order to arouse the masses," while, in other cases, "to gather parts into a whole" and "to concentrate the forces to deal with the enemy." The main strategy of the revolutionary war as expounded by Comrade Mao Zedong was to develop guerilla warfare to the fullest possible extent and on a large scale and then, under certain conditions, after the growth of our strength, to transform it into regular warfare as in the latter period of the ten-year civil war. During this period, the regular warfare still took the form of mobile warfare of a guerilla nature. Under other conditions, in accordance with the changes on the part of the enemy, regular warfare was transformed into guerilla warfare, as in the first period of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression. During this period, the main form of fighting was guerilla warfare but the chance of waging mobile warfare under favorable conditions was not given up. Owing to new conditions, new growth of the revolutionary strength, and new changes on the part of the enemy, guerilla warfare was changed into regular warfare as in the last stage of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression and in the period of the War of Liberation against Chiang Kai-shek and the United States. In the latter period of the War of Liberation, regular warfare developed to such an extent that it included the operations of army corps in which large numbers of heavy arms were employed and attacks on strongholds were launched. All these strategic changes occurred at the same time as changes in the revolutionary bases—the change from small bases to large bases, to bases which included cities, to victory in half of China and to victory throughout the country.

After the revolution had achieved nation-wide victory, Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out the necessity of building a completely modernized army in order to defend our Motherland. In September, 1949, Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out in his opening speech at the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference:

> "Our national defense must be consolidated and no imperialists will be allowed to invade our territory again. Our people's armed forces must be preserved and strengthened, with our heroic and tested People's Liberation Army as their foundation. We will not only have a powerful army but also a powerful navy and a powerful air force."

The seizure of Taiwan, a part of our territory, by American imperialism and its aggression against the Korean Democratic People's Republic have fully borne out the necessity of building modernized national defense forces as Comrade Mao Zedong directed two years ago. While the Chinese people organized the volunteers to fight triumphantly shoulder to shoulder with the Korean People's Army against American aggression, we were doing our best to build a completely modernized army, a powerful navy and a powerful air force.

Comrade Mao Zedong vividly and brilliantly applied the dialectics of Marxism-Leninism to the strategic problems of the revolutionary war and proved these dialectics triumphantly step by step. However, the opportunists and dogmatists always ignored the relative ratio of strength between us and the enemy and laid one-sided stress on "regular warfare." They castrated dialectics from life, and, therefore, life brought them nothing but sufferings.

V. I. Lenin: Socialism and War

Chapter 1: The Principles of Socialism and the War of 1914–1915

Section: The Attitude of Socialists Towards Wars

Socialists have always condemned war between nations as barbarous and brutal. But our attitude towards war is fundamentally different from that of the bourgeois pacifists (supporters and advocates of peace) and of the Anarchists. We differ froth the former in that we understand the inevitable connection between wars and the class struggle within the country; we understand that war cannot be abolished unless classes are abolished and Socialism is created; and we also differ in that we fully regard civil wars, i.e., wars waged by the oppressed class against the oppressing class, slaves against slave-owners, serfs against land-owners, and wage-workers against the bourgeoisie, as legitimate, progressive and necessary. We Marxists differ from both the pacifists and the Anarchists in that we deem it necessary historically (from the standpoint of Marx's dialectical materialism) to study each war separately. In history there have been numerous wars which, in spite of all the horrors, atrocities, distress and suffering that inevitably accompany alt wars, were progressive, i.e., benefited the development of mankind by helping to destroy the exceptionally harmful and reactionary institutions (for example, autocracy or serfdom), the most barbarous despotisms in Europe (Turkish and Russian). Therefore, it is necessary to examine the historically specific features of precisely the present war.

Section: Historical Types of Wars in Modern Times

The Great French Revolution ushered in a new epoch in the history of mankind. From that time to the Paris Commune, from 1789 to 1871, one of the types of wars were wars of a bourgeois-progressive, national-liberating character. In other words, the chief content and historical significance of these wars were the overthrow of absolutism and feudalism, the undermining of these institutions, the overthrow of alien oppression. Therefore, those were progressive wars, and during *such* wars, all honest, revolutionary democrats, and also all Socialists, always sympathized with the success of that country (i.e., with that bourgeoisie), which had helped to overthrow, or sap, the most dangerous foundation of feudalism, absolutism and the oppression of other nations. For example, the revolutionary wars waged by France contained an element of plunder and conquest of alien territory by the French, but this does not in the least alter the fundamental historical significance of these wars, which destroyed and shattered feudalism and absolutism in the whole of old, serf-ridden Europe. In the Franco-Prussian war, Germany plundered France, but this does not alter the fundamental historical significance of this war, which liberated tens of millions of German people from feudal disintegration and from the oppression of two despots, the Russian tsar and Napoleon III.

Section: The Difference Between Aggressive and Defensive War

The epoch of 1789-1871 left deep tracts and revolutionary memories. Before feudalism, absolutism and alien oppression were overthrown, the development of the proletarian struggle for Socialism was out of the question. When speaking of the legitimacy of "defensive" war in relation to the wars of *such* an epoch, Socialists always had in mind precisely these objects, which amounted to revolution against medievalism and serfdom. By "defensive" war Socialists always meant a "*just*" war in this sense (W. Liebknecht once expressed himself precisely in this way). Only in this sense have Socialists regarded, and now regard, wars "for the defense of the fatherland", or "defensive" wars, as legitimate, progressive and just. For example, if tomorrow, Morocco was to declare war on France, India on England, Persia or China on Russia, and so forth, those would be "just", "defensive" wars, *irrespective* of who attacked first; and every Socialist would sympathize with the victory of the oppressed, dependent, unequal states against the oppressing, slave owning, predatory "great" powers.

But picture to yourselves a slave-owner who owned 100 slaves warring against a slave-owner who owned 200 slaves for a more "just" distribution of slaves. Clearly, the application of the term "defensive" war, or war "for the defense of the fatherland" in such a case would be historically false, and in practice would be sheer deception of the common people, of philistines, of ignorant people, by the astute slaveowners. Precisely in this way are the present-day imperialist bourgeoisie deceiving the peoples by means of "national ideology and the term "defense of the fatherland in the present war between slave-owners for fortifying and strengthening slavery.

Section: The Present War is An Imperialist War

Nearly everybody admits that the present war is an imperialist war, but in most cases this term is distorted or applied to one side, or a loophole is left for the assertion that this war may, after all, have a bourgeois-progressive, national-liberating significance. Imperialism is the highest stage in the development of capitalism, reached only in the twentieth century. Capitalism now finds the old national states, without the formation of which it could not have overthrown feudalism, too tight for it. Capitalism has developed concentration to such a degree that whole branches of industry have been seized by syndicates, trusts and associations of capitalist billionaires, and almost the entire globe has been divided up among the "lords of capital, either in the form of colonies, or by enmeshing other countries in thousands of threads of financial exploitation. Free trade and competition have been superseded by the striving for monopoly, for the seizure of territory for the investment of capital, for the export of raw materials from them, and so forth. From the liberator of nations that capitalism was in the struggle against feudalism, imperialist capitalism has become the greatest oppressor of nations. Formerly progressive, capitalism has become reactionary; it has developed the forces of production to such a degree that mankind is faced with the alternative of going over to Socialism or of suffering years and even decades of armed struggle between the "great powers for the artificial preservation of capitalism by means of colonies, monopolies, privileges and national oppression of every kind.

To explain the significance of imperialism, we will quote exact figures showing the division of the world among the so-called "great" (i.e., successful in great plunder) powers:

Division of the World Among the "Great" Slave-owning Powers

	Colonies				Metropolises		Total	
	1876		1914		1914			
"Great" Powers	km²	Inhabitants	km²	Inhabitants	km²	Inhabitants	km²	Inhabitants
	millions		millions		millions		millions	
England	22.5	251.9	33.5	393.5	0.3	46.5	33.8	440.0
Russia	17.0	15.9	17.4	33.2	5.4	136.2	22.8	169.4
France	0.9	6.0	10.6	55.5	0.5	39.6	11.1	95.1
Germany	–	–	2.9	12.3	0.5	64.9	3.4	77.2
Japan	–	–	0.3	19.2	0.4	53.0	0.7	72.2
United States of America	–	–	0.3	9.7	9.4	97.0	9.7	106.7
Six "great" powers	40.4	273.8	65.0	523.4	16.5	437.2	81.5	960.6
Colonies belonging *not* to great powers (but to Belgium, Holland and other states)			9.9	45.3			9.9	45.3
Three "semi-colonial" countries (Turkey, China and Persia)							14.5	361.2
Total							**105.9**	**1,367.1**
Other states and countries							28.0	289.9
Entire globe (without Polar regions)							133.9	1,657.0

From this it is seen how most of the nations which fought at the head of others for freedom in 1798-1871, have now, after 1876. on the basis of highly developed and "overripe" capitalism, become the oppressors and enslavers of the majority of the populations and nations of the globe. From 1876 to 1914, six "great" powers grabbed 25 million sq. kilometers, i.e., an area two and a half times that of Europe! Six powers are enslaving over *half a billion* (521 million) inhabitants of colonies. For every four inhabitants of the "great" powers there are five inhabitants of "their" colonies. And everybody knows that colonies are conquered by fire and sword, that the populations of colonies are brutally treated, that they are exploited in a thousand ways (by exporting capital, concessions, etc., cheating when selling them goods, subordination to the authorities of the "ruling" nation, and so on and so forth). The Anglo-French bourgeoisie are deceiving the people when they say that they are waging war for the freedom of nations and for Belgium; actually, they are waging war for the purpose of retaining the colonies they have inordinately grabbed. The German imperialists would free Belgium, etc., at once if the British and French would agree "fairly" to share their colonies with them. The peculiarity of the situation lies in that in this war the fate of the colonies is being decided by war on the Continent. From the standpoint of bourgeois justice and national freedom (or the right of nations to existence), Germany would be absolutely right as against England and France, for she has been "done out" of colonies, her enemies are oppressing an immeasurably far larger number of nations than she is, and the Slays who are oppressed by her ally Austria undoubtedly enjoy far more freedom than those in tsarist Russia, that real "prison of nations". But Germany is fighting not for the liberation, but for the oppression of nations. It is not the business of Socialists to help the younger and stronger robber (Germany) to rob the older and overgorged robbers. Socialists must take advantage of the struggle between the robbers to overthrow them all. To be able to do this, the Socialists must first of all tell the people the truth, namely, that this war is in a treble sense a war between slave-owners to fortify slavery. This is a war firstly, to fortify the enslavement of the colonies by means of a "fairer" distribution and subsequent more "concerted exploitation of them; secondly, to fortify the oppression of other nations within the "great" powers, for *both* Austria *and* Russia (Russia more and much worse than Austria) maintain their rule only by such oppression, intensifying it by means of war; and thirdly, to fortify and prolong wage slavery, for the proletariat is split up and suppressed, while the capitalists gain, making fortunes out of the war, aggravating national prejudices and intensifying reaction, which has raised its head in all countries. even in the freest and most republican.

Section: "War is the Continuation of Politics by Other" (i.e., Violent) "Means" [178]

This famous aphorism was uttered by one of the profoundest writers on the problems of war, Clausewitz. Marxists have always rightly regarded this thesis as the theoretical basis of views concerning the significance of every given war. It was precisely from this viewpoint that Marx and Engels always regarded different wars.

[178] See Karl von Clausewitz, Vom Kriege, Berlin 1957, Vol. I, p.4.

Apply this view to the present war. You will see that for decades, for almost half a century, the governments and the ruling classes of England, and France, and Germany, and Italy, and Austria, and Russia, pursued a policy of, plundering colonies, of oppressing other nations, of suppressing the working-class movement. It is this, and only this policy that is being continued in the present war. In particular, the policy of both Austria and Russia peace-time as well as in war, is a policy of enslaving and not of liberating nations. In China, Persia. India and other dependent countries, on the contrary, we have seen during the past decades a policy of rousing tens and hundreds of millions of people to national life, of liberating them from the oppression of the reactionary "great" powers. A war on such a historical ground can even today be a bourgeois-progressive, national-liberation war.

It is sufficient to glance at the present war from the viewpoint that it is a continuation of the politics of the great powers, and of the principal classes within them, to see at once the howling anti-historicalness, falsity and hypocrisy of the view that the "defense of the fatherland" idea can be justified in the present war.

Section: The Example of Belgium

The favorite plea of the social-chauvinist triple (now quadruple) entente [179] (in Russia. Plekhanov and Co.), is the example of Belgium. But this example goes against them. The German imperialists shamelessly violated the neutrality of Belgium, as belligerent states have done always and everywhere, trampling upon *all* treaties and obligations if necessary. Let us suppose that all the states interested in the observation of international treaties declared war on Germany with the demand for the liberation and indemnification of Belgium. In such a case, the sympathies of Socialists would, of course, be on the side of Germany's enemies. But the whole point is that the "triple (and quadruple) entente" is waging war *not* over Belgium this is perfectly well known, and only hypocrites conceal this. England is grabbing Germany's colonies and Turkey; Russia is grabbing Galicia and Turkey, France wants Alsace-Lorraine and even the left hank of the Rhine; a treaty has been concluded with Italy for the division of the spoils (Albania, Asia Minor); bargaining is going on with Bulgaria and Rumania, also for the division of the spoils. In the present war waged by the present governments it is *impossible* to help Belgium *without* helping to strangle Austria or Turkey, etc.! How does "defense of the fatherland" come in here? Herein, precisely, lies the specific feature of imperialist war, war between reactionary-bourgeois, historically obsolete governments, waged for the purpose of oppressing other nations. Whoever justifies participation in the present war perpetuates imperialist oppression of nations. Whoever advocates taking advantage of the present embarrassments of the governments to fight for the social revolution champions the real freedom of really all nations, which is possible only under Socialism.

[179] An imperialist alliance of Britain, France, Russia and Italy. The latter joined after breaking away from the Triple Alliance.

Section: What is Russia Fighting For?

In Russia, capitalist imperialism of the latest type has fully revealed itself in the policy of tsarism towards Persia, Manchuria and Mongolia; but, in general, military and feudal imperialism predominates in Russia. In no country in the world is the majority of the population oppressed so much as it is in Russia; Great Russians constitute only 43 per cent of the population, he., less than half; all the rest are denied rights as aliens, Of the 170 million inhabitants of Russia, *about 100 million* are oppressed and denied rights. Tsarism is waging war to seize Galicia and finally to crush the liberties of the Ukrainians, to seize Armenia, Constantinople, etc. Tsarism regards the war as a means of diverting attention from the growth of discontent within the country and of suppressing the growing revolutionary movement. At the present time, for every two Great Russians in Russia there are from two to three rightless "aliens": tsarism is striving by means of the war to increase the number of nations oppressed by Russia, to perpetuate this oppression and thereby undermine the struggle for freedom which the Great Russians themselves are waging. The possibility of oppressing and robbing other nations perpetuates economic stagnation, because, often, the source of income is not the development of productive forces, but the semi-feudal exploitation of "aliens". Thus, on the part of Russia, the war is distinguished for its profoundly reactionary and anti-liberating character.

Section: What is Social-Chauvinism?

Social-chauvinism is advocacy of the idea of "defense of the fatherland" in the present war. Further, this idea logically leads to the abandonment of the class struggle during the war, to voting war credits, etc. Actually, the social-chauvinists are pursuing an anti-proletarian, bourgeois policy; for actually, they are championing not "defense of the fatherland" in the sense of fighting foreign oppression, but the "right" of one or other of the "great" powers to plunder colonies and to oppress other nations. The social-chauvinists repeat the bourgeois deception of the people that the war is being waged to protect the freedom and existence of nations, and thereby they go over to the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. In the category of social-chauvinists are those who justify and embellish the governments and bourgeoisie of *one* of the belligerent groups of powers, as well as those who, like Kautsky, argue that the Socialists of *all* the belligerent powers have an equal right to "defend the fatherland". Social-chauvinism, being actually defense of the privileges, advantages, robbery and violence of one's "own" (or every) imperialist bourgeoisie, is the utter betrayal of all socialist convictions and of the decision of the Basle International Socialist Congress.

Section: The Basle Manifesto [180]

The manifesto on war that was unanimously adopted in Basle in 1911 had in view the very war between England and Germany and their present allies that broke out in 1914 The manifesto

[180] The Basle Manifesto on the war issue was unanimously adopted at the special congress of the Second International held on November 4-25, 1912, at Basle, Switzerland. The manifesto revealed the predatory aims of the war the imperialists were preparing and urged workers everywhere resolutely to combat the war danger. The manifesto proposed that in the event of an imperialist war breaking out, Socialists should take advantage of the economic and political crisis to precipitate the socialist revolution. (On the Basic Manifesto, see also V.I. Lenin, The Collapse of the Second International, Collected Works, Eng. ed., International Publishers, New York 1930, Vol. XVIII, pp.273-82.)

openly declares that no plea of the interests of the people can justify such a war, waged "for the sake of the profits of the capitalists" and "the ambitions of dynasties" on the basis of the imperialist, predatory policy of the great powers. The manifesto openly declares that war is dangerous "for the governments" (all without exception), notes their fear of "a proletarian revolution", and very definitely points to the example of the Commune of 1871, and of October-December 1905, *i.e., to the examples of revolution and civil war*. Thus, the Basle Manifesto lays down, precisely for the present war, the tactics of revolutionary struggle by the workers on an international scale against their governments, the tactics of proletarian revolution. The Basle Manifesto repeats the statement in the Stuttgart resolution that, in the event of war breaking out, Socialists must take advantage of the "economic and political crisis" it will cause, to "hasten the downfall of capitalism", i.e., to take advantage of the governments' embarrassments and the anger of the masses, caused by the war, for the socialist revolution.

The policy of the social-chauvinists, their justification of the war from the bourgeois-liberation standpoint, their sanctioning of "defense of the fatherland", voting credits, entering cabinets, and so on and so forth, is downright treachery to Socialism, which can be explained only, as we will see lower down, by the victory of opportunism and of the national-liberal labor policy in the majority of European parties.

Section: False References to Marx and Engels

The Russian social-chauvinists (headed by Plekhanov), refer to Marx's tactics in the war of 1870; the German (of the type of Lensch, David and Co.) to Engels' statement in 1891 that in the event of war against Russia and France together, it would be the duty of the German Socialists to defend their fatherland; and lastly, the social-chauvinists of the Kautsky type, who want to reconcile and legitimatize international chauvinism, refer to the fact that Marx and Engels, while condemning war, nevertheless, constantly, from to 1870-1871 and 1876-1877, took the side of one or another belligerent state once war had broken out

All these references are outrageous distortions of the views of Marx and Engels in the interest of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists, in just the same way as the writings of the Anarchists Guillaume and Co. distort the views of Marx and Engels in justification of anarchism. The war of 1870-1871 was a historically progressive war on the part of Germany until Napoleon III was defeated; for the latter, together with the tsar, had oppressed Germany for many years, keeping her in a state of feudal disintegration. But as soon as the war developed into the plunder of France (the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine), Marx and Engels emphatically condemned the Germans. And even at the beginning of that war Marx and Engels approved of the refusal of Bebel and Liebknecht to vote for credits and advised the Social-Democrats not to merge with the bourgeoisie, but to uphold the

---

At the Basic Congress Kautsky, Vandervelde and the other leaders of the Second International voted for the Manifesto, but as soon as the world war broke out in 1914, they went back on it, and sided with their imperialist governments.

independent class interests of the proletariat. To apply the appraisal of this bourgeois-progressive and national-liberating war to the present imperialist war means mocking at truth. The same applies with still greater force to the war of 1854-1855, and to all the wars of the nineteenth century, when there was *no* modern imperialism, *no* ripe objective conditions f or Socialism, and *no* mass Socialist parties *in any* of the belligerent countries, i.e., none of the conditions from which the Basle Manifesto deduced the tactics of "proletarian revolution" *in connection* with a war between the great powers.

Whoever refers today to Marx's attitude towards the wars of the epoch of the *progressive* bourgeoisie and forgets Man's statement that "the workers have no fatherland", a statement that applies *precisely* to the epoch of the reactionary, obsolete bourgeoisie, to the epoch of the socialist revolution. shamelessly distorts Marx and substitute, the bourgeois for the socialist point of view.

Section: The Collapse of the Second International

The Socialists of all the world solemnly declared in Basle, in 1912, that they regarded the impending war in Europe as the "criminal" and most reactionary affair of *all* the governments, which must hasten the downfall of capitalism by inevitably calling forth a revolution against it. The war came; the crisis came. Instead of revolutionary tactics, the majority of the Social-Democratic parties conducted reactionary tactics, went over to the side of their respective governments and bourgeoisie. This betrayal of Socialism signifies the collapse of the Second (1889-1914) International, and we must understand what caused this collapse, what brought social-chauvinism into being what gave it strength.

Section: Social-Chauvinism is Consummated Opportunism

During the whole epoch of the Second International, a struggle raged everywhere in the Social-Democratic parties between the revolutionary and the opportunist wings. In a number of countries, a split has taken place along this line (England, Italy, Holland, Bulgaria). Not a single Marxist has any doubt that opportunism expresses bourgeois policy within the working-class movement, expresses the interests of the petty bourgeoisie and the alliance of a tiny section of bourgeoisified workers with "*their*" bourgeoisie against the interests of the proletarian masses, the oppressed masses.

The objective conditions of the end of the nineteenth century exceptionally intensified opportunism, converted the utilization of bourgeois legality into subservience to it, created a tiny stratum of bureaucrats and aristocrats within the working class, and drew into the ranks of the Social-Democratic parties numerous petty-bourgeois "fellow travelers".

The war accelerated this development and transformed opportunism into social-chauvinism, transformed the secret alliance between the opportunists and the bourgeoisie into an open one. Simultaneously, the military authorities everywhere have introduced martial law and have muzzled the mass of the workers, whose old leaders have nearly all gone over to the bourgeoisie.

Opportunism and social-chauvinism have the same economic basis: the interests of a tiny stratum of privileged workers and of the petty bourgeoisie who are defending their privileged position, their "right" to crumbs of the profits "their" national bourgeoisie obtain from robbing other nations, from the advantages of their position as the ruling nation, etc.

Opportunism and social-chauvinism have the same ideological-political content: collaboration of classes instead of class struggle, renunciation of revolutionary methods of struggle, helping one's "own" government in its embarrassed situation instead of taking advantage of these embarrassments for revolution. If we take all the European countries as a whole, if we pay attention not to individuals (even the most authoritative), we will find that it is the opportunist *trend* that has become the chief bulwark of social-chauvinism, whereas from the camp of the revolutionaries, more or less consistent protests against it are heard nearly everywhere. And if we take, for example, the grouping of trends at the Stuttgart International Socialist Congress in 1907, [181] we will find that international Marxism was opposed to imperialism, while international opportunism was in favor of it already at that time.

Section: Unity with the Opportunists Means Alliance Between the Workers and "Their" National Bourgeoisie and Splitting the International Revolutionary Working Class

In the past epoch, before the war, although opportunism was often regarded as a "deviationist", "extremist" part of the Social-Democratic Party, it was nevertheless regarded as a legitimate part. The war has shown that this cannot be so in future. Opportunism has "matured", is now playing to the full its role as emissary of the bourgeois in the working-class movement. Unity with the opportunists has become sheer hypocrisy, an example of which we see in the German Social-Democratic Party. On all important occasions (for example, the voting on August 4), [182] the opportunists come forward with an ultimatum, which they carry out with the aid of their numerous connections with the bourgeoisie, of their majority on the executives of the trade unions, etc. *Unity* with the opportunists *actually* means today, subordinating the working class to "its" national bourgeoisie, alliance with it for the purpose of oppressing other nations and of fighting for great-power privileges, it means *splitting* the revolutionary proletariat in all countries.

---

[181] The Stuttgart international Socialist Congress, held on August 18-24, 1907. At this congress the R.S.D.L.P. was represented by 37 delegates. Lenin, Lunacharsky, Litvinov and others represented the Bolsheviks.

Most of the work of the congress was conducted in commissions, which drafted resolutions for submission to the plenary sessions. Lenin was a member of the commission that drafted the resolution on Militarism and International Conflicts. Jointly with Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin moved his historic amendment to Bebel's resolution, declaring that it was the duty of Socialists to take advantage of the crisis brought about by war to rouse the masses for the overthrow of capitalism. The congress accepted this amendment. (On the congress see V.I. Lenin, The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart, Selected Works, Eng. ed., Lawrence and Wishart, London 1943, Vol. IV, pp.314-23, and Collected Works, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. XIII, pp.59-65.)

[182] The voting on August 4 – Oft August 4, 1914, the Social-Democratic group in the German Reichstag voted in favor of granting the government of Wilhelm II war credits and for supporting the imperialist war. The leaders of German Social-Democracy betrayed the working class and took up the position of social-chauvinism and of defense of their imperialist bourgeoisie.

Hard as the struggle may be, in individual cases, against the opportunists who predominate in many organisations, peculiar as the process of purging the workers' parties of opportunists may be in individual countries, this process is inevitable and fruitful. Reformist Socialism is dying; regenerated Socialism "will be revolutionary, uncompromising and insurrectionary", to use the apt expression of the French Socialist Paul Golay.

Section: "Kautskyism"

Kautsky, the biggest authority in the Second International, gives us a highly typical and glaring example of how the verbal recognition of Marxism has led actually to its conversion into "Struveism", [183] or into "Brentanoism". [184] We see this also from the example of Plekhanov. By means of obvious sophistry they rob Marxism of its revolutionary living spirit; they recognize *everything* in Marxism *except* revolutionary methods of struggle, the preaching of and preparation for such methods, and the training of the masses precisely in this direction. Kautsky, in an unprincipled fashion, "reconciles" the fundamental idea of social-chauvinism, recognition of defense of the fatherland in the present war, with a diplomatic, sham concession to the Lefts it, the shape of abstaining from voting credits, the verbal claim of being in the opposition, etc. Kautsky, who in 1909 wrote a whole book on the approaching epoch of revolutions and on the connection between war and revolutions, Kautsky, who in 1912 signed the Basle Manifesto on taking revolutionary advantage of the impending war, is now, in every way, justifying and embellishing social-chauvinism and, like Plekhanov, joins the bourgeoisie iii ridiculing all thought of revolution, all steps towards direct revolutionary struggle.

The working class cannot play its world-revolutionary role unless it wages a ruthless struggle against this renegacy. spinelessness, subservience to opportunism and unexampled vulgarization of the theories of Marxism. Kautskyism is not fortuity, but a social product of the contradictions within the Second International, a combination of loyalty to Marxism in words and subordination to opportunism in deeds.

This fundamental falseness of "Kautskyism" manifests itself in different ways in different countries. In Holland, Roland-HoIst while rejecting the idea of defending the fatherland, defends unity with the opportunists' party. In Russia Trotsky, while also rejecting this idea, also defends unity with the opportunist and chauvinist Nasha Zarya group. In Rumania, Rakovsky, while declaring war on opportunism as being responsible for the collapse of the International, is at the same time ready to recognize the legitimacy of the idea of defending the fatherland. All this is a manifestation of the evil which the Dutch Marxists (Gorter and Pannekoek) have called "passive radicalism", and which

[183] Struveism – see pp. 48-49 of this book.

[184] Brentanoism – a bourgeois reformist theory which "recognized the 'school of capitalism', but rejected the school of the revolutionary class struggle" (Lenin). Lujo Brentano, a German bourgeois economist, advocate of so-called "State Socialism", tried to prove that it was possible to achieve social equality within the capitalist system by means of reforms and the conciliation of the interests of the capitalists and the workers. Under the cloak of Marxist phraseology, Brentano and his followers tried to subordinate the working-dan movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie.

amounts to substituting for Marxism eclecticism in theory and servility to, or impotence in the face of, opportunism in practice.

Section: The Marxists' Slogan is the Slogan of Revolutionary Social-Democracy

The war has undoubtedly created a most acute crisis and has increased the distress of the masses to an incredible degree. The reactionary character of this war, and the shameless lies told by the bourgeoisie of *all* countries in covering up their predatory aims with "national" ideology, are inevitably creating, on the basis of an objectively revolutionary situation, revolutionary moods among the masses. It is our duty to help the masses to become conscious of these moods, to deepen and formulate them. This task is correctly expressed only by the slogan: convert the imperialist war into civil war; and *all* consistently waged class struggles during the war, all seriously conducted "mass action" tactics inevitably lead to this. It is impossible to foretell whether a powerful revolutionary movement will flare up during the first or the second war of the great powers, whether during or after it; in any case, our bounden duty is systematically and undeviatingly to work precisely in this direction.

The Basle Manifesto refers directly to the example set by the Paris Commune, i.e., to the conversion of a war between governments into civil war. Half a century ago, the proletariat was too weak; the objective conditions for Socialism had not yet ripened; there could be no coordination and cooperation between the revolutionary movements in all the belligerent countries; the "national ideology" (the traditions of 1792), with which a section of the Parisian workers were imbued, was their petty-bourgeois weakness, which Marx noted at the time, and was one of the causes of the fall of the Commune. Half a century after it, the conditions that weakened the revolution at that time have passed away, and it is unpardonable for a Socialist at the present time to resign himself to the abandonment of activities precisely in the spirit of the Paris Communards.

Section: The Example Shown by the Fraternization in the Trenches

The bourgeois newspapers of all the belligerent countries have reported cases of fraternization between the soldiers of the belligerent nations even in the trenches. And the issue by the military authorities (of Germany, England) of draconic orders against such fraternization proved that the governments and the bourgeoisie attached grave importance to it. he fact that such cases of fraternization have been possible even when opportunism reigns supreme in the top ranks of the Social-Democratic parties of Western Europe, and when social-chauvinism is supported by the entire Social-Democratic press and by all the authorities of the Second International, shows us how possible it would be to shorten the present criminal, reactionary and slave-owners' war and to organize a revolutionary international movement if systematic work were conducted in this direction, if only by the Left-wing Socialists in all the belligerent countries.

Section: The Importance of an Underground Organisation

The most prominent Anarchists all over the world, no less than the opportunists, have disgraced themselves with social-chauvinism (in the spirit of Plekhanov and Kautsky) in this war.

One of the useful results of this war will undoubtedly be that it will kill both anarchism and opportunism.

While under no circumstances or conditions refraining from utilizing all legal possibilities, however small, for the purpose of organizing the masses and of preaching Socialism, the Social-Democratic parties must break with subservience to legality. "You shoot first, Messieurs the Bourgeoisie," [185] wrote Engels, hinting precisely at civil war and at the necessity of our violating legality *after* the bourgeoisie had violated it. The crisis has shown that the bourgeoisie violate it in all countries, even the freest, and that it is impossible to lead the masses to revolution unless an underground organisation is set up for the purpose of advocating, discussing, appraising and preparing revolutionary methods of struggle. In Germany, for example, all the *honest* things that Socialists are doing, are being done in spite of despicable opportunism and hypocritical "Kautskyism", and are being done secretly. In England, people are sent to penal servitude for printing appeals against joining the army.

To regard the repudiation of underground methods of propaganda, and ridiculing the latter in the legally published press, *as* being compatible with membership of the Social-Democratic Patty is treachery to Socialism.

Section: Concerning Defeat of "One's Own" Government in the Imperialist War

Both the advocates of victory for their governments in the present war and the advocates of the slogan "neither victory not defeat", equally take the standpoint of social-chauvinism. A revolutionary class cannot but wish for the defeat of its government in a reactionary war, cannot fail to see that its military reverses facilitate its overthrow. Only a bourgeois who believes that a war started by the governments must necessarily end as a war between governments and wants it to end as such, can regard as "ridiculous" and "absurd" the idea that the Socialists of *all* the belligerent countries should wish for the defeat of *all* "their" governments and express this wish. On the contrary, it is precisely a statement of this kind that would conform to the cherished thoughts of every class-conscious worker, and would be in line with our activities towards converting the imperialist war into civil war.

Undoubtedly, the serious anti-war agitation that is being conducted by a section of the British, German and Russian Socialists has "weakened the military power" of the respective governments, but such agitation stands to the credit of the Socialists. Socialists must explain to the masses that they have no other road of salvation except the revolutionary overthrow of "their" governments, and that advantage must be taken of these governments' embarrassments in the present war precisely for this purpose.

[185] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Der Sozialismus in Deutschland, Collected Works, Ger. ed., Berlin 1963, Vol. XXII, p. 251.

Section: Pacifism and the Peace Slogan

The sentiments of the masses in favor of peace often express incipient protest, anger and consciousness of the reactionary character of the war. It is the duty of all Social-Democrats to utilize these sentiments. They will take a most ardent pan in every movement and in every demonstration on this ground; but they will not deceive the people by conceding the idea that peace without annexations, without the oppression of nations, without plunder, without the germs of new wars among the present governments and ruling classes is possible in the absence of a revolutionary movement. Such a deception of the people would merely play into the hands of the secret diplomacy of the belligerent governments and facilitate their counter-revolutionary plans. Whoever wants a lasting and democratic peace must be in favor of civil war against the governments and the bourgeoisie.

Section: The Right of Nations to Self-Determination

The most widespread deception of the people perpetrated by the bourgeoisie it, the present war is the concealment of its predatory aims with "national-liberation" ideology. The English promise the liberation of Belgium, the Germans of Poland, etc. Actually, as we have seen, this is a war waged by the oppressors of the majority of the nations of the world for the purpose of fortifying and expanding such oppression.

Socialists cannot achieve their great aim without fighting against all oppression of nations. Therefore, they must without fail demand that the Social-Democratic parties of *oppressing* countries (especially of the so-called "great" powers) should recognize and champion the right of *oppressed* nations to self-determination, precisely in the political sense of the term, i.e., the tight to political secession. The Socialist of a ruling or colony-owning nation who fails to champion this right is a chauvinist.

The championing of this right, far from encouraging the formation of small states, leads, on the contrary, to the freer, fearless and therefore wider and mote widespread formation of very big states and federations of states, which are more beneficial for the masses and more fully in keeping with economic development.

The Socialists of *oppressed* nations must, in their turn, unfailingly fight for the complete (including organisational) unity of the *workers* of the oppressed and oppressing nationalities. The idea of the juridical separation of one nation from another (so-called "cultural-national autonomy" advocated by Bauer and Renner) is reactionary.

Imperialism is the epoch of the constantly increasing oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of "great" powers and, therefore, it is impossible to fight for the socialist international revolution against imperialism unless the right of nations to self-determination is recognized. "No nation can be free if it oppresses other nations" (Marx and Engels). A proletariat that tolerates the slightest violence by "its" nation against other nations cannot be a socialist proletariat.

Among the Dutch, Scandinavian and Swiss revolutionary Social-Democrats who are combating the social-chauvinist lies about "defense of the fatherland" in the present imperialist war, there have been voices in favor of replacing the old Social-Democratic minimum-programme demand for a "militia", or "the armed nation," by a new demand: "disarmament." The Jugend-Internationale has inaugurated a discussion on this issue and published, in No. 3, an editorial supporting disarmament. There is also, we regret to note, a concession to the "disarmament" idea in R. Grimm's latest theses. [186] Discussion have been started in the periodicals Neue Leben [187] and Vorbote.

Let us take a closer look at the position of the disarmament advocates.

Section 1

Their principal argument is that the disarmament demand is the clearest, most decisive, most consistent expression of the struggle against all militarism and against all war.

But in this principal argument lies the disarmament advocates' principal error. Socialists cannot, without ceasing to be socialists, be opposed to all war.

Firstly, socialists have never been, nor can they ever be, opposed to revolutionary wars. The bourgeoisie of the imperialist "Great" Powers has become thoroughly reactionary, and the war *this* bourgeoisie is now waging we regard as a reactionary, slave-owners' and criminal war. But what about a war *against* this bourgeoisie? A war, for instance, waged by peoples oppressed by and dependent upon this bourgeoisie, or by colonial peoples, for liberation? In Section 5 of the *Internationale* group these we read: "National wars are no longer possible in the era of this unbridled imperialism." That is obviously wrong.

The history of the 20th century, this century of "unbridled imperialism," is replete with colonial wars. But what we Europeans, the imperialist oppressors of the majority of the world's peoples, with our habitual, despicable European chauvinism, call "colonial wars" are often national wars, or national rebellions of these oppressed peoples. One of the main features of imperialism is that it accelerates capitalist development in the most backward countries, and thereby extends and intensifies the struggle against national oppression. That is a fact, and from it inevitably follows that imperialism must often give rise to national wars. *Junius*, who defends the above-quoted "theses" in her pamphlet, says that in the imperialist era every national war against an imperialist Great Power leads to intervention of a rival imperialist Great Power. Every national war is this turned into an imperialist war. But that argument is wrong, too. This *can* happen, but does not always happen. Many colonial wars between 1900 and 1914 did not follow that course. And it would be simply

[186] The reference is to Robert Grimm's these on the war question published in the Grütlianer Nos. 162 and 164, July 1916.
[187] Neue Leben (New Life)—A monthly journal of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party published in Berne from January 1915 to December 1917. It expressed the views of the Zimmerwald Right and early in 1917 took up a social-chauvinist position.

ridiculous to declare, for instance, that after the present war, if it ends in the utter exhaustion of all the belligerents, "there can be no" national, progress, revolutionary wars "of any kind", wages, say, by China in alliance with India, Persia, Siam, etc., against the Great Powers.

To deny all possibility of national wars under imperialism is wrong in theory, obviously mistaken historically, and tantamount to European chauvinism in practice: we who belong to nations that oppress hundreds of millions in Europe, Africa, Asia, etc., are invited to tell the oppressed peoples that it is "impossible" for them to wage war against "our" nations!

Secondly, civil war is just as much a war as any other. He who accepts the class struggle cannot fail to accept civil wars, which in every class society are the natural, and under certain conditions inevitable, continuation, development and intensification of the class struggle. That has been confirmed by every great revolution. To repudiate civil war, or to forget about it, is to fall into extreme opportunism and renounce the socialist revolution.

Thirdly, the victory of socialism in one country does not at one stroke eliminate all wars in general. On the contrary, it presupposes wars. The development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly in different countries. It cannot be otherwise under commodity production. From this it follows irrefutably that socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously *in all* countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois. This is bound to create not only friction, but a direct attempt on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the socialist state's victorious proletariat. In such cases, a war on our part would be a legitimate and just war. It would be a war for socialism, for the liberation of other nations from the bourgeoisie. Engels was perfectly right when, in his letter to Kautsky of September 12, 1882, he clearly stated that it was possible for *already victorious* socialism to wage "defensive wars". What he had in mind was defense of the victorious proletariat against the bourgeoisie of other countries.

Only after we have overthrown, finally vanquished and expropriated the bourgeoisie of the whole world, and not merely in one country, will wars become impossible. And from a scientific point of view, it would be utterly wrong—and utterly unrevolutionary—for us to evade or gloss over the most important things: crushing the resistance of the bourgeoisie—the most difficult task, and one demanding the greatest amount of fighting, in the *transition* to socialism. The "social" parsons and opportunists are always ready to build dreams of future peaceful socialism. But the very thing that distinguishes them from revolutionary Social-Democrats is that they refuse to think about and reflect on the fierce class struggle and class *wars* needed to achieve that beautiful future.

We must not allow ourselves to be led astray by words. The term "defense of the fatherland", for instance, is hateful to many because both avowed opportunists and Kautskyites use it to cover up and gloss over the bourgeois lie about the *present* predatory war. This is a fact. But it does not follow that we must no longer see through to the meaning of political slogans. To accept "defense of the

fatherland" in the present war is no more nor less than to accept it as a "just" war, a war in the interests of the proletariat—no more nor less, we repeat, because invasions may occur in any war. It would be sheer folly to repudiate "defense of the fatherland" *on the part* of oppressed nations in their wars *against* the imperialist Great Powers, or on the part of a victorious proletariat in *its* war against some Galliffet of a bourgeois state.

Theoretically, it would be absolutely wrong to forget that every war is but the continuation of policy by other means. The present imperialist war is the continuation of the imperialist policies of two groups of Great Powers, and these policies were engendered and fostered by the sum total of the relationships of the imperialist era. But this very era must also necessarily engender and foster policies of struggle against national oppression and of proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and, consequently, also the possibility and inevitability; first, of revolutionary national rebellions and wars; second, of proletarian wars and rebellions *against* the bourgeoisie; and, third, of a combination of both kinds of revolutionary war, etc.

Section 2

To this must be added the following general consideration.

An oppressed class which does not strive to learn to use arms, to acquire arms, only deserves to be treated like slaves. We cannot, unless we have become bourgeois pacifists or opportunists, forget that we are living in a class society from which there is no way out, nor can there be, save through the class struggle. In every class society, whether based on slavery, serfdom, or, as at present, wage-labor, the oppressor class is always armed. Not only the modern standing army, but even the modern militia—and even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, Switzerland, for instance—represent the bourgeoisie armed *against* the proletariat. That is such an elementary truth that it is hardly necessary to dwell upon it. Suffice it to point to the use of troops against strikers in all capitalist countries.

A bourgeoisie armed against the proletariat is one of the biggest fundamental and cardinal facts of modern capitalist society. And in face of this fact, revolutionary Social-Democrats are urged to "demand" "disarmament"! That is tantamount of complete abandonment of the class-struggle point of view, to renunciation of all thought of revolution. Our slogan must be: arming of the proletariat to defeat, expropriate and disarm the bourgeoisie. These are the only tactics possible for a revolutionary class, tactics that follow logically from, and are dictated by, the whole *objective development* of capitalist militarism. Only *after* the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world-historic mission, to consign all armaments to the scrap-heap. And the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but *only when this condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before*.

If the present war rouses among the reactionary Christian socialists, among the whimpering petty bourgeoisie, *only* horror and fright, only aversion to all use of arms, to bloodshed, death, etc.,

then we must say: Capitalist society is and has always been *horror without end*. If this most reactionary of all wars is now preparing for that society an *end to horror*, we have no reason to fall into despair. But the disarmament "demand", or more correctly, the dream of disarmament, is, objectively, nothing but an expression of despair at a time when, as everyone can see, the bourgeoisie itself is paving the way for the only legitimate and revolutionary war—civil war against the imperialist bourgeoisie.

A lifeless theory, some might say, but we would remind them of two world-historical facts: the role of the trusts and the employment of women in industry, on the one hand, and the Paris Commune of 1871 and the December 1905 uprising in Russia, on the other.

The bourgeoisie makes it its business to promote trusts, drive women and children into the factories, subject them to corruption and suffering, condemn them to extreme poverty. We do not "demand" such development, we do not "support" it. We fight it. But *how* do we fight? We explain that trusts and the employment of women in industry are progressive. We do not want a return to the handicraft system, pre-monopoly capitalism, domestic drudgery for women. Forward through the trusts, etc., and beyond them to socialism!

With the necessary changes that arguments are applicable also to the present militarization of the population. Today the imperialist bourgeoisie militarizes the youth as well as the adults; tomorrow, it may begin militarizing the women. Our attitude should be: All the better! Full speed ahead! For the faster we move, the nearer shall we be to the armed uprising against capitalism. How can Social-Democrats give way to fear of the militarization of the youth, etc., if they have not forgotten the example of the Paris Commune? This is not a "lifeless theory" or a dream. It is a fact. And it would be a sorry state of affairs indeed if, all the economic and political facts notwithstanding, Social-Democrats began to doubt that the imperialist era and imperialist wars must inevitably bring about a repetition of such facts.

A certain bourgeois observer of the Paris Commune, writing to an English newspaper in May 1871, said: "If the French nation consisted entirely of women, what a terrible nation it would be!" Woman and teenage children fought in the Paris Commune side by side with the men. It will be no different in the coming battles for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Proletarian women will not look on passively as poorly armed or unarmed workers are shot down by the well-armed forces of the bourgeoisie. They will take to arms, as they did in 1871, and from the cowed nations of today—or more correctly, from the present-day labor movement, disorganized more by the opportunists than by the governments—there will undoubtedly arise, sooner or later, but with absolute certainty, an international league of the "terrible nations" of the revolutionary proletariat.

The whole of social life is now being militarized. Imperialism is a fierce struggle of the Great Powers for the division and redivision of the world. It is therefore bound to lead to further militarization in all countries, even in neutral and small ones. How will proletarian women oppose

this? Only by cursing all war and everything military, only be demanding disarmament? The women of an oppressed and really revolutionary class will never accept that shameful role. They will say to their sons: "You will soon be grown up. You will be given a gun. Take it and learn the military art properly. The proletarians need this knowledge not to shoot your brothers, the workers of other countries, as is being done in the present war, and as the traitors to socialism are telling you to do. They need it to fight the bourgeoisie of their own country, to put an end to exploitation, poverty and war, and not by pious wishes, but by defeating and disarming the bourgeoisie."

If we are to shun such propaganda, precisely such propaganda, in connection with the present war, then we had better stop using fine words about international revolutionary Social-Democracy, the socialist revolution and war against war.

Section 3

The disarmament advocates object to the "armed nation" clause in the programme also because it more easily leads, they allege, to concessions to opportunism. The cardinal point, namely, the relation of disarmament to the class struggle and to the social revolution, we have examined above. We shall now examine the relation between the disarmament demand and opportunism. One of the chief reasons why it is unacceptable is precisely that, together with the illusions it creates, it inevitably weakens and devitalizes our struggle against opportunism.

Undoubtedly, this struggle is the main, immediate question now confusing the International. Struggle against imperialism that is not closely linked with the struggle against opportunism is either an empty phrase or a fraud. One of the main defects of Zimmerwald and Kienthal [188]—on the main reasons why these embryos of the Third International may possibly end in a fiasco—is that the question of fighting opportunism was not even raised openly, let alone solved in the sense of proclaiming the need to break with the opportunists. Opportunism has triumphed—temporarily—in the European labor movement. Its two main shades are apparent in all the big countries: first, the avowed, cynical, and therefore less dangerous social-imperialism of Messrs. Plekhanov, Scheidemann, Legien, Albert Thomas and Sembat, Vandervelde, Hyndman, Henderson, et al,; second, the concealed, Kautskyite opportunism: Kautsky-Haase and the social-Democratic Labor Group in Germany; [189] Longuet, Pressemane, Mayeras, et al., in France; Ramsay MacDonald and the other leaders of the Independent Labor Party in England; Martov, Chkheidze, et al., in Russia; Treves and the other so-called Left reformists in Italy.

Avowed opportunism is openly and directly opposed to revolution and to incipient revolutionary movements and outbursts. It is in direct alliance with the governments, varied as the

[188] Lenin is referring to the international socialist conferences at Zimmerwald and Kienthal.
[189] he Social-Democratic Labor Group—An organization of German Centrists founded in march 1916 by Reichstag members who had broken with the Social-Democratic Reichstag group. It had the support of the majority of the Berlin organization and became the backbone of the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany, founded in April 1917. The new party sought to justify avowed social-chauvinists and advocated preservation of unity with them.

forms of this alliance may be—from accepting ministerial posts to participation in the war industries committees (in Russia). [190] The masked opportunists, the Kautskyites, are much more harmful and dangerous to the labor movement, because they hide their advocacy of alliance with the former under a cloak of plausible, pseudo-"Marxist" catchwords and pacifist slogans. The fight against both these forms of prevailing opportunism must be conducted in *all* fields of proletarian politics: parliament, the trade unions, strikes, the armed forces, etc. The main distinguishing feature of *both* these forms of prevailing opportunism is the concrete question of the *connection between the present war and revolution, and the other concrete questions of revolution, and the other concrete questions of revolution*, are hushed up, concealed, or treated with an eye to police prohibitions. And this despite the fact that before the war the connection between *this* impending war and the proletarian revolution was emphasized innumerable times, both unofficially and officially in the Basle Manifesto. [191] The main defect of the disarmament demand is its evasion of all the concrete questions of revolution. Or do the advocates of disarmament stand for an altogether new kind of revolution, unarmed revolution?

To proceed. We are by no means opposed to the fight for reforms. And we do not wish to ignore the sad possibility—if the worst comes to the worst—of mankind going through a second imperialist war, if revolution does not come out of the present war, in spite of our efforts. We favor a programme of reforms directed *also* against the opportunists. They would be only too glad if we left the struggle for reforms entirely to them and sought escape from sad reality in a nebulous "disarmament" fantasy. "Disarmament" means simply running away from unpleasant reality, not fighting it.

In such a programme, we would say something like this: "To accept the defense of the fatherland slogan in the 1914–16 imperialist war is to corrupt the labor movement with the aid of a bourgeois lie." Such a concrete reply to a concrete question would be more correct theoretically, much more useful to the proletariat and more unbearable to the opportunists, than the disarmament demand and repudiation of "all and any" defense of the fatherland. And we would add: "The bourgeoisie of all the imperialist Great Powers—England, France, Germany, Austria, Russia, Japan, the United States—has become so reactionary and so intent on world domination, that *any* war waged by *the bourgeoisie of those* countries is bound to be reactionary. The proletariat must not only oppose all such wars, but must also wish for the defeat of its 'own' government in such wars and

---

[190] The war industries committees were established in Russia in May 1915 by the imperialist bourgeoisie to help the tsarist government in the prosecution of the war. The Central War Industry Committee was headed by one of Russia's biggest capitalists, Guchkov, leader of the Octobrists. In an attempt to bring the workers under their influence and foster chauvinist sentiments, the bourgeoisie decided to organize "workers' groups" in these committees, thereby creating the impression that a "class peace" had been achieved in Russia between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The Bolsheviks declared a boycott of the committees and successfully carried it out with the support of the majority of workers.

As a result of Bolshevik propaganda, elections to the "workers' groups" were held only in 70 out of a total of 239 regional and local committees, and workers' representatives were elected only in 36 of them.

[191] The Basle Manifesto—A manifesto on the war issue. Was adopted at the extraordinary International Socialist Congress held in Basle on November 24–25 1912.

utilize its defeat for revolutionary insurrection, if an insurrection to prevent the war proves unsuccessful."

On the question of a militia, we should say: We are not in favor of a bourgeois militia; we are in favor only of a proletarian militia. Therefore, "not a penny, not a man", not only for a standing army, but even for a bourgeois militia, even in countries like the United States, or Switzerland, Norway, etc. The more so that in the freest republican countries (e.g., Switzerland) we see that the militia is being increasingly Prussianized, particularly in 1907 and 1911, and prostituted by being used against strikers. We can demand popular election of officers, abolition of all military law, equal rights for foreign and native-born workers (a point particularly important for those imperialist states which, like Switzerland, are more and more blatantly exploiting larger numbers of foreign workers, while denying them all rights). Further, we can demand the right of every hundred, say, inhabitants of a given country to form voluntary military-training associations, with free election of instructors paid by the state, etc. Only under these conditions could the proletariat acquire military training for *itself* and not for its slaveowners; and the need for such training is imperatively dictated by the interests of the proletariat. The Russian revolution showed that every success of the revolutionary movement, even a partial success like the seizure of a certain city, a certain factory town, or winning over a certain section of the army, inevitably *compels* the victorious proletariat to carry out just such a programme.

Lastly, it stands to reason that opportunism can never be defeated by mere programs; it can only be defeated by deeds. The greatest, and fatal, error of the bankrupt Second International was that its words did not correspond to its deeds, that it cultivated the habit of hypocritical and unscrupulous revolutionary phrase-mongering (note the present attitude of Kautsky and Co. towards the Basle Manifesto). Disarmament as a social idea, i.e., an idea that springs from, and can affect, a certain social environment, and is not the invention of some crackpot, springs, evidently, from the peculiar "tranquil" conditions prevailing, by way of exception, in certain small states, which have for a fairly long time stood aside from the world's path of war and bloodshed, and hope to remain in that way. To be convinced of this, we have only to consider the arguments advanced, for instance, by the Norwegian advocates of disarmament. "We are a small country," they say. "Our army is small; there is nothing we can do against the Great Powers [and, consequently, nothing we can do to resist forcible involvement in an imperialist *alliance* with one or the other Great Power group].... We want to be left in peace in our backwoods and continue our backwoods politics, demand disarmament, compulsory arbitration, permanent neutrality, etc." ("permanent" after the Belgian fashion, no doubt?).

The petty striving of petty states to hold aloof, the petty-bourgeois desire to keep as far away as possible from the great battles of world history, to take advantage of one's relatively monopolistic position in order to remain in hidebound passivity—this is the *objective* social environment which may ensure the disarmament idea a certain degree of success and a certain degree of popularity in

some small states. That striving is, of course, reactionary and is based entirely on illusions, for, in one way or another, imperialism draws the small states into the vortex of world economy and world politics.

In Switzerland, for instance, the imperialist environment objectively prescribes *two* courses to the labor movement: the opportunists, in alliance with the bourgeoisie, are seeking to turn the country into a republican-democratic monopolistic federation that would thrive on profits from imperialist bourgeois tourists, and to make this "tranquil" monopolistic position as profitable and as tranquil as possible.

The genuine Swiss Social-Democrats are striving to use Switzerland's relative freedom and her "international" position to help the victory of the close alliance of the revolutionary elements in the European workers' parties. Switzerland, then God, does not have "a separate language of her own", but uses three world languages, the three languages spoken in the adjacent belligerent countries.

If twenty thousand Swiss party members were to pay a weekly levy of two centimes as a sort of "extra war tax", we would have 20,000 francs per annum, a sum more than sufficient periodically to publish in three languages and distribute among the workers and soldiers of the belligerent countries—in spite of the bans imposed by the general staffs—all the truthful evidence about the incipient revolt of the workers, their fraternizing in the trenches, their hope that the weapons will be used for revolutionary struggle against the imperialist bourgeoisie of their "own" countries, etc.

That is not new. It is being done by the best papers, like *La Sentinelle*, *Volksrecht*, and the *Berner Tagwacht*, [192] although, unfortunately, on an inadequate scale. Only through such activity can the splendid decision of the Aarau Party Congress [193] become something more than merely a splendid decision.

---

[192] La Sentinelle—A Newspaper, organ of the Swiss Social-Democratic organization of Neuchatel Canton (Switzerland), published at La Chaux-de-Fonds from 1890 to 1906 and resumed in 1910. During the First World War it followed an internationalist policy.

Volksrecht (People's Right)—A daily paper, organ of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party founded in Zurich in 1898. During the First World War it published articles by Left Zimmerwaldists.

Berner Tagwacht (Berne Guardian)—A Social-Democratic newspaper founded in Berne in 1893. It published articles by Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring and other Social-Democrats in the early days of the First World War. In 1917, it came out in open support of the social-chauvinists.

[193] The Aarau Congress of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party met on November 20–21 1915. The central issue was the party's attitude towards the Zimmerwald internationalist groups, and the struggle developed between the three following trends: = 1) anti-Zimmerwaldists; = 2) supporters of the Zimmerwald Right; and = 3) supporters of the Zimmerwald Left. Robert Grimm tabled a resolution urging the party to affiliate with the Zimmerwald group and endorse the political programme of the Zimmerwald Right. The Left forces, in an amendment moved by the Lausanne branch, called for mass revolutionary struggle against the war, declaring that only a victorious proletarian revolution could put an end to the imperialist war. Under Grimm's pressure, the amendment was withdrawn, but it was again proposed by M. M. Kharitonov, a Bolshevik with the right to vote delegated by one of the party's branches. Out of tactical considerations, Grimm and his supporters were obliged to approve the amendment and it was carried by 258 votes to 141.

The question that interests us now is: Does the disarmament demand correspond to this revolutionary trend among the Swiss Social-Democrats? It obviously does not. Objectively, disarmament is an extremely national, a specifically national programme of small states. It is certainly not the international programme of international revolutionary Social-Democracy.

Lin Biao [194]: Long Live the Victory of People's War!

Rely on the Peasants and Establish Rural Base Areas

The peasantry constituted more than 80 percent of the entire population of semi-colonial and semi-feudal China. They were subjected to the threefold oppression and exploitation of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, and they were eager for resistance against Japan for revolution. It was essential to rely mainly on the peasants if the people's war was to be won.

But at the outset not all comrades in our Party saw this point. The history of our Party shows that in the period of the First Revolutionary Civil War, one of the major errors of the Right opportunists, represented by Chen Tu-hsiu, was their failure to recognize the importance of the peasant question and their opposition to arousing and arming the peasants. In the period of the Second Revolutionary Civil War, one of the major errors of the "Left" opportunists, represented by Wang Ming, was likewise their failure to recognize the importance of the peasant question. They did not realize that it was essential to undertake long-term and painstaking work among the peasants and establish revolutionary base areas in the countryside; they were under the illusion that they could rapidly seize the big cities and quickly win nationwide victory in the revolution. The errors of both the Right and the "Left" opportunists brought serious setbacks and defeats to the Chinese revolution.

As far back as the period of the First Revolutionary Civil War, Comrade Mao Zedong had pointed out that the peasant question occupied an extremely important position in the Chinese revolution, that the bourgeois-democratic revolution against imperialism and feudalism as in essence a peasant revolution and that the basic task of the Chinese proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution was to give leadership to the peasants' struggle.

In the period of the War of Resistance Against Japan, Comrade Mao Zedong again stressed that the peasants were the most reliable and the most numerous ally of the proletariat and constituted the main force in the War of Resistance. The peasants were the main source of manpower for China's armies. The funds and the supplies needed for a protracted war came chiefly from the peasants. In the anti-Japanese war, it was imperative to rely mainly on the peasants and to arouse them to participate in the war on the broadest scale.

The War of Resistance Against Japan was in essence a peasant revolutionary war led by our Party. By arousing and organizing the peasant masses and integrating them with the proletariat, our Party created a powerful force capable of defeating the strongest enemy.

[194] Released before the exposure of Lin Bao as a secret enemy of the people, this article was nonetheless prepared under the personal direction of Chairman Mao and represents his line.

To rely on the peasants, build rural base areas and use the countryside to encircle and finally capture the cities - such was the way to victory in the Chinese revolution.

Basing himself on the characteristics of the Chinese revolution, Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out the importance of building rural revolutionary base areas.

Since China's key cities have long been occupied by the powerful imperialists and their reactionary Chinese allies, it is imperative for the revolutionary ranks to turn the backward villages into advanced, consolidated base areas, into great military, political, economic and cultural bastions of the revolution from which to fight their vicious enemies who are using the cities for attacks on the rural districts, and in this way gradually to achieve the complete victory of the revolution through protracted fighting; it is imperative for them to do so if they do not wish to compromise with imperialism and its lackeys but are determined to fight on, and if they intend to build up and temper their forces, and avoid decisive battles with a powerful enemy while their own strength is inadequate.[195]

Experience in the period of the Second Revolutionary Civil War showed that, when this strategic concept of Comrade Mao Zedong's was applied, there was an immense growth in the revolutionary forces and one Red base area after another was built. Conversely, when it was violated and the nonsense of the "Left" opportunists was applied, the revolutionary forces suffered severe damage, with losses of nearly 100 percent in the cities and 90 percent in the rural areas.

During the War of Resistance Against Japan, the Japanese imperialist forces occupied many of China's big cities and the main lines of communication, but owing to the shortage of troops they were unable to occupy the vast countryside, which remained the vulnerable sector of the enemy's rule. Consequently, the possibility of building rural base areas became even greater. Shortly after the beginning of the War of Resistance, when the Japanese forces surged into China's hinterland and the Kuomintang forces crumbled and fled in one defeat after another, the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies led by our Party followed the wise policy laid down by Comrade Mao Zedong and boldly drove into the areas behind the enemy lines in small contingents and established base areas throughout the countryside. During the eight years of the war, we established nineteen anti-Japanese base areas in northern, central and southern China. With the exception of the big cities and the main lines of communication, the vast territory in the enemy's rear was in the hands of the people.

In the anti-Japanese base areas, we carried our democratic reforms, improved the livelihood of the people, and mobilized and organized the peasant masses. Organs of anti-Japanese democratic political power were established on an extensive scale and the masses of the people enjoyed the democratic right to run their own affairs; at the same time, we carried out the policies of "a reasonable burden" and "the reduction of rent and interest," which weakened the feudal system of exploitation and improved the people's livelihood. As a result, the enthusiasm of the peasant masses was deeply aroused, while the various anti-Japanese strata were given due consideration and were thus united. In formulating our policies for the base areas, we also took care that these policies should facilitate our work in the enemy-occupied areas.

[195] Mao Zedong, "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party," *Selected Works,* Eng. ed., FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. II, pp. 316-17.

In the enemy-occupied cities and villages, we combined legal with illegal struggle, united the basic masses and all patriots, and divided and disintegrated the political power of the enemy and his puppets so as to prepare ourselves to attack the enemy from within in coordination with operations from without when conditions were ripe.

The base areas established by our Party became the centre of gravity in the Chinese people's struggle to resist Japan and save the country. Relying on these bases, our Party expanded and strengthened the people's revolutionary forces, persevered in the protracted war and eventually won the War or Resistance Against Japan.

Naturally, it was impossible for the development of the revolutionary base areas to be plain sailing all the time. They constituted a tremendous threat to the enemy and were bound to be attacked. Therefore, their development was a tortuous process of expansion, contraction and then renewed expansion. Between 1937 and 1940 the population in the anti-Japanese base areas grew to 100,000,000. But in 1941-42 the Japanese imperialists used the major part of their invading forces to launch frantic attacks on our base areas and wrought havoc. Meanwhile, the Kuomintang, too, encircled these base areas, blockaded them and went so far as to attack them. So, by 1942, the anti-Japanese base areas had contracted and their population was less than 50,000,000. Placing complete reliance on the masses, our Party resolutely adopted a series of correct policies and measures, with the result that the base areas were able to hold out under extremely difficult circumstances. After this setback, the army and the people in the base areas were tempered and grew stronger. From 1943 onwards, our base areas were gradually restored and expanded, and by 1945 the population had grown to 160,000,000. Taking the entire course of the Chinese revolution into account, our revolutionary base areas went through even more ups and downs, and they weathered a great many tests before the small, separate base areas, expanding in a series of waves, gradually developed into extensive and contiguous base areas.

At the same time, the work of building the revolutionary base areas was a grand rehearsal in preparation for nationwide victory. In these base areas, we built the Party, ran the organs of state power, built the people's armed forces and set up mass organizations; we engaged in industry and agriculture and operated cultural, educational and all other undertakings necessary for the independent existence of a separate region. Our base areas were in fact a state in miniature. And with the steady expansion of our work in the base areas, our Party established a powerful people's army, trained cadres for various kinds of work, accumulated experience in many fields and build up both the material and the moral strength that provided favorable conditions for nationwide victory.

The revolutionary base areas established in the War of Resistance later became the springboards for the People's War of Liberation, in which the Chinese people defeated the Kuomintang reactionaries. In the War of Liberation, we continued the policy of first encircling the cities from the countryside and then capturing the cities, and thus won nationwide victory.

Build a People's Army of a New Type

"Without a people's army the people have nothing."[196] This is the conclusion drawn by Comrade Mao Zedong from the Chinese people's experience in their long years of revolutionary struggle, experience that was bought in blood. This is a universal truth of Marxism-Leninism.

The special feature of the Chinese revolution was armed revolution against armed counter-revolution. The main form of struggle was war and the main form of organization was the army which was under the absolute leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, while all the other forms of organization and struggle led by our Party were coordinated, directly or indirectly, with the war.

During the First Revolutionary Civil War, many fine Party comrades took an active part in the armed revolutionary struggle. But our Party was then still in its infancy and did not have a clear understanding of this special feature of the Chinese revolution. It was only after the First Revolutionary Civil War, only after the Kuomintang had betrayed the revolution, massacred large numbers of Communists and destroyed all the revolutionary mass organizations, that our Party reached a clearer understanding of the supreme importance of organizing revolutionary armed forces and of studying the strategy and tactics of revolutionary war, and created the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army, the first people's army under the leadership of the Communist Party of China.

During the Second Revolutionary Civil War, the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army created by Comrade Mao Zedong grew considerably and at one time reached a total of 300,000 men. But it later lost nine-tenths of its forces as a result of the wrong political and military lines followed by the "Left" opportunist leadership.

At the start of the War of Resistance Against Japan, the people's army led by the Chinese Communist Party had only a little over 40,000 men. The Kuomintang reactionaries attempted to restrict, weaken and destroy this people's army in every conceivable way. Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out that, in these circumstances, in order to sustain the War of Resistance and defeat the Japanese aggressors, it was imperative greatly to expand and consolidate the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies and all the guerrilla units led by our Party. The whole Party should give close attention to war and study military affairs. Every Party member should be ready at all times to take up arms and go to the front.

Comrade Mao Zedong also incisively stated that Communists do not fight for personal military power but must fight for military power for the Party and for the people.

Guided by the Party's correct line of expanding the revolutionary armed forces, the Communist-led Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies and anti-Japanese guerrilla units promptly went to the forefront at the very beginning of the war. We spread the seeds of the people's armed forces in the vast areas behind the enemy lines and kindled the flames of guerrilla warfare everywhere. Our people's army steadily expanded in the struggle, so that by the end of the war it was already a million strong, and there was also a militia of over two million. That was why we were able to engage nearly two-thirds of the Japanese forces of aggression and 95 per cent of the puppet troops and to become the main force in the War of Resistance Against Japan. While resisting the Japanese invading forces, we repulsed three large-scale anti-Communist onslaughts launched by the

[196] Mao Zedong, "On Coalition Government," *Selected Works,* Eng. ed., FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. III, pp. 296-97.

Kuomintang reactionaries in 1939, 1941 and 1943, and smashed their countless "friction-mongering" activities.

Why were the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies able to grow big and strong from being small and weak and to score such great victories in the War of Resistance Against Japan?

The fundamental reason was that the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies were founded on Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of army building. They were armies of a new type, a people's army which whole-heartedly serves the interests of the people.

Guided by Comrade Mao Zedong's theory on building a people's army, our army was under the absolute leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and most loyally carried out the Party's Marxist-Leninist line and policies. It had a high degree of conscious discipline and was heroically inspired to destroy all enemies and conquer all difficulties. Internally there was full unity between cadres and fighters, between those in higher and those in lower positions of responsibility, between the different departments and between the various fraternal army units. Externally, there was similarly full unity between the army and the people and between the army and the local government.

During the anti-Japanese war our army staunchly performed the three tasks set by Comrade Mao Zedong, namely, fighting, mass work, and production, and it was at the same time a fighting force, a political work force and a production corps. Everywhere it went, it did propaganda work among the masses, organized and armed them and helped them set up revolutionary political power. Our army men strictly observed the Three Main Rules of Discipline and the Eight Points for Attention,[197] carried out campaigns to "support the government and cherish the people," and did good deeds for the people everywhere. They also made use of every possibility to engage in production themselves so as to overcome economic difficulties, better their own livelihood and lighten the people's burden. By their exemplary conduct they won the whole-hearted support of the masses, who affectionately called them "our own boys."

Our army consisted of local forces as well as of regular forces; moreover, it energetically built and developed the militia, thus practicing the system of combining the three military formations, i.e., the regular forces, the local forces and the militia.

Our army also pursued correct policies in winning over enemy officers and men in giving lenient treatment to prisoners of war. During the anti-Japanese war, we not only brought about the revolt and surrender of large numbers of puppet troops, but succeeded in converting not a few Japanese prisoners, who had been badly poisoned by fascist ideology. After they were politically awakened, they organized themselves into anti-war organizations such as the League for the

[197] The Three Main Rules of Discipline and the Eight Points for Attention were drawn up by Comrade Mao Zedong for the Chinese Workers' and Peasants' Red Army during the Agrarian Revolutionary War and were later adopted as rules of discipline by the Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army and the present People's Liberation Army. As these rules varied slightly in content in the army units of different areas, the General Headquarters of the Chinese People's Liberation Army in October 1947 issued a standard version as follows: The Three Main Rules of Discipline: 1. Obey orders in all your actions. 2. Do not take a single needle or piece of thread from the masses. 3. Turn in everything captured. **The Eight Points for Attention:** 1. Speak politely. 2. Pay fairly for what you buy. 3. Return everything you borrow. 4. Pay for anything you damage. 5. Do not hit or swear at people. 6. Do not damage crops. 7. Do not take liberties with women. 8. Do not ill-treat captives.

Liberation of the Japanese People, the Anti-War League of the Japanese in China and the League of Awakened Japanese, helped us to disintegrate the Japanese army and cooperated with us in opposing Japanese militarism. Comrade Sanzo Nosaka, the leader of the Japanese Communist Party, who was then in Yenan, gave us great help in this work.

The essence of Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of army building is that in building a people's army prominence must be given to politics, i.e., the army must first and foremost be built on a political basis. Politics is the commander; politics is the soul of everything. Political work is the lifeline of our army. True, a people's army must pay attention to the constant improvement of its weapons and equipment and its military technique, but in its fighting, it does not rely purely on weapons and technique, it relies mainly on politics, on the proletarian revolutionary consciousness and courage of the commanders and fighters, on the support and backing of the masses.

Owing to the application of Comrade Mao Zedong's line on army building, there has prevailed in our army at all times a high level of proletarian political consciousness, an atmosphere of keenness to study the thought of Mao Zedong, an excellent morale, a solid unity and a deep hatred for the enemy, and thus a gigantic moral force has been brought into being. In battle it has feared neither hardships nor death, it has been able to charge or hold its ground as the conditions require. One man can play the role of several, dozens or even hundreds, and miracles can be performed.

All this makes the people's army led by the Chinese Communist Party fundamentally different from any bourgeois army, and from all the armies of the old type which served the exploiting classes and were driven and utilized by a handful of people. The experience of the people's war in China shows that a people's army created in accordance with Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of army building is incomparably strong and invincible.

Mao Zedong: Problem's of War and Strategy

Section 1: China's Characteristics and Revolutionary War

The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries.

But while the principle remains the same, its application by the party of the proletariat finds expression in varying ways according to the varying conditions. Internally, capitalist countries practice bourgeois democracy (not feudalism) when they are not fascist or not at war; in their external relations, they are not oppressed by, but themselves oppress, other nations. Because of these characteristics, it is the task of the party of the proletariat in the capitalist countries to educate the workers and build up strength through a long period of legal struggle, and thus prepare for the final overthrow of capitalism. In these countries, the question is one of a long legal struggle, of utilizing parliament as a platform, of economic and political strikes, of organizing trade unions and educating the workers. There the form of organization is legal and the form of struggle bloodless (non-military). On the issue of war, the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries oppose the imperialist wars waged by their own countries; if such wars occur, the policy of these Parties is to bring about the defeat of the reactionary governments of their own countries. The one war they want to fight is the

civil war for which they are preparing. [198] But this insurrection and war should not be launched until the bourgeoisie becomes really helpless, until the majority of the proletariat are determined to rise in arms and fight, and until the rural masses are giving willing help to the proletariat. And when the time comes to launch such an insurrection and war, the first step will be to seize the cities, and then advance into the countryside' and not the other way about. All this has been done by Communist Parties in capitalist countries, and it has been proved correct by the October Revolution in Russia.

China is different however. The characteristics of China are that she is not independent and democratic but semi-colonial and semi-feudal, that internally she has no democracy but is under feudal oppression and that in her external relations she has no national independence but is oppressed by imperialism. It follows that we have no parliament to make use of and no legal right to organize the workers to strike. Basically, the task of the Communist Party here is not to go through a long period of legal struggle before launching insurrection and war, and not to seize the big cities first and then occupy the countryside, but the reverse.

When imperialism is not making armed attacks on our country, the Chinese Communist Party either wages civil war jointly with the bourgeoisie against the warlords (lackeys of imperialism), as in 1924-27 in the wars in Kwangtung Province [199] and the Northern Expedition, or unites with the peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie to wage civil war against the landlord class and the comprador bourgeoisie (also lackeys of imperialism), as in the War of Agrarian Revolution of 1927-36. When imperialism launches armed attacks on China, the Party unites all classes and strata in the country opposing the foreign aggressors to wage a national war against the foreign enemy, as it is doing in the present War of Resistance Against Japan.

All this shows the difference between China and the capitalist countries. In China war is the main form of struggle and the army is the main form of organization. Other forms such as mass organization and mass struggle are also extremely important and indeed indispensable and in no circumstances to be overlooked, but their purpose is to serve the war. Before the outbreak of a war all organization and struggle are in preparation for the war, as in the period from the May 4th

---

[198] See V. I. Lenin, "The War and Russian Social-Democracy" (Collected Works, Eng. ed., Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, Vol. XXI, pp. 27-34), "The Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. Groups Abroad" (ibid., pp. 158-64), "The Defeat of One's own Government in the Imperialist War" (ibid., pp. 275-80), "The Defeat of Russia and the Revolutionary Crisis" (ibid., pp. 378-82). These articles, written in 1914-15, deal Specifically with the imperialist war of that time. See also History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1951, pp. 258-67.

[199] In 1924, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, in alliance with the Communist Party and the revolutionary workers and peasants, defeated the "Merchants' Corps", an armed force of the compradors and landlords which engaged in counter-revolutionary activities in Canton in collaboration with the British imperialists. The revolutionary army, which had been founded on the basis of co-operation between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party, set out from Canton early in 1925, fought the Eastern Campaign and, with the support of the peasants, defeated the troops of the warlord Chen Chiung-ming. It then returned to Canton and overthrew the Yunnan and Kwangsi warlords who had entrenched themselves there. That autumn it conducted the Second Eastern Campaign and finally wiped-out Chen Chiung-ming's forces. These campaigns, in which members of the Communist Party and the Communist Youth League fought heroically in the van, brought about the political unification of Kwangtung Province and paved the way for the Northern Expedition.

Movement of 1919 to the May 30th Movement of 1925. After war breaks out, all organization and struggle are coordinated with the war either directly or indirectly, as, for instance, in the period of the Northern Expedition when all organization and struggle in the rear areas of the revolutionary army were coordinated with the war directly, and those in the Northern warlord areas were coordinated with the war indirectly. Again, in the period of the War of Agrarian Revolution all organization and struggle inside the Red areas were coordinated with the war directly, and outside the Red areas indirectly. Yet again in the present period, the War of Resistance, all organization and struggle in the rear areas of the anti-Japanese forces and in the areas occupied by the enemy are directly or indirectly coordinated with the war.

"In China the armed revolution is fighting the armed counterrevolution. That is one of the specific features and one of the advantages of the Chinese revolution." [200] This thesis of Comrade Stalin's is perfectly correct and is equally valid for the Northern Expedition, the War of Agrarian Revolution, and the present War of Resistance Against Japan. They are all revolutionary wars; all directed against counter-revolutionaries and all waged mainly by the revolutionary people, differing only in the sense that a civil war differs from a national war, and that a war conducted by the Communist Party differs from a war it conducts jointly with the Kuomintang. Of course, these differences are important. They indicate the breadth of the main forces in the war (an alliance of the workers and peasants, or of the workers, peasants and bourgeoisie) and whether our antagonist in the war is internal or external (whether the war is against domestic or foreign foes, and, if domestic, whether against the Northern warlords or against the Kuomintang); they also indicate that the content of China's revolutionary war differs at different stages of its history. But all these wars are instances of armed revolution fighting armed counterrevolution, they are all revolutionary wars, and all exhibit the specific features and advantages of the Chinese revolution. The thesis that revolutionary war "is one of the specific features and one of the advantages of the Chinese revolution" fits China's conditions perfectly. The main task of the party of the Chinese proletariat, a task confronting it almost from its very inception, has been to unite with as many allies as possible and, according to the circumstances, to organize armed struggles for national and social liberation against armed counterrevolution, whether internal or external. Without armed struggle the proletariat and the Communist Party would have no standing at all in China, and it would be impossible to accomplish any revolutionary task.

Our Party did not grasp this point fully during the first five or six years after it was founded, that is, from 1921 to its participation in the Northern Expedition in 1926. It did not then understand the supreme importance of armed struggle in China, or seriously prepare for war and organize armed forces, or apply itself to the study of military strategy and tactics. During the Northern Expedition it neglected to win over the army but laid one-sided stress on the mass movement, with the result that the whole mass movement collapsed the moment the Kuomintang turned reactionary.

[200] J. V. Stalin, "The Prospects of the Revolution in China", Works, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1954, Vol. VIII, p. 379

For a long time after 1927 many comrades continued to make it the Party's central task to prepare for insurrections in the cities and to work in the White areas. It was only after our victory in repelling the enemy's third "encirclement and suppression" campaign in 1931 that some comrades fundamentally changed their attitude on this question. But this was not true of the whole Party, and there were other comrades who did not think along the lines presented here.

Experience tells us that China's problems cannot be settled without armed force. An understanding of this point will help us in successfully waging the War of Resistance Against Japan from now on. The fact that the whole nation is rising in armed resistance in the war against Japan should inculcate a better understanding of the importance of this question in the whole Party, and every Party member should be prepared to take up arms and go to the front at any moment. Moreover, our present session has clearly defined the direction for our efforts by deciding that the Party's main fields of work are in the battle zones and in the enemy's rear. This is also an excellent antidote against the tendency of some Party members to be willing only to work in Party organizations and in the mass movement but to be unwilling to study or participate in warfare, and against the failure of some schools to encourage students to go to the front, and other such phenomena. In most of China, Party organizational work and mass work are directly linked with armed struggle; there is not and cannot be, any Party work or mass work that is isolated and stands by itself. Even in rear areas remote from the battle zones (like Yunnan, Kweichow and Szechuan) and in enemy-occupied areas (like Peiping, Tientsin, Nanking and Shanghai), Party organizational work and mass work are coordinated with the war, and should and must exclusively serve the needs of the front. In a word, the whole Party must pay great attention to war, study military matters and prepare itself for fighting.

Section 2: The War History of the Kuomintang

It will be useful for us to look at the history of the Kuomintang and see what attention it pays to war.

From the start, when he organized a small revolutionary group, Sun Yat-sen staged armed insurrections against the Ching Dynasty. [201] The period of *Tung Meng Hui* (the Chinese Revolutionary League) was replete with armed insurrections, right up to the armed overthrow of the Ching Dynasty by the Revolution of 1911. Then, during the period of the Chinese Revolutionary Party, he carried out a military campaign against Yuan Shih-kai. [202] Subsequent events such as the southern

[201] In 1894, Dr. Sun Yat-sen formed a small revolutionary organization in Honolulu called the Hsing Chung Hui (Society for China's Regeneration). With the support of the secret societies among the people, he staged two armed insurrections in Kwangtung Province against the Ching government after its defeat in the Sino-Japanese war in 1895, one at Canton in 1895 and the other at Huichow in 1900.

[202] In 1912, the Chinese Revolutionary League was reorganized into the Kuomintang and made a compromise with the Northern warlord regime headed by Yuan Shih-kai. In 1913 Yuan's troops marched southward to suppress the forces which had emerged in the provinces of Kiangsi, Anhwei and Kwangtung in the course of the 1911 revolution. Armed resistance was organized by Dr. Sun Yat-sen but it was soon crushed. In 1914, realizing the error of the Kuomintang's policy of compromise, Dr. Sun formed the Chung Hua Ke Ming Tang (Chinese Revolutionary Party) in Tokyo, Japan, in

movement of the naval units, [203] the northern expedition from Kweilin [204] and the founding of the Whampoa Military Academy [205] were also among Sun Yat-sen's military undertakings.

After Sun Yat-sen came Chiang Kai-shek, who brought the Kuomintang's military power to its zenith. He values the army as his very life and has had the experience of three wars, namely, the Northern Expedition, the Civil War and the War of Resistance Against Japan. For the last ten years Chiang Kai-shek has been a counter-revolutionary. He has created a huge "Central Army" for counter-revolutionary purposes. He has held firmly to the vital point that whoever has an army has power and that war decides everything. In this respect we ought to learn from him. In this respect both Sun Yat-sen and Chiang Kai-shek are our teachers.

Since the Revolution of 1911, all the warlords have clung to their armies for dear life, setting great store by the principle, "Whoever has an army has power."

Tan Yen-kai, [206] a clever bureaucrat who had a checkered career in Hunan, was never a civil governor pure and simple but always insisted on being both the military governor and the civil governor. Even when he became President of the National Government first in Canton and then in Wuhan, he was concurrently the commander of the Second Army. There are many such warlords who understand this peculiarity of China's.

There have also been parties in China, notably the Progressive Party, [207] which did not want to have an army; yet even this party recognized that it could not get government positions without

---

order to distinguish his organization from the Kuomintang of the time. The new Party was actually an alliance of the political representatives of a section of the petty bourgeoisie and a section of the bourgeoisie against Yuan Shih-kai. Through this alliance, Dr. Sun Yat-sen staged a minor insurrection in Shanghai in 1914. In 1915 when Yuan Shih-kai proclaimed himself emperor, Tsai Ngo and others set out from Yunnan to take action against him, and Dr. Sun was also very active in advocating and promoting armed opposition to Yuan Shih-kai.

[203] In 1917 Dr. Sun Yat-sen went from Shanghai to Canton at the head of a naval force which was under his influence. Using Kwangtung as a base and co-operating with the Southwestern warlords who were opposed to the Northern warlord Tuan Chi-jui, he set up a military government opposed to Tuan Chi-jui.

[204] In 1921 Dr. Sun Yat-sen planned a northern expedition from Kweilin, Kwangsi Province. But his plan was frustrated by the mutiny of his subordinate, Chen Chiung ming, who was in league with the Northern warlords.

[205] In 1921 Dr. Sun Yat-sen planned a northern expedition from Kweilin, Kwangsi Province. But his plan was frustrated by the mutiny of his subordinate, Chen Chiung ming, who was in league with the Northern warlords.

[206] Tan Yen-kai was a native of Hunan who had been a Henlin, a member of the highest official scholastic body under the Ching Dynasty. He was a careerist who first advocated a constitutional monarchy and then took part in the Revolution of 1911. His later adherence to the Kuomintang reflected the contradiction between the Hunan landlords and the Northern warlords.

[207] The Progressive Party was organized by Liang Chi-chao and others under the aegis of Yuan Shih-kai during the first years of the Republic.

some warlord backing. Among its successive patrons have been Yuan Shih-kai, [208] Tuan Chi-jui [209] and Chiang Kai-shek (to whom the Political Science Group, [210] formed out of a section of the Progressive Party, has attached itself).

A few small political parties with a short history, e.g., the Youth Party, [211] have no army, and so have not been able to get anywhere.

In other countries there is no need for each of the bourgeois parties to have an armed force under its direct command. But things are different in China, where, because of the feudal division of the country, those landlord or bourgeois groupings or parties which have guns have power, and those which have more guns have more power. Placed in such an environment, the party of the proletariat should see clearly to the heart of the matter.

Communists do not fight for personal military power (they must in no circumstances do that, and let no one ever again follow the example of Chang Kuo-tao), but they must fight for military power for the Party, for military power for the people. As a national war of resistance is going on, we must also fight for military power for the nation. Where there is naivety on the question of military power, nothing whatsoever can be achieved. It is very difficult for the laboring people, who have been deceived and intimidated by the reactionary ruling classes for thousands of years, to awaken to the importance of having guns in their own hands. Now that Japanese imperialist oppression and the nation-wide resistance to it have pushed our laboring people into the arena of war, Communists should prove themselves the most politically conscious leaders in this war. Every Communist must grasp the truth, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." Our principle is that the Party commands the gun, and the gun must never be allowed to command the Party. Yet, having guns, we can create Party organizations, as witness the powerful Party organizations which the Eighth Route Army has created in northern China. We can also create cadres, create schools, create culture, create

---

[208] Yuan Shih-kai was the head of the Northern warlords in the last years of the Ching Dynasty. After the Ching Dynasty was overthrown by the Revolution of 1911, he usurped the presidency of the Republic and organized the first government of the Northern warlords, which represented the big landlord and big comprador classes. He did this by relying on counter-revolutionary armed force and on the support of the imperialists and by taking advantage of the conciliationist character of the bourgeoisie, which was then leading the revolution. In 1915 he wanted to make himself emperor and, to gain the support of the Japanese imperialists, accepted the Twenty-one Demands with which Japan aimed at obtaining exclusive control of all China. In December of the same year an uprising against his assumption of the throne took place in Yunnan Province and promptly won nation-wide response and support. Yuan Shih-kai died in Peking in June 1916.

[209] Tuan Chi-jui was an old subordinate of Yuan Shih-kai and head of the Anhwei clique of Northern warlords. After Yuan's death he more than once controlled the Peking government.

[210] The extremely right-wing Political Science Group was formed in 1916 by a section of the Progressive Party and a section of the Kuomintang. It gambled now on the Southern, now on the Northern, warlords in order to grab government posts. During the Northern Expedition of 1926-27, its pro-Japanese members, such as Huang Fu, Chang Chun and Yang Yung-tai, began to collaborate with Chiang Kai-shek and, using their reactionary political experience, helped him build up a counter revolutionary regime.

[211] The Youth Party, also called the Chinese Youth Party or the Etatiste Party, was formed by a handful of unscrupulous fascist politicians. They made counter-revolutionary careers for themselves by opposing the Communist Party and the Soviet Union and received subsidies from the various groups of reactionaries in power and from the imperialists.

mass movements. Everything in Yenan has been created by having guns. All things grow out of the barrel of a gun. According to the Marxist theory of the state, the army is the chief component of state power. Whoever wants to seize and retain state power must have a strong army. Some people ridicule us as advocates of the "omnipotence of war". Yes, we are advocates of the omnipotence of revolutionary war; that is good, not bad, it is Marxist. The guns of the Russian Communist Party created socialism. We shall create a democratic republic. Experience in the class struggle in the era of imperialism teaches us that it is only by the power of the gun that the working class and the laboring masses can defeat the armed bourgeoisie and landlords; in this sense we may say that only with guns can the whole world be transformed. We are advocates of the abolition of war, we do not want war; but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun.

Section 3: The War History of the Chinese Communist Party

Our Party failed to grasp the importance of engaging itself directly in preparations for war and in the organization of armed forces for a period of three or four years, that is; from 1921 (when the Chinese Communist Party was founded) to 1924 (when the First National Congress of the Kuomintang was held), and it still lacked adequate understanding of this issue in the 1924-27 period and even later; nevertheless, after 1924, when it began to participate in the Whampoa Military Academy, it entered a new stage and began to see the importance of military affairs. Through helping the Kuomintang in the wars in Kwangtung Province and participating in the Northern Expedition, the Party gained leadership over some armed forces. [212] Then, having learned a bitter lesson from the failure of the revolution, the Party organized the Nanchang Uprising, [213] the Autumn Harvest Uprising [214] and the Canton Uprising, and entered on a new period, the founding of the Red Army. That was the crucial period in which our Party arrived at a thorough understanding of the importance of the army. Had there been no Red Army and no war fought by the Red Army in this period, that is, had the Communist Party adopted Chen Tu-hsiu's liquidationism, the present War of Resistance would have been inconceivable or could not have been sustained for long.

---

[212] Comrade Mao Tse-tung is here referring mainly to the independent regiment commanded by General Yeh Ting, a Communist, during the Northern Expedition. See "The Struggle in the Chingkang Mountains", Note 14 Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Eng. ed., PLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. I, p. 104.

[213] Nanchang, capital of Kiangsi Province, was the scene of the famous uprising on August 1, 1927 led by the Communist Party of China in order to combat the counterrevolution of Chiang Kai-shek and Wang Ching-wei and to continue the revolution of 1924-27. More than thirty thousand troops took part in the uprising which was led by Comrades Chou En-lai, Chu Teh, Ho Lung and Yeh Ting. The insurrectionary army withdrew from Nanchang on August I as planned, but suffered a defeat when approaching Chowchow and Swatow in Kwangtung Province. Led by Comrades Chu Teh and Chen Yi, part of the troops later fought their way to the Chingkang Mountains and joined forces with the First Division of the First Workers' and Peasants' Revolutionary Army under Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

[214] The famous Autumn Harvest Uprising under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung was launched in September 1927 by the people's armed forces of Hsiushui Pinghsiang, Pingkiang and Liuyang Counties on the Hunan-Kiangsi border, who formed the First Division of the First Workers' and Peasants' Revolutionary Army. Comrade Mao Tse-tung led this force to the Chingkang Mountains where a revolutionary base was established.

At its emergency meeting held on August 7, 1927, the Central Committee of the Party combated Right opportunism in the political sphere, thus enabling the Party to take a big stride forward. At its fourth plenary session in January 1931, the Sixth Central Committee nominally combated "Left" opportunism in the political sphere, but in fact itself committed the error of "Left" opportunism anew. The two meetings differed in their content and historical role, but neither of them dealt seriously with the problems of war and strategy, a fact which showed that war had not yet been made the centre of gravity in the Party's work. After the central leadership of the Party moved into the Red areas in 1933, this situation underwent a radical change, but mistakes in principle were again committed on the problem of war (and all other major problems), bringing serious losses to the revolutionary war. The Tsunyi Meeting of 1935, on the other hand, was mainly a fight against opportunism in the military sphere and gave top priority to the question of war, and this was a reflection of the war conditions of the time. Today we can say with confidence that in the struggles of the past seventeen years the Chinese Communist Party has forged not only a firm Marxist political line but also a firm Marxist military line. We have been able to apply Marxism in solving not only political but also military problems; we have trained not only a large core of cadres capable of running the Party and the state, but also a large core of cadres capable of running the army. These achievements are the flower of the revolution, watered by the blood of countless martyrs, a glory that belongs not only to the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people, but also to the Communist Parties and the peoples of the whole world. There are only three armies in the whole world which belong to the proletariat and the laboring people, the armies led by the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union, of China and of Spain, and as yet Communist Parties in other countries have had no military experience; hence our army and our military experience are all the more precious.

In order to carry the present War of Resistance Against Japan to victory, it is extremely important to expand and consolidate the Eighth Route Army, the New Fourth Army and all the guerrilla forces led by our Party. Acting on this principle, the Party should dispatch a sufficient number of its best members and cadres to the front. Everything must serve victory at the front, and the organizational task must be subordinated to the political task.

Section 4: Changes in the Party's Military Strategy in the Civil War and the National War

The changes in our Party's military strategy are worth studying. Let us deal separately with the two processes, the civil war and the national war.

The civil war can be roughly divided into two strategic periods. Guerrilla warfare was primary in the first period and regular warfare in the second. But this regular warfare was of the Chinese type, regular only in its concentration of forces for mobile warfare and in a certain degree of centralization and planning in command and organization; in other respects, it retained a guerrilla character and, as regular warfare, was on a low level and not comparable with the regular warfare of foreign armies or, in some ways, even with that of the Kuomintang army. Thus, in a sense, this type of regular warfare was only guerrilla warfare raised to a higher level.

The War of Resistance Against Japan can also be roughly divided into two strategic periods, so far as our Party's military tasks are concerned. In the first period (comprising the stages of the strategic defensive and strategic stalemate) it is guerrilla warfare which is primary, while in the second (the stage of the strategic counteroffensive) it is regular warfare which will be primary. However, the guerrilla warfare of the first period of the War of Resistance differs considerably in content from that of the first period of the civil war, because the dispersed guerrilla tasks are being carried out by the regular (*i.e.*, regular to a certain degree) Eighth Route Army. Likewise, the regular warfare of the second period of the War of Resistance will be different from that of the second period of the civil war because we can assume that, given up-to-date equipment, a great change will take place both in the army and in its operations. Our army will then attain a high degree of centralization and organization, and its operations will lose much of their guerrilla character and attain a high degree of regularity; what is now on a low level will then be raised to a higher level, and the Chinese type of regular warfare will change into the general type. That will be our task in the stage of the strategic counter-offensive.

Thus, we see that the two processes, the civil war and the War of Resistance Against Japan, and their four strategic periods, contain three changes in strategy. The first was the change from guerrilla warfare to regular warfare in the civil war. The second was the change from regular warfare in the civil war to guerrilla warfare in the War of Resistance. And the third will be the change from guerrilla warfare to regular warfare in the War of Resistance.

The first of the three changes encountered great difficulties. It involved a twofold task. On the one hand, we had to combat the Right tendency of localism and guerrilla-ism, which consisted in clinging to guerrilla habits and refusing to make the turn to regularization, a tendency which arose because our cadres underestimated the changes in the enemy's situation and our own tasks. In the Central Red Area, it was only after much painstaking education that this tendency was gradually corrected. On the other hand, we also had to combat the "Left" tendency of over-centralization and adventurism which put undue stress on regularization, a tendency which arose because some of the leading cadres overestimated the enemy, set the tasks too high and mechanically applied foreign experience regardless of the actual conditions. For three long years (before the Tsunyi Meeting) this tendency imposed enormous sacrifices on the Central Red Area, and it was corrected only after we had learned lessons for which we paid in blood. Its correction was the achievement of the Tsunyi Meeting.

The second change in strategy took place in the autumn of 1937 (after the Lukouchiao Incident), at the juncture of the two different wars. We faced a new enemy, Japanese imperialism, and had as our ally our former enemy, the Kuomintang (which was still hostile to us), and the theatre of war was the vast expanse of northern China (which was temporarily our army's front but would soon be the enemy's rear and would remain so for a long time). In this special situation, our change in strategy was an extremely serious one. In this special situation we had to transform the regular army of the past into a

guerrilla army (in respect to its dispersed operations, and not to its sense of organization or to its discipline), and transform the mobile warfare of the past into guerrilla warfare, so that we could adapt ourselves to the kind of enemy facing us and to the tasks before us. But this change was, to all appearances, a step backward and therefore necessarily very difficult. Both underestimation and morbid fear of Japan, tendencies likely to occur at such a time, did actually occur among the Kuomintang. When the Kuomintang changed over from civil war to national war, it suffered many needless losses mainly because of its underestimation of the enemy, but also because of its morbid fear of Japan (as exemplified by Han Fu-chu and Liu Chih [215]). On the other hand, we have affected the change fairly smoothly and, instead of suffering losses, have won big victories. The reason is that the great majority of our cadres accepted the correct guidance of the Central Committee in good time and skillfully sized up the actual situation; even though there were serious arguments between the Central Committee and some of the army cadres. The extreme importance of this change for persevering in, developing and winning the War of Resistance as a whole, as well as for the future of the Communist Party of China, can be seen immediately if we think of the historic significance of anti-Japanese guerrilla warfare in determining the fate of the national liberation struggle in China. In its extraordinary breadth and protractedness, China's anti-Japanese guerrilla war is without precedent, not only in the East but perhaps in the whole history of mankind.

The third change, from guerrilla to regular warfare against Japan, belongs to the future development of the war, which will presumably give rise to new circumstances and new difficulties. We need not discuss it now.

Section 5: The Strategic Role of Guerrilla Warfare Against Japan

In the anti-Japanese war as a whole, regular warfare is primary and guerrilla warfare supplementary, for only regular warfare can decide the final outcome of the war. Of the three strategic stages (the defensive, the stalemate and the counter-offensive) in the entire process of the war in the country as a whole, the first and last are stages in which regular warfare is primary and guerrilla warfare supplementary. In the intermediate stage guerrilla warfare will become primary and regular warfare supplementary, because the enemy will be holding on to the areas he has occupied and we will be preparing for the counter-offensive but will not yet be ready to launch it. Though this stage will possibly be the longest, it is still only one of the three stages in the entire war. If we take the war as a whole, therefore, regular warfare is primary and guerrilla warfare supplementary. Unless we understand this, unless we recognize that regular warfare will decide the final outcome of the war, and unless we pay attention to building a regular army and to studying and directing regular warfare, we shall be unable to defeat Japan. This is one aspect of the matter.

[215] Han Fu-chu was a Kuomintang warlord in Shantung Province. Liu Chih another warlord, who commanded Chiang Kai-shek's personal troops in Honan Province, was responsible for the defense of the Paoting area in Hopei after the outbreak of the War of Resistance Against Japan. Both of them fled before the Japanese without firing a shot.

All the same, guerrilla warfare has its important strategic place throughout the war. Without guerrilla warfare and without due attention to building guerrilla units and guerrilla armies and to studying and directing guerrilla warfare, we shall likewise be unable to defeat Japan. The reason is that, since the greater part of China will be converted into the enemy's rear, in the absence of the most extensive and persistent guerrilla warfare the enemy will entrench himself securely without any fear of attacks from behind, will inflict heavy losses on our main forces fighting at the front and will launch increasingly fierce offensives; thus it will be difficult for us to bring about a stalemate, and the very continuation of the War of Resistance may be jeopardized. But even if things do not turn out that way, other unfavorable circumstances will ensue, such as the inadequate building up of strength for our counter-offensive, the absence of supporting actions during the counter-offensive, and the possibility that the enemy will be able to replace his losses. If these circumstances arise and are not overcome by the timely development of extensive and persistent guerrilla warfare, it will likewise be impossible to defeat Japan. Hence, though guerrilla warfare occupies a supplementary place in the war as a whole, it does have an extremely important place in strategy. In waging the War of Resistance Against Japan it is undoubtedly a grave error to neglect guerrilla warfare. This is the other aspect of the matter.

Given a big country, guerrilla warfare is possible; hence there was guerrilla warfare in the past too. But guerrilla warfare can be persevered in only when led by the Communist Party. That is why guerrilla warfare generally failed in the past and why it can be victorious only in modern times and only in big countries in which Communist Parties have emerged, as in the Soviet Union during its civil war and in China at present. Considering the present circumstances and the general situation with respect to the war, the division of labor between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party in the anti-Japanese war, in which the former carries on frontal regular warfare and the latter carries on guerrilla warfare behind the enemy lines, is both necessary and proper, and is a matter of mutual need, mutual co-ordination and mutual assistance.

It can thus be understood how important and necessary it was for our Party to change its military strategy from the regular warfare of the latter period of the civil war to the guerrilla warfare of the first period of the War of Resistance. The favorable effects of this change can be summed up in the following eighteen points:

i. reduction of the areas occupied by the enemy forces;
ii. expansion of the base areas of our own forces;
iii. in the stage of the defensive, co-ordination with operations at the regular front, so as to pin down the enemy;
iv. in the stage of stalemate, maintenance of a firm hold on the base areas behind the enemy lines, so as to facilitate the training and reorganization of troops at the regular front;
v. in the stage of the counter-offensive, co-ordination with the regular front in recovering lost territory;

vi. the quickest and most effective expansion of our forces;
vii. the widest expansion of the Communist Party, so that a Party branch may be organized in every village;
viii. the broadest development of the mass movements, so that all the people behind the enemy lines, except for those in his strongholds, may be organized;
ix. the most extensive establishment of organs of anti-Japanese democratic political power;
x. the widest development of anti-Japanese cultural and educational work;
xi. the most extensive improvement of the people's livelihood;
xii. the most effective disintegration of the enemy troops;
xiii. the most extensive and enduring impact on popular feeling and stimulation of morale throughout the country;
xiv. the most extensive impetus to progress in the friendly armies and parties;
xv. adaptation to the situation in which the enemy is strong and we are weak, so that we suffer fewer losses and win more victories;
xvi. adaptation to the fact that China is large and Japan small, so as to make the enemy suffer more losses and win fewer victories;
xvii. the quickest and most effective training of large numbers of cadres for leadership; and
xviii. the most effective solution of the problem of provisions.

It is also beyond doubt that in the long course of struggle the guerrilla units and guerrilla warfare will not remain as they are but will develop to a higher stage and evolve gradually into regular units and regular warfare. Through guerrilla warfare, we shall build up our strength and turn ourselves into a decisive element in the crushing of Japanese imperialism.

Section 6: Pay Great Attention to the Study of Military Matters

All the issues between two hostile armies depend on war for their solution, and China's survival or extinction depends on her victory or defeat in the present war. Hence our study of military theory, of strategy and tactics and of army political work brooks not a moment's delay. Though our study of tactics is still inadequate, our comrades who are engaged in military work have achieved a great deal in the last ten years and, on the basis of Chinese conditions, have brought forth much that is new; the shortcoming here is that there has been no general summing-up. But so far only a few people have taken up the study of the problems of strategy and the theory of war. First-rate results have been achieved in the study of our political work, which, in wealth of experience and in the number and quality of its innovations, ranks second only to that of the Soviet Union; here too the shortcoming is insufficient synthesis and systematization. The popularization of military knowledge is an urgent task for the Party and the whole country. We must now pay great attention to all these things, but most of all to the theory of war and strategy. I deem it imperative that we arouse interest in the study of military theory and direct the attention of the whole membership to the study of military matters.

Chapter 1: Why Raise the Question of Strategy in Guerrilla War?

In the War of Resistance Against Japan, regular warfare is primary and guerrilla warfare supplementary. This point has already been correctly settled. Thus, it seems there are only tactical problems in guerrilla warfare. Why then raise the question of strategy?

If China were a small country in which the role of guerrilla warfare was only to render direct support over short distances to the campaigns of the regular army, there would, of course, be only tactical problems but no strategic ones. On the other hand, if China were a country as strong as the Soviet Union and the invading enemy could either be quickly expelled, or, even though his expulsion were to take some time, he could not occupy extensive areas, then again guerrilla warfare would simply play a supporting role in campaigns, and would naturally involve only tactical but not strategic problems.

The question of strategy in guerrilla war does arise, however, in the case of China, which is neither small nor like the Soviet Union, but which is both a large and a weak country. This large and weak country is being attacked by a small and strong country, but the large and weak country is in an era of progress; this is the source of the whole problem. It is in these circumstances that vast areas have come under enemy occupation and that the war has become a protracted one. The enemy is occupying vast areas of this large country of ours, but Japan is a small country, she does not have sufficient soldiers and has to leave many gaps in the occupied areas, so that our anti-Japanese guerrilla warfare consists primarily not in interior-line operations in support of the campaigns of the regular troops but in independent operations on exterior lines; furthermore, China is progressive, that is to say, she has a staunch army and broad masses of people, both led by the Communist Party, so that, far from being small-scale, our anti-Japanese guerrilla warfare is in fact large-scale warfare. Hence the emergence of a whole series of problems, such as the strategic defensive, the strategic offensive, etc. The protracted nature of the war and its attendant ruthlessness have made it imperative for guerrilla warfare to undertake many unusual tasks; hence such problems as those of the base areas, the development of guerrilla warfare into mobile warfare, and so on. For all these reasons, China's guerrilla warfare against Japan has broken out of the bounds of tactics to knock at the gates of strategy, and it demands examination from the viewpoint of strategy. The point that merits our particular attention is that such extensive as well as protracted guerrilla warfare is quite new in the entire history of war. This is bound up with the fact that we are now in the Nineteen Thirties and Nineteen Forties and that we now have the Communist Party and the Red Army. Herein lies the heart of the matter. Our enemy is probably still cherishing fond dreams of emulating the Mongol conquest of the Sung Dynasty, the Manchu conquest of the Ming Dynasty, the British occupation of North America and India, the Latin occupation of Central and South America, etc. But such dreams have no practical value in present-day China because there are certain factors present in the China of today which were absent in those historical instances, and one of them is guerrilla

warfare, which is quite a new phenomenon. If our enemy overlooks this fact, he will certainly come to grief.

These are the reasons why our anti-Japanese guerrilla warfare, though occupying only a supplementary place in the War of Resistance as a whole, must nevertheless be examined from the viewpoint of strategy.

Why not, then, apply to guerrilla warfare the general strategic principles of the War of Resistance?

The question of strategy in our anti-Japanese guerrilla warfare is indeed closely linked with the question of strategy in the War of Resistance as a whole, because they have much in common. On the other hand, guerrilla warfare is different from regular warfare and has its own peculiarities, and consequently many peculiar elements are involved in the question of strategy in guerrilla warfare. Without modification it is impossible to apply the strategic principles of the War of Resistance in general to guerrilla warfare with its own peculiarities.

Chapter 2: The Basic Principle of War is to Preserve Oneself and Destroy the Enemy

Before discussing the question of strategy in guerrilla warfare in concrete terms, a few words are needed on the fundamental problem of war.

All the guiding principles of military operations grow out of the one basic principle: to strive to the utmost to preserve one's own strength and destroy that of the enemy. In a revolutionary war, this principle is directly linked with basic political principles. For instance, the basic political principle of China's War of Resistance Against Japan, *i.e.*, its political aim, is to drive out Japanese imperialism and build an independent, free and happy new China. In terms of military action this principle means the use of armed force to defend our motherland and to drive out the Japanese invaders. To attain this end, the operations of the armed units take the form of doing their utmost to preserve their own strength on the one hand and destroy the enemies on the other. How then do we justify the encouragement of heroic sacrifice in war? Every war exacts a price, sometimes an extremely high one. Is this not in contradiction with "preserving oneself"? In fact, these is no contradiction at all; to put it more exactly; sacrifice and self-preservation are both opposite and complementary to each other. For such sacrifice is essential not only for destroying the enemy but also for preserving oneself--partial and temporary "non-preservation" (sacrifice, or paying the price) is necessary for the sake of general and permanent preservation. From this basic principle stems the series of principles guiding military operations, all of which--from the principles of shooting (taking cover to preserve oneself, and making full use of fire-power to destroy the enemy) to the principles of strategy--are permeated with the spirit of this basic principle. All technical, tactical and strategic principles represent applications of this basic principle. The principle of preserving oneself and destroying the enemy is the basis of all military principles.

Chapter 3: Six Specific Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War Against Japan

Now let us see what policies or principles have to be adopted in guerrilla operations against Japan before we can attain the object of preserving ourselves and destroying the enemy. Since the guerrilla units in the War of Resistance (and in all other revolutionary wars) generally grow out of nothing and expand from a small to a large force, they must preserve themselves and, moreover, they must expand. Hence the question is, what policies or principles have to be adopted before we can attain the object of preserving and expanding ourselves and destroying the enemy?

Generally speaking, the main principles are as follows: (1) the use of initiative, flexibility and planning in conducting offensives within the defensive, battles of quick decision within protracted war, and exterior-line operations within interior-line operations; (2) co-ordination with regular warfare; (3) establishment of base areas; (4) the strategic defensive and the strategic offensive; (5) the development of guerrilla warfare into mobile warfare; and (6) correct relationship of command. These six items constitute the whole of the strategic programme for guerrilla war against Japan and are the means necessary for the preservation and expansion of our forces, for the destruction and expulsion of the enemy, for co-ordination with regular warfare and the winning of final victory.

Chapter 4: Initiative, Flexibility and Planning in Conducting Offensives Within the Defensive, Battles of Quick Decision Within Protracted War, and Exterior-line Operations Within Interior-line Operations

Here the subject may be dealt with under four headings: (1) the relationship between the defensive and the offensive, between protractedness and quick decision, and between the interior and exterior lines; (2) the initiative in all operations; (3) flexible employment of forces; and (4) planning in all operations.

To start with the first.

If we take the War of Resistance as a whole, the fact that Japan is a strong country and is attacking while China is a weak country and is defending herself makes our war strategically a defensive and protracted war. As far as the operational lines are concerned, the Japanese are operating on exterior and we on interior lines. This is one aspect of the situation. But there is another aspect which is just the reverse. The enemy forces, though strong (in arms, in certain qualities of their men, and certain other factors), are numerically small, whereas our forces, though weak (likewise, in arms, in certain qualities of our men, and certain other factors), are numerically very large. Added to the fact that the enemy is an alien nation invading our country while we are resisting his invasion on our own soil, this determines the following strategy. It is possible and necessary to use tactical offensives within the strategic defensive, to fight campaigns and battles of quick decision within a strategically protracted war and to fight campaigns and battles on exterior lines within strategically interior lines. Such is the strategy to be adopted in the War of Resistance as a whole. It holds true both for regular and for guerrilla warfare. Guerrilla warfare is different only in degree and form. Offensives in guerrilla warfare generally take the form of surprise attacks. Although surprise attacks

can and should be employed in regular warfare too, the degree of surprise is less. In guerrilla warfare, the need to bring operations to a quick decision is very great, and our exterior-line ring of encirclement of the enemy in campaigns and battles is very small. All these distinguish it from regular warfare.

Thus, it can be seen that in their operations guerrilla units have to concentrate the maximum forces, act secretly and swiftly, attack the enemy by surprise and bring battles to a quick decision, and that they must strictly avoid passive defense, procrastination and the dispersal of forces before engagements. Of course, guerrilla warfare includes not only the strategic but also the tactical defensive. The latter embraces, among other things, containing and outpost actions during battles; the disposition of forces for resistance at narrow passes, strategic points, rivers or villages in order to deplete and exhaust the enemy; and action to cover withdrawal. But the basic principle of guerrilla warfare must be the offensive, and guerrilla warfare is more offensive in its character than regular warfare. The offensive, moreover, must take the form of surprise attacks, and to expose ourselves by ostentatiously parading our forces is even less permissible in guerrilla warfare than in regular warfare. From the fact that the enemy is strong and we are weak it necessarily follows that, in guerrilla operations in general even more than in regular warfare, battles must be decided quickly, though on some occasions guerrilla fighting may be kept up for several days, as in an assault on a small and isolated enemy force cut off from help. Because of its dispersed character, guerrilla warfare can spread everywhere, and in many of its tasks, as in harassing, containing and disrupting the enemy and in mass work, its principle is dispersal of forces; but a guerrilla unit, or a guerrilla formation, must concentrate its main forces when it is engaged in destroying the enemy, and especially when it is striving to smash an enemy attack. "Concentrate a big force to strike at a small section of the enemy force" remains a principle of field operations in guerrilla warfare.

Thus, it can also be seen that, if we take the War of Resistance as a whole, we can attain the aim of our strategic defensive and finally defeat Japanese imperialism only through the cumulative effect of many offensive campaigns and battles in both regular and guerrilla warfare, namely, through the cumulative effect of many victories in offensive actions. Only through the cumulative effect of many campaigns and battles of quick decision, namely, the cumulative effect of many victories achieved through quick decision in offensive campaigns and battles, can we attain our goal of strategic protractedness, which means gaining time to increase our capacity to resist while hastening or awaiting changes in the international situation and the internal collapse of the enemy, in order to be able to launch a strategic counter-offensive and drive the Japanese invaders out of China. We must concentrate superior forces and fight exterior-line operations in every campaign or battle, whether in the stage of strategic defensive or in that of strategic counter-offensive, in order to encircle and destroy the enemy forces, encircling part if not all of them, destroying part if not all of the forces we have encircled, and inflicting heavy casualties on the encircled forces if we cannot capture them in large numbers. Only through the cumulative effect of many such battles of annihilation can we change the relative position as between the enemy and ourselves, thoroughly smash his strategic

encirclement--that is, his scheme of exterior-line operations--and finally, in co-ordination, with international forces and the revolutionary struggles of the Japanese people, surround the Japanese imperialists and deal them the *coup de grace.* These results are to be achieved mainly through regular warfare, with guerrilla warfare making a secondary contribution. What is common to both, however, is the accumulation of many minor victories to make a major victory. Herein lies the great strategic role of guerrilla warfare in the War of Resistance.

Now let us discuss initiative, flexibility and planning in guerrilla warfare.

What is initiative in guerrilla warfare?

In any war, the opponents contend for the initiative, whether on a battlefield, in a battle area, in a war zone or in the whole war, for the initiative means freedom of action for an army. Any army which, losing the initiative, is forced into a passive position and ceases to have freedom of action, faces the danger of defeat or extermination. Naturally, gaining the initiative is harder in strategic defensive and interior-line operations and easier in offensive exterior-line operations. However, Japanese imperialism has two basic weaknesses, namely, its shortage of troops and the fact that it is fighting on foreign soil. Moreover, its underestimation of China's strength and the internal contradictions among the Japanese militarists have given rise to many mistakes in command, such as piecemeal reinforcement, lack of strategic coordination, occasional absence of a main direction for attack, failure to grasp opportunities in some operations and failure to wipe out encircled forces, all of which may be considered the third weakness of Japanese imperialism. Thus, despite the advantage of being on the offensive and operating on exterior lines, the Japanese militarists are gradually losing the initiative, because of their shortage of troops (their small territory, small population, inadequate resources, feudalistic imperialism, etc.), because of the fact that they are fighting on foreign soil (their war is imperialist and barbarous) and because of their stupidities in command. Japan is neither willing nor able to conclude the war at present, nor has her strategic offensive yet come to an end, but, as the general trend shows, her offensive is confined within certain limits, which is the inevitable consequence of her three weaknesses; she cannot go on indefinitely till she swallows the whole of China. Already there are signs that Japan will one day find herself in an utterly passive position. China, on the other hand, was in a rather passive position at the beginning of the war, but, having gained experience, she is now turning to the new policy of mobile warfare, the policy of taking the offensive, seeking quick decisions and operating on exterior lines in campaigns and battles, which, together with the policy of developing widespread guerrilla warfare, is helping China to build up a position of initiative day by day.

The question of the initiative is even more vital in guerrilla warfare. For most guerrilla units operate in very difficult circumstances, fighting without a rear, with their own weak forces facing the enemy's strong forces, lacking experience (when the units are newly organized), being separated, etc. Nevertheless, it is possible to build up the initiative in guerrilla warfare, the essential condition being to seize on the enemy's three weaknesses. Taking advantage of the enemy's shortage of troops (from

the viewpoint of the war as a whole), the guerrilla units can boldly use vast areas as their fields of operation; taking advantage of the fact that the enemy is an alien invader and is pursuing a most barbarous policy, the guerrilla units can boldly enlist the support of millions upon millions of people; and taking advantage of the stupidities in the enemy's command, the guerrilla units can give full scope to their resourcefulness. While the regular army must seize on all these weaknesses of the enemy and turn them to good account in order to defeat him, it is even more important for the guerrilla units to do so. As for the guerrilla units' own weaknesses, they can be gradually reduced in the course of the struggle. Moreover, these weaknesses sometimes constitute the very condition for gaining the initiative. For example, it is precisely because the guerrilla units are small that they can mysteriously appear and disappear in their operations behind enemy lines, without the enemy's being able to do anything about them, and thus enjoy a freedom of action such as massive regular armies never can.

When the enemy is making a converging attack from several directions' a guerrilla unit can exercise initiative only with difficulty and can lose it all too easily. In such a case, if its appraisals and dispositions are wrong, it is liable to get into a passive position and consequently fail to smash the converging enemy attack. This may occur even when the enemy is on the defensive and we are on the offensive. For the initiative results from making a correct appraisal of the situation (both our own and that of the enemy) and from making the correct military and political dispositions. A pessimistic appraisal out of accord with the objective conditions and the passive dispositions ensuing from it will undoubtedly result in the loss of the initiative and throw one into a passive position. On the other hand, an over-optimistic appraisal out of accord with the objective conditions and the risky (unjustifiably risky) dispositions ensuing from it will also result in the loss of the initiative and eventually land one in a position similar to that of the pessimists. The initiative is not an innate attribute of genius, but is something an intelligent leader attains through open-minded study and correct appraisal of the objective conditions and through correct military and political dispositions. It follows that the initiative is not ready-made but is something that requires conscious effort.

When forced into a passive position through some incorrect appraisal and disposition or through overwhelming pressure, a guerrilla unit must strive to extricate itself. How this can be done depends on the circumstances. In many cases it is necessary to "move away". The ability to move is the distinctive feature of a guerrilla unit. To move away is the principal method for getting out of a passive position and regaining the initiative. But it is not the sole method. The moment when the enemy is most energetic and we are in the greatest difficulties is often the very moment when things begin to turn against him and in our favor. Frequently a favorable situation recurs and the initiative is regained as a result of "holding out a little longer".

Next, let us deal with flexibility.

Flexibility is a concrete expression of the initiative. The flexible employment of forces is more essential in guerrilla warfare than in regular warfare.

A guerrilla commander must understand that the flexible employment of his forces is the most important means of changing the situation as between the enemy and ourselves and of gaining the initiative. The nature of guerrilla warfare is such that guerrilla forces must be employed flexibly in accordance with the task in hand and with such circumstances as the state of the enemy, the terrain and the local population, and the chief ways of employing the forces are dispersal, concentration and shifting of position. In employing his forces, a guerrilla commander is like a fisherman casting his net, which he should be able to spread wide as well as draw in tight. When casting his net, the fisherman has to ascertain the depth of the water, the speed of the current and the presence or absence of obstructions; similarly, when dispersing his units, a guerrilla commander must take care not to incur losses through ignorance of the situation or through miscalculated action. Just as the fisherman must keep a grip on the cord in order to draw his net in tight, so the guerrilla commander must maintain liaison and communication with all his forces and keep enough of his main forces at hand. Just as a frequent change of position is necessary in fishing, so a frequent shift of position is necessary for a guerrilla unit. Dispersal, concentration and shifting of position are the three ways of flexibly employing forces in guerrilla warfare.

Generally speaking, the dispersal of guerrilla units, or "breaking up the whole into parts", is employed chiefly: (1) when we want to threaten the enemy with a wide frontal attack because he is on the defensive, and there is temporarily no chance to mass our forces for action; (2) when we want to harass and disrupt the enemy throughout an area where his forces are weak; (3) when we are unable to break through the enemy's encirclement and try to slip away by making ourselves less conspicuous; (4) when we are restricted by terrain or supplies; or (5) when we are carrying on mass work over a wide area. But whatever the circumstances, when dispersing for action we should pay attention to the following**:** (1) we should never make an absolutely even dispersal of forces, but should keep a fairly large part in an area convenient for maneuver, so that any possible exigency can be met and there is a centre of gravity for the task being carried out in dispersion; and (2) we should assign to the dispersed units clearly defined tasks, fields of operation, time limits for actions, places for reassembly and ways and means of liaison.

Concentration of forces, or "assembling the parts into a whole", is the method usually applied to destroy an enemy when he is on the offensive and sometimes to destroy some of his stationary forces when he is on the defensive. Concentration of forces does not mean absolute concentration, but the massing of the main forces for use in one important direction while retaining or dispatching part of the forces for use in other directions to contain, harass or disrupt the enemy, or to carry on mass work.

Although the flexible dispersal or concentration of forces according to circumstances is the principal method in guerrilla warfare, we must also know how to shift (or transfer) our forces flexibly. When the enemy feels seriously threatened by guerrillas, he will send troops to attack or suppress them. Hence the guerrilla units will have to take stock of the situation. If advisable, they

should fight where they are; if not, they should lose no time in shifting elsewhere. Sometimes, in order to crush the enemy units one by one, guerrilla units which have destroyed an enemy force in one place may immediately shift to another so as to wipe out a second enemy force; sometimes, finding it inadvisable to fight in one place, they may have to disengage quickly and fight the enemy elsewhere. If the enemy's forces in a certain place present a particularly serious threat, the guerrilla units should not linger, but should move off with lightning speed. In general, shifts of position should be made with secrecy and speed. In order to mislead, decoy and confuse the enemy, they should constantly use stratagems, such as making a feint to the east but attacking in the west, appearing now in the south and now in the north, hit-and-run attacks, and night actions.

Flexibility in dispersal, concentration and shifts of position is a concrete expression of the initiative in guerrilla warfare, whereas rigidness and inertia inevitably lead to passivity and cause unnecessary losses. But a commander proves himself wise not just by recognition of the importance of employing his forces flexibly but by skill in dispersing, concentrating or shifting them in good time according to the specific circumstances. This wisdom in sensing changes and choosing the right moment to act is not easily acquired; it can be gained only by those who study with a receptive mind and investigate and ponder diligently. Prudent consideration of the circumstances is essential to prevent flexibility from turning into impulsive action.

Lastly, we come to planning.

Without planning, victories in guerrilla warfare are impossible. Any idea that guerrilla warfare can be conducted in haphazard fashion indicates either a flippant attitude or ignorance of guerrilla warfare. The operations in a guerrilla zone as a whole, or those of a guerrilla unit or formation, must be preceded by as thorough planning as possible, by preparation in advance for every action. Grasping the situation, setting the tasks, disposing the forces, giving military and political training, securing supplies, putting the equipment in good order, making proper use of the people's help, etc.--all these are part of the work of the guerrilla commanders, which they must carefully consider and conscientiously perform and check up on. There can be no initiative, no flexibility, and no offensive unless they do so. True, guerrilla conditions do not allow as high a degree of planning as do those of regular warfare, and it would be a mistake to attempt very thorough planning in guerrilla warfare. But it is necessary to plan as thoroughly as the objective conditions permit, for it should be understood that fighting the enemy is no joke.

The above points serve to explain the first of the strategic principles of guerrilla warfare, the principle of using initiative, flexibility and planning in conducting offensives within the defensive, battles of quick decision within protracted war, and exterior-line operations within interior-line operations. It is the key problem in the strategy of guerrilla warfare. The solution of this problem provides the major guarantee of victory in guerrilla warfare so far as military command is concerned.

Although a variety of matters have been dealt with here, they all revolve around the offensive in campaigns and battles. The initiative can be decisively grasped only after victory in an offensive. Every offensive operation must be organized on our initiative and not launched under compulsion. Flexibility in the employment of forces revolves around the effort to take the offensive, and planning likewise is necessary chiefly in order to ensure success in offensive operations. Measures of tactical defense are meaningless if they are divorced from their role of giving either direct or indirect support to an offensive. Quick decision refers to the tempo of an offensive, and exterior lines refer to its scope. The offensive is the only means of destroying the enemy and is also the principal means of self-preservation, while pure defense and retreat can play only a temporary and partial role in self-preservation and are quite useless for destroying the enemy.

The principle stated above is basically the same for both regular and guerrilla war; it differs to some degree only in its form of expression. But in guerrilla war it is both important and necessary to note this difference. It is precisely this difference in form which distinguishes the operational methods of guerrilla war from those of regular war. If we confuse the two different forms in which the principle is expressed, victory in guerrilla war will be impossible.

Chapter 5: Co-ordination With Regular Warfare

The second problem of strategy in guerrilla warfare is its coordination with regular warfare. It is a matter of clarifying the relation between guerrilla and regular warfare on the operational level, in the light of the nature of actual guerrilla operations. An understanding of this relation is very important for effectiveness in defeating the enemy.

There are three kinds of co-ordination between guerrilla and regular warfare, co-ordination in strategy, in campaigns and in battles.

Taken as a whole, guerrilla warfare behind the enemy lines, which cripples the enemy, pins him down, disrupts his supply lines and inspires the regular forces and the people throughout the country, is coordinated with regular warfare in strategy. Take the case of the guerrilla warfare in the three northeastern provinces. Of course, the question of co-ordination did not arise before the nation-wide War of Resistance, but since the war began the significance of such coordination has become obvious. Every enemy soldier the guerrillas kill there, every bullet they make the enemy expend, every enemy soldier they stop from advancing south of the Great Wall, can be reckoned a contribution to the total strength of the resistance. It is, moreover, clear that they are having a demoralizing effect on the whole enemy army and all Japan and a heartening effect on our whole army and people. Still clearer is the role in strategic co-ordination played by the guerrilla warfare along the Peiping-Suiyuan, Peiping-Hankow, Tientsin-Pukow, Tatung-Puchow, Chengting-Taiyuan and Shanghai-Hangchow Railways. Not only are the guerrilla units performing the function of co-ordination with the regular forces in our present strategic defensive, when the enemy is on the strategic offensive; not only will they co-ordinate with the regular forces in disrupting the enemy's

hold on the occupied territory, after he concludes his strategic offensive and switches to the safeguarding of his gains; they will also co-ordinate with the regular forces in driving out the enemy forces and recovering all the lost territories, when the regular forces launch the strategic counter-offensive. The great role of guerrilla warfare in strategic coordination must not be overlooked. The commanders both of the guerrilla units and of the regular forces must clearly understand this role.

In addition, guerrilla warfare performs the function of coordination with regular warfare in campaigns. For instance, in the campaign at Hsinkou, north of Taiyuan, the guerrillas played a remarkable role in co-ordination both north and south of Yenmenkuan by wrecking the Tatung-Puchow Railway and the motor roads running through Pinghsingkuan and Yangfangkou. Or take another instance. After the enemy occupied Fenglingtu, guerrilla warfare, which was already widespread throughout Shansi Province and was conducted mainly by the regular forces, played an even greater role through co-ordination with the defensive campaigns west of the Yellow River in Shensi Province and south of the Yellow River in Honan Province. Again, when the enemy attacked southern Shantung, the guerrilla warfare in the five provinces of northern China contributed a great deal through co-ordination with the campaigns of our army. In performing a task of this sort, the leaders of each guerrilla base behind the enemy lines, or the commanders of a guerrilla formation temporarily dispatched there, must dispose their forces well and, by adopting different tactics suited to the time and place, move energetically against the enemy's most vital and vulnerable spots in order to cripple him, pin him down, disrupt his supply lines, inspire our armies campaigning on the interior lines, and so fulfil their duty of coordinating with the campaign. If each guerrilla zone or unit goes it alone without giving any attention to coordinating with the campaigns of the regular forces, its role in strategic co-ordination will lose a great deal of its significance, although it will still play some such role in the general strategy. All guerrilla commanders should give this point serious attention. To achieve co-ordination in campaigns, it is absolutely necessary for all larger guerrilla units and guerrilla formations to have radio equipment.

Finally, co-ordination with the regular forces in battles, in actual fighting on the battlefield, is the task of all guerrilla units in the vicinity of an interior-line battlefield. Of course, this applies only to guerrilla units operating close to the regular forces or to units of regulars dispatched on temporary guerrilla missions. In such cases, a guerrilla unit has to perform whatever task it is assigned by the commander of the regular forces, which is usually to pin down some of the enemy's forces, disrupt his supply lines, conduct reconnaissance, or act as guides for the regular forces. Even without such an assignment the guerrilla unit should carry out these tasks on its own initiative. To sit by idly, neither moving nor fighting, or to move about without fighting, would be an intolerable attitude for a guerrilla unit.

Chapter 6: The Establishment of Base Areas

The third problem of strategy in anti-Japanese guerrilla warfare is the establishment of base areas, which is important and essential because of the protracted nature and ruthlessness of the war.

The recovery of our lost territories will have to await the nation-wide strategic counter-offensive; by then the enemy's front will have extended deep into central China and cut it in two from north to south, and a part or even a greater part of our territory will have fallen into the hands of the enemy and become his rear. We shall have to extend guerrilla warfare all over this vast enemy-occupied area, make a front out of the enemy's rear, and force him to fight ceaselessly throughout the territory he occupies. Until such time as our strategic counteroffensive is launched and so long as our lost territories are not recovered, it will be necessary to persist in guerrilla warfare in the enemy's rear, certainly for a fairly long time, though one cannot say definitely for how long. This is why the war will be a protracted one. And in order to safeguard his gains in the occupied areas, the enemy is bound to step up his anti-guerrilla measures and, especially after the halting of his strategic offensive, to embark on relentless suppression of the guerrillas. With ruthlessness thus added to protractedness, it will be impossible to sustain guerrilla warfare behind the enemy lines without base areas.

What, then, are these base areas? They are the strategic bases on which the guerrilla forces rely in performing their strategic tasks and achieving the object of preserving and expanding themselves and destroying and driving out the enemy. Without such strategic bases, there will be nothing to depend on in carrying out any of our strategic tasks or achieving the aim of the war. It is a characteristic of guerrilla warfare behind the enemy lines that it is fought without a rear, for the guerrilla forces are severed from the country's general rear. But guerrilla warfare could not last long or grow without base areas. The base areas, indeed, are its rear.

History knows many peasant wars of the "roving rebel" type, but none of them ever succeeded. In the present age of advanced communications and technology, it would be all the more groundless to imagine that one can win victory by fighting in the manner of roving rebels. However, this roving-rebel idea still exists among impoverished peasants, and in the minds of guerrilla commanders it becomes the view that base areas are neither necessary nor important. Therefore, ridding the minds of guerrilla commanders of this idea is a prerequisite for deciding on a policy of establishing base areas. The question of whether or not to have base areas and of whether or not to regard them as important, in other words, the conflict between the idea of establishing base areas and that of fighting like roving rebels, arises in all guerrilla warfare, and, to a certain extent, our anti-Japanese guerrilla warfare is no exception. Therefore, the struggle against the roving-rebel ideology is an inevitable process. Only when this ideology is thoroughly overcome and the policy of establishing base areas is mutated and applied will there be conditions favorable for the maintenance of guerrilla warfare over a long period.

Now that the necessity and importance of base areas have been made clear, let us pass on to the following problems which must be understood and solved when it comes to establishing the base areas. These problems are the types of base areas, the guerrilla zones and the base areas, the conditions for establishing base areas, their consolidation and expansion, and the forms in which we and the enemy encircle one another.

Base areas in anti-Japanese guerrilla warfare are mainly of three types, those in the mountains, those on the plains and those in the river-lake-estuary regions.

The advantage of setting up base areas in mountainous regions is obvious, and those which have been, are being or will be established in the Changpai, Wutai, Taihang, Taishan, Yenshan and Maoshan Mountains all belong to this type. They are all places where anti-Japanese guerrilla warfare can be maintained for the longest time and are important strongholds for the War of Resistance. We must develop guerrilla warfare and set up base areas in all the mountainous regions behind the enemy lines.

Of course, the plains are less suitable than the mountains, but it is by no means impossible to develop guerrilla warfare or establish any base areas there. Indeed, the widespread guerrilla warfare in the plains of Hopei and of northern and northwestern Shantung proves that it is possible to develop guerrilla warfare in the plains. While there is as yet no evidence on the possibility of setting up base areas there and maintaining them for long, it has been proved that the setting up of temporary base areas is possible, and it should be possible to set up base areas for small units or for seasonal use. On the one hand, the enemy does not have enough troops at his disposal and is pursuing a policy of unparalleled brutality, and on the other hand, China has a vast territory and vast numbers of people who are resisting Japan; the objective conditions for spreading guerrilla warfare and setting up temporary base areas in the plains are therefore fulfilled. Given competent military command, it should of course be possible to establish bases for small guerrilla units there, bases which are long-term but not fixed. [216] Broadly speaking, when the strategic offensive of the enemy is brought to a halt and he enters the stage of safeguarding his occupied areas, he will undoubtedly launch savage attacks on all the guerrilla base areas, and those in the plains will naturally be the first to bear the brunt. The large guerrilla formations operating on the plains will be unable to keep on fighting there for long and will gradually have to move up into the mountains as the circumstances require, as for instance, from the Hopei Plain to the Wutai and Taihang Mountains, or from the Shantung Plain to Taishan Mountain and the Shantung Peninsula in the east. But in the circumstances of our national war, it is not impossible for numerous small guerrilla units to keep going in various counties over the vast plains and adopt a fluid way of fighting, *i.e.*, by shifting their bases from place to place. It is definitely possible to conduct seasonal guerrilla warfare by taking advantage of the "green curtain" of tall crops in summer and of the frozen rivers in winter. As the enemy has no strength to spare now and will never be able to attend to everything even when he has the strength to spare, it is absolutely necessary for us to decide on the policy, for the present, of spreading guerrilla warfare far and wide and setting up temporary base areas in the plains and, for the future, of

[216] Experience gained in the War of Resistance proved that it was possible to establish long-term and, in many places, stable base areas in the plains. This was due to their vastness and big populations, the correctness of the Communist Party's policies, the extensive mobilization of the people and the enemy's shortage of troops. Comrade Mao Tse-tung affirmed this possibility more definitely in later directives.

preparing to keep up guerrilla warfare by small units, if only seasonally, and of creating base areas which are not fixed.

Objectively speaking, the possibilities of developing guerrilla warfare and establishing base areas are greater in the river-lake-estuary regions than in the plains, though less than in the mountains. The dramatic battles fought by "pirates" and "water-bandits", of which our history is full, and the guerrilla warfare round the Hunghu Lake kept up for several years in the Red Army period, both testify to the possibility of developing guerrilla warfare and of establishing base areas in the river-lake-estuary regions. So far, however, the political parties and the masses who are resisting Japan have given this possibility little attention. Though the subjective conditions are as yet lacking, we should undoubtedly turn our attention to this possibility and start working on it. As one aspect in the development of our nation-wide guerrilla warfare, we should effectively organize guerrilla warfare in the Hungtse Lake region north of the Yangtse River, in the Taihu Lake region south of the Yangtse, and in all river-lake-estuary regions in the enemy-occupied areas along the rivers and on the seacoast, and we should create permanent base areas in and near such places. By overlooking this aspect, we are virtually providing the enemy with water transport facilities; this is a gap in our strategic plan for the War of Resistance which must be filled in good time.

Section 2: Guerrilla Zones and Base Areas

In guerrilla warfare behind the enemy lines, there is a difference between guerrilla zones and base areas. Areas which are surrounded by the enemy but whose central parts are not occupied or have been recovered, like some counties in the Wutai Mountain region *(i.e.,* the Shansi-Chahar-Hopei border area) and also some places in the Taihang and Taishan mountain regions, are ready-made bases for the convenient use of guerrilla units in developing guerrilla warfare. But elsewhere in these areas the situation is different, as for instance in the eastern and northern sections of the Wutai Mountain region, which include parts of western Hopei and southern Chahar, and in many places east of Paoting and west of Tsangchow. When guerrilla warfare began, the guerrillas could not completely occupy these places but could only make frequent raids; they are areas which are held by the guerrillas when they are there and by the puppet regime when they are gone, and are therefore not yet guerrilla bases but only what may be called guerrilla zones. Such guerrilla zones will be transformed into base areas when they have gone through the necessary processes of guerrilla warfare, that is, when large numbers of enemy troops have been annihilated or defeated there, the puppet regime has been destroyed, the masses have been roused to activity, anti-Japanese mass organizations have been formed, people's local armed forces have been developed, and anti-Japanese political power has been established. By the expansion of our base areas, we mean the addition of areas such as these to the bases already established.

In some places, for example, eastern Hopei, the whole area of guerrilla operations has been a guerrilla zone from the very beginning. The puppet regime is of long standing there, and from the beginning the whole area of operations has been a guerrilla zone both for the people's armed forces

that have grown out of local uprisings and for the guerrilla detachments dispatched from the Wutai Mountains. At the outset of their activities, all they could do was to choose some fairly good spots there as temporary rear or base areas. Such places will not be transformed from guerrilla zones into relatively stable base areas until the enemy forces are destroyed and the work of arousing the people is in full swing.

Thus, the transformation of a guerrilla zone into a base area is an arduous creative process, and its accomplishment depends on the extent to which the enemy is destroyed and the masses are aroused.

Many regions will remain guerrilla zones for a long time. In these regions the enemy will not be able to set up stable puppet regimes, however much he tries to maintain control, while we, on our part, will not be able to achieve the aim of establishing anti-Japanese political power, however much we develop guerrilla warfare. Examples of this kind are to be found in the enemy-occupied regions along the railway lines, in the neighborhood of big cities and in certain areas in the plains.

As for the big cities, the railway stops and the areas in the plains which are strongly garrisoned by the enemy, guerrilla warfare can only extend to the fringes and not right into these places which have relatively stable puppet regimes. This is another kind of situation.

Mistakes in our leadership or strong enemy pressure may cause a reversal of the state of affairs described above, *i.e.*, a guerrilla base may turn into a guerrilla zone, and a guerrilla zone may turn into an area under relatively stable enemy occupation. Such changes are possible, and they deserve special vigilance on the part of guerrilla commanders.

Therefore, as a result of guerrilla warfare and the struggle between us and the enemy, the entire enemy-occupied territory will fall into the following three categories: first, anti-Japanese bases held by our guerrilla units and our organs of political power; second, areas held by Japanese imperialism and its puppet regimes; and third, intermediate zones contested by both sides, namely, guerrilla zones. Guerrilla commanders have the duty to expand the first and third categories to the maximum and to reduce the second category to the minimum. This is the strategic task of guerrilla warfare.

Section 3: Conditions for Establishing Base Areas

The fundamental conditions for establishing a base area are that there should be anti-Japanese armed forces, that these armed forces should be employed to inflict defeats on the enemy and that they should arouse the people to action. Thus, the establishment of a base area is first and foremost a matter of building an armed force. Leaders in guerrilla war must devote their energy to building one or more guerrilla units, and must gradually develop them in the course of struggle into guerrilla formations or even into units and formations of regular troops. The building up of an armed force is the key to establishing a base area; if there is no armed force or if the armed force is weak, nothing can be done. This constitutes the first condition.

The second indispensable condition for establishing a base area is that the armed forces should be used in co-ordination with the people to defeat the enemy. All places under enemy control are enemy, and not guerrilla, base areas, and obviously cannot be transformed into guerrilla base areas unless the enemy is defeated. Unless we repulse the enemy's attacks and defeat him, even places held by the guerrillas will come under enemy control, and then it will be impossible to establish base areas.

The third indispensable condition for establishing a base area is the use of all our strength, including our armed forces, to arouse the masses for struggle against Japan. In the course of this struggle we must arm the people, *i.e.,* organize self-defense corps and guerrilla units. In the course of this struggle, we must form mass organizations, we must organize the workers, peasants, youth, women, children, merchants and professional people--according to the degree of their political consciousness and fighting enthusiasm--into the various mass organizations necessary for the struggle against Japanese aggression, and we must gradually expand them. Without organization, the people cannot give effect to their anti-Japanese strength. In the course of this struggle, we must weed out the open and the hidden traitors, a task which can be accomplished only by relying on the strength of the people. In this struggle, it is particularly important to arouse the people to establish, or to consolidate, their local organs of anti-Japanese political power. Where the original Chinese organs of political power have not been destroyed by the enemy, we must reorganize and strengthen them with the support of the broad masses, and where they have been destroyed by the enemy, we should rebuild them by the efforts of the masses. They are organs of political power for carrying out the policy of the Anti-Japanese National United Front and should unite all the forces of the people to fight against our sole enemy, Japanese imperialism, and its jackals, the traitors and reactionaries.

A base area for guerrilla war can be truly established only with the gradual fulfillment of the three basic conditions, *i.e.,* only after the anti-Japanese armed forces are built up, the enemy has suffered defeats and the people are aroused.

Mention must also be made of geographical and economic conditions. As for the former, we have already discussed three different categories in the earlier section on the types of base areas, and here we need only mention one major requirement, namely, that the area must be extensive. In places surrounded by the enemy on all sides, or on three sides, the mountainous regions naturally offer the best conditions for setting up base areas which can hold out for a long time, but the main thing is that there must be enough room for the guerrillas to maneuver, namely, the areas have to be extensive. Given an extensive area, guerrilla warfare can be developed and sustained even in the plains, not to mention the river-lake-estuary regions. By and large, the vastness of China's territory and the enemy's shortage of troops provide guerrilla warfare in China with this condition. This is an important, even a primary condition, as far as the possibility of waging guerrilla warfare is concerned, and small countries like Belgium which lack this condition have few or no such

possibilities. [217] In China, this condition is not something which has to be striven for, nor does it present a problem; it is there physically, waiting only to be exploited.

So far as their physical setting is concerned, the economic conditions resemble the geographical conditions. For now, we are discussing the establishment of base areas not in a desert, where no enemy is to be found, but behind the enemy lines; every place the enemy can penetrate already has its Chinese inhabitants and an economic basis for subsistence, so that the question of choice of economic conditions in establishing base areas simply does not arise. Irrespective of the economic conditions, we should do our utmost to develop guerrilla warfare and set up permanent or temporary base areas in all places where Chinese inhabitants and enemy forces are to be found. In a political sense, however, the economic conditions do present a problem, a problem of economic policy which is of immense importance to the establishment of base areas. The economic policy of the guerrilla base areas must follow the principles of the Anti-Japanese National United Front by equitably distributing the financial burden and protecting commerce. Neither the local organs of political power nor the guerrilla units must violate these principles, or otherwise the establishment of base areas and the maintenance of guerrilla warfare would be adversely affected. The equitable distribution of the financial burden means that "those with money should contribute money", while the peasants should supply the guerrilla units with grain within certain limits. The protection of commerce means that the guerrilla units should be highly disciplined and that the confiscation of shops, except those owned by proved traitors, should be strictly prohibited. This is no easy matter, but the policy is set and must be put into effect.

Section 4: The Consolidation and Expansion of Base Areas

In order to confine the enemy invaders to a few strongholds, that is, to the big cities and along the main communication lines, the guerrillas must do all they can to extend guerrilla warfare from their base areas as widely as possible and hem in all the enemy's strongholds, thus threatening his existence and shaking his morale while expanding the base areas. This is essential. In this context, we must oppose conservatism in guerrilla warfare. Whether originating in the desire for an easy life or in overestimation of the enemy's strength, conservatism can only bring losses in the War of Resistance and is harmful to guerrilla warfare and to the base areas themselves. At the same time, we must not forget the consolidation of the base areas, the chief task being to arouse and organize the masses and to train guerrilla units and local armed forces. Such consolidation is needed for maintaining

[217] Ever since the end of World War II, the national and democratic revolutionary movement has been surging forward in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In many countries the people, led by their own revolutionary and progressive forces, have carried on sustained armed struggles to overthrow the dark rule of imperialism and reaction. This demonstrates that in the new historical circumstances--when the socialist camp, the revolutionary forces of the people in the colonial countries and the forces of the people striving for democracy and progress in all countries are taking giant strides forward, when the world capitalist system is weakening still further, and when the colonial rule of imperialism is heading for disintegration--the conditions under which the people of various countries conduct guerrilla warfare today need not be quite the same as those which were necessary in the days of the guerrilla warfare waged by the Chinese people against Japan. In other words, guerrilla war can be victoriously waged in a county which is not large in territory, as for instance, in Cuba, Algeria, Laos and southern Viet Nam.

protracted warfare and also for expansion, and in its absence energetic expansion is impossible. If we attend only to expansion and forget about consolidation in our guerrilla warfare, we shall be unable to withstand the enemy's attacks, and consequently not only forfeit the possibility of expansion but also endanger the very existence of the base areas. The correct principle is expansion with consolidation, which is a good method and allows us to take the offensive or the defensive as we choose. Given a protracted war, the problem of consolidating and expanding base areas constantly arises for every guerrilla unit. The concrete solution depends, of course, on the circumstances. At one time, the emphasis may be on expansion, *i.e.,* on expanding the guerrilla zones and increasing the number of guerrillas. At another, the emphasis may be on consolidation, *i.e.,* on organizing the masses and training the troops. As expansion and consolidation differ in nature, and as the military dispositions and other tasks will differ accordingly, an effective solution of the problem is possible only if we alternate the emphasis according to time and circumstances.

Section 5: Forms in Which We and the Enemy Encircle One Another

Taking the War of Resistance as a whole, there is no doubt that we are strategically encircled by the enemy, because he is on the strategic offensive and is operating on exterior lines while we are on the strategic defensive and are operating on interior lines. This is the first form of enemy encirclement. We on our part encircle each of the enemy columns advancing on us along separate routes, because we apply the policy of the offensive and of exterior-line operations in campaigns and battles by using numerically preponderant forces against these enemy columns advancing on us from exterior lines. This is the first form of our encirclement of the enemy. Next, if we consider the guerrilla base areas in the enemy's rear, each area taken singly is surrounded by the enemy on all sides, like the Wutai Mountain region, or on three sides, like the northwestern Shansi area. This is the second form of enemy encirclement. However, if one considers all the guerrilla base areas together and in their relation to the battle fronts of the regular forces, one can see that we in turn surround a great many enemy forces. In Shansi Province, for instance, we have surrounded the Tatung-Puchow Railway on three sides (the east and west flanks and the southern end) and the city of Taiyuan on all sides; and there are many similar instances in Hopei and Shantung Provinces. This is the second form of our encirclement of the enemy. Thus, there are two forms of encirclement by the enemy forces and two forms of encirclement by our own--rather like a game of *weichi.* [218] Campaigns and battles fought by the two sides resemble the capturing of each other's pieces, and the establishment of strongholds by the enemy and of guerrilla base areas by us resembles moves to dominate spaces on the board. It is in the matter of "dominating the spaces" that the great strategic role of guerrilla base areas in the rear of the enemy is revealed. We are raising this question in the War of Resistance in order that the nation's military authorities and the guerrilla commanders in all areas should place on the agenda the development of guerrilla warfare behind the enemy lines and the establishment of base areas

[218] Weichi is an old Chinese game, in which the two players try to encircle each ochre pieces on the board. When a player's pieces are encircled, they are counted as "dead" (captured). But if there is a sufficient number of blank spaces among the encircled pieces, then the latter are still "alive" (not captured).

wherever possible, and carry this out as a strategic task. If on the international plane we can create an anti-Japanese front in the Pacific region, with China as one strategic unit, and the Soviet Union and other countries which may join it as other strategic units, we shall then have one more form of encirclement against the enemy than he has against us and bring about exterior-line operations in the Pacific region by which to encircle and destroy fascist Japan. To be sure, this is of little practical significance at present, but such a prospect is not impossible.

Chapter 7: The Strategic Defensive and the Strategic Offensive in Guerrilla War

The fourth problem of strategy in guerrilla war concerns the strategic defensive and the strategic offensive. This is the problem of how the policy of offensive warfare, which we mentioned in our discussion of the first problem, is to be carried out in practice, when we are on the defensive and when we are on the offensive in our guerrilla warfare against Japan.

Within the nation-wide strategic defensive or strategic offensive, to be more exact, the strategic counter-offensive), small-scale strategic defensives and offensives take place in and around each guerrilla base area. By strategic defensive we mean our strategic situation and policy when the enemy is on the offensive and we are on the defensive; by strategic offensive we mean our strategic situation and policy when the enemy is on the defensive and we are on the offensive.

Section 1: The Strategic Defensive in Guerrilla War

After guerrilla warfare has broken out and grown to a considerable extent, the enemy will inevitably attack the guerrilla base areas, especially in the period when his strategic offensive against the country as a whole is brought to an end and he adopts the policy of safeguarding his occupied areas. It is essential to recognize the inevitability of such attacks, for otherwise the guerrilla commanders will be caught wholly unprepared, and in the face of heavy enemy attacks they will undoubtedly become alarmed and confused and their forces will be routed.

To wipe out the guerrillas and their base areas, the enemy frequently resorts to converging attacks. For instance, in each of the four or five "punitive expeditions" directed against the Wutai Mountain region, the enemy made a planned advance in three, four or even six or seven columns simultaneously. The larger the scale of the guerrilla fighting, the more important the position of the base areas, and the greater the threat to the enemy's strategic centers and vital communication lines, the fiercer will be the enemy's attacks. Therefore, the fiercer the enemy's attacks on a guerrilla area, the greater the indication that the guerrilla warfare there is successful and is being effectively coordinated with the regular fighting.

When the enemy launches a converging attack in several columns, the guerrilla policy should be to smash it by counter-attack. It can be easily smashed if each advancing enemy column consists of only one unit, whether big or small, has no follow-up units and is unable to station troops along the route of advance, construct blockhouses or build motor roads. When the enemy launches a converging attack, he is on the offensive and operating on exterior lines, while we are on the

defensive and operating on interior lines. As for our dispositions, we should use our secondary forces to pin down several enemy columns, while our main force should launch surprise attacks (chiefly in the form of ambushes) in a campaign or battle against a single enemy column, striking it when it is on the move. The enemy, though strong, will be weakened by repeated surprise attacks and will often withdraw when he is halfway; the guerrilla units can then make more surprise attacks during the pursuit and weaken him still further. The enemy generally occupies the county towns or other towns in our base areas before he stops his offensive or begins to withdraw, and we should encircle these towns, cutting off his grain supply and severing his communications, so that when he cannot hold out and begins to retreat, we can seize the opportunity to pursue and attack him. After smashing one column, we should shift our forces to smash another, and, by smashing them one by one, shatter the converging attack.

A big base area like the Wutai Mountain region forms a military area, which is divided into four or five, or even more, military subareas, each with its own armed forces operating independently. By employing the tactics described above, these forces have often smashed the enemy's attacks simultaneously or successively.

In our plan of operations against a converging attack by the enemy, we generally place our main force on interior lines. But when we have the strength to spare, we should use our secondary forces (such as the county or the district guerrilla units, or even detachments of the main force) on exterior lines to disrupt the enemy's communications and pin down his reinforcements. Should the enemy stay put in our base area, we may reverse the tactics, namely, leave some of our forces in the base area to invest the enemy while employing the main force to attack the region whence he has come and to step up our activities there, in order to induce him to withdraw and attack our main force; this is the tactic of "relieving the state of Chao by besieging the state of Wei". [219]

In the course of operations against a converging attack, the local anti-Japanese self-defense corps and all the mass organizations should mobilize for action and in every way help our troops to fight the enemy. In fighting the enemy, it is important both to enforce local martial law and, as far as possible, to "strengthen our defense works and clear the fields". The purpose of the former is to suppress traitors and prevent the enemy from getting information, and of the latter to assist our own operations (by strengthening our defense works) and prevent the enemy from getting food (by clearing the herds). "Clearing the fields" means harvesting the crops as soon as they are ripe.

When the enemy retreats, he often burns down the houses in the cities and towns he has occupied and razes the villages along his route, with the purpose of destroying the guerrilla base

[219] In 353 BC the state of Wei laid siege to Hantan, capital of the state of Chao. The king of the state of Chi, an ally of Chao, ordered his generals Tien Chi and Sun Pin to aid Chao with their troops. Knowing that the crack forces of Wei had entered Chao and left their own territory weakly garrisoned, General Sun Pin attacked the state of Wei whose troops withdrew to defend their own country. Taking advantage of their exhaustion, the troops of Chi engaged and routed them at Kueiling (northeast of the present Horse County in Shantung). The siege of Hanean, capital of Chao, was thus lifted. Since then, Chinese strategists have referred to similar tactics as "relieving the state of Chao by besieging the state of Wei".

areas; but in so doing he deprives himself of shelter and food in his next offensive, and the damage recoils upon his own head. This is a concrete illustration of what we mean by one and the same thing having two contradictory aspects.

A guerrilla commander should not think of abandoning his base area and shifting to another, unless it proves impossible, after repeated operations to smash the enemy's heavy converging attacks. In these circumstances he must guard against pessimism. So long as the leaders do not blunder in matters of principle, it is generally possible to smash the converging attacks and hold on to the base areas in the mountainous regions. It is only in the plains that, when confronted by a heavy converging attack, the guerrilla commander should consider other measures in the light of the specific circumstances, namely, leaving many small units for scattered operations, while temporarily shifting large guerrilla formations to some mountainous region, so that they can return and resume their activities in the plains once the main forces of the enemy move away.

Generally speaking, the Japanese cannot adopt the principle of blockhouse warfare, which the Kuomintang employed in the days of the civil war, because their forces are inadequate in relation to China's vast territory. However, we should reckon with the possibility that they may use it to some extent against those guerrilla base areas which pose a particular threat to their vital positions, but even in such circumstances we should be prepared to keep up guerrilla warfare in those areas. Since we have had the experience of being able to maintain guerrilla warfare during the civil war, there is not the slightest doubt of our greater capacity to do so in a national war. Though, in point of relative military strength, the enemy can throw forces that are vastly superior in quantity as well as in quality against some of our base areas, there remain the insoluble national contradiction between us and the enemy and the unavoidable weaknesses of his command. Our victories are based on thorough work among the masses and flexible tactics in our operations.

Section 2: The Strategic Offensive in Guerrilla War

After we have smashed an enemy offensive and before the enemy starts a new offensive, he is on the strategic defensive and we are on the strategic offensive.

At such times our operational policy is not to attack enemy forces which are entrenched in defensive positions and which we are not sure of defeating, but systematically to destroy or drive out the small enemy units and puppet forces in certain areas, which our guerrilla units are strong enough to deal with, and to expand our areas, arouse the masses for struggle against Japan, replenish and train our troops and organize new guerrilla units. If the enemy still remains on the defensive when these tasks are under way, we can expand our new areas still further and attack weakly garrisoned cities and communication lines and hold them for as long as circumstances permit. These are all tasks of the strategic offensive, and the purpose is to take advantage of the fact that the enemy is on the defensive so that we may effectively build up our own military and mass strength, effectively reduce the enemy's strength and prepare to smash the enemy methodically and vigorously when he mounts an offensive again.

It is essential to rest and train our troops, and the best time for doing so is when the enemy is on the defensive. It is not a question of shutting ourselves off from everything else for rest and training, but of funding time for rest and training while expanding our areas, mopping up small enemy units and arousing the people. This is usually also the time for tackling the difficult problem of getting food supplies, bedding, clothing, etc.

It is also the time for destroying the enemy's communication lines on a large scale, hampering his transport and giving direct support to the regular forces in their campaigns.

At such times the guerrilla base areas, guerrilla zones and guerrilla units are in high spirits, and the areas devastated by the enemy are gradually rehabilitated and revived. The people in the enemy-occupied territories are also delighted, and the fame of the guerrillas resounds everywhere. On the other hand, in the camp of the enemy and his running dogs, the traitors, panic and disintegration are mounting, while there is growing hatred of the guerrillas and their base areas and preparations to deal with them are intensified. During the strategic offensive, therefore, it is impermissible for the guerrilla commanders to become so elated as to underrate the enemy and forget to strengthen unity in their own ranks and to consolidate their base areas and their forces. At such times, they must skillfully watch the enemy's every move for signs of any new offensive against us, so that the moment it comes they can wind up their strategic offensive in good order, turn to the strategic defensive and thereby smash the enemy's offensive

Chapter 8: Development of Guerrilla War into Mobile War

The fifth problem of strategy in guerrilla war against Japan is its development into mobile war, a development which is necessary and possible because the war is protracted and ruthless. If China could speedily defeat the Japanese invaders and recover her lost territories, and if the war were neither protracted nor ruthless, this would not be necessary. But as, on the contrary, the war is protracted and ruthless, guerrilla warfare cannot adapt itself to such a war except by developing into mobile warfare. Since the war is protracted and ruthless, it is possible for the guerrilla units to undergo the necessary steeling and gradually to transform themselves into regular forces, so that their mode of operations is gradually regularized and guerrilla warfare develops into mobile warfare. The necessity and possibility of this development must be clearly recognized by the guerrilla commanders if they are to persist in, and systematically carry out, the policy of turning guerrilla warfare into mobile warfare.

In many places, such as the Wutai Mountain region, the present guerrilla warfare owes its growth to the strong detachments sent there by the regular forces. The operations there, though generally of a guerrilla character, have contained an element of mobile warfare from the very beginning. This element will gradually increase as the war goes on. Herein lies the advantage which makes possible the swift expansion of the present anti-Japanese guerrilla warfare and its rapid development to a higher level; thus, the conditions for guerrilla warfare are far superior to what they were in the three northeastern provinces.

To transform guerrilla units waging guerrilla warfare into regular forces waging mobile warfare, two conditions are necessary--an increase in numbers, and an improvement in quality. Apart from directly mobilizing the people to join the forces, increased numbers can be attained by amalgamating small units, while better quality depends on steeling the fighters and improving their weapons in the course of the war.

In amalgamating small units, we must, on the one hand, guard against localism, whereby attention is concentrated exclusively on local interests and centralization is impeded, and, on the other, guard against the purely military approach, whereby local interests are brushed aside.

Localism exists among the local guerrilla units and local governments, which are frequently preoccupied with local considerations to the neglect of the general interest, or which prefer to act each on its own because they are unaccustomed to acting in larger groups. The commanders of the main guerrilla units or of the guerrilla formations must take this into account and adopt the method of gradual amalgamation of part of the local units, allowing the localities to keep some of their forces and expand their guerrilla warfare; the commanders should draw these units into joint operations and then bring about their amalgamation without breaking up their original organization or reshuffling their cadres, so that the small groups may integrate smoothly into the larger group.

As against localism, the purely military approach represents the wrong viewpoint held in the main forces by those who are bent on expanding their own strength and who neglect to assist the local armed units. They do not realize that the development of guerrilla warfare into mobile warfare means not the abandonment of guerrilla warfare but the gradual formation, in the midst of widespread guerrilla warfare, of a main force capable of conducting mobile warfare, a force around which there must still be numerous guerrilla units carrying on extensive guerrilla operations. These guerrilla units are powerful auxiliaries to the main force and serve as inexhaustible reserves for its continuous growth. Therefore, if a commander of a main force has made the mistake of neglecting the interests of the local population and the local government as a result of a purely military approach, he must correct it in order that the expansion of the main force and the multiplication of the local armed units may both receive due attention.

To raise the quality of the guerrilla units it is imperative to raise their political and organizational level and improve their equipment, military technique, tactics and discipline, so that they gradually pattern themselves on the regular forces and shed their guerrilla ways. Politically, it is imperative to get both the commanders and the fighters to realize the necessity of raising the guerrilla units to the level of the regular forces, to encourage them to strive towards this end, and to guarantee its attainment by means of political work. Organizationally, it is imperative gradually to fulfil all the requirements of a regular formation in the following respects--military and political organs, staff and working methods, a regular supply system, a medical service, etc. In the matter of equipment, it is imperative to acquire better and more varied weapons and increase the supply of the necessary communications equipment. In the matter of military technique and tactics, it is imperative to raise

the guerrilla units to the level required of a regular formation. In the matter of discipline, it is imperative to raise the level so that uniform standards are observed, every order is executed without fail and all slackness is eliminated. To accomplish all these tasks requires a prolonged effort, and it cannot be done overnight; but that is the direction in which we must develop. Only thus can a main force be built up in each guerrilla base area and mobile warfare emerge for more effective attacks on the enemy. Where detachments or cadres have been sent in by the regular forces, the goal can be achieved more easily. Hence all the regular forces have the responsibility of helping the guerrilla units to develop into regular units.

Chapter 9: The Relationship of Command

The last problem of strategy in guerrilla war against Japan concerns the relationship of command. A correct solution of this problem is one of the prerequisites for the unhampered development of guerrilla warfare.

Since guerrilla units are a lower level of armed organization characterized by dispersed operations, the methods of command in guerrilla warfare do not allow as high a degree of centralization as in regular warfare. If any attempt is made to apply the methods of command in regular warfare to guerrilla warfare, its great flexibility will inevitably be restricted and its vitality sapped. A highly centralized command is in direct contradiction to the great flexibility of guerrilla warfare and must not and cannot be applied to it.

However, guerrilla warfare cannot be successfully developed without some centralized command. When extensive regular warfare and extensive guerrilla warfare are going on at the same time, their operations must be properly coordinated; hence the need for a command coordinating the two, *i.e.*, for a unified strategic command by the national general staff and the war-zone commanders. In a guerrilla zone or guerrilla base area with many guerrilla units, there are usually one or more guerrilla formations (sometimes together with regular formations) which constitute the main force, a number of other guerrilla units, big and small, which represent the supplementary force, and many armed units composed of people not withdrawn from production; the enemy forces there usually form a unified complex to concert their operations against the guerrillas. Consequently, the problem arises of setting up a unified or centralized command in such guerrilla zones or base areas.

Hence, as opposed both to absolute centralization and to absolute decentralization, the principle of command in guerrilla war should be centralized strategic command and decentralized command in campaigns and battles.

Centralized strategic command includes the planning and direction of guerrilla warfare as a whole by the state, the co-ordination of guerrilla warfare with regular warfare in each war zone, and the unified direction of all the anti-Japanese armed forces in each guerrilla zone or base area. Here lack of harmony, unity and centralization is harmful, and every effort must be made to ensure all three. In general matters, that is, matters of strategy, the lower levels should report to the i higher and

follow their instructions so as to ensure concerted action. Centralization, however, stops at this point, and it would likewise be harmful to go beyond it and interfere with the lower levels in matters of detail like the specific dispositions for a campaign or battle. For such details must be settled in the light of specific conditions, which change from time to time and from place to place and are quite beyond the knowledge of the distant higher levels of command. This is what is meant by the principle of decentralized command in campaigns and battles. The same principle generally applies in regular operations, especially when communications are inadequate. In a word, it means guerrilla warfare waged independently and with the initiative in our hands within the framework of a unified strategy.

Where a guerrilla base area constitutes a military area divided into sub-areas, each comprising several counties, each of which is again divided into districts, the relationship between the various levels, from the headquarters of the military area and sub-areas down to the county and district governments, is one of consecutive subordination, and every armed force must, according to its nature, be under the direct command of one of these. On the principle that has been enunciated, in the relationship of command at these levels matters of general policy should be centralized in the higher levels, while actual operations should be carried out in the light of the specific circumstances by the lower levels, which should have the right of independent action. If a higher level has something to say about the actual operations undertaken at a lower level, it can and should advance its views as "instructions" but must not issue hard and fast "commands". The more extensive the area, the more complex the situation and the greater the distance between the higher and the lower levels, the more advisable it becomes to allow greater independence to the lower levels in their actual operations and thus give those operations a character conforming more closely to the local requirements, so that the lower levels and the local personnel may develop the ability to work independently, cope with complicated situations, and successfully expand guerrilla warfare. For an armed unit or bigger formation which is engaged in a concentrated operation, the principle to be applied is one of centralization in its internal relationship of command, since the situation is clear to the higher command; but the moment this unit or formation breaks up for dispersed action, the principle of centralization in general matters and of decentralization in details should be applied, for then the specific situation cannot be clear to the higher command.

Absence of centralization where it is needed means negligence by the higher levels or usurpation of authority by the lower levels, neither of which can be tolerated in the relationship between higher and lower levels, especially in the military sphere. If decentralization is not affected where it should be, that means monopolization of power by the higher levels and lack of initiative on the part of the lower levels, neither of which can be tolerated in the relationship between higher and lower levels, especially in the command of guerrilla warfare. The above principles constitute the only correct policy for solving the problem of the relationship of command.

Section: Statement of the Problem

1. It will soon be July 7, the first anniversary of the great War of Resistance Against Japan. Rallying in unity, persevering in resistance and persevering in the united front, the forces of the whole nation have been valiantly fighting the enemy for almost a year. The people of the whole world are attentively following this war, which has no precedent in the history of the East, and which will go down as a great war in world history too. Every Chinese suffering from the disasters of the war and fighting for the survival of his nation daily yearns for victory. But what actually will be the course of the war? Can we win? Can we win quickly? Many people are talking about a protracted war, but why is it a protracted war? How to carry on a protracted war? Many people are talking about Final victory, but why will final victory be ours? How shall we strive for final victory? Not everyone has found answers to these questions; in fact, to this day most people have not done so. Therefore, the defeatist exponents of the theory of national subjugation have come forward to tell people that China will be subjugated, that final victory will not be China's. On the other hand, some impetuous friends have come forward to tell people that China will win very quickly without having to exert any great effort. But are these views correct? We have said all along they are not. However, most people have not yet grasped what we have been saying. This is partly because we did not do enough propaganda and explanatory work, and partly because the development of objective events had not yet fully and clearly revealed their inherent nature and their features to the people, who were thus not in a position to foresee the over-all trend and the outcome and hence to decide on a complete set of policies and tactics. Now things are better, the experience of ten months of war has been quite sufficient to explode the utterly baseless theory of national subjugation and to dissuade our impetuous friends from their theory of quick victory. In these circumstances many people are asking for a comprehensive explanation. All the more so with regard to protracted war, not only because of the opposing theories of national subjugation and quick victory but also because of the shallow understanding of its nature. "Our four hundred million people have been making a concerted effort since the Lukouchiao Incident, and the final victory will belong to China." This formula has a wide currency. It is a correct formula but needs to be given more content. Our perseverance in the War of Resistance and in the united front has been possible because of many factors. Internally, they comprise all the political parties in the country from the Communist Party to the Kuomintang, all the people from the workers and peasants to the bourgeoisie, and all the armed forces from the regular forces to the guerrillas; internationally, they range from the land of socialism to justice-loving people in all countries; in the camp of the enemy, they range from those people in Japan who are against the war to those Japanese soldiers at the front who are against the war. In short, all these forces have contributed in varying degrees to our War of Resistance. Every man with a conscience should salute them. We Communists, together with all the other ant-Japanese political parties and the whole people, have no other course than to strive to unite all forces for the defeat of the diabolical Japanese aggressors. July 1 this year will be the 17th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of

China. A serious study of protracted war is necessary in order to enable every Communist to play a better and greater part in the War of Resistance. Therefore, my lectures will be devoted to such a study. I shall try to speak on all the problems relevant to the protracted war, but I cannot possibly go into everything in one series of lectures.

2. All the experience of the ten months of war proves the error both of the theory of China's inevitable subjugation and of the theory of China's quick victory. The former gives rise to the tendency to compromise and the latter to the tendency to underestimate the enemy. Both approaches to the problem are subjective and one-sided, or, in a word, unscientific.

3. Before the War of Resistance, there was a great deal of talk about national subjugation. Some said, "China is inferior in arms and is bound to lose in a war." Others said, "If China offers armed resistance, she is sure to become another Abyssinia." Since the beginning of the war, open talk of national subjugation has disappeared, but secret talk, and quite a lot of it too, still continues. For instance, from time to time an atmosphere of compromise arises and the advocates of compromise argue that "the continuance of the war spells subjugation". [220] In a letter from Hunan a student has written:

> In the countryside everything seems difficult. Doing propaganda work on my own, I have to talk to people when and where I find them. The people I have talked to are by no means ignoramuses; they all have some understanding of what is going on and are very interested in what I have to say. But when I run into my own relatives, they always say: "China cannot win; she is doomed." They make one sick ! Fortunately, they do not go around spreading their views, otherwise things would really be bad. The peasants would naturally put more stock in what they say.

Such exponents of the theory of China's inevitable subjugation form the social basis of the tendency to compromise. They are to be found everywhere in China, and therefore the problem of compromise is liable to crop up within the anti-Japanese front at any time and will probably remain with us right until the end of the war. Now that Hsuchow has fallen and Wuhan is in danger, it will not be unprofitable, I think, to knock the bottom out of the theory of national subjugation.

4. During these ten months of war all kinds of views which are indicative of impetuosity have also appeared. For instance, at the outset of the war many people were groundlessly optimistic, underestimating Japan and even believing that the Japanese could not get as far as Shansi. Some

---

[220] This theory of national subjugation was the view held by the Kuomintang. The Kuomintang was unwilling to resist Japan and fought Japan only under compulsion. After the Lukouchiao Incident (July 7, 1937), the Chiang Kai-shek clique reluctantly took part in the War of Resistance, while the Wang Ching-wei clique became the representatives of the theory of national subjugation, was ready to capitulate to Japan and in fact subsequently did so. However, the idea of national subjugation not only existed in the Kuomintang, but also affected certain sections of the middle strata of society and even certain backward elements among the laboring people. As the corrupt and impotent Kuomintang government lost one battle after another and the Japanese troops advanced unchecked to the vicinity of Wuhan in the first year of the War of Resistance, some backward people became profoundly pessimistic.

belittled the strategic role of guerrilla warfare in the War of Resistance and doubted the proposition, "With regard to the whole, mobile warfare is primary and guerrilla warfare supplementary; with regard to the parts, guerrilla warfare is primary and mobile warfare supplementary." They disagreed with the Eighth Route Army's strategy, "Guerrilla warfare is basic, but lose no chance for mobile warfare under favorable conditions", which they regarded as a "mechanical" approach. [221] During the battle of Shanghai some people said: "If we can fight for just three months, the international situation is bound to change, the Soviet Union is bound to send troops, and the war will be over." They pinned their hopes for the future of the War of Resistance chiefly on foreign aid. [222] After the Taierhchuang victory, [223] some people maintained that the Hsuchow campaign should be fought as a "quasi-decisive campaign" and that the policy of protracted war should be changed. They said such things as, "This campaign marks the last desperate struggle of the enemy," or, "If we win, the Japanese warlords will be demoralized and able only to await their Day of Judgement." [224] The victory at Pinghsingkuan turned some people's heads, and further victory at Taierhchuang has turned more people's heads. Doubts have arisen as to whether the enemy will attack Wuhan. Many people think "probably not", and many others "definitely not". Such doubts may affect all major issues. For instance, is our anti-Japanese strength already sufficient? Some people may answer affirmatively, for our present strength is already sufficient to check the enemy's advance, so why increase it? Or, for instance, is the slogan "Consolidate and expand the Anti-Japanese National United Front" still, correct? Some people may answer negatively, for the united front in its present state is already strong enough to repulse the enemy, so why consolidate and expand it? Or, for instance, should our efforts in diplomacy and international propaganda be intensified? Here again the answer may be in the negative. Or, for instance, should we proceed in earnest to reform the army system and the system of government, develop the mass movement, enforce education for national defense, suppress traitors and Trotskyites, develop war industries and improve the people's livelihood? Or, for instance, are the slogans calling for the defense of Wuhan, of Canton and of the Northwest and for the vigorous development of guerrilla warfare in the enemy's rear still, correct? The answers might all be in the

[221] These views were to be found within the Communist Party. During the first six months of the War of Resistance, there was a tendency to take the enemy lightly among some members of the Party, who held the view that Japan could be defeated at a single blow. It was not that they felt our own forces to be so strong, since they well knew that the troops and the organized people's forces led by the Communist Party were still small, but that the Kuomintang had begun to resist Japan. In their opinion, the Kuomintang was quite powerful, and, in co-ordination with the Communist Party, could deal Japan telling blows. They made this erroneous appraisal because they saw only one aspect of the Kuomintang, that it was resisting Japan, but overlooked the other aspect, that it was reactionary and corrupt.

[222] Such was the view of Chiang Kai-shek and company. Though they were compelled to resist Japan, Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang pinned their hopes solely on prompt foreign aid and had no confidence in their own strength, much less in the strength of the people.

[223] Taierhchuang is a town in southern Shantung where the Chinese army fought a battle in March 1938 against the Japanese invaders. By pitting 400,000 men against Japan's 70,000 to 80,000, the Chinese army defeated the Japanese.

[224] This view was put forward in an editorial in the Ta King Pao, then the organ of the Political Science Group in the Kuomintang. Indulging in wishful thinking, this clique hoped that a few more victories of the Taierhchuang type would stop Japan's advance and that there would be no need to mobilize the people for a protracted war which would threaten the security of its own class. This wishful thinking then pervaded the Kuomintang as a whole.

negative. There are even some people who, the moment a slightly favorable turn occurs in the war situation, are prepared to intensify the "friction" between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party, diverting attention from external to internal matters. This almost invariably occurs whenever a comparatively big battle is won or the enemy's advance comes to a temporary halt. All the above can be termed political and military short-sightedness. Such talk, however plausible, is actually specious and groundless. To sweep away such verbiage should help the victorious prosecution of the War of Resistance.

5. The question now is**:** Will China be subjugated? The answer is, no, she will not be subjugated, but will win final victory. Can China win quickly? The answer is, no, she cannot win quickly, and the War of Resistance will be a protracted war.

6. As early as two years ago, we broadly indicated the main arguments on these questions. On July 16, 1936, five months before the Sian Incident and twelve months before the Lukouchiao Incident, in an interview with the American correspondent, Mr. Edgar Snow, I made a general estimate of the situation with regard to war between China and Japan and advanced various principles for winning victory. The following excerpts may serve as a reminder:

> *Question:* Under what conditions do you think China can defeat and destroy the forces of Japan?
>
> *Answer:* Three conditions are required: first, the establishment of an anti-Japanese united front in China; second, the formation of an international anti-Japanese united front; third, the rise of the revolutionary movement of the people in Japan and the Japanese colonies. From the standpoint of the Chinese people, the unity of the people of China is the most important of the three conditions.
>
> *Question:* How long do you think such a war would last?
>
> *Answer:* That depends on the strength of China's anti-Japanese united front and many other conditioning factors involving China and Japan. That is to say, apart from China's own strength, which is the main thing, international help to China and the help rendered by the revolution in Japan are also important. If China's anti-Japanese united front is greatly expanded and effectively organized horizontally and vertically, if the necessary help is given to China by those governments and peoples which recognize the Japanese imperialist menace to their own interests and if revolution comes quickly in Japan, the war will speedily be brought to an end and China will speedily win victory. If these conditions are not realized quickly, the war will be prolonged. But in the end, just the same, Japan will certainly be defeated and China will certainly be victorious. Only the sacrifices will be great and there will be a very painful period.
>
> *Question:* What is your opinion of the probable course of development of such a war, politically and militarily?

Answer: Japan's continental policy is already fixed, and those who think they can halt the Japanese advance by making compromises with Japan at the expense of more Chinese territory and sovereign rights are indulging in mere fantasy. We definitely know that the lower Yangtse valley and our southern seaports are already included in the continental programme of Japanese imperialism. Moreover, Japan wants to occupy the Philippines, Siam, Indo-China, the Malay Peninsula and the Dutch East Indies in order to cut off other countries from China and monopolize the southwestern Pacific. This is Japan's maritime policy. In such a period, China will undoubtedly be in an extremely difficult position. But the majority of the Chinese people believe that such difficulties can be overcome; only the rich in the big port cities are defeatists because they are afraid of losing their property. Many people think it would be impossible for China to continue the war, once her coastline is blockaded by Japan. This is nonsense. To refute them we need only cite the war history of the Red Army. In the present War of Resistance Against Japan, China's position is much superior to that of the Red Army in the civil war. China is a vast country, and even if Japan should succeed in occupying a section of China with as many as 100 to 200 million people, we would still be far from defeated. We would still have ample strength to fight against Japan, while the Japanese would have to fight defensive battles in their rear throughout the war. The heterogeneity and uneven development of China's economy are rather advantageous in the war of resistance. For example, to sever Shanghai from the rest of China would definitely not be as disastrous to China as would be the severance of New York from the rest of the United States. Even if Japan blockades the Chinese coastline, it is impossible for her to blockade China's Northwest, Southwest and West. Thus, once more the central point of the problem is the unity of the entire Chinese people and the building up of a nation-wide anti-Japanese front. This is what we have long been advocating.

Question: If the war drags on for a long time and Japan is not completely defeated, would the Communist Party agree to the negotiation of a peace with Japan and recognize her rule in northeastern China?

Answer: No. Like the people of the whole country, the Chinese Communist Party will not allow Japan to retain an inch of Chinese territory.

Question: What, in your opinion, should be the main strategy and tactics to be followed in this "war of liberation"?

Answer: Our strategy should be to employ our main forces to operate over an extended and fluid front. To achieve success, the Chinese troops must conduct their warfare with a high degree of mobility on extensive battlefields, making swift advances and withdrawals, swift concentrations and dispersals. This means large-scale mobile warfare, and not positional warfare depending exclusively on defense works with deep trenches, high fortresses and successive rows of defensive positions. It does not mean the abandonment of all the vital strategic points, which should be defended by positional warfare as long as profitable. But the

pivotal strategy must be mobile warfare. Positional warfare is also necessary, but strategically it is auxiliary and secondary. Geographically the theatre of the war is so vast that it is possible for us to conduct mobile warfare most effectively. In the face of the vigorous actions of our forces, the Japanese army will have to be cautious. Its war-machine is ponderous and slow-moving, with limited efficiency. If we concentrate our forces on a narrow front for a defensive war of attrition, we would be throwing away the advantages of our geography and economic organization and repeating the mistake of Abyssinia. In the early period of the war, we must avoid any major decisive battles, and must first employ mobile warfare gradually to break the morale and combat effectiveness of the enemy troops.

Besides employing trained armies to carry on mobile warfare, we must organize great numbers of guerrilla units among the peasants. One should know that the anti-Japanese volunteer units in the three northeastern provinces are only a minor demonstration of the latent power of resistance that can be mobilized from the peasants of the whole country. The Chinese peasants have very great latent power; properly organized and directed, they can keep the Japanese army busy twenty-four hours a day and worry it to death. It must be remembered that the war will be fought in China, that is to say, the Japanese army will be entirely surrounded by the hostile Chinese people, it will be forced to move in all its provisions and guard them, it must use large numbers of troops to protect its lines of communications and constantly guard against attacks and it needs large forces to garrison Manchuria and Japan as well.

In the course of the war, China will be able to capture many Japanese soldiers and seize many weapons and munitions with which to arm herself; at the same time China will win foreign aid to reinforce the equipment of her troops gradually. Therefore, China will be able to conduct positional warfare in the latter period of the war and make positional attacks on the Japanese-occupied areas. Thus, Japan's economy will crack under the strain of China's long resistance and the morale of the Japanese forces will break under the trial of innumerable battles. On the Chinese side, however, the growing latent power of resistance will be constantly brought into play and large numbers of revolutionary people will be pouring into the front lines to fight for their freedom. The combination of all these and other factors will enable us to make the final and decisive attacks on the fortifications and bases in the Japanese-occupied areas and drive the Japanese forces of aggression out of China.

The above views have been proved correct in the light of the experience of the ten months of war and will also be borne out in the future.

7. As far back as August 25, 1937, less than two months after the Lukouchiao Incident, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party clearly pointed out in its "Resolution on the Present Situation and the Tasks of the Party":

The military provocation by the Japanese aggressors at Lukouchiao and their occupation of Peiping and Tientsin represent only the beginning of their large-scale invasion of China south of the Great Wall. They have already begun their national mobilization for war. Their propaganda that they have "no desire to aggravate the situation" is only a smokescreen for further attacks.

The resistance at Lukouchiao on July 7 marked the starting point of China's national War of Resistance.

Thus, a new stage has opened in China's political situation, the stage of actual resistance. The stage of preparation for resistance is over. In the present stage the central task is to mobilize all the nation's forces for victory in the War of Resistance.

The key to victory in the war now lies in developing the resistance that has already begun into a war of total resistance by the whole nation. Only through such a war of total resistance can final victory be won.

The existence of serious weaknesses in the War of Resistance may lead to many setbacks, retreats, internal splits, betrayals, temporary and partial compromises and other such reverses. Therefore, it should be realized that the war will be an arduous and protracted war. But we are confident that, through the efforts of our Party and the whole people, the resistance already started will sweep aside all obstacles and continue to advance and develop.

The above thesis, too, has been proved correct in the light of the experience of the ten months of war and will also be borne out in the future.

8. Epistemologically speaking, the source of all erroneous views on war lies in idealist and mechanistic tendencies on the question. People with such tendencies are subjective and one-sided in their approach to problems. They either indulge in groundless and purely subjective talk, or, basing themselves upon a single aspect or a temporary manifestation, magnify it with similar subjectivity into the whole of the problem. But there are two categories of erroneous views, one comprising fundamental, and therefore consistent, errors which are hard to correct, and the other comprising accidental, and therefore temporary, errors which are easy to correct. Since both are wrong, both need to be corrected. Therefore, only by opposing idealist and mechanistic tendencies and taking an objective and all-sided view in making a study of war can we draw correct conclusions on the question of war.

Section: Why a Protracted War?

30. Let us now examine the problem of protracted war. A correct answer to the question "Why a protracted war?" can be arrived at only on the basis of all the fundamental contrasts between China and Japan. For instance, if we say merely that the enemy is a strong imperialist power while we are a weak semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, we are in danger of falling into the theory of national

subjugation. For neither in theory nor in practice can a struggle become protracted by simply pitting the weak against the strong. Nor can it become protracted by simply pitting the big against the small, the progressive against the reactionary, or abundant support against meagre support. The annexation of a small country by a big one or of a big country by a small one is a common occurrence. It often happens that a progressive country which is not strong is destroyed by a big, reactionary country, and the same holds for everything that is progressive but not strong. Abundant or meagre support is an important but a subsidiary factor, and the degree of its effect depends upon the fundamental factors on both sides. Therefore, when we say that the War of Resistance Against Japan is a protracted war, our conclusion is derived from the interrelations of all the factors at work on both sides. The enemy is strong and we are weak, and the danger of subjugation is there. But in other respects, the enemy has shortcomings and we have advantages. The enemy's advantage can be reduced and his shortcomings aggravated by our efforts. On the other hand, our advantages can be enhanced and our shortcoming remedied by our efforts. Hence, we can win final victory and avert subjugation, while the enemy will ultimately be defeated and will be unable to avert the collapse of his whole imperialist system.

31. Since the enemy has advantages only in one respect but shortcomings in all others and we have shortcomings in only one respect but advantages in all others, why has this produced not a balance, but, on the contrary, a superior position for him and an inferior position for us at the present time? Quite clearly, we cannot consider the question in such a formal way. The fact is that the disparity between the enemy's strength and our own is now so great that the enemy's shortcomings have not developed, and for the time being cannot develop, to a degree sufficient to offset his strength, while our advantages have not developed, and for the time being cannot develop, to a degree sufficient to compensate for our weakness. Therefore, there can as yet be no balance, only imbalance.

32. Although our efforts in persevering in the War of Resistance and the united front have somewhat changed the enemy's strength and superiority as against our weakness and inferiority, there has as yet been no basic change. Hence during a certain stage of the war, to a certain degree the enemy will be victorious and we shall suffer defeat. But why is it that in this stage the enemy's victories and our defeats are definitely restricted in degree and cannot be transcended by complete victory or complete defeat? The reason is that, first, from the very beginning the enemy's strength and our weakness have been relative and not absolute, and that, second, our efforts in persevering in the War of Resistance and in the united front have further accentuated this relativeness. In comparison with the original situation, the enemy is still strong, but unfavorable factors have reduced his strength, although not yet to a degree sufficient to destroy his superiority, and similarly we are still weak, but favorable factors have compensated for our weakness, although not yet to a degree sufficient to transform our inferiority. Thus, it turns out that the enemy is relatively strong and we are relatively weak, that the enemy is in a relatively superior and we are in a relatively inferior position. On both sides, strength and weakness, superiority and inferiority, have never been absolute, and

besides, our efforts in persevering in resistance to Japan and in the united front during the war have brought about further changes in the original balance of forces between us and the enemy. Therefore, in this stage the enemy's victory and our defeat are definitely restricted in degree, and hence the war becomes protracted.

33. But circumstances are continually changing. In the course of the war, provided we employ correct military and political tactics, make no mistakes of principle and exert our best efforts, the enemy's disadvantages and China's advantages will both grow as the war is drawn out, with the inevitable result that there will be a continual change in the difference in comparative strength and hence in the relative position of the two sides. When a new stage is reached, a great change will take place in the balance of forces, resulting in the enemies defeat and our victory.

34. At present the enemy can still manage to exploit his strength, and our War of Resistance has not yet fundamentally weakened him. The insufficiency in his manpower and material resources is not yet such as to prevent his offensive; on the contrary, they can still sustain his offensive to a certain extent. The reactionary and barbarous nature of his war, a factor which intensifies both class antagonisms within Japan and the resistance of the Chinese nation, has not yet brought about a situation which radically impedes his advance. The enemy's international isolation is increasing but is not yet complete. In many countries which have indicated they will help us, the capitalists dealing in munitions and war materials and bent solely on profit are still furnishing Japan with large quantities of war supplies, [225] and their governments [226] are still reluctant to join the Soviet Union in practical sanctions against Japan. From all this it follows that our War of Resistance cannot be won quickly and can only be a protracted war. As for China, although there has been some improvement with regard to her weakness in the military, economic, political and cultural spheres in the ten months of resistance, it is still a long way from what is required to prevent the enemy's offensive and prepare our counteroffensive. Moreover, quantitatively speaking, we have had to sustain certain losses. Although all the factors favorable to us are having a positive effect, it will not be sufficient to halt the enemy's offensive and to prepare for our counter-offensive unless we make an immense effort. Neither the abolition of corruption and the acceleration of progress at home, nor the curbing of the pro-Japanese forces and the expansion of the anti-Japanese forces abroad, are yet accomplished facts. From all this it follows that our war cannot be won quickly but can only be a protracted war.

Section: The Three Stages of the Protracted War

35. Since the Sino-Japanese war is a protracted one and final victory will belong to China, it can reasonably be assumed that this protracted war will pass through three stages. The first stage covers the period of the enemy's strategic offensive and our strategic defensive. The second stage will be the period of the enemy's strategic consolidation and our preparation for the counter-offensive. The third stage will be the period of our strategic counter-offensive and the enemy's strategic retreat. It is impossible to predict the concrete situation in the three stages, but certain main trends in the war may be pointed out in the light of present conditions. The objective course of events will be

[225] The capitalists referred to here are chiefly those of the United States.

[226] By "their governments" Comrade Mao Tse-tung is here referring to the governments of the imperialist countries--Britain, the United States and France.

exceedingly rich and varied, with many twists and turns, and nobody can cast a horoscope for the Sino-Japanese war; nevertheless, it is necessary for the strategic direction of the war to make a rough sketch of its trends. Although our sketch may not be in full accord with the subsequent facts and will be amended by them, it is still necessary to make it in order to give firm and purposeful strategic direction to the protracted war.

36. The first stage has not yet ended. The enemy's design is to occupy Canton, Wuhan and Lanchow and link up these three points. To accomplish this, aim the enemy will have to use at least fifty divisions, or about one and a half million men, spend from one and a half to two years, and expend more than ten thousand million yen. In penetrating so deeply, he will encounter immense difficulties, with consequences disastrous beyond imagination. As for attempting to occupy the entire length of the Canton-Hankow Railway and the Sian-Lanchow Railway, he will have to fight perilous battles and even so may not fully accomplish his design. But in drawing up our operational plan we should base ourselves on the assumption that the enemy may occupy the three points and even certain additional areas, as well as link them up, and we should make dispositions for a protracted war, so that even if he does so, we shall be able to cope with him. In this stage the form of fighting we should adopt is primarily mobile warfare, supplemented by guerrilla and positional warfare. Through the subjective errors of the Kuomintang military authorities, positional warfare was assigned the primary role in the first phase of this stage, but it is nevertheless supplementary from the point of view of the stage as a whole. In this stage, China has already built up a broad united front and achieved unprecedented unity. Although the enemy has used and will continue to use base and shameless means to induce China to capitulate in the attempt to realize his plan for a quick decision and to conquer the whole country without much effort, he has failed so far, nor is he likely to succeed in the future. In this stage, in spite of considerable losses, China will make considerable progress, which will become the main basis for her continued resistance in the second stage. In the present stage the Soviet Union has already given substantial aid to China. On the enemy side, there are already signs of flagging morale, and his army's momentum of attack is less in the middle phase of this stage than it was in the initial phase, and it will diminish still further in the concluding phase. Signs of exhaustion are beginning to appear in his finances and economy; war-weariness is beginning to set in among his people and troops and within the clique at the helm of the war, "war frustrations" are beginning to manifest themselves and pessimism about the prospects of the war is growing.

37. The second stage may be termed one of strategic stalemate. At the tail end of the first stage, the enemy will be forced to fix certain terminal points to his strategic offensive owing to his shortage of troops and our firm resistance, and upon reaching them he will stop his strategic offensive and enter the stage of safeguarding his occupied areas. In the second stage, the enemy will attempt to safeguard the occupied areas and to make them his own by the fraudulent method of setting up puppet governments, while plundering the Chinese people to the limit; but again, he will be confronted with stubborn guerrilla warfare. Taking advantage of the fact that the enemy's rear is unguarded, our guerrilla warfare will develop extensively in the first stage, and many base areas will

be established, seriously threatening the enemy's consolidation of the occupied areas, and so in the second stage there will still be widespread fighting. In this stage, our form of fighting will be primarily guerrilla warfare, supplemented by mobile warfare. China will still retain a large regular army, but she will find it difficult to launch the strategic counter-offensive immediately because, on the one hand, the enemy will adopt a strategically defensive position in the big cities and along the main lines of communication under his occupation and, on the other hand, China will not yet be adequately equipped technically. Except for the troops engaged in frontal defense against the enemy, our forces will be switched in large numbers to the enemy's rear in comparatively dispersed dispositions, and, basing themselves on all the areas not actually occupied by the enemy and coordinating with the people's local armed forces, they will launch extensive, fierce guerrilla warfare against enemy-occupied areas, keeping the enemy on the move as far as possible in order to destroy him in mobile warfare, as is now being done in Shansi Province. The fighting in the second stage will be ruthless, and the country will suffer serious devastation. But the guerrilla warfare will be successful, and if it is well conducted the enemy may be able to retain only about one-third of his occupied territory, with the remaining two-thirds in our hands, and this will constitute a great defeat for the enemy and a great victory for China. By then the enemy-occupied territory as a whole will fall into three categories: first, the enemy base areas; second, our base areas for guerrilla warfare; and, third, the guerrilla areas contested by both sides. The duration of this stage will depend on the degree of change in the balance of forces between us and the enemy and on the changes in the international situation; generally speaking, we should be prepared to see this stage last a comparatively long time and to weather its hardships. It will be a very painful period for China; the two big problems will be economic difficulties and the disruptive activities of the traitors. The enemy will go all out to wreck China's united front, and the traitor organizations in all the occupied areas will merge into a so-called "unified government". Owing to the loss of big cities and the hardships of war, vacillating elements within our ranks will clamor for compromise, and pessimism will grow to a serious extent. Our tasks will then be to mobilize the whole people to unite as one man and carry on the war with unflinching perseverance, to broaden and consolidate the united front, sweep away all pessimism and ideas of compromise, promote the will to hard struggle and apply new wartime policies, and so to weather the hardships. In the second stage, we will have to call upon the whole country resolutely to maintain a united government, we will have to oppose splits and systematically improve fighting techniques, reform the armed forces, mobilize the entire people and prepare for the counter-offensive. The international situation will become still more unfavorable to Japan and the main international forces will incline towards giving more help to China, even though there may be talk of "realism" of the Chamberlain type which accommodates itself to *faits accomplis*. Japan's threat to Southeast Asia and Siberia will become greater, and there may even be another war. As regards Japan, scores of her divisions will be inextricably bogged down in China. Widespread guerrilla warfare and the people's anti-Japanese movement will wear down this big Japanese force, greatly reducing it and also disintegrating its morale by stimulating the growth of homesickness, war-weariness and even anti-war sentiment. Though it would be wrong to say that Japan will achieve no results at all in her

plunder of China, yet, being short of capital and harassed by guerrilla warfare, she cannot possibly achieve rapid or substantial results. This second stage will be the transitional stage of the entire war; it will be the most trying period but also the pivotal one. Whether China becomes an independent country or is reduced to a colony will be determined not by the retention or loss of the big cities in the first stage but by the extent to which the whole nation exerts itself in the second. If we can persevere in the War of Resistance, in the united front and in the protracted war, China will in that stage gain the power to change from weakness to strength. It will be the second act in the three-act drama of China's War of Resistance. And through the efforts of the entire cast, it will become possible to perform a most brilliant last act.

38. The third stage will be the stage of the counter-offensive to recover our lost territories. Their recovery will depend mainly upon the strength which China has built up in the preceding stage and which will continue to grow in the third stage. But China's strength alone will not be sufficient, and we shall also have to rely on the support of international forces and on the changes that will take place inside Japan, or otherwise we shall not be able to win; this adds to China's tasks in international propaganda and diplomacy. In the third stage, our war will no longer be one of strategic defensive, but will turn into a strategic counter-offensive manifesting itself in strategic offensives; and it will no longer be fought on strategically interior lines, but will shift gradually to strategically exterior lines. Not until we fight our way to the Yalu River can this war be considered over. The third stage will be the last in the protracted war, and when we talk of persevering in the war to the end, we mean going all the way through this stage. Our primary form of fighting will still be mobile warfare, but positional warfare will rise to importance. While positional defense cannot be regarded as important in the first stage because of the prevailing circumstances, positional attack will become quite important in the third stage because of the changed conditions and the requirements of the task. In the third stage guerrilla warfare will again provide strategic support by supplementing mobile and positional warfare, but it will not be the primary form as in the second stage.

39. It is thus obvious that the war is protracted and consequently ruthless in nature. The enemy will not be able to gobble up the whole of China but will be able to occupy many places for a considerable time. China will not be able to oust the Japanese quickly, but the greater part of her territory will remain in her hands. Ultimately the enemy will lose and we will win, but we shall have a hard stretch of road to travel.

40. The Chinese people will become tempered in the course of this long and ruthless war. The political parties taking part in the war will also be steeled and tested. The united front must be persevered in; only by persevering in the united front can we persevere in the war; and only by persevering in the united front and in the war can we win final victory. Only thus can all difficulties be overcome. After travelling the hard stretch of road, we shall reach the highway to victory. This is the natural logic of the war.

41. In the three stages the changes in relative strength will proceed along the following lines. In the first stage, the enemy is superior and we are inferior in strength. With regard to our inferiority, we must reckon on changes of two different kinds from the eve of the War of Resistance to the end of this stage. The first kind is a change for the worse. China's original inferiority will be aggravated by war losses, namely, decreases in territory, population, economic strength, military strength and cultural institutions. Towards the end of the first stage, the decrease will probably be considerable, especially on the economic side. This point will be exploited by some people as a basis for their theories of national subjugation and of compromise. But the second kind of change, the change for the better, must also be noted. It includes the experience gained in the war, the progress made by the armed forces, the political progress, the mobilization of the people, the development of culture in a new direction, the emergence of guerrilla warfare, the increase in international support, etc. What is on the downgrade in the first stage is the old quantity and the old quality, the manifestations being mainly quantitative. What is on the upgrade is the new quantity and the new quality, the manifestations being mainly qualitative. It is the second kind of change that provides a basis for our ability to fight a protracted war and win final victory.

42. In the first stage, changes of two kinds are also occurring on the enemies side. The first kind is a change for the worse and manifests itself in hundreds of thousands of casualties, the drain on arms and ammunition, deterioration of troop morale, popular discontent at home, shrinkage of trade, the expenditure of over ten thousand-million-yen, condemnation by world opinion, etc. This trend also provides a basis for our ability to fight a protracted war and win final victory. But we must likewise reckon with the second kind of change on the enemy's side, a change for the better, that is, his expansion in territory, population and resources. This too is a basis for the protracted nature of our War of Resistance and the impossibility of quick victory, but at the same time certain people will use it as a basis for their theories of national subjugation and of compromise. However, we must take into account the transitory and partial character of this change for the better on the enemy's side. Japan is an imperialist power heading for collapse, and her occupation of China's territory is temporary. The vigorous growth of guerrilla warfare in China will restrict her actual occupation to narrow zones. Moreover, her occupation of Chinese territory has created and intensified contradictions between Japan and other foreign countries. Besides, generally speaking, such occupation involves a considerable period in which Japan will make capital outlays without drawing any profits, as is shown by the experience in the three northeastern provinces. All of which again gives us a basis for demolishing the theories of national subjugation and of compromise and for establishing the theories of protracted war and of final victory.

43. In the second stage, the above changes on both sides will continue to develop. While the situation cannot be predicted in detail, on the whole Japan will continue on the downgrade and

China on the upgrade. [227] For example, Japan's military and financial resources will be seriously drained by China's guerrilla warfare, popular discontent will grow in Japan, the morale of her troops will deteriorate further, and she will become more isolated internationally. As for China, she will make further progress in the political, military and cultural spheres and in the mobilization of the people; guerrilla warfare will develop further; there will be some new economic growth on the basis of the small industries and the widespread agriculture in the interior; international support will gradually increase; and the whole picture will be quite different from what it is now. This second stage may last quite a long time, during which there will be a great reversal in the balance of forces, with China gradually rising and Japan gradually declining. China will emerge from her inferior position, and Japan will lose her superior position; first the two countries will become evenly matched, and then their relative positions will be reversed. Thereupon, China will in general have completed her preparations for the strategic counter-offensive and will enter the stage of the counter-offensive and the expulsion of the enemy. It should be reiterated that the change from inferiority to superiority and the completion of preparations for the counter-offensive will involve three things, namely, an increase in China's own strength, an increase in Japan's difficulties, and an increase in international support; it is the combination of all these forces that will bring about China's superiority and the completion of her preparations for the counter-offensive.

44. Because of the unevenness in China's political and economic development, the strategic counter-offensive of the third stage will not present a uniform and even picture throughout the country in its initial phase but will be regional in character, rising here and subsiding there. During this stage, the enemy will not relax his divisive tricks to break China's united front, hence the task of maintaining internal unity in China will become still more important, and we shall have to ensure that the strategic counter-offensive does not collapse halfway through internal dissension. In this period the international situation will become very favorable to China. China's task will be to take advantage of it in order to attain complete liberation and establish an independent democratic state, which at the same time will mean helping the world anti-fascist movement.

45. China moving from inferiority to parity and then to superiority, Japan moving from superiority to parity and then to inferiority; China moving from the defensive to stalemate and then to the counter-offensive, Japan moving from the offensive to the safeguarding of her gains and then to retreat--such will be the course of the Sino-Japanese war and its inevitable trend.

46. Hence the questions and the conclusions are as follows: Will China be subjugated? The answer is, no, she will not be subjugated, but will win final victory. Can China win quickly? The

[227] Comrade Mao Tse-tung's prediction that there would be an upswing in China during the stage of stalemate in the War of Resistance Against Japan was completely confirmed in the case of the Liberated Areas under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party. But there was actually a decline instead of an upswing in the Kuomintang areas, because the ruling clique headed by Chiang Kai-shek was passive in resisting Japan and active in opposing the Communist Party and the people. This roused opposition among the broad masses of the people and raised their political consciousness

answer is, no, she cannot win quickly, and the war must be a protracted one. Are these conclusions correct? I think they are.

47. At this point, the exponents of national subjugation and of compromise will again rush in and say, "To move from inferiority to parity China needs a military and economic power equal to Japan's, and to move from parity to superiority she will need a military and economic power greater than Japan's. But this is impossible, hence the above conclusions are not correct."

48. This is the so-called theory that "weapons decide everything", [228] which constitutes a mechanical approach to the question of war and a subjective and one-sided view. Our view is opposed to this; we see not only weapons but also people. Weapons are an important factor in war, but not the decisive factor; it is people, not things, that are decisive. The contest of strength is not only a contest of military and economic power, but also a contest of human power and morale. Military and economic power is necessarily wielded by people. If the great majority of the Chinese, of the Japanese and of the people of other countries are on the side of our War of Resistance Against Japan, how can Japan's military and economic power, wielded as it is by a small minority through coercion, count as superiority? And if not, then does not China, though wielding relatively inferior military and economic power, become the superior? There is no doubt that China will gradually grow in military and economic power, provided she perseveres in the War of Resistance and in the united front. As for our enemy, weakened as he will be by the long war and by internal and external contradictions, his military and economic power is bound to change in the reverse direction. In these circumstances, is there any reason why China cannot become the superior? And that is not all. Although we cannot as yet count the military and economic power of other countries as being openly and to any great extent on our side, is there any reason why we will not be able to do so in the future? If Japan's enemy is not just China, if in future one or more other countries make open use of their considerable military and economic power defensively or offensively against Japan and openly help us, then will not our superiority be still greater? Japan is a small country, her war is reactionary and barbarous, and she will become more and more isolated internationally; China is a large country, her war is progressive and just, and she will enjoy more and more support internationally. Is there any reason why the long-term development of these factors should not definitely change the relative position between the enemy and ourselves?

49. The exponents of quick victory, however, do not realize that war is a contest of strength, and that before a certain change has taken place in the relative strength of the belligerents, there is no basis for trying to fight strategically decisive battles and shorten the road to liberation. Were their ideas to be put into practice, we should inevitably run our heads into a brick wall. Or perhaps they are just talking for their own pleasure without really intending to put their ideas into practice. In the

[228] According to the theory that "weapons decide everything", China which was inferior to Japan in regard to arms was bound to be defeated in the war. This view was current among all the leaders of the Kuomintang reaction, Chiang Kai-shek included.

end Mr. Reality will come and pour a bucket of cold water over these chatterers, showing them up as mere windbags who want to get things on the cheap, to have gains without pains. We have had this kind of idle chatter before and we have it now, though not very much so far; but there may be more as the war develops into the stage of stalemate and then of counter-offensive. But in the meantime, if China's losses in the first stage are fairly heavy and the second stage drags on very long, the theories of national subjugation and of compromise will gain great currency. Therefore, our fire should be directed mainly against them and only secondarily against the idle chatter about quick victory.

50. That the war will be protracted is certain, but nobody can predict exactly how many months or years it will last, as this depends entirely upon the degree of the change in the balance of forces. All those who wish to shorten the war have no alternative but to work hard to increase our own strength and reduce that of the enemy. Specifically, the only way is to strive to win more battles and wear down the enemy's forces, develop guerrilla warfare to reduce enemy-occupied territory to a minimum, consolidate and expand the united front to rally the forces of the whole nation, build up new armies and develop new war industries, promote political, economic and cultural progress, mobilize the workers, peasants, businessmen, intellectuals and other sections of the people, disintegrate the enemy forces and win over their soldiers, carry on international propaganda to secure foreign support, and win the support of the Japanese people and other oppressed peoples. Only by doing all this can we reduce the duration of the war. There is no magic short-cut.

Section: Fighting for Perpetual Peace

57. The protracted nature of China's anti-Japanese war is inseparably connected with the fight for perpetual peace in China and the whole world. Never has there been a historical period such as the present in which war is so close to perpetual peace. For several thousand years since the emergence of classes, the life of mankind has been full of wars; each nation has fought countless wars, either internally or with other nations. In the imperialist epoch of capitalist society, wars are waged on a particularly extensive scale and with a peculiar ruthlessness. The first great imperialist war of twenty years ago was the first of its kind in history, but not the last. Only the war which has now begun comes close to being the final war, that is, comes close to the perpetual peace of mankind. By now one-third of the world's population has entered the war. Look ! Italy, then Japan; Abyssinia, then Spain, then China. The population of the countries at war now amounts to almost 600 million, or nearly a third of the total population of the world. The characteristics of the present war are its uninterruptedness and its proximity to perpetual peace. Why is it uninterrupted? After attacking Abyssinia, Italy attacked Spain, and Germany joined in; then Japan attacked China. What will come next? Undoubtedly Hitler will fight the great powers. "Fascism is war" [229] --this is perfectly true. There will be no interruption in the development of the present war into a world war; mankind will

[229] "Fascism is unbridled chauvinism and predatory war," said Comrade Georgi Dimitrov in his report to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in August 1935, entitled "The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International" (see Selected Articles and Speeches, Eng. ed., Lawrence & Wishart London, 1951, p. 44). In July 1937, Comrade Dimitrov published an article entitled Fascism Is War.

not be able to avoid the calamity of war. Why then do we say the present war is near to perpetual peace? The present war is the result of the development of the general crisis of world capitalism which began with World War I; this general crisis is driving the capitalist countries into a new war and, above all, driving the fascist countries into new war adventures. This war, we can foresee, will not save capitalism, but will hasten its collapse. It will be greater in scale and more ruthless than the war of twenty years ago, all nations will inevitably be drawn in, it will drag on for a very long time, and mankind will suffer greatly. But, owing to the existence of the Soviet Union and the growing political consciousness of the people of the world, great revolutionary wars will undoubtedly emerge from this war to oppose all counter-revolutionary wars, thus giving this war the character of a struggle for perpetual peace. Even if later there should be another period of war, perpetual world peace will not be far off. Once man has eliminated capitalism, he will attain the era of perpetual peace, and there will be no more need for war. Neither armies, nor warships, nor military aircraft, nor poison gas will then be needed. Thereafter and for all time, mankind will never again know war. The revolutionary wars which have already begun are part of the war for perpetual peace. The war between China and Japan, two countries which have a combined population of over 500 million, will take an important place in this war for perpetual peace, and out of it will come the liberation of the Chinese nation. The liberated new China of the future will be inseparable from the liberated new world of the future. Hence our War of Resistance Against Japan takes on the character of a struggle for perpetual peace.

58. History shows that wars are divided into two kinds, just and unjust. All wars that are progressive are just, and all wars that impede progress are unjust. We Communists oppose all unjust wars that impede progress, but we do not oppose progressive, just wars. Not only do we Communists not oppose just wars, we actively participate in them. As for unjust wars, World War I is an instance in which both sides fought for imperialist interests; therefore, the Communists of the whole world firmly opposed that war. The way to oppose a war of this kind is to do everything possible to prevent it before it breaks out and, once it breaks out, to oppose war with war, to oppose unjust war with just war, whenever possible. Japan's war is an unjust war that impedes progress, and the peoples of the world, including the Japanese people, should oppose it and are opposing it. In our country the people and the government, the Communist Party and the Kuomintang, have all raised the banner of righteousness in the national revolutionary war against aggression. Our war is sacred and just, it is progressive and its aim is peace. The aim is peace not just in one country but throughout the world, not just temporary but perpetual peace. To achieve this aim we must wage a life-and-death struggle, be prepared for any sacrifice, persevere to the end and never stop short of the goal. However great the sacrifice and however long the time needed to attain it, a new world of perpetual peace and brightness already lies clearly before us. Our faith in waging this war is based upon the new China and the new world of perpetual peace and brightness for which we are striving. Fascism and imperialism wish to perpetuate war, but we wish to put an end to it in the not-too-distant future. The great majority of mankind should exert their utmost efforts for this purpose. The 450 million

people of China constitute one quarter of the world's population, and if by their concerted efforts they overthrow Japanese imperialism and create a new China of freedom and equality, they will most certainly be making a tremendous contribution to the struggle for perpetual world peace. This is no vain hope, for the whole world is approaching this point in the course of its social and economic development, and provided that the majority of mankind work together, our goal will surely be attained in several decades.

Section: Man's Dynamic Role in War

59.We have so far explained why the war is a protracted war and why the final victory will be China's, and in the main dealt with what protracted war is and what it is not. Now we shall turn to the question of what to do and what not to do. How to conduct protracted war and how to win the final victory? These are the questions answered below. We shall therefore successively discuss the following problems: man's dynamic role in war, war and politics, political mobilization for the War of Resistance, the object of war, offence within defense, quick decisions within a protracted war, exterior lines within interior lines, initiative, flexibility, planning, mobile warfare, guerrilla warfare, positional warfare, war of annihilation, war of attrition, the possibilities of exploiting the enemy's mistakes, the question of decisive engagements in the anti-Japanese war, and the army and the people as the foundation of victory. Let us start with the problem of man's dynamic role.

60. When we say we are opposed to a subjective approach to problems, we mean that we must oppose ideas which are not based upon or do not correspond to objective facts, because such ideas are fanciful and fallacious and will lead to failure if acted on. But whatever is done has to be done by human beings; protracted war and final victory will not come about without human action. For such action to be effective there must be people who derive ideas, principles or views from the objective facts, and put forward plans, directives, policies, strategies and tactics. Ideas, etc. are subjective, while deeds or actions are the subjective translated into the objective, but both represent the dynamic role peculiar to human beings. We term this kind of dynamic role "man's conscious dynamic role", and it is a characteristic that distinguishes man from all other beings. All ideas based upon and corresponding to objective facts are correct ideas, and all deeds or actions based upon correct ideas are correct actions. We must give full scope to these ideas and actions, to this dynamic role. The anti-Japanese war is being waged to drive out imperialism and transform the old China into a new China; this can be achieved only when the whole Chinese people are mobilized and full scope is given to their conscious dynamic role in resisting Japan. If we just sit by and take no action, only subjugation awaits us and there will be neither protracted war nor final victory.

61. It is a human characteristic to exercise a conscious dynamic role. Man, strongly displays this characteristic in war. True, victory or defeat in war is decided by the military, political, economic and geographical conditions on both sides, the nature of the war each side is waging and the international support each enjoys, but it is not decided by these alone; in themselves, all these provide only the possibility of victory or defeat but do not decide the issue. To decide the issue, subjective effort must be added, namely, the directing and waging of war, man's conscious dynamic role in war.

62. In seeking victory, those who direct a war cannot overstep the limitations imposed by the objective conditions; within these limitations, however, they can and must play a dynamic role in striving for victory. The stage of action for commanders in a war must be built upon objective

possibilities, but on that stage, they can direct the performance of many a drama, full of sound and color, power and grandeur. Given the objective material foundations, the commanders in the anti-Japanese war should display their prowess and marshal all their forces to crush the national enemy, transform the present situation in which our country and society are suffering from aggression and oppression, and create a new China of freedom and equality; here is where our subjective faculties for directing war can and must be exercised. We do not want any of our commanders in the war to detach himself from the objective conditions and become a blundering hothead, but we decidedly want every commander to become a general who is both bold and sagacious. Our commanders should have not only the boldness to overwhelm the enemy but also the ability to remain masters of the situation throughout the changes and vicissitudes of the entire war. Swimming in the ocean of war, they must not flounder but make sure of reaching the opposite shore with measured strokes. Strategy and tactics, as the laws for directing war, constitute the art of swimming in the ocean of war.

Section: War and Politics.

63. "War is the continuation of politics." In this sense war is politics and war itself is a political action; since ancient times there has never been a war that did not have a political character. The anti-Japanese war is a revolutionary war waged by the whole nation, and victory is inseparable from the political aim of the war--to drive out Japanese imperialism and build a new China of freedom and equality--inseparable from the general policy of persevering in the War of Resistance and in the united front, from the mobilization of the entire people, and from the political principles of the unity between officers and men, the unity between army and people and the disintegration of the enemy forces, and inseparable from the effective application of united front policy, from mobilization on the cultural front, and from the efforts to win international support and the support of the people inside Japan. In a word, war cannot for a single moment be separated from politics. Any tendency among the anti-Japanese armed forces to belittle politics by isolating war from it and advocating the idea of war as an absolute is wrong and should be corrected.

64. But war has its own particular characteristics and, in this sense, it cannot be equated with politics in general. "War is the continuation of politics by other . . . means." [230] When politics develops to a certain stage beyond which it cannot proceed by the usual means, war breaks out to sweep the obstacles from the way. For instance, the semi-independent status of China is an obstacle to the political growth of Japanese imperialism, hence Japan has unleashed a war of aggression to sweep away that obstacle. What about China? Imperialist oppression has long been an obstacle to China's bourgeois-democratic revolution; hence many wars of liberation have been waged in the effort to sweep it away. Japan is now using war for the purpose of oppressing China and completely blocking the advance of the Chinese revolution, and therefore China is compelled to wage the War of Resistance in her determination to sweep away this obstacle. When the obstacle is removed, our political aim will be attained and the war concluded. But if the obstacle is not completely swept away, the war will have to continue till the aim is fully accomplished. Thus, anyone who seeks a compromise before the task of the anti-Japanese war is fulfilled is bound to fail, because even if a compromise were to occur for one reason or another, the war would break out again, since the broad masses of the people would certainly not submit but would continue the war until its political

[230] V. I. Lenin, Socialism and War, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1950, p. 19.

objective was achieved. It can therefore be said that politics is war without bloodshed while war is politics with bloodshed.

65. From the particular characteristics of war there arise a particular set of organizations, a particular series of methods and a particular kind of process. The organizations are the armed forces and everything that goes with them. The methods are the strategy and tactics for directing war. The process is the particular form of social activity in which the opposing armed forces attack each other or defend themselves against one another, employing strategy and tactics favorable to themselves and unfavorable to the enemy. Hence war experience is a particular kind of experience. All who take part in war must rid themselves of their customary ways and accustom themselves to war before they can win victory.

Mao Zedong: Quotations from Mao Zedong

Chapter 5: War and Peace

War is the highest form of struggle for resolving contradictions, when they have developed to a certain stage, between classes, nations, states, or political groups, and it has existed ever since the emergence of private property and of classes.

"Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War" (December 1936), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 180.

"War is the continuation of politics." In this sense, war is politics and war itself is a political action; since ancient times there has never been a war that did not have a political character.... However, war has its own particular characteristics and, in this sense, it cannot be equated with politics in general. "War is the continuation of politics by other . . . means." When politics develops to a certain stage beyond which it cannot proceed by the usual means, war breaks out to sweep the obstacles from the way.... When the obstacle is removed and our political aim attained the war will stop. Nevertheless, if the obstacle is not completely swept away, the war will have to continue until the aim is fully accomplished.... It can therefore be said that politics is war without bloodshed while war is politics with bloodshed.

"On Protracted War" (May 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, pp. 152-53 *

History shows that wars are divided into two kinds, just and unjust. All wars that are progressive are just, and all wars that impede progress are unjust. We Communists oppose all unjust wars that impede progress, but we do not oppose progressive, just wars. Not only do we Communists not oppose just wars; we actively participate in them. As for unjust wars, World War I is an instance in which both sides fought for imperialist interests; therefore, the Communists of the whole world firmly opposed that war. The way to oppose a war of this kind is to do everything possible to prevent it before it breaks out and, once it breaks out, to oppose war with war, to oppose unjust war with just war, whenever possible.

Ibid., p. 150.

Revolutions and revolutionary wars are inevitable in class society, and without them it is impossible to accomplish any leap in social development and to overthrow the reactionary ruling classes and therefore impossible for the people to win political power.

"On Contradiction" (August1937), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 344.*

Revolutionary war is an antitoxin that not only eliminates the enemy's poison but also purges us of our own filth. Every just, revolutionary war is endowed with tremendous power and can transform many things or clear the way for their transformation. The Sino-Japanese war will transform both China and Japan; provided China perseveres in the War of Resistance and in the united front, the old Japan will surely be transformed into a new Japan and the old China into a new China, and people and everything else in both China and Japan will be transformed during and after the war.

"On Protracted War" (May 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 131.*

Every Communist must grasp the truth; "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

"Problems of War and Strategy" (November 6, 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 224.

The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds well universally, for China and for all other countries.

Ibid. p. 219.

Without armed struggle neither the proletariat, nor the people, nor the Communist Party would have any standing at all in China and it would be impossible for the revolution to triumph. In these years [the eighteen years since the founding of the Party] the development, consolidation and bolshevization of our Party have proceeded in the midst of revolutionary wars; without armed struggle the Communist Party would assuredly not be what it is today. Comrades throughout the Party must never forget this experience for which we have paid in blood.

"Introducing The Communist" (October 4, 1939), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 292.*

According to the Marxist theory of the state, the army is the chief component of state power. Whoever wants to seize and retain state power must have a strong army. Some people ridicule us as advocates of the "omnipotence of war". Yes, we are advocates of the omnipotence of revolutionary war; that is good, not bad, it is Marxist. The guns of the Russian Communist Party created socialism. We shall create a democratic republic. Experience in the class struggle in the era of imperialism teaches us that it is only by the power of the gun that the working class and the laboring masses can defeat the armed bourgeoisie and landlords; in this sense we may say that only with guns can the whole world be transformed.

"Problems of War and Strategy" (November 6, 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 225.

We are advocates of the abolition of war, we do not want war; but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun.

Ibid.

War, this monster of mutual slaughter among men, will be finally eliminated by the progress of human society, and in the not-too-distant future too. But there is only one way to eliminate it and that is to oppose war with war, to oppose counterrevolutionary war with revolutionary war, to oppose national counter-revolutionary war with national revolutionary war, and to oppose counter-revolutionary class war with revolutionary class war.... When human society advances to the point where classes and states are eliminated, there will be no more wars, counter-revolutionary or revolutionary, unjust or just; that will be the era of perpetual peace for mankind. Our study of the laws of revolutionary war springs from the desire to eliminate all wars. Herein, lies the distinction between us Communists and all the exploiting classes.

"Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War" (December 1936), Selected Works, Vol. I, pp. 182-83.

Our country and all the other socialist countries want peace; so, do the peoples of all the countries of the world. The only ones who crave war and do not want peace are certain monopoly capitalist groups in a handful of imperialist countries that depend on aggression for their profits.

"Opening Address at the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China" (September 15, 1956).

To achieve a lasting world peace, we must further develop our friendship and co-operation with the fraternal countries in the socialist camp and strengthen our solidarity with all peace-loving countries. We must endeavor to establish normal diplomatic relations, based on mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty and of equality and mutual benefit, with all countries willing to live together with us in peace. We must give active support to the national independence and liberation movement in countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America as well as to the peace movement and to just struggles in all the countries of the world.

Ibid.

As for the imperialist countries, we should unite with their peoples and strive to coexist peacefully with those countries, do business with them and prevent any possible war, but under no circumstances should we harbor any unrealistic notions about them.

On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People (February 27, 1957), 1st pocket ed., p. 75.

We desire peace. However, if imperialism insists on fighting a war, we will have no alternative but to take the firm resolution to fight to the finish before going ahead with our construction. If you are afraid of war day in day out, what will you do if war eventually comes? First, I said that the East Wind is prevailing over the West Wind and war will not break out, and now I have added these explanations about the situation in case war should break out. Both possibilities have thus been taken into account.

Speech at the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties (November 18, 1957), quoted in "Statement by the Spokesman of the Chinese Government" (September 1, 1963).*

People all over the world are now discussing whether a third world war will break out. On this question, too, we must be mentally prepared and do some analysis. We stand firmly for peace and against war. However, if the imperialists insist on unleashing another war, we should not be afraid of it. Our attitude on this question is the same as our attitude towards any disturbance: first, we are against it; second, we are not afraid of it. The First World War was followed by the birth of the Soviet Union with a population of 200 million. The Second World War was followed by the emergence of the socialist camp with a combined population of 900 million. If the imperialists insist on launching a third world war, it is certain that several hundred million more will turn to socialism, and then there will not be much room left on earth for the imperialists; it is also likely that the whole structure of imperialism will utterly collapse.

On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People (February 27, 1957), 1st pocket ed., pp. 67-68.

Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again . . . until their doom- that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law. When we say "imperialism is ferocious", we mean that its nature will never change, that the imperialists will never lay down their butcher knives, that they will never become Buddhas, till their doom. Fight, fail, fight again, fail again, fight again . . . until their victory; that is the logic of the people, and they too will never go against this logic. This is another Marxist law. The Russian people's revolution followed this law, and so has the Chinese people's revolution.

"Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle" (August 14, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 428.

Just because we have won victory, we must never relax our vigilance against the frenzied plots for revenge by the imperialists and their running dogs. Whoever relaxes vigilance will disarm himself politically and land himself in a passive position.

"Address to the Preparatory Committee of the New Political Consultative Conference" (June 15, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 407.

The imperialists and their running dogs, the Chinese reactionaries, will not resign themselves to defeat in this land of China. They will continue to gang up against the Chinese people in every possible way. For example, they will smuggle their agents into China to sow dissension and make trouble. That is certain; they will never neglect these activities. To take another example, the imperialists will incite the Chinese reactionaries, and even throw in their own forces, to blockade China's ports. They will do this as long as it is possible. Furthermore, if they still hanker after adventures, they will send some of their troops to invade and harass frontiers of China; this, too, is not impossible. All this we must take fully into account.

Ibid.*

The world is progressing, the future is bright and no one can change this general trend of history. We should carry on constant propaganda among the people on the facts of world progress and the bright future ahead so that they will build their confidence in victory.

"On the Chungking Negotiations" (October 17, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. IV. p. 59.

The commanders and fighters of the entire Chinese People's Liberation Army absolutely must not relax in the least their will to fight; any thinking that relaxes the will to fight and belittles the enemy is wrong.

"Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China" (March 5, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 361.

Chapter 8: People's War

The revolutionary war is a war of the masses; only mobilizing the masses and relying on them can wage it.

"Be Concerned with the Well-Being of the Masses, Pay Attention to Methods of Work" (January 27, 1934), Selected Works, Vol. I. p. 147.*

What is a true bastion of iron? It is the masses, the millions upon millions of people who genuinely and sincerely support the revolution. That is the real iron bastion, which it is impossible, and impossible, for any force on earth to smash. The counter-revolution cannot smash us; on the contrary, we shall smash it. Rallying millions upon millions of people round the revolutionary government and expanding our revolutionary war, we shall wipe out all counter-revolution and take over the whole of China.

Ibid., p. 150.*

The richest source of power to wage war lies in the masses of the people. It is mainly because of the unorganized state of the Chinese masses that Japan dares to bully us. When this defect is remedied, then the Japanese aggressor, like a mad bull crashing into a ring of flames, will be surrounded by hundreds of millions of our people standing upright, the mere sound of their voices will strike terror into him, and he will be burned to death.

"On Protracted War" (May 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 186.

The imperialists are bullying us in such a way that we will have to deal with them seriously. Not only must we have a powerful regular army; we must also organize contingents of the people's militia on a big scale. This will make it difficult for the imperialists to move a single inch in our country in case of invasion.

Interview with a Hsinhua News Agency correspondent (September 29, 1958).

Considering the revolutionary war as a whole, the operations of the people's guerrillas and those of the main forces of the Red Army complement each other like a man's right arm and left arm, and if we had only the main forces of the Red Army without the people's guerrillas, we would be like

a warrior with only one arm. In concrete terms, and especially concerning military operations, when we talk of the people in the base area as a factor, we mean that we have an armed people. That is the main reason why the enemy is afraid to approach our base area.

"Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War" (December 1936), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 238.

Unquestionably, victory or defeat in war is determined mainly by the military, political, economic and natural conditions on both sides. However, not by these alone. It is also determined by each side's subjective ability in directing the war. In his endeavor to win a war, a military strategist cannot overstep the limitations imposed by the material conditions; within these limitations, however, he can and must strive for victory. The stage of action for a military strategist is built upon objective material conditions, but on that stage, he can direct the performance of many a drama, full of sound and color, power and grandeur.

Ibid., pp. 190-91.*

The object of war is specifically "to preserve oneself and destroy the enemy" (to destroy the enemy means to disarm him or "deprive him of the power to resist", and does not mean to destroy every member of his forces physically). In ancient warfare, the spear and the shield were used, the spear to attack and destroy the enemy, and the shield to defend and preserve oneself. To the present day, all weapons are still an extension of the spear and the shield. The bomber, the machine-gun, the long-range gun and poison gas are developments of the spear, while the air-raid shelter, the steel helmet, the concrete fortification and the gas mask are developments of the shield. The tank is a new weapon combining the functions of both spear and shield. Attack is the chief means of destroying the enemy, but defense cannot be dispensed with. In attack, the immediate object is to destroy the enemy, but at the same time, it is self-preservation, because if the enemy is not destroyed, you will be destroyed. In defense, the immediate object is to preserve yourself, but at the same time defense is a means of supplementing attack or preparing to go over to the attack. Retreat is in the category of defense and is a continuation of defense, while pursuit is a continuation of attack. It should be pointed out that destruction of the enemy is the primary object of war and self-preservation the secondary, because only by destroying the enemy in large numbers can one effectively preserve oneself. Therefore, attack, the chief means of destroying the enemy, is primary, while defense, a supplementary means of destroying the enemy and a means of self-preservation, is secondary. In actual warfare, defense plays the chief role much of the time and by attack for the rest of the time, but if war is taken as a whole, attack remains primary.

"On Protracted War" (May 1938). Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 156.

All the guiding principles of military operations grow out of the one basic principles: to strive to the utmost to preserve one's own strength and destroy that of the enemy.... How then do we justify the encouragement of heroic sacrifice in war? Every war exacts a price, sometimes an extremely high one. Is this not in contradiction with "preserving oneself"? In fact, there is no contradiction at all; to put it more exactly, sacrifice and self-preservation are both opposite and complementary to each

other. For such sacrifice is essential not only for destroying the enemy but also for preserving oneself - partial and temporary "non-preservation" (sacrifice, or paying the price) is necessary for the sake of general and permanent preservation. From this basic principle stems the series of principles guiding military operations, all of which - from the principles of shooting (taking cover to preserve oneself, and making full use of fire-power to destroy the enemy) to the principles of strategy - are permeated with the spirit of this basic principle. All technical principles and all principles concerning tactics, campaigns and strategy represent applications of this basic principle. The principle of preserving oneself and destroying the enemy is the basis of all military principles.

"Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War Against Japan" (May 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, pp. 81-82.*

Our principles of operation are:

(1) Attack dispersed isolated enemy forces first; attack concentrated strong enemy forces later.
(2) Take small and medium cities and extensive rural areas first; take big cities later.
(3) Make wiping out the enemy's effective strength our main objective; do not make holding or seizing a city or place our main objective. Holding or seizing a city or place is the outcome of wiping out the enemy's effective strength, and often a city or place can be held or seized for good only after it has changed hands a number of times.
(4) In every battle, concentrate an absolutely superior force (two, three, four and sometimes even five or six times the enemy's strength), encircle the enemy forces completely, strive to wipe them out thoroughly and do not let any escape from the net. In special circumstances, use the method of dealing the enemy crushing blows, that is, concentrate all our strength to make a frontal attack and an attack on one or both of his flanks, with the aim of wiping out one part and routing another so that our army can swiftly move its troops to smash other enemy forces. Strive to avoid battles of attrition in which we lose more than we gain or only break even. In this way, although inferior as a whole (in terms of numbers), we shall be superior in every part and every specific campaign, and this ensures victory in the campaign. As time goes on, we shall become superior as a whole and eventually wipe out the entire enemy.
(5) Fight no battle unprepared, fight no battle you are not sure of winning; make every effort to be well prepared for each battle, make every effort to ensure victory in the given set of conditions as between the enemy and ourselves.
(6) Give full play to our style of fighting - courage in battle, no fear of sacrifice, no fear of fatigue, and continuous fighting (that is, fighting successive battles in a short time without rest).
(7) Strive to wipe out the enemy when he is on the move. At the same time, pay attention to the tactics of positional attack and capture enemy fortified points and cities.
(8) Concerning attacking cities, resolutely seize all enemy fortified points and cities that are weakly defended. At opportune moments, seize all enemy fortified points and cities defended with moderate strength, provided circumstances permit. As for all strongly defended enemy fortified points and cities, wait until conditions are ripe and then take them.

(9) Replenish our strength with all the arms and most of the personnel captured from the enemy. Our army's main sources of manpower and materiel are at the front.

(10) Make good use of the intervals between campaigns to rest, train and consolidate our troops. Periods of rest, training and consolidation should not in general be very long, and the enemy should as far as possible be permitted no breathing space. These are the main methods the People's Liberation Army has employed in defeating Chiang Kai-shek. They are the result of the tempering of the People's Liberation Army in long years of fighting against domestic and foreign enemies and are completely suited to our present situation . . .. our strategy and tactics are based on a people's war; no army opposed to the people can use our strategy and tactics.

"The Present Situation and Our Tasks" (December 25, 1947), Selected Military Writings, 2nd ed., pp. 349-50.*

Without preparedness, superiority is not real superiority and there can be no initiative either. Having grasped this point, a force that is inferior but prepared can often defeat a superior enemy by surprise attack.

"On Protracted War" (May 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, pp. 165-66.

Chapter 9: The People's Army

Without a People's army, the people have nothing.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, pp. 296-97.

This army is powerful because all its members have a conscious discipline; they have come together and they fight not for the private interests of a few individuals or a narrow clique, but for the interests of the broad masses and of the whole nation. The sole purpose of this army is to stand firmly with the Chinese people and to serve them whole-heartedly.

Ibid. p. 264.*

The Chinese Red Army is an armed body for carrying out the political tasks of the revolution. Especially at present, the Red Army should certainly not confine itself to fighting; besides fighting to destroy the enemy's military strength, it should shoulder such important tasks as doing propaganda among the masses, organizing the masses, arming them, helping them to establish revolutionary political power and setting up Party organizations. The Red Army fights not merely for the sake of fighting but in order to conduct propaganda among the masses, organize them, arm them, and help them to establish revolutionary political power. Without these objectives, fighting loses its meaning and the Red Army loses the reason for its existence.

"On Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party" (December 1929), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 106.*

The People's Liberation Army is always a fighting force. Even after countrywide victory, our army will remain a fighting force during the historical period in which classes have not been

abolished in our country and the imperialist system still exists in the world. On this point, there should be no misunderstanding or wavering.

"Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China" (March 5, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 362.

We have an army for fighting as well as an army for labor. For fighting, we have the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies but even they do a dual job, warfare and production. With these two kinds of armies, and with a fighting army skilled in these two tasks and in mass work, we can overcome our difficulties and defeat Japanese imperialism.

"Get Organized!" (November 29,), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 153.

Our national defense will be consolidated and no imperialist will be allowed to invade our territory again. Our People's armed forces must be maintained and developed with the brave and steeled People's Liberation Army as their foundation. We will have not only a powerful army but also a powerful air force and a powerful navy.

Opening address at the First Plenary Session of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (September 21, 1949).

Our principle is that the Party commands the gun, and the gun must never be allowed to command the Party.

"Problems of War and Strategy" (November 6, 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 224.

All our officers and fighters must always bear in mind that we are the great People's Liberation Army, we are the troops led by the great Communist Party of China. Provided we constantly observe the directives of the Party, we are sure to win.

"Manifesto of the Chinese People's Liberation Army" (October 1947), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 152.

Mao Zedong: On the Coalition Government

Section 3: Two Lines in the Anti-Japanese War

The Key to China's Problems

In speaking of the domestic situation, we have also to make a specific analysis of China's War of Resistance.

China is one of the five biggest countries taking part in the war against fascism and it is the principal country fighting the Japanese aggressors on the continent of Asia. Not only have the Chinese people played a very great role in the war against Japan, but they will also play a very great role in safeguarding peace in the postwar world and the decisive one in safeguarding peace in the East. China has made very great efforts to liberate herself and to help the allied countries during the eight years of the War of Resistance Against Japan. These efforts have been made primarily by the people of China. Vast numbers of officers and men in China's armies have fought and shed their blood at the front; the workers, peasants, intellectuals and industrialists of China have worked hard

in the rear; the Chinese overseas have made donations to support the war; and all the anti-Japanese political parties, except for such of their members as are opposed to the people, have played their part in the war. In short, with their blood and sweat, the Chinese people have heroically fought the Japanese aggressors for eight long years. But for a number of years the Chinese reactionaries have been spreading rumors and misleading public opinion in order to prevent the world from knowing the truth about the role played by the Chinese people in the war. Besides, there has as yet been no comprehensive summing-up of the varied experience gained by China during those eight years of war. Therefore, this congress should make a proper summing-up of all this experience in order to educate the people and provide our Party with a basis for the formulation of policy.

When it comes to such summing up, it is plain to all that there are two different guiding lines in China. One leads to the defeat of the Japanese aggressors, while the other not only makes their defeat impossible but in some respects actually helps them and undermines our War of Resistance.

The Kuomintang government's policy of passive resistance to Japan and its reactionary domestic policy of active repression of the people have resulted in military setbacks, enormous territorial losses, financial and economic crisis, oppression and hardship for the people and the disruption of national unity. This reactionary policy has been an obstruction to mobilizing and uniting all the anti-Japanese forces of the Chinese people for the effective prosecution of the war, and has hindered the awakening and unity of the people. Yet this political awakening and this unity have never ceased to develop, but have moved forward along a tortuous course, under the twofold repression of the Japanese aggressors and the Kuomintang government. Clearly, there have been two lines in China for a long time, the Kuomintang government's line of oppression of the people and of passive resistance, and the Chinese people's line of enhancing their own consciousness and unity for the waging of a people's war. Herein lies the key to all China's problems.

History Follows a Tortuous Course

To help people understand why this question of the two lines is the key to all of China's problems, it is necessary to trace the history of our War of Resistance Against Japan.

The Chinese people's War of Resistance has followed a tortuous course. It began as far back as 1931. On September 18 of that year, the Japanese aggressors occupied Shenyang, and within a few months they seized the three northeastern provinces. The Kuomintang government adopted a policy of nonresistance. But against the will of the Kuomintang government and led or assisted by the Chinese Communist Party, the people and a patriotic section of the troops of these provinces organized the Anti-Japanese Volunteers and the Anti-Japanese United Army and engaged in heroic guerrilla warfare. At one time this heroic guerrilla warfare grew to great dimensions and, despite many difficulties and setbacks, it has never been put down by the enemy. When the Japanese aggressors attacked Shanghai in 1932, a group of patriots in the Kuomintang once again defied the

will of the Kuomintang government and led the 19th Route Army in resisting the Japanese aggressors. In 1933 the Japanese aggressors invaded Rehe and Chaha'er Provinces, and for the third time a group of patriots in the Kuomintang defied the will of the Kuomintang government and cooperated with the Communist Party in organizing the Anti-Japanese Allied Army to resist the enemy. But in all this fighting against Japan support came entirely from the Chinese people, the Chinese Communist Party, other democratic groups and the patriotic Chinese overseas, while the Kuomintang government with its policy of nonresistance contributed nothing. On the contrary, the anti-Japanese actions in Shanghai and Chaha'er were both wrecked by the Kuomintang government itself. In 1933 it also destroyed the people's government which had been established in Fujian by the 19th Route Army.

Why did the Kuomintang government of that day adopt a policy of nonresistance? The main reason was that it had wrecked Kuomintang-Communist cooperation and the unity of the Chinese people in 1927.

In 1924 Dr. Sun Yat-sen, accepting the proposals of the Chinese Communist Party, called the First National Congress of the Kuomintang in which Communists took part, adopted the Three Great Policies of alliance with Russia, cooperation with the Communist Party and assistance to the peasants and workers, established the Huangpu Military Academy and formed the national united front of the Kuomintang, the Communist Party and all sections of the people. As a result, the reactionary forces in Guangdong Province were destroyed in 192425, the triumphant Northern Expedition was carried out during 192627, most of the areas along the Yangzi and Yellow Rivers were taken over, the Northern warlord government was defeated, and the people's struggle for liberation was unfolded on a scale never before seen in Chinese history. But at a critical moment in the progress of the Northern Expedition, in the late spring and early summer of 1927, the treacherous and reactionary policies of "party purge" and massacre adopted by the Kuomintang authorities wrecked this national united front—the united front of the Kuomintang, the Communist Party and all sections of the people, which embodied the Chinese people's cause of liberation—and all its revolutionary policies. Yesterday's allies, the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people, were now regarded as enemies, and yesterday's enemies, the imperialists and feudalists, were now regarded as allies. So, it came about that a sudden attack was perfidiously launched against the Chinese Communist Party and the people, and the great, dynamic and vigorous revolution was crushed. Thereupon unity was replaced by civil war, democracy by dictatorship, and a China full of brightness by a China covered in darkness. But the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people were neither cowed nor conquered nor exterminated. They picked themselves up, wiped off the blood, buried their fallen comrades and went into battle again. Holding high the great standard of revolution, they rose in armed resistance and over a vast territory in China they set up people's governments, carried out land reform, built up a people's army—the Chinese Red Army—and preserved and expanded the revolutionary forces of the Chinese people. Dr. Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary Three People's Principles,

which the Kuomintang reactionaries had discarded, were carried forward by the people, the Communist Party and other democrats.

After the invasion of the three northeastern provinces by the Japanese aggressors, the Chinese Communist Party in 1933, proposed to all the Kuomintang forces then attacking the revolutionary base areas and the Red Army that an armistice agreement be concluded to facilitate united resistance to Japan; this proposal was made with three conditions—that the attacks should stop, that the people should be granted democratic rights, and that the people should be armed. But the Kuomintang authorities rejected it.

From then on, the Kuomintang government's policy of civil war became increasingly vicious, while the voice of the Chinese people grows increasingly powerful in its demand for an end to civil war and for united resistance to Japan. All kinds of popular patriotic organizations were formed in Shanghai and many other places. Between 1934 and 1936, under the leadership of the Central Committee of our Party, the main forces of the Red Army north and south of the Yangzi River went through untold hardships and moved to northwestern China, joining forces with the Red Army units there. It was in those two years that the Chinese Communist Party decided on, and carried out, a new and comprehensive political line in keeping with the new situation—the line of the National United Front Against Japan, with united resistance to Japan and the establishment of a new-democratic republic as the goal of struggle. On December 9, 1935, the student masses in Beijing launched a heroic patriotic movement under our Party's leadership; they formed the Chinese National Liberation Vanguard Corps[231] and spread this movement to all the big cities in China. On December 12, 1936, two patriotic Kuomintang groups which favored resistance to Japan, the Northeastern Army and the 17th Route Army, together staged the famous Xian Incident in courageous opposition to the reactionary Kuomintang policy of compromising with Japan and massacring the people at home. Other patriots in the Kuomintang were likewise dissatisfied with the policy of the Kuomintang authorities at the time. These were the circumstances in which the Kuomintang authorities were forced to abandon their policy of civil war and to acknowledge the demands of the people. The peaceful settlement of the Xian Incident became the turning point; under the new circumstances internal cooperation took shape and the nationwide War of Resistance Against Japan began. In May

[231] The Chinese National Liberation Vanguard Corps, or to give its shorter name the National Vanguard Corps, was a revolutionary youth organization formed under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party in September 1936 by the progressive youth who participated in the December 9th Movement of 1935. After the outbreak of the War of Resistance, many of its members saw action and took part in building base areas behind the enemy lines. The organizations of the National Vanguard Corps in the Kuomintang areas were forcibly dissolved by the Chiang Kai-shek government in 1938; those in the Liberated Areas were later merged into the Association of Youth for National Salvation, an organization of even broader scope.

1937, shortly before the Lugouqiao Incident, [232] our Party called the historic national conference at which the new political line followed by the Central Committee of the Party since 1935 was endorsed.

From the Lugouqiao Incident of July 7, 1937 to the fall of Wuhan in October 1938, the Kuomintang government was relatively active in the war against Japan. During that period the largescale Japanese attacks and the mounting patriotic indignation of the whole people compelled the Kuomintang government to make resistance to the Japanese aggressors the centre of gravity of its policy, which made it easier to bring about an upsurge in the struggle of the whole army and people against Japan, and for a time there was a new and dynamic atmosphere. All the people, including the Communists and other democrats, earnestly hoped that the Kuomintang government would seize the opportunity, at a time when the nation was in peril and the people were filled with enthusiasm, to institute democratic reforms and put Dr. Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary Three People's Principles into practice. But their hopes came to nought. Even in those two years of relatively active resistance, the Kuomintang authorities continued to oppose the mobilization of the masses for a people's war and to place restrictions on the people's spontaneous efforts to unite for anti-Japanese and democratic action. While the Kuomintang government had somewhat changed its previous attitude to the Chinese Communist Party and the other anti-Japanese parties, it continued to deny them equal status and restrict their activities in many ways. Patriotic political prisoners were still kept in jail in large numbers. Above all, the Kuomintang government still maintained the oligarchic dictatorship it had established after launching the civil war in 1927, so that it was impossible to set up a democratic coalition government representing the unanimous will of the nation.

At the very beginning of this period, we Communists pointed out that there were two alternative lines for China's war of Resistance Against Japan, an all-embracing people's war leading to victory, or a partial war in which the people remained oppressed, leading to defeat. We also pointed out that the war would be protracted and would inevitably involve many obstacles and hardships, but that by their exertions the Chinese people were sure to win the final victory.

The People's War

During the same period the main forces of the Communist-led Red Army, which had moved to northwestern China, were redesignated as the Eighth Route Army of the Chinese National Revolutionary Army, while the Chinese Red Army's guerrilla units, which had remained in various places on both sides of the Yangzi River, were redesignated as the New Fourth Army of the Chinese National Revolutionary Army. The former went to fight on the northern China front and the latter on

[232] On July 7, 1937, the Japanese invading forces attacked the Chinese garrison at Lugouqiao, some ten kilometers southwest of Beijing. Under the influence of the ardent and nationwide anti-Japanese movement the Chinese troops put up resistance. This incident marked the beginning of the Chinese people's heroic War of Resistance Against Japan which lasted for eight years.

the central China front. During the civil war period, the Chinese Red Army, which had preserved and developed the democratic tradition of the Huangpu Military Academy and of the National Revolutionary Army of the Northern Expedition days, had at one time grown to several hundred thousand men. But by the beginning of the War of Resistance Against Japan it had been reduced to a few tens of thousands as a result of the ruthless destruction wrought in our southern base areas by the Kuomintang government, our losses during the Long March, and other causes. Consequently, there were some who looked down on this army and thought that the main reliance for resistance to Japan should be placed on the Kuomintang. But the people are the best judges. The people knew that despite their small number at the time, the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies were of high quality, that they alone could wage a real people's war and that boundless prospects would open up before them once they reached the anti-Japanese fronts and joined with the broad masses there. And the people were right. By now, as I make this report, our army has already expanded to 910,000 men, and the number of our rural militia, who are not withdrawn from normal productive work, has grown to more than 2,200,000. Despite the fact that our regular army is still numerically much smaller than that of the Kuomintang (counting the Kuomintang units under local as well as central control), it has already become the main force in China's War of Resistance, judging by the number of Japanese and puppet forces it is engaging and the extent of its battle fronts, by its combat effectiveness, by the mass support it enjoys in its operations, and by its political quality, cohesion and unity.

This army is powerful because all its members have a discipline based on political consciousness; they have come together and they fight not for the private interests of a few individuals or a narrow clique, but for the interests of the broad masses and of the whole nation. The sole purpose of this army is to stand firmly with the Chinese people and to serve them wholeheartedly.

Guided by this purpose, this army has an indomitable spirit and is determined to vanquish all enemies and never to yield. No matter what the difficulties and hardships, so long as a single man remains, he will fight on.

Guided by this purpose, this army has achieved remarkable unity in its own ranks and with those outside its ranks. Internally, there is unity between officers and men, between the higher and lower ranks, and between military work, political work and rear service work, and externally, there is unity between the army and the people, between the army and government organizations, and between our army and the friendly armies. It is imperative to overcome anything that impairs this unity.

Guided by this purpose, this army has a correct policy for winning over enemy officers and men and for dealing with prisoners of war. Without exception all members of the enemy forces who surrender, who come over to our side or who, after laying down their arms, wish to join in fighting

the common foe, are welcomed and given proper education. It is forbidden to kill, maltreat or insult any prisoner of war.

Guided by this purpose, this army has built up a system of strategy and tactics which is essential for the people's war. It is skilled in flexible guerrilla warfare conducted in accordance with the changing concrete conditions and is also skilled in mobile warfare.

Guided by this purpose, this army has built up a system of political work which is essential for the people's war and is aimed at promoting unity in its own ranks, unity with the friendly armies and unity with the people, and at disintegrating the enemy forces and ensuring victory in battle.

Guided by this purpose, the entire army, operating under conditions of guerrilla warfare, is able to utilize, and has in fact utilized, the intervals between battles and between training periods to produce grain and other necessities, thus becoming wholly, half or at least partly self-supporting, so that economic difficulties are overcome, living conditions improved and the burden on the people lightened. Every possibility has been exploited to establish a number of small-scale armaments works in various military base areas.

Furthermore, this army is powerful because it has the people's self-defense corps and the militia—the vast armed organizations of the masses—fighting in coordination with it. In the Liberated Areas of China all men and women, from youth to middle age, are organized in the people's anti-Japanese self-defense corps on a voluntary and democratic basis and without giving up their work in production. The cream of the self-defense corps, except for those who join the army or the guerrilla units, is brought into the militia. Without the cooperation of these armed forces of the masses it would be impossible to defeat the enemy.

Finally, this army is powerful because of its division into two parts, the main forces and the regional forces, with the former available for operations in any region whenever necessary and the latter concentrating on defending their own localities and attacking the enemy there in cooperation with the local militia and the self-defense corps. This division of labor has won the wholehearted support of the people. Without this correct division of labor—if, for example, attention was paid only to the role of the main forces while that of the regional forces were neglected—it would likewise be impossible to defeat the enemy in the conditions obtaining in China's Liberated Areas. Under the regional forces, numerous armed working teams have been organized, which are well trained and hence better qualified for military, political and mass work; they penetrate into the rearmost areas behind the enemy lines, strike at the enemy and arouse the masses to anti-Japanese struggle, thus giving support to the frontal military operations of the various Liberated Areas. In all this they have achieved great success.

Under the leadership of their democratic governments, all the anti-Japanese people in the Liberated Areas of China are called upon to join organizations of workers, peasants, youth and

women, and cultural, professional and other organizations, which will wholeheartedly perform various tasks in support of the armed forces. Those tasks are not limited to rallying the people to join the army, transporting grain for it, caring for soldiers' families and helping the troops in meeting their material needs. They also include mobilizing the guerrilla units, militia and self-defense corps to make widespread raids and lay land mines against the enemy, gather intelligence about him, comb out traitors and spies, transport and protect the wounded and take direct part in the army's operations. At the same time, the people in all the Liberated Areas are enthusiastically taking up various kinds of political, economic, cultural and health work. The most important thing in this connection is to mobilize everybody for the production of grain and other necessities and to ensure that all government institutions and schools, except in special cases, devote their free time to production for their own support in order to supplement the self-sufficiency production campaigns of the army and the people and thus help to create a great upsurge of production to sustain the protracted War of Resistance. In China's Liberated Areas, the enemy has wrought great havoc, and floods, droughts and damage by insect pests have been frequent. However, the democratic governments there have been leading the people in overcoming these difficulties in an organized way, and unprecedented results have been achieved by the great mass campaigns for pest extermination, flood control and disaster relief, thus making it possible to persevere in the protracted War of Resistance. In a word, everything for the front, everything for the defeat of the Japanese aggressors and for the liberation of the Chinese people—this is the general slogan, the general policy for the whole army and the whole people in the Liberated Areas of China.

Such is a real people's war. Only by waging such a people's war can we defeat the national enemy. The Kuomintang has failed precisely because of its desperate opposition to a people's war.

Once it is equipped with modern weapons, the army of China's Liberated Areas will become still more powerful and will be able to accomplish the final defeat of the Japanese aggressors.

Two Battle Fronts

From the very beginning there have been two fronts in China's War of Resistance, the Kuomintang front and the front of the Liberated Areas.

After the fall of Wuhan in October 1938, the Japanese aggressors stopped their strategic offensive against the Kuomintang front and gradually shifted their main forces to the front of the Liberated Areas; at the same time, taking advantage of the defeatist sentiments of the Kuomintang government, they declared their willingness to arrive at a compromise peace with it, and, adopting a policy designed to deceive the Chinese nation, they induced the traitor Wang Jingwei to leave Chongqing and establish a puppet government in Nanjing. The Kuomintang government then began to change its policy, gradually shifting the emphasis from resistance to Japan to opposition to the Communist Party and the people. This shift first made itself apparent in the military sphere. To

conserve its own military strength, the Kuomintang government adopted the policy of passive resistance to Japan; it threw the burden of fighting onto the front of the Liberated Areas by letting the Japanese invaders attack the Liberated Areas in force, while itself "sitting on top of the mountain to watch the tigers fight."

In 1939, the Kuomintang government adopted the reactionary "Measures for Restricting the Activities of Alien Parties" and completely deprived the people and the anti-Japanese parties of whatever rights they had won during the early period of the War of Resistance. From then on, in the Kuomintang areas, all the democratic parties, and first and foremost the Communist Party of China, have been driven underground by the Kuomintang government. In every province in those areas the prisons and concentration camps are packed with Communists, young patriots and other fighters for democracy. In the five years from 1939 to the autumn of 1943, the Kuomintang government launched three anti-Communist onslaughts [233] to split national unity, and thus created serious danger of civil war. It was in this period that the "disbanding" of the New Fourth Army was ordered and more than nine thousands of its troops in southern Anhui were annihilated—an event which shocked the world. To this very moment the attacks by Kuomintang troops on the forces of the Liberated Areas have not ceased, nor is there any sign that they will. At the same time, the Kuomintang reactionaries have been pouring out slanders and calumnies of all sorts. It is they who have fabricated such labels and expressions as "traitor party," "traitor army," "traitor areas," and "sabotaging the War of Resistance and endangering the state," for the purpose of maligning the Communist Party, the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies and the Liberated Areas. To meet the crisis, on July 7, 1939 the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party issued a manifesto setting forth the following slogans, "Persist in resistance and oppose capitulation! Persist in unity and oppose a split! Persist in progress and oppose retrogressions!" In those five years, our Party, acting on these timely slogans, vigorously repulsed the three reactionary and antipopular anti-Communist onslaughts and overcame the crisis on each occasion.

There was actually no serious fighting on the Kuomintang front during those years. The sword edge of Japanese aggression was mainly directed against the Liberated Areas. By 1943, the army and the people of the Liberated Areas were pinning down 64 percent of the Japanese forces invading China and 95 percent of the puppet troops, while the Kuomintang front faced only 36 percent of the former and 5 percent of the latter.

[233] For a fuller account of the three anti-Communist onslaughts, see "A Comment on the Sessions of the Kuomintang Central Executive Committee and of the People's Political Council," pp. 125139 of this volume.

In 1944 the Japanese aggressors launched operations to force China's north-south trunk railways open for through traffic; [234] panic-stricken, the Kuomintang forces were totally incapable of offering resistance. Within a few months extensive areas in Henan, Hunan, Guangxi and Guangdong Provinces had fallen into the enemy's hands. It was not until then that some change took place in the proportion of enemy forces engaged on the two fronts. Even so, at the moment of making this report, of the 40 divisions comprising 580,000 Japanese soldiers in China (not counting those in the three northeastern provinces), 22 1/2 divisions, comprising 320,000 men or 56 percent of the total forces, are engaged on the front of the Liberated Areas, and no more than 17 1/2 divisions, comprising 260,000 men or 44 percent, are engaged on the Kuomintang front. As for the puppet troops engaged on the two fronts, the ratio has not changed at all.

It should also be pointed out that the puppet troops, numbering more than 800,000 men (in both the regular and the local forces), are chiefly composed either of units that surrendered under their Kuomintang commanders or of units organized by the Kuomintang officers after their surrender. The Kuomintang reactionaries have furnished these puppet troops in advance with a false and traitorous theory, namely, "saving the nation by a devious path," and have given them moral and organizational support since their surrender, directing them to attack the Chinese people's Liberated Areas in coordination with the Japanese aggressors. These reactionaries have also mustered large forces, totaling no less than 797,000 men, to blockade and attack the Shaanxi-Gansu-Ningxia Border Region and other Liberated Areas. This grave situation is being kept from the knowledge of many Chinese and foreigners by the Kuomintang government's policy of suppressing news.

China's Liberated Areas

China's Liberated Areas, led by the Communist Party, now have a population of 95,500,000. They exist from Inner Mongolia in the north to Hainan Island in the south; almost everywhere the enemy goes, he finds the Eighth Route Army, the New Fourth Army or some other people's forces in operation. This vast liberated territory consists of nineteen major Liberated Areas, covering greater or lesser parts of the provinces of Liaoning, Rehe, Chaha'er, Suiyuan, Shaanxi, Gansu, Ningxia, Shanxi, Hebei, Henan, Shandong, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Anhui, Jiangxi, Hubei, Hunan, Guangdong and Fujian. Yanan is the centre from which guidance is given to all those Liberated Areas. The Shaanxi-Gansu-Ningxia Border Region west of the Yellow River, with a population of only 1,500,000, is but one of the nineteen areas forming this vast liberated part of China and, indeed, the smallest in population except for one in eastern Zhejiang Province and another on Hainan Island. Unaware of this, some people think China's liberated territory consists chiefly of the Shaanxi-Gansu-Ningxia Border Region. This misconception arises from the Kuomintang government's blockade. In every one of the

[234] These operations to force China's north-south trunk railways open for through traffic constituted the offensive launched in May 1944 by the Japanese army to seize the Guangzhou-Hankou Railway along its entire length and thus secure an uninterrupted land link between northern and southern China.

Liberated Areas, all the requisite policies of the Anti-Japanese National United Front have been put into practice, and popularly elected governments, that is, local coalition governments, have been or are being set up, in which Communists and representative personalities of other anti-Japanese parties or without any party affiliation are cooperating. The entire strength of the people has been mobilized in the Liberated Areas. As a result, despite the formidable pressure of the enemy, the Kuomintang's military blockade and attacks and the complete absence of outside help, China's Liberated Areas have stood firm and have grown steadily, reducing the territory occupied by the enemy and extending their own; they have become the model for a democratic China and the main force driving out the Japanese aggressors and liberating the Chinese people in military cooperation with the allied countries. The armed forces of China's Liberated Areas, the Eighth Route Army, the New Fourth Army and the other armed forces of the people, have not only set a heroic example in fighting Japan, but have also set an example in carrying out the democratic policies of the Anti-Japanese National United Front. The declaration issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on September 22, 1937 affirming that "Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three People's Principles being what China needs today, our Party is ready to fight for their complete realization," has been completely carried into effect in China's Liberated Areas.

The Kuomintang Areas

Persisting in its dictatorial rule, the chief ruling clique of the Kuomintang has followed a policy of passive resistance to Japan and a domestic policy directed against the people. In consequence, its armed forces have shrunk to less than half their original size and most of them have virtually lost their combat effectiveness; there is a profound rift between this clique and the broad masses and a grave crisis of mass impoverishment, seething discontent and widespread revolt; not only has its role in the war been sharply reduced, but it has also become an obstacle to the mobilization and unity of all the anti-Japanese forces of the Chinese people.

Why has such a grave situation arisen under the leadership of the Kuomintang's chief ruling clique? It has arisen because that clique represents the interests of China's big landlords, big bankers and big compradors. The handful of people forming this reactionary stratum monopolize all the important military, political, economic and cultural organizations under the Kuomintang government. They place the safeguarding of their own interests above resistance to Japan. They too say "the nation above all," but their actions do not accord with the demands of the great majority of the nation. They too say "the state above all," but what they mean is the feudal-fascist dictatorship of the big landlords, big bankers and big compradors, and not a democratic state of the people. Therefore, they are afraid of the rise of the people, afraid of the democratic movement and afraid of full mass mobilization for war against Japan. Herein lies the root cause of their policy of passive resistance to Japan and their reactionary domestic policy against the people, democracy and the Communist Party. They have a double-faced policy in everything. For instance, on the one hand they are resisting Japan but on the other they are pursuing a passive war policy, and moreover they are

the constant target of Japanese inducements to surrender. They talk about developing China's economy, but in fact they build up their own bureaucrat-capital, i.e., the capital of the big landlords, bankers and compradors, and monopolize the lifelines of China's economy, ruthlessly oppressing the peasants, the workers, the petit bourgeoisie and the non-monopoly bourgeoisie. They talk about putting "democracy" into practice and "handing state power back to the people," yet they ruthlessly suppress the people's movement for democracy and refuse to introduce the mildest democratic reform. They say that "the Communist problem is a political one and should be solved politically," yet they ruthlessly suppress the Chinese Communist Party militarily, politically and economically, regarding it as "enemy No. 1" and the Japanese aggressors as only "enemy No. 2," and day in and day out they busy themselves with preparations for a civil war and plots to annihilate the Communist Party. They say they will establish a "modern state," yet they work desperately to maintain the feudal-fascist dictatorship of the big landlords, bankers and compradors. While maintaining formal diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, they are in fact hostile to it. They chant "Asia before Europe" in chorus with the US isolationists in order to prolong the life of fascist Germany, which amounts to prolonging the life of fascists everywhere, including their own fascist rule over the Chinese people, yet at the same time they indulge in diplomatic manoeuvres, masquerading as antifascist heroes. If you look for the root of these contradictory double-faced policies, you will find they all stem from the social stratum of the big landlords, bankers and compradors.

Nevertheless, the Kuomintang is not a homogeneous political party. Though it is controlled and led by the reactionary clique representing the stratum of the big landlords, bankers and compradors, it must not be entirely identified with this clique. Some Kuomintang leaders do not belong to this clique by which they are even slighted, pushed aside or attacked. Many of its cadres and rank and file and many members of the Three People's Principles Youth League are dissatisfied with the leadership of this clique, and some even oppose it. The same is true of all the Kuomintang armies, government organs and economic and cultural institutions which this reactionary clique controls. There are quite a number of democratic elements in all of them. Moreover, the reactionary clique itself, divided as it is into several contending factions, is not a closeknit body. Undoubtedly it is wrong to regard the Kuomintang as a homogeneous body of reactionaries.

A Contrast

The Chinese people have come to see the sharp contrast between the Liberated Areas and the Kuomintang areas.

Are not the facts clear enough? Here are two lines, the line of a people's war and the line of passive resistance, which is against a people's war; one leads to victory even in the difficult conditions in China's Liberated Areas with their total lack of outside aid, and the other leads to defeat even in the extremely favorable conditions in the Kuomintang areas with foreign aid available.

The Kuomintang government attributes its failures to lack of arms.

Yet one may ask, which of the two are short of arms, the Kuomintang troops or the troops of the Liberated Areas? Of all China's forces, those of the Liberated Areas lack arms most acutely, their only weapons being those they capture from the enemy or manufacture under the most adverse conditions.

Is it not true that the forces directly under the Kuomintang central government are far better armed than the provincial troops? Yet in combat effectiveness most of the central forces are inferior to the provincial troops.

The Kuomintang commands vast reserves of manpower, yet its wrong recruiting policy makes manpower replenishment very difficult. Though cut off from each other by the enemy and engaged in constant fighting, China's Liberated Areas are able to mobilize inexhaustible manpower because the militia and self-defense corps system, which is well-adapted to the needs of the people, is applied everywhere, and because misuse and waste of manpower are avoided.

Although the Kuomintang controls vast areas abounding in grain and the people supply it with 70100 million *dan* annually, its army is always short of food and its soldiers are emaciated because the greater part of the grain is embezzled by those through whose hands it passes. But although most of China's Liberated Areas, which are located in the enemy rear, have been devastated by the enemy's policy of "burn all, kill all, loot all," and although some regions like northern Shaanxi are very arid, we have successfully solved the grain problem through our own efforts by increasing agricultural production.

The Kuomintang areas are facing a very grave economic crisis; most industries are bankrupt, and even such necessities as cloth have to be imported from the United States. But China's Liberated Areas are able to meet their own needs in cloth and other necessities through the development of industry.

In the Kuomintang areas, the workers, peasants, shop assistants, government employees, intellectuals and cultural workers live in extreme misery. In the Liberated Areas all the people have food, clothing and work.

It is characteristic of the Kuomintang areas that, exploiting the national crisis for profiteering purposes, officials have concurrently become traders and habitual grafters without any sense of shame or decency. It is characteristic of China's Liberated Areas that, setting an example of plain living and hard work, the cadres take part in production in addition to their regular duties; honesty is held in high esteem while graft is strictly prohibited.

In the Kuomintang areas the people have no freedom at all. In China's Liberated Areas the people have full freedom.

Who is to blame for all the anomalies which confront the Kuomintang rulers? Are others to blame, or they themselves? Are foreign countries to blame for not giving them enough aid, or are the Kuomintang government's dictatorial rule, corruption and incompetence to blame? Isn't the answer obvious?

Who Is "Sabotaging the War of Resistance and Endangering the State?"

In the light of the indisputable evidence, is it not the Kuomintang government itself that has been sabotaging the Chinese people's War of Resistance and endangering our country? For fully ten years that government devoted itself wholly to civil war, turning the edge of its sword against the people while utterly neglecting national defense, and by its policy of nonresistance it gave away the four northeastern provinces. When the Japanese aggressors drove south of the Great Wall, it put up a flurry of resistance and then retreated from Lugouqiao all the way to the province of Guizhou. Yet the Kuomintang alleges that "the Communist Party is sabotaging the War of Resistance and endangering the state" (see resolutions of the Eleventh Plenary Session of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang, held in September 1943). Its only evidence is that the Communist Party has united with all sections of the people to create the Liberated Areas which are heroically resisting Japan. The logic of the Kuomintang is so different from that of the Chinese people that the failure to arrive at a common language on many problems is not to be wondered at.

Here are two questions.

First, what exactly has made the Kuomintang government abandon so vast and so well populated a territory, stretching from Heilongjiang Province to Lugouqiao and from Lugouqiao to Guizhou? Can it be anything other than its policy first of nonresistance and then of passive resistance to Japan, and its domestic policy of opposing the people?

Second, what exactly has enabled China's Liberated Areas to smash the ruthless and prolonged attacks of the Japanese and puppet forces, to recover such vast territories and liberate such an immense population from the grip of the national enemy? Can it be anything other than our correct line, the line of a people's war?

"Disobedience To Governmental and Military Orders"

The Kuomintang government also constantly accuses the Chinese Communist Party of "disobedience to governmental and military orders." All we need say is that fortunately the Chinese Communists, sharing the common sense of the Chinese people, have not obeyed such "governmental and military orders" as in fact would have meant handing over to the Japanese aggressors the

Liberated Areas which the Chinese people had recaptured from them amid great difficulties and hardships. Some examples are the "Measures for Restricting the Activities of Alien Parties" in 1939, the orders for the "disbandment of the New Fourth Army" and for its "withdrawal north of the old course of the Yellow River" in 1941, the order for the "dissolution of the Communist Party of China" in 1943, the order for us to "disband all the troops except for ten divisions within a definite time limit" in 1944, and the proposal which the Kuomintang government called "a concession" in the recent talks with us and which would require us to hand over our armed forces and local governments in exchange for a few posts in its dictatorial government, but without the formation of a coalition government. Fortunately, we have not submitted to this sort of thing and have thus preserved an undefiled stretch of soil and a heroic anti-Japanese army for the Chinese people. Should not the Chinese people congratulate themselves on such "disobedience?" Does not the Kuomintang government feel it has done enough after presenting the Japanese aggressors with the vast populated area from Heilongjiang to Guizhou through its own fascist government decrees and defeatist military orders? The Japanese aggressors and the reactionaries welcome these "governmental and military orders," but can such things be welcomed by any upright Chinese patriot? Unless there is a coalition government, not in form but in fact, not a fascist dictatorship but a democratic government, is it conceivable that the Chinese people would permit the Chinese Communists to hand over the Liberated Areas where the people have won freedom as well as the people's armies that have performed signal service in the War of Resistance to the present Kuomintang government, which is defeatist, fascist and dictatorial? Without the Liberated Areas and the people's army, could the anti-Japanese cause of the Chinese people be what it is today? And can one possibly conceive what the future of the Chinese nation would be?

The Danger of Civil War

To this day the chief ruling clique in the Kuomintang is persisting in its reactionary policy of dictatorship and civil war. There are many signs that it has long been making, and is now stepping up, preparations to unleash civil war as soon as the forces of a certain allied country have cleared a considerable part of the Chinese mainland of the Japanese aggressors. It also hopes that the generals of certain allied countries will do the same job in China as the British General Scobie [235] has been doing in Greece. It applauds the butchery perpetrated by Scobie and the reactionary Greek government. It is planning to plunge China once again into the maelstrom of civil war, as in 192737. Behind the smokescreen of "convening the national assembly" and "political settlement," it is secretly preparing

[235] Scobie was the commander of the British imperialist forces of aggression in Greece. In October 1944, when the German invaders were retreating in defeat on the European continent, Scobie's troops entered the country, bringing with them the reactionary Greek government that had been in exile in London. Scobie directed and assisted this government in attacking the Greek People's Liberation Army, which had waged a long and heroic struggle against the German invaders, and in massacring Greek patriots, and so plunged Greece into a blood bath.

civil war. If our fellow-countrymen fail to take note, fail to expose its schemes and put a stop to these preparations, then one fine morning they will hear the cannonade of civil war.

Negotiations

After obtaining the consent of other democratic parties, the Communist Party of China put forward the demand at the People's Political Council in September 1944 that the Kuomintang one-party dictatorship be abolished immediately and a democratic coalition government be formed for the purpose of defeating the Japanese aggressors, building a new China and preventing civil war. This was undoubtedly a timely demand, and in the space of a few months it has won the warm response of the broad masses.

We have had many rounds of negotiations with the Kuomintang government on the question of abolishing the one-party dictatorship, forming a coalition government and instituting essential democratic reforms, but it has rejected all our proposals. Not only is the Kuomintang unwilling to abolish the one-party dictatorship and form a coalition government, it is unwilling to introduce a single one of the urgently needed democratic reforms, such as the abolition of the secret police, the annulment of the reactionary laws and decrees that suppress the people's freedom, the release of political prisoners, recognition of the legal status of the political parties, recognition of the Liberated Areas and the withdrawal of the armies blockading and attacking them. Consequently, political relations in China have become very strained.

Two Prospects

In the light of the situation as a whole and of the above analysis of the actual international and domestic state of affairs, I would ask everyone here to be on the alert and not to expect that our cause will proceed smoothly and easily. No, it will not. Actually, there are two possibilities, two prospects, one good and one bad. One possibility or prospect is that the fascist dictatorship will continue and democratic reforms will not be allowed, that the stress will be on opposing the people instead of the Japanese aggressors, and even that civil war may break out after the Japanese aggressors are defeated, dragging China back into her old miserable state, without independence, freedom, democracy, unity, prosperity or strength. This possibility or prospect is still there, and it has not ceased to exist or has not automatically vanished simply because of the favorable international situation and the increased political consciousness and organized strength of our people. Those who hope that this possibility or prospect will become a reality in China are the reactionary clique within the Kuomintang at home and the imperialist minded reactionaries abroad. This is one aspect which must be taken into account.

But there is another aspect and, again in the light of the situation as a whole and the foregoing analysis of the international and domestic state of affairs, we can gain added confidence and courage in striving for the second possibility or prospect. It is that of overcoming all difficulties, uniting the

whole people, abolishing the Kuomintang's fascist dictatorship, carrying out democratic reforms, consolidating and expanding the anti-Japanese forces, thoroughly defeating the Japanese aggressors and building an independent, free, democratic, united, prosperous and powerful new China. Those who hope that this possibility or prospect will become a reality in China are the masses, the Communist Party and the other democratic parties at home, and all the nations that treat us as equals and the progressives and the masses abroad.

We know full well that we Communists together with the whole Chinese people still face great difficulties and many obstacles and have a long and tortuous road to travel. But we know equally well that, together with the whole Chinese people, we shall overcome all the difficulties and obstacles and accomplish the task which history has entrusted China. The great task for us and for the whole people is to avert the first possibility or prospect and work for the second with every ounce of our energy. Essentially the international and domestic situation favors us Communists together with the Chinese people as a whole. This I have already made quite clear. We hope that the Kuomintang authorities will have the courage to change their present wrong policies in view of the general world trend and the popular feeling in China, so that the war can be won, the sufferings of the Chinese people can be reduced and a new China can soon be brought into being. It must be understood that, however tortuous the road, the Chinese people will certainly accomplish the task of achieving independence and liberation, and that the time has come for them to do so. It falls to our generation to fulfil the great aspirations cherished by countless martyrs in the past century, and any attempt to stop us will undoubtedly end in failure.

Unit 7. The Party of the Proletariat .

Topics covered:

X. The Communist Party.
XI. The Party in backward countries. Mao Tse-tung's thesis.
XII. Ideological-political and organizational building of the Party.
XIII. The Communist Party in the country.

Bibliography:

- Chen Po-ta:
  - Mao Tse-tung on the Chinese Revolution, Chapter VIII.
- Lenin:
  - What is to be Done?, Chapter IV.
  - Conditions of Admission to the III International.
- Mao Zedong:
  - Quotations, Chapter I, X, XI, XII, XXV, XXIX.
- Mariátegui:

- Act of the Foundation of CPP
- Marx:
  - General Statutes of the International Workingmen's Association.
- CPSU(b):
  - History of the CPSU(b), Chapter II, Point IV.
- Stalin:
  - Foundations of Leninism. Chapter VIII.

Selection:

Chen Po-ta: Mao Zedong on the Chinese Revolution.

Section 8: Problems on the Building of the Party

The process through which Comrade Mao Zedong has synthesized Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution is also the process through which the Communist Party of China has become daily more Bolshevized.

How can all the correct lines of the Party be consistently carried out and become mass lines? How can all the possibilities which the Party points out and is struggling for be turned into realities? The central problem is the problem concerning the Party itself.

Comrade Mao Zedong has often said that with-out a Bolshevized party of the Lenin-Stalin type, the victory of the Chinese revolution would be impossible. Comrade Mao Zedong says:

"If we want to carry on the revolution, we must have a revolutionary party of the Lenin-Stalin type. Without such a revolutionary party, built in accordance with the revolutionary theory and style of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin, it is impossible to lead the working class and the broad masses of the people to vanquish imperialism and its jackals. In the period of more than one hundred years since Marxism came into being, it was only when the Russian Bolshevik Party set an example in leading the October Revolution and Socialist construction and in defeating fascist aggression that revolutionary parties of the new type were established and developed on a worldwide scale. With such new revolutionary parties, the physiognomy of the world revolution has changed. The change has been so radical that trans-formations utterly inconceivable to people of the older generation have spectacularly taken place. The Communist Party of China is precisely a party established and developed after the model of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Since the Communist Party of China came into being, the Chinese revolution has assumed an entirely new physiognomy." [236]

Without a compact Marxist-Leninist theory, it would be impossible to have such a revolutionary party. As Lenin's maxim states:

[236] *World Revolutionary Forces Unite Against Imperialist Aggression.*

"The role of vanguard can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by an advanced theory." [237]

Stalin says in the conclusion of The History of the *Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks),* Short Course:

"Only a party which has mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory can confidently advance and lead the working class forward."

Comrade Mao Zedong firmly believed that our Party, in order to be fully competent to shoulder a series of great historical tasks and to be really capable of leading the Chinese people from one victory to another, must first of all bring about Marxist-Leninist ideological unity in its own ranks, raise the ideological level of Marxism-Leninism in the whole of the Party and consolidate the correct leadership of Marxism-Leninism. Comrade Mao Zedong said:

"To defeat the enemy, our ranks must be in good order, our steps in perfect co-ordination, our troops well-trained, and our weapons well-made." [238]

As viewed by Comrade Mao Zedong, what is the foundation for the good order in our ranks and for our steps to be in perfect co-ordination? It is Marxist-Leninist unity. How can we become well-trained troops? How can our weapons become good weapons? Only by raising the ideological level of Marxism-Leninism throughout the Party. Comrade Mao Zedong said:

"But if we can make ourselves masters of the science of Marxism-Leninism and have faith in the masses, stand closely by them and lead them forward, we shall be fully able to surmount any obstacle and overcome any difficulty. And our strength will be invincible." [239]

Thus, Comrade Mao Zedong could not but make considerable efforts to fight against various erroneous ideologies and to build and consolidate our Party ideologically.

Comrade Mao Zedong has very clearly linked the attitude towards Marxism-Leninism with Party spirit and regards the two as being identical. He pointed out:

"Without a scientific attitude or with an incompletely scientific attitude or, in other words, not having, or having only but incompletely, the Marxist attitude to the unity of theory and practice is to be devoid of Party spirit or deficient in it." [240]

Two subjectivist ideologies, dogmatism and empiricism, which had made their appearance in the Party and which the Party had to oppose with great vigor were pointed out with extreme conciseness by Comrade Mao Zedong. He said: "Arising from two opposite extremes, dogmatism and

[237] *What Is to Be Done?*
[238] *Rectify the Party's Style of Work*
[239] *The Present Situation and Our Tasks.*
[240] *Reform Our Study.*

empiricism alike are subjectivism." Emerging from two opposite extremes, both ideologies converged into a common fundamental point, that is, one-sidedness.

"Both see only a part rather than the whole." [241]

On the basis of this one-sidedness which they have in common, both ideologies, in face of certain practical problems at a given time, would link up with each other and arrive at a common viewpoint. These two subjectivist ideologies constituted the foundation of the ideology of all those who were guilty of either Right opportunism or "Left" opportunism within the Party. They deviated completely from Marxism-Leninism in epistemology, and became the most fundamental problem in the inner-Party struggle between correct ideology and erroneous ideology. Therefore, Comrade Mao Zedong deemed it essential to defeat opportunism on this most fundamental ideological problem, with a view to effectively combating various forms of opportunism.

The petty bourgeoisie is the social basis of these two kinds of subjectivism. The reason why these erroneous reactionary ideologies were so serious with us was that a considerable number of our Party members came from the petty bourgeoisie. As Comrade Mao Zedong has said:

> "China is a country with a very large petty bourgeoisie. Our Party is surrounded by this enormous class; many of our Party members come from this class and it is unavoidable that each of them joins the Party with a long or short petty-bourgeois tail on him." [242]

Therefore, Comrade Mao Zedong has never relaxed his fight against subjectivist ideologies which he began a long time ago. In 1929, Comrade Mao Zedong had already concretely pointed out that it was necessary to:

> (1) "teach Party members to apply, in place of subjective analysis and appraisal, the Marxist-Leninist method in analyzing a political situation and appraising class forces;"
>
> (2) "direct the Party members' attention to social and economic investigations and studies, to determine thereby the tactics of struggle and the methods of work, and make comrades understand that straying from the investigation of actual conditions they will fall into the abyss of phantasy and adventurism." [243]

In 1937, generalizing from his long experiences, Comrade Mao Zedong wrote his outstanding philosophical works, *On Practice* and *On Contradiction*, which were directed against these two kinds of subjectivism. The rectification movement which Comrade Mao Zedong initiated later, and which was of extremely great historic significance in the history of our Party was launched because of such subjectivist ideologies.

---

[241] *Rectify the Party's Style of Work*
[242] *Oppose Stereotyped Party Writing.*
[243] *On Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party.*

One of the very salient contributions made by Comrade Mao Zedong in relation to the problems concerning the Party was his exposure of these two kinds of subjectivism—dogmatism and empiricism—which stemmed from two opposite extremes and which could end in convergence and his pointing out of the correct orientation in overcoming these two kinds of subjectivism. Comrade Mao Zedong said:

"In opposing subjectivism, therefore, we must make each of the two above-mentioned types of people develop the aspect in which they are found wanting, and make each type complement itself with the strong qualities of the other. Those with knowledge of books must turn to actuality, so that they will develop, and not stop dead at books or commit the mistake of dogmatism. Those who have working experience must turn to the study of theory and take up reading seriously, so that they can systematize and synthesize their experiences to raise them to a theoretical plane, and will not erroneously take partial experiences for the universal truth or commit the mistake of empiricism." [244]

To be guided by the orientation pointed out by Comrade Mao Zedong means the attainment of the unity of theory and practice. In the exposition of his views, Comrade Mao Zedong has made frequent use of the following well-known saying of Stalin:

> "Theory becomes aimless if it is not connected with revolutionary practice, just as practice gropes in the dark if its path is not illumined by revolutionary theory." [245]

The error of dogmatism belongs to the former category; the error of empiricism belongs to the latter. To correct both errors means to achieve unity of theory and practice.

To combine the study of the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin with a continuous study of the experiences of the masses such is the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong. This is what Comrade Mao Zedong calls "the synthesis of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution."

Based on the experience of our Party in the field of leadership, Comrade Mao Zedong has pointed out:

> "In all practical work of our Party, any correct leadership must come from the masses and return to the masses. This means that we should assemble the scattered, unsystematic opinions of the masses, make a study of them, and crystallize them into systematized ideas. Then we propagate these ideas among the masses, explain them, and turn them into ideas of the masses themselves. The masses are further guided to hold on persistently to these ideas through their actions, and, through such mass actions, to test their correctness. Subsequent opinions of the masses are then again crystallized and returned to the masses for them to hold

[244] *Rectify the Party's Style of Work.*
[245] *The Foundations of Leninism.*

on persistently. Such an unending cycle brings to us each time a higher degree of correctness, vividness, and richness. This is the Marxist-Leninist epistemology or methodology." [246]

How can we continually crystallize the opinions and experiences of the masses and then apply such crystallized opinions and experiences to the masses? It is by adhering to the general guiding principles of Marxism-Leninism. The empiricists, forsaking the general guiding principles of Marxism-Leninism, could only linger in a condition of scattered and unsystematic opinions. The dogmatists, forsaking the opinions and the new experiences of the masses, were unable to conduct any research or to crystallize and systematize the opinions of the masses. All this doomed their leadership to errors and doomed the work under their leadership to failure.

The 30-year history of our Party is the history of the struggle between the correct Marxist-Leninist leadership and the erroneous, anti-Marxist-Leninist leadership. It is also the history in which Comrade Mao Zedong's correct leadership has defeated the erroneous leadership, thereby overcoming the setbacks and difficulties encountered in the revolution, and leading the revolution finally to its great victory.

The struggle carried out by this correct leadership in ideologically opposing subjectivism and in politically opposing opportunism was linked with the fight against sectarianism in organisational matters.

Petty-bourgeois narrow-mindedness takes the form of sectarianism in political life and in organisation, in addition to one-sidedness in ideology. Subjectivism means ideological isolation from the masses both inside and outside the Party, while sectarianism means political and organisational isolation from the masses both inside and outside the Party. They are two aspects of one and the same thing. Such sectarianism once produced evil consequences over a long period.

In 1929, Comrade Mao Zedong severely attacked cliquism, pointing out that "it is possessed of a great corrosive and centrifugal effect." [247] The so-called cliquism means sectarianism. In 1942, Comrade Mao Zedong said:

"After twenty years' steeling our Party is no longer dominated by sectarianism. Remnants of sectarianism, however, still exist both in the Party's internal and external relations. Sectarianism in the Party's internal relations leads to mutual exclusiveness among ourselves and affects the unity and solidarity of the Party. Sectarianism in the Party's external relations leads to our exclusiveness of all non-Party people and hinders the Party in its task of uniting the people of the whole country. The Party can advance unimpeded in its great mission of achieving solidarity among all the comrades of the Party and all the people of the country only when these two evils are eradicated." [248]

---

[246] *The Central Committee's Decisions on Methods of Leadership.*
[247] *Combat Liberalism.*
[248] *Rectify the Party's Style of Work.*

Another very salient contribution made by Comrade Mao Zedong in relation to the problems of the Party was that by hoisting this banner against sectarianism he consolidated the entire ranks of the Party and developed correct relations between the Party and the masses. Obviously, it is only when we are ideologically and politically correct and only when we are correct in inner-Party relations and in relations with the masses that our victory will become inevitable.

How can we most effectively overcome to a great extent subjectivism and sectarianism within our Party? Since our Party, because of historical conditions, includes a large number of members of petty-bourgeois origin, to overcome their various mistakes and to consolidate the unity of the Party requires that we adopt an attitude at once serious and prudent rather than liberalistic and rash.

The third salient contribution made by Comrade Mao Zedong in relation to the problems concerning the Party was that he advanced a form of movement befitting our inner-Party struggle, that is, the form of the rectification movement, the study movement. The form of this movement consists in organizing, under the unified leadership of the Party, and among the Party cadres and the masses of Party members, an adequate study and discussion of problems of our inner-Party history, the problem of errors within the Party, and Marxist-Leninist literature and Party documents to be made available to them by the Party; and in adopting the form of criticism and self-criticism with a view to leading them along the road of ideological and political consciousness and making them, with the assistance of the Party, consciously "stick to truth and correct mistakes." The purpose of the movement is described by Comrade Mao Zedong as follows:

> "First: take warning from the past so as to be more careful in the future; and second: treat the illness in order to cure the patient. We must ruthlessly expose all past errors and analyze and criticize them scientifically so that we will take greater care in our future work and do better. This is the meaning of the first principle. But we have the same aim in exposing errors and criticizing defects as a doctor in his treatment of a case, that is, to treat the illness but not to kill the patient. A person suffering from acute appendicitis will recover if his appendix is removed by the surgeon. Any person who has committed errors, no matter how serious, is welcome to treatment until he is sound again and becomes a good comrade, so long as he does not conceal his malady for fear of taking medicine, i.e., does not persist in his errors until he becomes incorrigible, but honestly and sincerely wishes to be cured and made better." [249]

This is what Comrade Mao Zedong has stated repeatedly:

"For the twofold purpose of clarifying ideology and uniting the comrades."

In other words, in dealing with the erroneous ideologies within the Party, we need a serious attitude as opposed to liberalism and a prudent attitude as opposed to harshness. That this has

[249] *Ibid.*

greatly benefited our Party and has been very successful is verified by the history of our Party since the initiation of the rectification movement in 1942.

As can be seen, the rectification movement altered the physiognomy of our Party very profoundly and on a vast scale. First, the Marxist-Leninist ideological level has thus been greatly elevated throughout our Party. Secondly, our Party membership has rallied with unprecedented unity around the Central Committee and Comrade Mao Zedong. These two aspects have ensured and are ensuring that the political line of Comrade Mao Zedong is carried through in every respect, enabling us to defeat one enemy after another.

In April, 1945, the Party held its Seventh Congress. It was this Congress that unified the whole of the Party, summarized the achievements of the Party resulting from the carrying out of Comrade Mao Zedong's correct policy during the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression and laid the groundwork for the victory of the people of the whole country. The political report which Comrade Mao Zedong delivered at the Congress set forth the policy and programme for rallying the entire Party and the people of the country in the struggle for nationwide victory of the revolution. The march of events during the past six years has testified to the total correctness of the political line decided upon at the Congress, as evidenced by the complete realization of the nation-wide victory of the great revolution. This Congress was held on the basis of the ideological rectification movement, and the whole body of the Party cadres, having gone through this movement, were therefore able to carry out triumphantly the historical task assigned them by the Congress.

The casualties in the ideological rectification movement were nothing but subjectivism and sectarianism together with the form in which they manifested themselves-Party jargon. What was gained was that our Party made ideological preparation for and gave political leadership to the victory of the people's great revolution against imperialism.

That is to say, under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong, our Party has become a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party capable of shouldering any historical task. That is to say, under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong, following the example of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, our Party has become a Bolshevized revolutionary party.

Herein lies the reason why our continued advance and our victory in future tasks are assured.

V. I. Lenin: What Is to Be Done?

Chapter 4: The Primitiveness of the Economists and the Organization of the Revolutionaries

Rabocheye Dyelo's assertions, which we have analyzed, that the economic struggle is the most widely applicable means of political agitation and that our task now is to lend the economic struggle itself a political character, etc., express a narrow view, not only of our political, but also of our organizational tasks. The "economic struggle against the employers and the government" does not at all require an all-Russia centralized organization, and hence this struggle can never give rise to such an organization as will combine, in one general assault, all the manifestations of political opposition,

protest, and indignation, an organization that will consist of professional revolutionaries and be led by the real political leaders of the entire people. This stands to reason. The character of any organization is naturally and inevitably determined by the content of its activity. Consequently, *Rabocheye Dyelo*, by the assertions analyzed above, sanctifies and legitimizes not only narrowness of political activity, but also of organizational work. In this case, *Rabocheye Dyelo*, as always, proves itself an organ whose consciousness yields to spontaneity. Yet subservience to spontaneously developing forms of organisation, failure to realize the narrowness and primitiveness of our organisational work, of our "handicraft" methods in this most important sphere, failure to realize this, I say, is a veritable ailment from which our movement suffers. It is not an ailment that comes with decline, but one, of course, that comes with growth. It is however at the present time, when the wave of spontaneous indignation, as it were, is sweeping over us, leaders and organizers of the movement, that an irreconcilable struggle must be waged against all defense of backwardness, against any legitimation of narrowness in this matter. It is particularly necessary to arouse in all who participate in practical work, or are preparing to take up that work, discontent with the *amateurism* prevailing among us and an unshakable determination to rid ourselves of it.

Section A: WHAT IS PRIMITIVENESS?

We shall try to answer this question by giving a brief description of the activity of a typical Social-Democratic study circle of the period 1894-1901. We have noted that the entire student youth of the period was absorbed in Marxism. Of course, these students were not only, or even not so much, interested in Marxism as a theory; they were interested in it as an answer to the question, "What is to be done?", as a call to take the field against the enemy. These new warriors marched to battle with astonishingly primitive equipment and training. In a vast number of cases, they had almost no equipment and absolutely no training. They marched to war like peasants from the plough, armed only with clubs. A students' circle establishes contacts with workers and sets to work, without any connection with the old members of the movement, without any connection with study circles in other districts, or even in other parts of the same city (or in other educational institutions), without any organisation of the various divisions of revolutionary work, without any systematic plan of activity covering any length of time. The circle gradually expands its propaganda and agitation; by its activities it wins the sympathies of fairly large sections of workers and of a certain section of the educated strata, which provide it with money and from among whom the "committee" recruits new groups of young people. The attractive power of the committee (or League of Struggle) grows, its sphere of activity becomes wider, and the committee expands this activity quite spontaneously; the very people who a year or a few months previously spoke at the students' circle gatherings and discussed the question, "Whither?", who established and maintained contacts with the workers and wrote and published leaflets, now, establish contacts with other groups of revolutionaries, procure literature, set to work to publish a local newspaper, begin to talk of organizing a demonstration, and finally turn to open warfare (which may, according to circumstances, take the form of issuing the first agitational leaflet or the first issue of a newspaper, or of organizing the first demonstration). Usually,

the initiation of such actions ends in an immediate and complete fiasco. Immediate and complete, because this open warfare was not the result of a systematic and carefully thought-out and gradually prepared plan for a prolonged and stubborn struggle, but simply the result of the spontaneous growth of traditional study circle work; because, naturally, the police, in almost every case, knew the principal leaders of the local movement, since they had already "gained a reputation" for themselves in their student days, and the police waited only for the right moment to make their raid. They deliberately allowed the study circle sufficient time to develop its work so that they might, obtain a palpable *corpus delicti*, and they always permitted several of the persons known to them to remain at liberty "for breeding" (which, as far as I know, is the technical term used both by our people and by the gendarmes). One cannot help comparing this kind of warfare with that conducted by a mass of peasants, armed with clubs, against modern troops. And one can only wonder at the vitality of the movement which expanded, grew, and scored victories despite the total lack of training on the part of the fighters. True, from the historical point of view, the primitiveness of equipment was not only inevitable at first, but *even legitimate* as one of the conditions for the wide recruiting of fighters, but as soon as serious war operations began (and they began in fact with the strikes in the summer of 1896), the defects in our fighting organisations made themselves felt to an ever-increasing degree. The government, at first thrown into confusion and committing a number of blunders (e.g., its appeal to the public describing the misdeeds of the socialists, or the banishment of workers from the capitals to provincial industrial centers), very soon adapted itself to the new conditions of the struggle and managed to deploy well its perfectly equipped detachments of *agents provocateurs*, spies, and gendarmes. Raids became so frequent, affected such a vast number of people, and cleared out the local study circles so thoroughly that the masses of the workers lost literally all their leaders, the movement assumed an amazingly sporadic character, and it became utterly impossible to establish continuity and coherence in the work. The terrible dispersion of the local leaders; the fortuitous character of the study circle memberships; the lack of training in, and the narrow outlook on, theoretical, political, and organisational questions were all the inevitable result of the conditions described above. Things have reached such a pass that in several places the workers, because of our lack of self-restraint and the inability to maintain secrecy, begin to lose faith in the intellectuals and to avoid them; the intellectuals, they say, are much too careless and cause police raids!

Anyone who has the slightest knowledge of the movement is aware that all thinking Social-Democrats have at last begun to regard these amateurish methods as a disease. In order that the reader who is not acquainted with the movement may have no grounds for thinking that we are "inventing" a special stage or special disease of the movement, we shall refer once again to the witness we have quoted. We trust we shall be forgiven for the length of the passage:

> "While the gradual transition to more extensive practical activity," writes B-v in *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 6, "a transition that is directly dependent on the general transitional period through which the Russian working-class movement is now passing, is a characteristic feature, . . . there is, however, another, no less interesting feature in the general mechanism of the Russian

workers' revolution. *We refer to the general lack of revolutionary forces fit for action*, [all italics ours — Lenin] which is felt not only in St. Petersburg, but throughout Russia. With the general revival of the working-class movement, with the general development of the working masses, with the growing frequency of strikes, with the increasingly open mass struggle of the workers, and with the intensified government persecution, arrests, deportation, and exile, this *lack of highly skilled revolutionary forces is becoming more and more marked* and, without a doubt, *cannot but affect the depth and the general character of the movement.* Many strikes take place without any strong and direct influence upon them by the revolutionary organisations.... A shortage of agitational leaflets and illegal literature Is felt.... The workers' study circles are left without agitators.... In addition, there is a constant dearth of funds. In a word, *the growth of the working-class movement is outstripping the growth and development of the revolutionary organisations.* The numerical strength of the active revolutionaries is too small to enable them to concentrate in their own hands the influence exercised upon the whole mass of discontented workers, or to give this discontent even a shadow of coherence and organisation.... The separate study circles, the separate revolutionaries, scattered, uncombined, do not represent a single, strong, and disciplined organisation with proportionately developed parts. . . ." Admitting that the immediate organization of fresh study circles to replace those that have been broken up merely proves the vitality of the movement ... but does not prove the existence of an adequate number of adequately prepared revolutionary workers, the author concludes: "The lack of practical training among the St. Petersburg revolutionaries is seen in the results of their work. The recent trials, especially that of the Self-Emancipation Group and the Labor-against-Capital group, clearly showed that the young agitator, lacking a detailed knowledge of working class conditions and, consequently, of the conditions under which agitation can be carried on in a given factory, ignorant of the principles of secrecy, and understanding only the general principles of Social-Democracy [if he does], is able to carry on his work for perhaps four, five, or six months. Then come arrests, which frequently lead to the break-up of the entire organisation, or at all events, of part of it. The question arises; therefore, can the group conduct successful activity if its existence is measured by months?... Obviously, the defects of the existing organisations cannot be wholly ascribed to the transitional period.... Obviously, the numerical, and above all the qualitative, make-up of the functioning organisations is no small factor, and the first task our Social-Democrats must undertake ... is that of *effectively combining the organisations and making a strict selection of their membership."*

Section B: Primitiveness and Economism

We must now deal with a question that has undoubtedly come to the mind of every reader. Can a connection be established between primitiveness as growing pains that affect the *whole* movement, and Economism, which is *one* of the currents in Russian Social-Democracy? We think that it can. Lack of practical training, of ability to carry on organisational work is certainly common *to us all*, including those who have from the very outset unswervingly stood for revolutionary Marxism. Of

course, were it only lack of practical training, no one could blame the practical workers. But the term "primitiveness" embraces something more than lack of training; it denotes a narrow scope of revolutionary work generally, failure to understand that a good organisation of revolutionaries cannot be built on the basis of such narrow activity, and lastly — and this is the main thing — attempts to justify this narrowness and to elevate it to a special "theory", i.e., subservience to spontaneity on this question too. Once such attempts were revealed, it became clear that primitiveness is connected with Economism and that we shall never rid ourselves of this narrowness of our organisational activity until we rid ourselves of Economism generally (i.e., the narrow conception of Marxist theory, as well as of the role of Social-Democracy and of its political tasks). These attempts manifested themselves in a twofold direction. Some began to say that the working masses themselves have not yet advanced the broad and militant political tasks which the revolutionaries are attempting to "impose" on them; that they must continue to struggle for *immediate* political demands, to conduct "the economic struggle against the employers and the government" [250] (and, naturally, corresponding to this struggle which is "accessible" to the mass movement there must be an organisation that will be "accessible" to the most untrained youth). Others, far removed from any theory of "gradualness", said that it is possible and necessary to "bring about a political revolution", but that this does not require building a strong organisation of revolutionaries to train the proletariat in steadfast and stubborn struggle. All we need do is to snatch up our old friend, the "accessible" cudgel. To drop metaphor, it means that we must organize a general strike, [251] or that we must stimulate the "spiritless" progress of the working-class movement by means of "excitative terror". [252] Both these trends, the opportunists and the "revolutionists", bow to the prevailing amateurism; neither believes that it can be eliminated, neither understands our primary and imperative practical task to establish *an organisation of revolutionaries* capable of lending energy, stability, and continuity to the political struggle.

We have quoted the words of B-v: "The growth of the working-class movement is outstripping the growth and development of the revolutionary organisations." This "valuable remark of a close observer" (*Rabocheye Dyelo*'s comment on B-v's article) has a twofold value for us. It shows that we were right in our opinion that the principal cause of the present crisis in Russian Social-Democracy is the *lag of the leaders* ("ideologists", revolutionaries, Social-Democrats) behind *the spontaneous upsurge of the masses*. It shows that all the arguments advanced by the authors of the Economist letter (in *Iskra*, No. 12), by Krichevsky and by Martynov, as to the danger of belittling the significance of the spontaneous element, of the drab everyday struggle, as to tactics-as-process, etc., are nothing more than a glorification and a defense of primitiveness. These people who cannot pronounce the word "theoretician" without a sneer, who describe their genuflections to common lack of training and

[250] Rabochaya Mysl and Rabocheye Dyelo, especially the Reply to Plekhanov. — Lenin
[251] See "Who Will Bring About the Political Revolution?" in the collection published in Russia, entitled The Proletarian Struggle. Re-issued by the Kiev Committee. — Lenin
[252] Regeneration of Revolutionism and the journal Svoboda. — Lenin

backwardness as a "sense for the realities of life", reveal in practice a failure to understand our most imperative *practical* tasks. To laggards they shout: Keep in step! Don't run ahead! To people suffering from a lack of energy and initiative in organisational work, from a lack of "plans" for wide and bold activity, they prate about "tactics-as-process"! The worst sin we commit is that we *degrade* our political *and organisational* tasks to the level of the immediate, "palpable", "concrete" interests of the everyday economic struggle; yet they keep singing to us the same refrain: Lend the economic struggle itself a political character! We repeat: this kind of thing displays as much "sense for the realities of life" as was displayed by the hero in the popular fable who cried out to a passing funeral procession, "Many happy returns of the day!"

Recall the matchless, truly "Narcissus-like" superciliousness with which these wiseacres lectured Plekhanov on the "workers' *circles* generally" (sic!) being "unable to cope with political tasks in the real and *practical* sense of the word, i.e., in the sense of the expedient and successful *practical* struggle for political demands" (*Rabocheye Dyelo's Reply,* p. 24). There are circles and circles, gentlemen! Circles of "amateurs" are not, of course, capable of coping with political tasks so long as they have not become aware of their amateurism and do not abandon it. If, besides this, these amateurs are enamored of their primitive methods, and insist on writing the word "practical" in italics, and imagine that being practical demands that one's tasks be reduced to the level of understanding of the most backward strata of the masses, then they are hopeless amateurs and, of course, certainly cannot *in general cope with any political tasks*. But a circle of leaders, of the type of Alexeyev and Myshkin, of Khalturin and Zhelyabov, is capable of coping with political tasks in the genuine and most practical sense of the term, for the reason and to the extent that their impassioned propaganda meets with response among the spontaneously awakening masses, and their sparkling energy is answered and supported by the energy of the revolutionary class. Plekhanov was profoundly right, not only in pointing to this revolutionary class and proving that its spontaneous awakening was inevitable, but in setting even the "workers' circles" a great and lofty political task. But you refer to the mass movement that has sprung up since that time in order to *degrade* this task, to *curtail* the energy and scope of activity of the "workers' circles". If you are not amateurs enamored of your primitive methods, what are you then? You boast that you are practical, but you fail to see what every Russian practical worker knows, namely, the miracles that the energy, not only of a circle, but even of an individual person is able to perform in the revolutionary cause. Or do you think that our movement cannot produce leaders like those of the seventies? If so, why do you think so? Because we lack training? But we are training ourselves, we will go on training ourselves, and we will be trained! Unfortunately, it is true that the surface of the stagnant waters of the "economic struggle against the employers and the government" is overgrown with fungus; people have appeared among us who kneel in prayer to spontaneity, gazing with awe (to take an expression from Plekhanov) upon the "posterior" of the Russian proletariat. But we will get rid of this fungus. The time has come when Russian revolutionaries, guided by a genuinely revolutionary theory, relying upon the genuinely revolutionary and spontaneously awakening class, can at last — at long last! — rise to full stature in

all their giant strength. All that is required is for the masses of our practical workers, and the still larger masses of those who dreamed of practical work when they were still at school, to pour scorn and ridicule upon any suggestion that may be made to degrade our political tasks and to restrict the scope of our organisational work. And we will achieve that, rest assured, gentlemen!

In the article "Where To Begin", I wrote in opposition to *Rabocheye Dyelo*: "The tactics of agitation in relation to some special question, or the tactics with regard to some detail of party organisation may be changed in twenty-four hours; but only people devoid of all principle are capable of changing, in twenty-four hours, or, for that matter, in twenty-four months, their view on the necessity — in general, constantly, and absolutely — of an organisation of struggle and of political agitation among the masses." [253] To this *Rabocheye Dyelo* replied: "This, the only one of *Iskra*'s charges that makes a pretense of being based on facts, is totally without foundation. Readers of *Rabocheye Dyelo* know very well that from the outset we not only called for political agitation, without waiting for the appearance of *Iskra* ... [saying at the same time that not only the workers' study circles, "but also the mass working-class movement could not regard as its first political task the overthrow of absolutism", but only the struggle for immediate political demands, and that "the masses begin to understand immediate political demands after one, or at all events, after several strikes"], . . . but that with our publications which we furnished from abroad for the comrades working in Russia, we provided the *only* Social-Democratic political and agitational material ... [and in this sole material you not only based the widest political agitation exclusively on the economic struggle, but you even went to the extent of claiming that this restricted agitation was the "most widely applicable". And do you not observe, gentlemen, that your own argument — that this was the *only* material provided — proves the necessity for *Iskra*'s appearance, and its struggle against *Rabocheye Dyelo*?].... On the other hand, our publishing activity actually prepared the ground for the tactical unity of the Party... [unity in the conviction that tactics is a process of growth of Party tasks that grow together with the Party? A precious unity indeed!]... and by that rendered possible the creation of a 'militant organisation' for which the Union Abroad did all that an organisation abroad could do" (*Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, p. 15). A vain attempt at evasion! I would never dream of denying that you did all you possibly could. I have asserted and assert now that the *limits* of what is "possible" for you to do are restricted by the narrowness of your outlook. It is ridiculous to talk of a "militant organisation" to fight for "immediate political demands", or to conduct the economic struggle against the employers and the government".

But if the reader wishes to see the pearls of "Economist" infatuation with amateurism, he must, of course, turn from the eclectic and vacillating *Rabocheye Dyelo* to the consistent and determined *Rabochaya Mysl*. In its *Separate Supplement*, p. 13, R. M. wrote: "Now two words about the so-called revolutionary intelligentsia proper. True, on more than one occasion it has proved itself prepared 'to enter into determined battle with tsarism'. The unfortunate thing, however, is that our

[253] See Collected Works, Vol. 5, p. 18 —Ed.

revolutionary intelligentsia, ruthlessly persecuted by the political police, imagined the struggle against the political police to be the political struggle against the autocracy. That is why, to this day, it cannot understand 'where the forces for the struggle against the autocracy are to be obtained'."

Truly matchless is the lofty contempt for the struggle against the police displayed by this worshipper (in the worst sense of the word) of the *spontaneous* movement! He is prepared *to justify* our inability to organize secret activity by the argument that with the spontaneous mass movement it is not at all important for us to struggle against the political police! Very few people indeed would subscribe to this appalling conclusion; to such an extent have our deficiencies in revolutionary organisations become a matter of acute importance. But if Martynov, for example, refuses to subscribe to this, it will only be because he is unable, or lacks the courage, to think out his ideas to their logical conclusion. Indeed, does the "task" of advancing concrete demands by the masses, demands that promise palpable results, call for special efforts to create a stable, centralized, militant organisation of revolutionaries? Cannot such a "task" be carried out even by masses that do not "struggle against the political police" at all? Could this task, moreover, be fulfilled if, in addition to the few leaders, it was not undertaken by such workers (the overwhelming majority) as are quite *incapable* of "struggling against the political police"? Such workers, average people of the masses, are capable of displaying enormous energy and self-sacrifice in strikes and in street, battles with the police and the troops, and are capable (in fact, are alone capable) of *determining* the outcome of our entire movement — but the struggle against the *political* police requires special qualities; it requires *professional* revolutionaries. And we must see to it, not only that the masses "advance" concrete demands, but that the masses of the workers "advance" an increasing number of such professional revolutionaries. Thus, we have reached the question of the relation between an organisation of professional revolutionaries and the labor movement pure and simple. Although this question has found little reflection in literature, it has greatly engaged us "politicians" in conversations and polemics with comrades who gravitate more or less towards Economism. It is a question meriting special treatment. But before taking it up, let us offer one further quotation by way of illustrating our thesis on the connection between primitiveness and Economism.

In his *Reply*, Mr. N. N. wrote: "The Emancipation of Labor group demands direct struggle against the government without first considering where the material forces for this struggle are to be obtained, and without indicating the *path of the struggle*." Emphasizing the last words, the author adds the following footnote to the word "Path": "This cannot be explained by purposes of secrecy, because the programme does not refer to a plot but to *a mass movement.* And the masses cannot proceed by secret paths. Can we conceive of a secret strike? Can we conceive of secret demonstrations and petitions?" (*Vademecum*, p. 59.) Thus, the author comes quite close to the question of the "material forces" (organizers of strikes and demonstrations) and to the "paths" of the struggle, but, nevertheless, is still in a state of consternation, because he "worships" the mass movement, i.e., he regards it as something that *relieves* us of the necessity of conducting revolutionary activity and not as something that should encourage us and *stimulate* our revolutionary activity. It is impossible for a

strike to remain a secret to those participating in it and to those immediately associated with it, but it may (and in the majority of cases does) remain a "secret" to the masses of the Russian workers, because the government takes care to cut all communication with the strikers, to prevent all news of strikes from spreading. Here indeed is where a special "struggle against the political police" is required, a struggle that can never be conducted actively by such large masses as take part in strikes. This struggle must be organized, according to "all the rules of the art", by people who are professionally engaged in revolutionary activity. The fact that the masses are spontaneously being drawn into the movement does not make the organisation of this struggle *less necessary*. On the contrary, it makes it *more necessary;* for we socialists would be failing in our direct duty to the masses if we did not prevent the police from making a secret of every strike and every demonstration (and if we did not ourselves from time to time secretly prepare strikes and demonstrations). And we *will succeed in doing this*, because the spontaneously awakening masses will *also produce* increasing, numbers of "professional revolutionaries" *from their own ranks* (that is, if we do not take it into our heads to advise the workers to keep on marking time).

Section C: Organisation of Workers and Organisation of Revolutionaries

It is only natural to expect that for a Social-Democrat whose conception of the political struggle coincides with the conception of the "economic struggle against the employers and the government", the "organisation of revolutionaries" will more or less coincide with the "organisation of workers". This, in fact, is what actually happens; so that when we speak of organisation, we literally speak in different tongues. I vividly recall, for example, a conversation I once had with a fairly consistent Economist, with whom I had not been previously acquainted. We were discussing the pamphlet, *Who Will Bring About the Political Revolution?* and were soon of a mind that its principal defect was its ignoring of the question of organisation. We had begun to assume full agreement between us; but, as the conversation proceeded, it became evident that we were talking of different things. My interlocutor accused the author of ignoring strike funds, mutual benefit societies, etc., whereas I had in mind an organisation of revolutionaries as an essential factor in "bringing about" the political revolution. As soon as the disagreement became clear, there was hardly, as I remember, a single question of principle upon which I was in agreement with the Economist!

What was the source of our disagreement? It was the fact that on questions both of organisation and of politics the Economists are forever lapsing from Social-Democracy into trade-unionism. The political struggle of Social-Democracy is far more extensive and complex than the economic struggle of the workers against the employers and the government. Similarly (indeed for that reason), the organisation of the revolutionary Social-Democratic Party must inevitably be of *a kind different* from the organisation of the workers designed for this struggle. The workers' organisation must in the first place be a trade union organisation; secondly, it must be as broad as possible; and thirdly, it must be as public as conditions will allow (here, and further on, of course, I refer only to absolutist Russia). On the other hand, the organisation of the revolutionaries must consist first and foremost of people who make revolutionary activity their profession (for which

reason I speak of the organisation of *revolutionaries*, meaning revolutionary Social-Democrats). In view of this common characteristic of the members of such an organisation, *all distinctions as between workers and intellectuals*, not to speak of distinctions of trade and profession, in both categories, *must be effaced*. Such an organisation must perforce not be very extensive and must be as secret as possible. Let us examine this threefold distinction.

In countries where political liberty exists the distinction between a trade union and a political organisation is clear enough, as is the distinction between trade unions and Social-Democracy. The relations between the latter and the former will naturally vary in each country according to historical, legal, and other conditions; they may be more or less close, complex, etc. (in our opinion they should be as close and as little complicated as possible); but there can be no question in free countries of the organisation of trade unions coinciding with the organisation of the Social-Democratic Party. In Russia, however, the yoke of the autocracy appears at first glance to obliterate all distinctions between the Social-Democratic organisation and the workers' associations, since *all* workers' associations and *all* study circles are prohibited, and since the principal manifestation and weapon of the workers' economic struggle — the strike — is regarded as a criminal (and sometimes even as a political!) offence. Conditions in our country, therefore, on the one hand, strongly "impel" the workers engaged in economic struggle to concern themselves with political questions, and, on the other, they "impel" Social-Democrats to confound trade-unionism with Social-Democracy (and our Krichevskys, Martynoys, and Co., while diligently discussing the first kind of "impulsion", fail to notice the second). Indeed, picture to yourselves people who are immersed ninety-nine per cent in "the economic struggle against the employers and the government". Some of them will never, during the *entire* course of their activity (from four to six months), be impelled to think of the need for a more complex organisation of revolutionaries. Others, perhaps, will come across the fairly widely distributed Bernsteinian literature, from which they will become convinced of the profound importance of the forward movement of "the drab everyday struggle". Still others will be carried away, perhaps, by the seductive idea of showing the world a new example of "close and organic contact with the proletarian struggle" — contact between the trade union and the Social Democratic movements. Such people may argue that the later a country enters the arena of capitalism and, consequently, of the working-class movement, the more the socialists in that country may take part in, and support, the trade union movement, and the less the reason for the existence of non-Social-Democratic trade unions. So far, the argument is fully correct; unfortunately, however, some go beyond that and dream of a complete fusion of Social-Democracy with trade-unionism. We shall soon see, from the example of the Rules of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle, what a harmful effect such dreams have upon our plans of organisation.

The workers' organisations for the economic struggle should be trade union organisations. Every Social-Democratic worker should as far as possibly assist and actively work in these organisations. But, while this is true, it is certainly not in our interest to demand that only Social-Democrats should be eligible for membership in the "trade" unions, since that would only narrow the

scope of our influence upon the masses. Let every worker who understands the need to unite for the struggle against the employers and the government join the trade unions. The very aim of the trade unions would be impossible of achievement, if they did not unite all who have attained at least this elementary degree of understanding, if they were not very *broad* organisations. The broader these organisations, the broader will be our influence over them — an influence due, not only to the "spontaneous" development of the economic struggle, but to the direct and conscious effort of the socialist trade union members to influence their comrades. But a broad organisation cannot apply methods of strict secrecy (since these demands far greater training than is required for the economic struggle). How is the contradiction between the need for a large membership and the need for strictly secret methods to be reconciled? How are we to make the trade unions as public as possible? Generally speaking, there can be only two ways to this end: either the trade unions become legalized (in some countries this preceded the legalization of the socialist and political unions), or the organisation is kept secret, but so "free" and amorphous, *lose* [254] as the Germans say, that the need for secret methods becomes almost negligible as far as the bulk of the members is concerned.

The legalization of non-socialist and non-political labor unions in Russia has begun, and there is no doubt that every advance made by our rapidly growing Social-Democratic working-class movement will multiply and encourage attempts at legalization — attempts proceeding for the most part from supporters of the existing order, but partly also from the workers themselves and from liberal intellectuals. The banner of legality has already been hoisted by the Vasilyevs and the Zubatovs. Support has been promised and rendered by the Ozerovs and the Wormses, and followers of the new tendency are now to be found among the workers. Henceforth, we cannot but reckon with this tendency. How we are to reckon with it, on this there can be no two opinions among Social-Democrats. We must steadfastly expose any part played in this movement by the Zubatovs and the Vasilyeys, the gendarmes and the priests, and explain their real intentions to the workers. We must also expose all the conciliatory, "harmonious" notes that will be heard in the speeches of liberal politicians at legal meetings of the workers, irrespective of whether the speeches are motivated by an earnest conviction of the desirability of peaceful class collaboration, by a desire to curry favor with the powers that be, or whether they are simply the result of clumsiness. Lastly, we must warn the workers against the traps often set by the police, who at such open meetings and permitted societies spy out the "fiery ones" and try to make use of legal organisations to plant their *agents provocateurs* in the illegal organisations.

Doing all this does not at all mean forgetting that *in the long* run the legalization of the working-class movement will be, to our advantage, and not to that of the Zubatovs. On the contrary, it is precisely our campaign of exposure that will help us to separate the tares from the wheat. What the tares are, we have already indicated. By the wheat we mean attracting the attention of ever larger numbers, including the most backward sections, of the workers to social and political questions, and

[254] German "loose".—Ed

freeing ourselves, the revolutionaries, from functions that are essentially legal (the distribution of legal books, mutual aid, etc.), the development of which will inevitably provide us with an increasing quantity of material for agitation. In this sense, we may, and should, say to the Zubatovs and the Ozerovs: Keep at it, gentlemen, do your best! Whenever you place a trap in the path of the workers (either by way of direct provocation, or by the "honest" demoralization of the workers with the aid of "Struvism") we will see to it that you are exposed. But whenever you take a real step forward, though it be the most "timid zigzag", we will say: Please continue! And the only step that can be a real step forward is a real, if small, extension of the workers' field of action. Every such extension will be to our advantage and will help to hasten the advent of legal societies of the kind in which it will not be *agents provocateurs* who are detecting socialists, but socialists who are gaining adherents. in a word, our task is to fight the tares. It is not our business to grow wheat in flower-pots. By pulling up the tares, we clear the soil for the wheat. And while the Afanasy Ivanoviches and Pulkheria Ivanovnas are tending their flower-pot crops, we must prepare the reapers, not only to cut down the tares of today, but to reap the wheat of tomorrow. [255]

Thus, we cannot by means of legalization *solve* the problem of creating a trade union organisation that will be as little secret and as extensive as possible (but we should be extremely glad if the Zubatovs and the Ozerovs disclosed to us even a partial opportunity for such a solution — to this end, however, *we must* strenuously combat them). There remain secret trade union organisations, and we must give all possible assistance to the workers who (as we definitely know) are adopting this course. Trade union organisations, not only can be of tremendous value in developing and consolidating the economic struggle, but can also become a very important auxiliary to political agitation and revolutionary organisation. In order to achieve this purpose, and in order to guide the nascent trade union movement in the channels desired by Social-Democracy, we must first understand clearly the absurdity of the plan of organisation the St. Petersburg Economists have been nursing for nearly five years. That plan is set forth in the "Rules for a Workers' Mutual Benefit Fund" of July 1897 ("*Listok*" *Rabotnika*, No. 9-10, p. 46, taken from *Rabochaya Mysl*, No. 1), as well as in the "Rules for a Trade Union Workers' Organisation" of October 1900 (special leaflet printed in St. Petersburg and referred to in *Iskra*, No. 1). Both these sets of rules have one main shortcoming: they set up the broad workers' organisation in a rigidly specified structure and confound it with the organisation of revolutionaries. Let us take the last-mentioned set of rules, since it is drawn up in greater detail. The body consists of *fifty-two* paragraphs. Twenty-three deal with the structure, the method of functioning, and the competence of the "workers' circles", which are to be organized in

[255] Iskra's campaign against the tares evoked the following angry outburst from Rabocheye Dyelo: "For Iskra, the signs of the times lie not so much in great events [of the spring], as in the miserable attempts of the agents of Zubatov to 'legalize' the working-class movement. It fails to see that these facts tell against it; for they testify that the working-class movement has assumed menacing proportions in the eyes of the government" (Two Conferences, p. 27). For all this we have to blame the "dogmatism" of the orthodox who "turn a deaf ear to the imperative demands of life". They obstinately refuse to see the yard-high wheat and are combating inch-high tares! Does this not reveal a "distorted sense of perspective in regard to the Russian working-class movement" (ibid., p. 27)?—Lenin

every factory ("a maximum of ten persons") and which elect "central (factory) groups". "The central group," says paragraph 2, "observes all that goes on in its factory or workshop and keeps a record of events." "The central group presents to subscribers a monthly financial account" (par. 17), etc. Ten paragraphs are devoted to the "district organisation", and nineteen to the highly complex interconnection between the Committee of the Workers' Organisation and the Committee of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle (elected representatives of each district and of the "executive groups" — "groups of propagandists, groups for maintaining contact with the provinces, and with the organisation abroad, groups for managing stores; publications, and funds").

Social-Democracy = "executive groups" in relation to the economic struggle of the workers! It would be difficult to show more glaringly how the Economists' ideas deviate from Social-Democracy to trade-unionism, and how alien to them is any idea that a Social-Democrat must concern himself first and foremost with an organisation of revolutionaries capable of guiding the *entire* proletarian struggle for emancipation. To talk of "the political emancipation of the working class" and of the struggle against "tsarist despotism", and at the same time to draft rules like these, means to have no idea whatsoever of the real political tasks of Social-Democracy. Not one of the fifty or so paragraphs reveal even a glimmer of understanding that it is necessary to conduct the widest possible political agitation among the masses, an agitation highlighting every aspect of Russian absolutism and the specific features of the various social classes in Russia. Rules like these are of no use even for the achievement of trade union, let alone political, aims, since trade unions are organized by *trades*, of which no mention is made.

But most characteristic, perhaps, is the amazing top-heaviness of the whole "system", which attempts to bind each single factory and its "committee" by a permanent string of uniform and ludicrously petty rules and a three-stage system of election. Hemmed in by the narrow outlook of Economism, the mind is lost in details that positively reek of red tape and bureaucracy. In practice, of course, three-fourths of the clauses are never applied; on the other hand, a "secret" organisation of this kind, with its central group in each factory, makes it very easy for the gendarmes to carry out raids on a vast scale. The Polish comrades have passed through a similar phase in their movement, with everybody enthusiastic about the extensive organisation of workers' benefit funds; but they very quickly abandoned this idea when they saw that such organisations only provided rich harvests for the gendarmes. If we have in mind broad workers' organisations, and not widespread arrests, if we do not want to provide satisfaction to the gendarmes, we must see to it that these organisations remain without any rigid formal structure. But will they be able to function in that case?

Let us see what the functions are: ". . . To observe all that goes on in the factory and keep a record of events" (par. 2 of the Rules). Do we really require a formally established group for this purpose? Could not the purpose be better served by correspondence conducted in the illegal papers without the setting up of special groups? ". . . To lead the struggles of the workers for the improvement of their workshop conditions" (par. 3). This, too, requires no set organisational form. Any sensible

agitator can in the course of ordinary conversation gather what the demands of the workers are and transmit them to a narrow — not a broad — organisation of revolutionaries for expression in a leaflet. " ... To organize a fund ... to which subscriptions of two kopeks per ruble [256] should be made" (par. 9) — and then to present to subscribers a monthly financial account (par. 17), to expel members who fail to pay their contributions (par. 10), and so forth. Why, this is a very paradise for the police; for nothing would be easier for them than to penetrate into such a secrecy of a "central factory fund", confiscate the money, and arrest the best people. Would it not be simpler to issue one-kopek or two-kopek coupons bearing the official stamp of a well-known (very narrow and very secret) organisation, or to make collections without coupons of any kind and to print reports in a certain agreed code in an illegal paper? The object would thereby be attained, but it would be a hundred times more difficult for the gendarmes to pick up clues.

I could go on analyzing the Rules, but I think that what has been said will suffice. A small, compact core of the most reliable, experienced, and hardened workers, with responsible representatives in the principal districts and connected by all the rules of strict secrecy with the organisation of revolutionaries, can, with the widest support of the masses and without any formal organisation, perform *all* the functions of a trade union organisation, in a manner, moreover, desirable to Social-Democracy. Only in this way can we secure the *consolidation* and development of a *Social-Democratic* trade union movement, despite all the gendarmes.

It may be objected that an organisation which is so *lose* that it is not even definitely formed, and which has not even an enrolled and registered membership, cannot be called an organisation at all. Perhaps so. Not the name is important. What is important is that this "organisation without members" shall do everything that is required, and from the very outset ensure a solid connection between our future trade unions and socialism. Only an incorrigible utopian would have a *broad* organisation of workers, with elections, reports, universal suffrage, etc., under the autocracy.

The moral to be drawn from this is simple. If we begin with the solid foundation of a strong organisation of revolutionaries, we can ensure the stability of the movement as a whole and carry out the aims both of Social-Democracy and of trade unions proper. If, however, we begin with a broad workers' organisation, which is supposedly most "accessible" to the masses (but which is actually most accessible to the gendarmes and makes revolutionaries most accessible to the police), we shall achieve neither the one aim nor the other; we shall not eliminate our rule-of-thumb methods, and, because we remain scattered and our forces are constantly broken up by the police, we shall only make trade unions of the Zubatov and Ozerov type the more accessible to the masses.

What, properly speaking, should be the functions of the organisation of revolutionaries? We shall deal with this question in detail. First, however, let us examine a very typical argument advanced by our terrorist, who (sad fate!) in this matter also is a next-door neighbor to the Economist.

[256] Of wages earned.—Tr.

Svoboda, a journal published for workers, contains in its first issue an article entitled "Organisation", the author of which tries to defend his friends, the Economist workers of Ivanovo-Voznesensk. He writes:

> "It is bad when the masses are mute and unenlightened, when the movement does not come from the rank and file. For instance, the students of a university town leave for their homes during the summer and other holidays, and immediately the workers' movement comes to a standstill. Can a workers' movement which has to be pushed on from outside be a real force? No, indeed.... It has not yet learned to walk; it is still in leading-strings. So, it is in all matters. The students go off, and everything comes to a standstill. The most capable are seized; the cream is skimmed and the milk turns sour. If the 'committee' is arrested, everything comes to a standstill until a new one can he formed. And one never knows what sort of committee will be set up next — it may be nothing like the former. The first said one thing, the second may say the very opposite. Continuity between yesterday and tomorrow is broken, the experience of the past does not serve as a guide for the future. And all because no roots have been struck in depth, in the masses; the work is carried on not by a hundred fools, but by a dozen wise men. A dozen wise men can be wiped out at a snap, but when the organisation embraces masses, everything proceeds from them, and nobody, however he tries, can wreck the cause" (p. 63).

The facts are described correctly. The picture of our amateurism is well drawn. But the conclusions are worthy of *Rabochaya Mysl*, both as regards their stupidity and their lack of political tact. They represent the height of stupidity, because the author confuses the philosophical and social-historical question of the "depth" of the "roots" of the movement with the technical and organisational question of the best method in combating the gendarmes. They represent the height of political tactlessness, because, instead of appealing from bad leaders to good leaders, the author appeals from the leaders in general to the "masses" . This is as much an attempt to drag us back organizationally as the idea of substituting excitative terrorism for political agitation drags us back politically. Indeed, I am experiencing a veritable *embarras de richesses*, and hardly know where to begin to disentangle the jumble offered up by *Svoboda*. For clarity, let me begin by citing an example. Take the Germans. It will not be denied, I hope, that theirs is a mass organisation, that in Germany everything proceeds from the masses, that the working-class movement there has learned to walk. Yet observe how these millions value their "dozen" tried political leaders, how firmly they cling to them. Members of the hostile parties in parliament have often taunted the socialists by exclaiming: "Fine democrats you are indeed! Yours is a working-class movement only in name; in actual fact the same clique of leaders is always in evidence, the same Bebel and the same Liebknecht, year in and year out, and that goes on for decades. Your supposedly elected workers' deputies are more permanent than the officials appointed by the emperor!" But the Germans only smile with contempt at these demagogic attempts to set the "masses" against the "leaders", to arouse bad and ambitious instincts in the former, and to rob the movement of its solidity and stability by undermining the confidence of the masses in their "dozen wise men". Political thinking is sufficiently developed

among the Germans, and they have accumulated sufficient political experience to understand that without the "dozen" tried and talented leaders (and talented men are not born by the hundreds), professionally trained, schooled by long experience, and working in perfect harmony, no class in modern society can wage a determined struggle. The Germans too have had demagogues in their ranks who have flattered the "hundred fools", exalted them above the "dozen wise men", extolled the "horny hand" of the masses, and (like Most and Hasselmann) have spurred them on to reckless "revolutionary" action and sown distrust towards the firm and steadfast leaders. It was only by stubbornly and relentlessly combating all demagogic elements within the socialist movement that German socialism has managed to grow and become as strong as it is. Our wiseacres, however, at a time when Russian Social-Democracy is passing through a crisis entirely due to the lack of sufficiently trained, developed, and experienced leaders to guide the spontaneously awakening masses, cry out ,with the profundity of fools: "It is a bad business when the movement does not proceed from the rank and file."

"A committee of students is of no use; it is not stable." Quite true. But the conclusion to be drawn from this is that we must have a committee of professional *revolutionaries*, and it is immaterial whether a student or a worker is capable of becoming a professional revolutionary. The conclusion you draw, how. ever, is that the working-class movement must not be pushed on from outside! In your political innocence you fail to notice that you are playing into the hands of our Economists and fostering our amateurism. Wherein, may I ask, did our students "push on" our workers? *In the sense* that the student brought to the worker the fragments of political knowledge he himself possesses, the crumbs of socialist ideas he has managed to acquire (for the principal intellectual diet of the present-day student, legal Marxism, could furnish only the rudiments, only scraps of knowledge). There has never been too much of *such* "pushing on from outside"; on the contrary, there has so far been all too little of it in our movement, for we have been stewing too assiduously in our own juice; we have bowed far too slavishly to the elementary "economic struggle of the workers against the employers and the government". We professional revolutionaries must and will make it our business to engage in *this kind* of "pushing on" a hundred times more forcibly than we have done hitherto. But the very fact that you select so hideous a phrase as "pushing on from outside" — a phrase which cannot but rouse in the workers (at least in the workers who are as unenlightened as you yourselves) a sense of distrust towards *all* who bring them political knowledge and revolutionary experience from outside, which cannot but rouse in them an instinctive desire to resist *all* such people — proves you to be demagogues, and *demagogues* are the worst enemies of the working class.

And, please — don't hasten howling about my "uncomradely methods" of debating. I have not the least desire to doubt the purity of your intentions. As I have said, one may become a demagogue out of sheer political innocence. But I have shown that you have descended to demagogy, and I will never tire of repeating that demagogues are the worst enemies of the working class. The worst enemies, because they arouse base instincts in the masses, because the unenlightened worker is unable to recognize his enemies in men who represent themselves, and sometimes sincerely so, as his

friends. The worst enemies, because in the period of disunity and vacillation, when our movement is just beginning to take shape, nothing is easier than to employ demagogic methods to mislead the masses, who can realize their error only later by bitter experience. That is why the slogan of the day for the Russian Social-Democrat must be — resolute struggle against Svoboda and *Rabocheye Dyelo*, both of which have sunk to the level of demagogy. We shall deal with this further in greater detail. [257]

"A dozen wise men can be more easily wiped out than a hundred fools." This wonderful truth (for which the hundred fools will always applaud you) appears obvious only because in the very midst of the argument you have skipped from one question to another. You began by talking and continued to talk of the unearthing of a "committee", of the unearthing of an "organisation", and now you skip to the question of unearthing the movement's "roots" in their "depths". The fact is, of course, that our movement cannot be unearthed, for the very reason that it has countless thousands of roots deep down among the masses; but that is not the point at issue. As far as "deep roots" are concerned, we cannot be "unearthed" even now, despite all our amateurism, and yet we all complain, and cannot but complain, that the "*organisations*" are being unearthed and as a result it is impossible to maintain continuity in the movement. But since you raise the question of *organisations* being unearthed and persist in your opinion, I assert that it is far more difficult to unearth a dozen wise men than a hundred fools. This position I will defend, no matter how much you instigate the masses against me for my "anti-democratic" views, etc. As I have stated repeatedly, by "wise men", in connection with organisation, I mean *professional revolutionaries*, irrespective of whether they have developed from among students or working men. I assert: (1) that no revolutionary movement can endure without a stable organisation of leaders maintaining continuity; (2) that the broader the popular mass drawn spontaneously into the struggle, which forms the basis of the movement and participates in it, the more urgent the need for such an organisation, and the more solid this organisation must be (for it is much easier for all sorts of demagogues to side-track the more backward sections of the masses); (3) that such an organisation must consist chiefly of people professionally engaged in revolutionary activity; (4) that in an autocratic state, the more we *confine* the membership of such an organisation to people who are professionally engaged in revolutionary activity and who have been professionally trained in the art of combating the political police, the more difficult will it be to unearth the organisation; and (5) the *greater* will be the number of people from the working class and from the other social classes who will be able to join the movement and perform active work in it.

I invite our Economists, terrorists, and "Economists-terrorists" [258] to confute these propositions. At the moment, I shall deal only with the last two points. The question as to whether it

[257] For the moment let us observe merely that our remarks on "pushing on from outside" and Svoboda's other disquisitions on organisation apply in their entirety to all the Economists, including the adherents of Rabocheye Dyelo; for some of them have actively preached and defended such views on organisation, while others among them have drifted into them.—Lenin

[258] This term is perhaps more applicable to Svoboda than the former, for in an article entitled "The Regeneration of Revolutionisin" the publication defends terrorism, while in the article at present under review it defends Economism.

is easier to wipe out "a dozen wisemen" or "a hundred fools" reduces itself to the question, above considered, whether it is possible to have a mass *organisation* when the maintenance of strict secrecy is essential. We can never give a mass organisation that degree of secrecy without which there can be no question of persistent and continuous struggle against the government. To concentrate all secret functions in the hands of as small a number of professional revolutionaries as possible does not mean that the latter will "do the thinking for all" and that the rank and file will not take an active part in the *movement*. On the contrary, the membership will promote increasing numbers of the professional revolutionaries from its ranks; for it will know that it is not enough for a few students and for a few working men waging the economic struggle to gather in order to form a "committee", but that it takes years to train oneself to be a professional revolutionary; and the rank and file will "think", not only of amateurish methods, but of such training. Centralization of the secret functions of the *organisation* by no means implies centralization of all the functions of the *movement*. Active participation of the widest masses in the illegal press will not diminish because a "dozen" professional revolutionaries centralize the secret functions connected with this work; on the contrary, it will *increase* tenfold. In this way, and in this way alone, shall we ensure that reading the illegal press, writing for it, and to some extent even distributing it, will *almost cease to be secret work*, for the police will soon come to realize the folly and impossibility of judicial and administrative red-tape procedure over every copy of a publication that is being distributed in the thousands. This holds not only for the press, but for every function of the movement, even for demonstrations. The active and widespread participation of the masses will not suffer; on the contrary, it will benefit by the fact that a "dozen" experienced revolutionaries, trained professionally no less than the police, will centralize all the secret aspects of the work — the drawing up of leaflets, the working out of approximate plans; and the appointing of bodies of leaders for each urban district, for each institution, etc. (I know that exception will be taken to my "undemocratic" views, but I shall reply below fully to this anything but intelligent objection.) Centralization of the most secret functions in an organisation of revolutionaries will not diminish, but rather increase the extent and enhance the quality of the activity of a large number of other organisations that are intended for a broad public and are therefore as loose and as non-secret as possible, such as workers' trade unions; workers' self-education circles and circles for reading illegal literature; and socialist, as well as democratic, circles among *all* other sections of the population; etc., etc. We must have such circles, trade unions, and organisations everywhere in *as large a number as possible* and with the widest variety of functions; but it would be absurd and harmful *to confound* them with the organisation of *revolutionaries*, to efface the border-line between them, to make still more hazy the all too faint recognition of the fact that in order to "serve" the mass

---

One might say of Svoboda that "it would if it could, but it can't". Its wishes and intentions are of the very best — but the result is utter confusion; this is chiefly due to the fact that, while Svoboda advocates continuity of organisation, it refuses to recognize continuity of revolutionary thought and Social-Democratic theory. It wants to revive the professional revolutionary ("The Regeneration of Revolutionism"), and to that end proposes, first, excitative terrorism, and, secondly, — an organisation of average workers" (Svoboda, No. 1, p. 66, et seq.), as less likely to be "pushed on from outside". In other words, it proposes to pull the house down to use the timber for heating it. — Lenin

movement we must have people who will devote themselves exclusively to Social-Democratic activities, and that such people must *train* themselves patiently and steadfastly to be professional revolutionaries.

Yes, this recognition is incredibly dim. Our worst sin with regard to organisation consists in the fact that by *our primitiveness we have lowered the prestige of revolutionaries in Russia*. A person who is flabby and shaky on questions of theory, who has a narrow outlook, who pleads the spontaneity of the masses as an excuse for his own sluggishness, who resembles a trade union secretary more than a spokesman of the people, who is unable to conceive of a broad and bold plan that would command the respect even of opponents, and who is inexperienced and clumsy in his own professional art — the art of combating the political police — such a man is not a revolutionary, but a wretched amateur!

Let no active worker take offence at these frank remarks, for as far as insufficient training is concerned, I apply them first and foremost to myself. I used to work in a study circle that set itself very broad, all-embracing tasks; and all of us, members of that circle, suffered painfully and acutely from the realization that we were acting as amateurs at a moment in history when we might have been able to say, varying a well-known statement: "Give us an organisation of revolutionaries, and we will overturn Russia" The more I recall the burning sense of shame I then experienced, the bitterer become my feelings towards those pseudo-Social-Democrats whose preachings "bring disgrace on the calling of a revolutionary", who fail to understand that our task is not to champion the degrading of the revolutionary to the level of an amateur, but to *raise* the amateurs to the level of revolutionaries.

Section D: The Scope of Organisational Work

We have heard B-v tell us about "the lack of revolutionary forces fit for action which is felt not only in St. Petersburg, but throughout Russia". Hardly anyone will dispute this fact. But the question is, how is it to be explained? B-v writes:

> "We shall not go into an explanation of the historical causes of this phenomenon; we shall merely state that a society, demoralized by prolonged political reaction and split by past and present economic changes, promotes from its own ranks an *extremely small number of persons fit for revolutionary work*; that the working class does produce revolutionary workers who to some extent reinforce the ranks of the illegal organisations, but that the number of such revolutionaries is inadequate to meet the requirements of the times. This is all the more so because the worker who spends eleven and a half hours a day in the factory is in such a position that he can, in the main, perform only the functions of an agitator; but propaganda and organisation, the delivery and reproduction of illegal literature, the issuance of leaflets, etc., are duties which must necessarily fall mainly upon the shoulders of an extremely small force of intellectuals" (*Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 6, pp. 38-39).

On many points we disagree with B-v, particularly with those we have emphasized, which most saliently reveal that, although weary of our amateurism (as is every thinking practical worker), B-v cannot find the way out of this intolerable situation because he is weighted down by Economism. The fact is that society produces very *many* persons fit for "the cause", but we are unable to make use of them all. The critical, transitional state of our movement in this respect may be formulated as follows: *There are no people — yet there is a mass of people*. There is a mass of people, because the working class and increasingly varied social strata, year after year, produce from their ranks an increasing number of discontented people who desire to protest, who are ready to render all the assistance they can in the struggle against absolutism, the intolerableness of which, though not yet recognized by all, is more and more acutely sensed by increasing masses of the people. At the same time, we have no people, because we have no leaders, no political leaders, no talented organizers capable of arranging. extensive and at the same time uniform and harmonious work that would employ all forces, even the most inconsiderable. "The growth and development of the revolutionary organisations" lag, not only behind the growth of the working-class movement, which even B-v admits, but behind that of the general democratic movement among all strata of the people. (In passing, probably B-V would now regard this as supplementing his conclusion.) The scope of revolutionary work is too narrow, as compared with the breadth of the spontaneous basis of the movement. It is too hemmed in by the wretched theory of "economic struggle against the employers and the government". Yet, at the present time, not only Social-Democratic political agitators, but Social-Democratic organizers must "go among all classes of the population". [259] There is hardly a single practical worker who will doubt that the Social-Democrats could distribute the thousand- and one-minute functions of their organisational work among individual representatives of the most varied classes. Lack of specialization is one of the most serious defects of our technique, about which B-v justly and bitterly complains. The smaller each separate "operation" in our common cause the more people we can find capable of carrying out such operations (people who, in the majority of cases, are completely incapable of becoming professional revolutionaries); more difficult will it be for the police to "net" all these "detail workers", and the more difficult will it be for them to frame up, out of an arrest for some petty affair, a "case" that would justify the government's expenditure on "security". As for the number of people ready to help us, we referred in the preceding chapter to the gigantic change that has taken place in this respect in the last five years or so. On the other hand, in order to unite all these tiny fractions into one whole, in order not to break up the movement while breaking up its functions, and in order to imbue the people who carry out the minute functions with the conviction that their work is necessary and important, without which conviction they will never

[259] Thus, an undoubted revival of the democratic spirit has recently been observed among persons in military service, partly as a consequence of the more frequent street battles with "enemies" like workers and students. As soon as our available forces permit, we must without fail devote the most serious attention to propaganda and agitation among soldiers and officers, and to the creation of "military organisations" affiliated to our Party.—Lenin

do the work, [260] it is necessary to have a strong organisation of tried revolutionaries. The more secret such an organisation is, the stronger and more widespread will be the confidence in the Party. As we know, in time of war, it is not only of the utmost importance to imbue one's own army with confidence in its strength, but it is important also to convince the enemy and all *neutral* elements of this strength; friendly neutrality may sometimes decide the issue. If such an organisation existed, one built up on a firm theoretical foundation and possessing a Social-Democratic organ, we should have no reason to fear that the movement might be diverted from its path by the numerous "outside" elements that are attracted to it. (On the contrary, it is precisely at the present time, with amateurism prevalent, that we see many Social-Democrats leaning towards the *Credo* and only imagining that they are Social Democrats.) In a word, specialization necessarily presupposes centralization, and in turn imperatively calls for it.

But B-v himself, who has so excellently described the necessity for specialization, underestimates its importance, in our opinion, in the second part of the argument we have quoted. The number of working-class revolutionaries is inadequate, he says. This is perfectly true, and once again we stress that the "valuable communication of a close observer" fully confirms our view of the causes of the present crisis in Social-Democracy, and, consequently, of the means required to overcome it. Not only are revolutionaries in general lagging behind the spontaneous awakening of the masses, but even worker-revolutionaries are lagging behind the spontaneous awakening of the working-class masses. This *fact* confirms with clear evidence, from the "practical" point of view, too, not only the absurdity but even the *politically reactionary nature* of the "pedagogics" to which we are so often treated in the discussion of our duties to the workers. This fact proves that our very first and most pressing duty is to help to train working-class revolutionaries who will be on the same level *in regard to Party activity* as the revolutionaries from amongst the intellectuals (we emphasize the words "in regard to Party activity", for, although necessary, it is neither so easy nor so pressingly necessary to bring the workers up to the level of intellectuals in other respects). Attention, therefore, must be devoted *principally to raising* the workers to the level of revolutionaries; it is not at all our task *to descend* to the level of the "working masses" as the Economists wish to do, or to the level of the "average worker" as *Svoboda* desires to do (and by this ascends to the second grade of Economist

[260] I recall that once a comrade told me of a factory inspector who wanted to help the Social-Democrats, and actually did, but complained bitterly that he did not know whether his "information" reached the proper revolutionary centre, how much his help was really required, and what possibilities there were for utilizing his small and petty services. Every practical worker can, of course, cite many similar instances in which our primitiveness deprived us of allies. These services, each "small" in itself, but invaluable when taken in the mass, could and would be rendered to us by office employees and officials, not only in factories, but in the postal service, on the railways, in the Customs, among the nobility, among the clergy, and in every other walk of life, including even the police and the Court! Had we a real party, a real militant organisation of revolutionaries, we would not make undue demands on every one of these "aides", we would not hasten always and invariably to bring them right into the very heart of our "illegality", but, on the contrary, we would husband them most carefully and would even train people especially for such functions, bearing in mind that many students could be of much greater service to the Party as "aides" holding some official post than as "short-term" revolutionaries. But, I repeat, only an organisation that is firmly established and has no lack of active forces would have the right to apply such tactics.—Lenin

"pedagogics"). I am far from denying the necessity for popular literature for the workers, and especially popular (of course, not vulgar) literature for the especially backward workers. But what annoys me is this constant confusion of pedagogics with questions of politics and organisation. You, gentlemen, who are so much concerned about the "average worker", as a matter of fact, rather insult the workers by your desire *to talk down* to them when discussing working-class politics and working-class organisation. Talk about serious things in a serious manner; leave pedagogics to the pedagogues, and not to politicians and organizers! Are there not advanced people, "average people", and "masses" among the intelligentsia too? Does not everyone recognize that popular literature is also required for the intelligentsia, and is not such literature written? Imagine someone, in an article on organizing college or high-school students, repeating over and over again, as if he had made a new discovery, that first of all we must have an organisation of "average students". The author of such an article would be ridiculed, and rightly so. Give us your ideas on organisation, if you have any, he would be told, and we ourselves will decide who is "average", who above average, and who below. But if you have no organisational ideas *of your own*, then all your exertions in behalf of the "masses" and "average people" will be simply boring. You must realize that these questions of "politics" and "organisation" are so serious in themselves that they cannot be dealt with in any other but a serious way. We can and must *educate* workers (and university and Gymnasium students) so that we *may be able to discuss* these questions with them. But once you do bring up these questions, you must give real replies to them; do not fall back on the "average", or on the "masses"; do not try to dispose of the matter with facetious remarks and mere phrases. [261]

To be fully prepared for his task, the worker-revolutionary must likewise become a professional revolutionary. Hence B-v is wrong in saying that since the worker spends eleven and a half hours in the factory, the brunt of all other revolutionary functions (apart from agitation) "*must necessarily* fall mainly upon the shoulders of an extremely small force of intellectuals". But this condition does not obtain out of sheer "necessity". It obtains because we are backward, because we do not recognize our duty to assist every capable worker to become a *professional* agitator, organizer, propagandist, literature distributor, etc., etc. In this respect, we waste our strength in a positively shameful manner; we lack the ability to husband that which should be tended and reared with special care. Look at the Germans: their forces are a hundredfold greater than ours. But they understand perfectly well that really capable agitators, etc., are not often promoted from the ranks of the "average". For this reason, they immediately try to place every capable working man in conditions that will enable him to develop and apply his abilities to the fullest: he is made a professional agitator, he is encouraged to widen the field of his activity, to spread it from one factory

[261] Svoboda, No. 1, p. 66, in the article "Organisation": "The heavy tread of the army of workers will reinforce all the demands that will be advanced in behalf of Russian Labor" — Labor with a capital L, of course. And the author exclaims: "I am not in the least hostile towards the intelligentsia, but [but — the word that Shchedrin translated as meaning: The ears never grow higher than the forehead!] — but I always get frightfully annoyed when a man comes to me uttering beautiful and charming words and demands that they be accepted for their [his?] beauty and other virtues" (p. 62). Yes, I always get "frightfully annoyed", too.—Lenin

to the whole of the industry, from a single locality to the whole country. He acquires experience and dexterity in his profession; he broadens his outlook and increases his knowledge; he observes at close quarters the prominent political leaders from other localities and of other parties; he strives to rise to their level and combine in himself the knowledge of the working-class environment and the freshness of socialist convictions with professional skill, without which. the proletariat *cannot* wage a stubborn struggle against its excellently trained enemies. In this way alone do the working masses produce men of the stamp of Bebel and Auer. But what is to a great extent automatic in a politically free country must in Russia be done deliberately and systematically by our organisations. A worker-agitator who is at all gifted and "promising" *must not be left* to work eleven hours a day in a factory. We must arrange that he be maintained by the Party; that he may go underground in good time; that he changes the place of his activity, if he is to enlarge his experience, widen his outlook, and be able to hold out for at least a few years in the struggle against the gendarmes. As the spontaneous rise of their movement becomes broader and deeper, the working-class masses promote from their ranks not only an increasing number of talented agitators, but also talented organizers, propagandists, and "practical workers" in the best sense of the term (of whom there are so few among our intellectuals who, for the most part, in the Russian manner, are somewhat careless and sluggish in their habits). When we have forces of specially trained worker-revolutionaries who have gone through extensive preparation (and, of course, revolutionaries "of all arms of the service"), no political police in the world will then be able to contend with them, for these forces, boundlessly devoted to the revolution, will enjoy the boundless confidence of the widest masses of the workers. We are directly to *blame* for doing too little to "stimulate" the workers to take this path, common to them and to the "intellectuals", of professional revolutionary training, and for all too often dragging them back by our silly speeches about what is "accessible" to the masses of the workers, to the "average workers", etc.

In this, as in other respects, the narrow scope of our organisational work is without a doubt due directly to the fact (although the overwhelming majority of the "Economists" and the novices in practical work do not perceive it) that we restrict our theories and our political tasks to a narrow field. Subservience to spontaneity seems to inspire a fear of taking even one step away from what is "accessible" to the masses, a fear of rising too high above mere attendance on the immediate and direct requirements of the masses. Have no fear, gentlemen! Remember that we stand so low on the plane of organisation that the very idea that we could rise *too* high is absurd!

Section E: "Conspiratorial" Organisation and "Democratism"

Yet there are many people among us who are so sensitive to the "voice of life" that they fear it more than anything in the world and charge the adherents of the views here expounded with following a Narodnaya Volya line, with failing to understand "democratism", etc. These accusations, which, of course, have been echoed by *Rabocheye Dyelo*, need to be dealt with.

The writer of these lines knows very well that the St. Petersburg Economists levelled the charge of Narodnaya Volya tendencies also against *Rabochaya Gazeta* (which is quite understandable

when one compares it with *Rabochaya Mysl*). We were not in the least surprised, therefore, when, soon after the appearance of *Iskra*, a comrade informed us that the Social-Democrats in the town of X describe *Iskra* as a Narodnaya Volya organ. We, of course, were flattered by this accusation; for what decent Social-Democrat has not been accused by the Economists of being a Narodnaya Volya sympathizer?

These accusations are the result of a twofold misunderstanding. First, the history of the revolutionary movement is so little known among us that the name "Narodnaya Volya" is used to denote any idea of a militant centralized organisation which declares determined war upon tsarism. But the magnificent organisation that the revolutionaries had in the seventies, and that should serve us as a model, was not established by the Narodnaya Volya, but by the *Zemlya i Volya*, which split up into the Chorny Peredel and the Narodnaya Volya. Consequently, to regard a militant revolutionary organisation as something specifically Narodnaya Volya in character is absurd both historically and logically; for *no* revolutionary trend, if it seriously thinks of struggle, can dispense with such an organisation. The mistake the Narodnaya Volya committed was not in striving to enlist all the discontented in the organisation and to direct this organisation to resolute struggle against the autocracy; on the contrary, that was its great historical merit. The mistake was in relying on a theory which in substance was not a revolutionary theory at all, and the Narodnaya Volya members either did not know how, or were unable, to link their movement inseparably with the class struggle in the developing capitalist society. Only a gross failure to understand Marxism (or an "understanding" of it in the spirit of "Struveism") could prompt the opinion that the rise of a mass, spontaneous working-class movement *relieves* us of the duty of creating as good an organisation of revolutionaries as the Zemlya i Volya had, or, indeed, an incomparably better one. On the contrary, this movement *imposes* the duty upon us; for the spontaneous struggle of the proletariat will not become its genuine "class struggle" until this struggle is led by a strong organisation of revolutionaries.

Secondly, many people, including apparently B. Krichevsky (*Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, p. 18), misunderstand the polemics that Social-Democrats have always waged against the "conspiratorial" view of the political struggle. We have always protested, and will, of course, continue to protest against *confining* the political struggle to conspiracy. [262] But this does not, of course, mean that we deny the need for a strong revolutionary organisation. Thus, in the pamphlet mentioned in the preceding footnote, after the polemics against reducing the political struggle to a conspiracy, a description is given (as a Social-Democratic ideal) of an organisation so strong as to be able to "resort to. . .rebellion" and to every other form of attack, in order to "deliver a smashing blow against absolutism". [263] In *form* such a strong revolutionary organisation in an autocratic country may also be

[262] Cf. The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats, p. 21, polemics against P. L. Lavrov. (See Collected Works, Vol. 2, pp. 340-41. —Ed.)—Lenin

[263] The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats, p. 23. (See Collected Works, Vol. 2, p. 342. —Ed.) Apropos, we shall give another illustration of the fact that Rabocheye Dyelo either does not understand what it is talking about or changes its views "with the wind". In No. 1 of Rabocheye Dyelo, we find the following passage in italics: "The substance set forth in the pamphlet accords entirely with the editorial programme of 'Rabocheye Dyelo'" (p. 142). Really? Does the view that

described as a "conspiratorial" organisation, because the French word "conspiration" is the equivalent of the Russian word "*zagovar*" ("conspiracy"), and such an organisation must have the utmost secrecy. Secrecy is such a necessary condition for this kind of organisation that all the other conditions (number and selection of members, functions, etc.) must be made to conform to it. It would be extremely naive indeed, therefore, to fear the charge that we Social-Democrats desire to create a conspiratorial organisation. Such a charge should be as flattering to every opponent of Economism as the charge of following a Narodnaya Volya line.

The objection may be raised that such a powerful and strictly secret organisation, which concentrates in its hands all the threads of secret activities, an organisation which of necessity is centralized, may too easily rush into a premature attack, may thoughtlessly intensify the movement before the growth of political discontent, the intensity of the ferment and anger of the working class, etc., have made such an attack possible and necessary. Our reply to this is: Speaking abstractly, it cannot be denied, of course, that a militant organisation may thoughtlessly engage in battle, which *may* end in a defeat entirely avoidable under other conditions. But we cannot confine ourselves to abstract reasoning on such a question, because every battle bears within itself the abstract possibility of defeat, and there is no way of *reducing* this possibility except by organized preparation for battle. If, however, we proceed from the concrete conditions at present obtaining in Russia, we must come to the positive conclusion that a strong revolutionary organisation is absolutely necessary precisely for the purpose of giving stability to the movement and of *safeguarding* it against the possibility of making thoughtless attacks. Precisely at the present time, when no such organisation yet exists, and when the revolutionary movement is rapidly and spontaneously growing, we *already observe* two opposite extremes (which, as is to be expected, "meet"). These are: the utterly unsound Economism and the preaching of moderation, and the equally unsound "excitative terror", which strives "artificially to call forth symptoms of the end of the movement, which is developing and strengthening itself, when this movement is as yet nearer to the start than to the end" (V. Zasulich, in *Zarya*, No. 2-3, p. 353). And the instance of *Rabocheye Dyelo* shows that *there* exist Social-Democrats who give way to both these extremes. This is not surprising, for, apart from other reasons, the "economic struggle against the employers and the government" can *never* satisfy revolutionaries, and opposite extremes will therefore always appear here and there. Only a centralized, militant organisation that consistently carries out a Social-Democratic policy, that satisfies, so to speak, all revolutionary instincts and strivings, can safeguard the movement against making thoughtless attacks and prepare attacks that hold out the promise of success.

---

the overthrow of the autocracy must not be set as the first task of the mass movement accord with the views expressed in The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats? Does the theory of "the economic struggle against the employers and the government" and the stages theory accord with the views expressed in that pamphlet? We leave it to the reader to judge whether a periodical that understands the meaning of "accordance in opinion" in this peculiar manner can have firm principles.—Lenin

A further objection may be raised, that the views on organisation here expounded contradict the "democratic principle". Now, while the earlier accusation was specifically Russian in origin, this one *is specifically foreign* in character. And only an organisation abroad (the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad) was capable of giving its Editorial Board instructions like the following:

> "*Organisational Principle.* In order to secure the successful development and unification of Social-Democracy, the broad democratic principle of Party organisation must be emphasized, developed, and fought for; this is particularly necessary in view of the anti-democratic tendencies that have revealed themselves in the ranks of our Party" (*Two Conferences*, p. 18).

We shall see in the next chapter how *Rabocheye Dyelo* combats *Iskra*'s "anti-democratic tendencies". For the present, we shall examine more closely the "principle" that the Economists advance. Everyone will probably agree that "the broad democratic principle" presupposes the two following conditions: first, full publicity, and secondly, election to all offices. It would be absurd to speak of democracy without publicity, moreover, without a publicity that is not limited to the membership of the organisation. We call the German Socialist Party a democratic organisation because all its activities are carried out publicly; even its party congresses are held in public. But no one would call an organisation democratic that is hidden from everyone but its members by a veil of secrecy. What is the use, then, of advancing "the *broad* democratic principle" when the fundamental condition for this principle *cannot be fulfilled* by a secret organisation? "The broad principle" proves itself simply to be a resounding but hollow phrase. Moreover, it reveals a total lack of understanding of the urgent tasks of the moment in regard to organisation. Everyone knows how great the lack of secrecy is among the "broad" masses of our revolutionaries. We have heard the bitter complaints of B-v on this score and his absolutely just demand for a "strict selection of members" (*Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 6, p. 42). Yet, persons who boast a keen "sense of realities" *urge*, in a situation like this, not the strictest secrecy and the strictest (consequently, more restricted) selection, of members, but "*the broad* democratic principle"! This is what you call being wide of the mark.

Nor is the situation any better with regard to the second attribute of democracy, the principle of election. In politically free countries, this condition is taken for granted. "They are members of the Party who accept the principles of the Party programme and render the Party all possible support," reads Clause 1 of the Rules of the German Social-Democratic Party. Since the entire political arena is as open to the public view as is a theatre stage to the audience, this acceptance or non-acceptance, support or opposition, is known to all from the press and from public meetings. Everyone knows that a certain political figure began in such and such a way, passed through such and such an evolution, behaved in a trying moment in such and such a manner, and possesses such and such qualities; consequently, *all* party members, knowing all the facts, can elect or refuse to elect this person to a particular party office. The general control (in the literal sense of the term) exercised over every act of a party man in the political field brings into existence an automatically operating mechanism which produces what in biology is called the "survival of the fittest". "Natural selection" by full publicity,

election, and general control provides the assurance that, in the last analysis, every political figure will be "in his proper place", do the work for which lie is best fitted by his powers and abilities, feel the effects of his mistakes on himself, and prove before all the world his ability to recognize mistakes and to avoid them.

Try to fit this picture into the frame of our autocracy! Is it conceivable in Russia for all who accept the principles of the Party programme and render the Party all possible support to control every action of the revolutionary working in secret? Is it possible for all to elect one of these revolutionaries to any particular office, when, in the very interests of the work, the revolutionary must conceal his identity from nine out of ten of these "all"? Reflect somewhat over the real meaning of the high-sounding phrases to which *Rabocheye Dyelo* gives utterance, and you will realize that "broad democracy" in Party organisation, amidst the gloom of the autocracy and the domination of gendarmerie, is nothing more than a *useless and harmful* toy. It is a useless toy because, in point of fact, no revolutionary organisation has ever practiced, or could practice, *broad* democracy, however much it may have desired to do so. It is a harmful toy because any attempt to practice "the broad democratic principle" will simply facilitate the work of the police in carrying out large-scale raids, will perpetuate the prevailing primitiveness, and will divert the thoughts of the practical workers from the serious and pressing task of training themselves to become professional revolutionaries to that of drawing up detailed "paper" rules for election systems. Only abroad, where very often people with no opportunity for conducting really active work gather, could this "playing at democracy" develop here and there, especially in small groups.

To show the unseemliness of *Rabocheye Dyelo*'s favorite trick of advancing the plausible "principle" of democracy in revolutionary affairs, we shall again summon a witness. This witness, Y. Serebryakov, editor of the London magazine, *Nakanune*, has a soft spot for *Rabocheye Dyelo* and is filled with a great hatred for Plekhanov and the "Plekhanovites". In its articles on the split in the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, *Nakanune* definitely sided with *Rabocheye Dyelo* and poured a stream of petty abuse upon Plekhanov. All the more valuable, therefore, is this witness in the question at issue. In *Nakanune* for July (No. 7) 1899, an article entitled "Concerning the Manifesto of the Self-Emancipation of the Workers Group", Serebryakov argued that it was "indecent" to talk about such things as "self-deception, leadership, and the so-called Areopagus in a serious revolutionary movement" and, *inter alia*, wrote:

> "Myshkin, Rogachov, Zhelyabov, Mikhailov, Perovskaya, Figner, and others never regarded themselves as leaders, and no one ever elected or appointed them as such, although in actuality, they were leaders, because, in the propaganda period, as well as in the period of the struggle against the government, they took the brunt of the work upon themselves, they went into the most dangerous places, and their activities were the most fruitful. They became leaders, not because they wished it, but because the comrades surrounding them had confidence in their wisdom, in their energy, in their loyalty. To be afraid of some kind of

Areopagus (if it is not feared, why write about it?) that would arbitrarily govern the movement is far too naive. Who would pay heed to it?"

We ask the reader, in what way does the "Areopagus" differ from "anti-democratic tendencies"? And is it not evident that *Rabocheye Dyelo*'s "plausible" organisational principle is equally naive and indecent; naive, because no one would pay heed to the "Areopagus", or people with "anti- democratic tendencies", if "the comrades surrounding them had" no "confidence in their wisdom, energy, and loyalty"; indecent, because it is a demagogic sally calculated to play on the conceit of some, on the ignorance of others regarding the actual state of our movement, and on the lack of training and the ignorance of the history of the revolutionary movement on the part of still others. The only serious organisational principle for the active workers of our movement should he the strictest secrecy, the strictest selection of members, and the training of professional revolutionaries. Given these qualities, something even more than "democratism" would be guaranteed to us, namely, complete, comradely, mutual confidence among revolutionaries. This is absolutely essential for us, because there can be no question of replacing it by general democratic control in Russia. It would be a great mistake to believe that the impossibility of establishing real "democratic" control renders the members of the revolutionary organisation beyond control altogether. They have not the time to think about toy forms of democratism (democratism within a close and compact body of comrades in which complete, mutual confidence prevails), but they have a lively sense of their *responsibility*, knowing as they do from experience that an organisation of real revolutionaries will stop at nothing to rid itself of an unworthy member. Moreover, there is a fairly well-developed public opinion in Russian (and international) revolutionary circles which has a long history behind it, and which sternly and ruthlessly punishes every departure from the duties of comradeship (and "democratism", real and not toy democratism, certainly forms a component part of the conception of comradeship). Take all this into consideration and you will realize that this talk and these resolutions about "anti-democratic tendencies" have the musty odour of the playing at generals which is indulged in abroad.

It must be observed also that the other source of this talk, viz., naivete is likewise fostered by the confusion of ideas concerning the meaning of democracy. In Mr. and Mrs. Webb's book on the English trade unions there is an interesting chapter entitled "Primitive Democracy". In it the authors relate how the English workers, in the first period of existence of their unions, considered it an indispensable sign of democracy for all the members to do all the work of managing the unions; not only were all questions decided by the vote of all the members, but all official duties were fulfilled by all the members in turn. A long period of historical experience was required for worker's to realize the absurdity of such a conception of democracy and to make them understand the necessity for representative institutions, on the one hand, and for full-time officials, on the other. Only after a number of cases of financial bankruptcy of trade union treasuries had occurred did the workers realize that the rates of contributions and benefits cannot be decided merely by a democratic vote, but that this requires also the advice of insurance experts. Let us take also Kautsky's book on

parliamentarism and legislation by the people. There we find that the conclusions drawn by the Marxist theoretician coincide with the lessons learned from many years of practical experience by the workers who organized "spontaneously". Kautsky strongly protests against Rittinghausen's primitive conception of democracy; he ridicules those who in the name of democracy demand that "popular newspapers shall be edited directly by the people"; he shows the' need for *professional* journalists, parliamentarians, etc., for the Social-Democratic leadership of the proletarian class struggle; he attacks the socialism of anarchists and *litterateurs* who in their "striving for effect" extol direct legislation by the whole people, completely failing to understand that this idea can be applied only relatively in modern society.

Those who have performed practical work in our movement know how widespread the "primitive" conception of democracy is among the masses of the students and workers. It is not surprising that this conception penetrates also into rules of organisations and into literature. The Economists of the Bernsteinian persuasion included in their rules the following: "§ 10. All affairs affecting the interests of the whole of the union organisation shall be decided by a majority vote of all its members." The Economists of the terrorist persuasion repeat after them. "The decisions of the committee shall become effective only after they have been referred to all the circles" *(Svoboda*, No. 1, p. 67). Observe that this proposal for a widely applied referendum is advanced *in addition* to the demand that *the whole of* the organisation be built on an elective basis! We would not, of course, on this account condemn practical workers who have had too few opportunities for studying the theory and practice of real democratic organisations. But when *Rabocheye Dyelo*, which lays claim to leadership, confines itself, under such conditions, to a resolution on broad democratic principles, can this be described as anything but a mere "striving for effect"?

Section F: Local and All-Russia Work

The objections raised against the plan of organisation here outlined on the grounds that it is undemocratic and conspiratorial are totally unsound. Nevertheless, there remains a question which is frequently put and which deserves detailed examination. This is the question of the relations between local work and all-Russia work. Fears are expressed that the formation of a centralized organisation may shift the centre of gravity from the former to the latter, damage the movement through weakening our contacts with the working masses and the continuity of local agitation generally. To these fears we reply that our movement in the past few years has suffered precisely from the fact that local workers have been too absorbed in local work; that therefore it is absolutely necessary to shift the centre of gravity somewhat to national work; and that, far from weakening this would strengthen our ties and the continuity of our local agitation. Let us take the question of central and local newspapers. I would ask the reader not to forget that we cite the publication of newspapers only as *an example* illustrating an immeasurably broader and more varied revolutionary activity in general.

In the first period of the mass movement (1896-98), an attempt was made by local revolutionary workers to publish an all-Russia paper — *Rabochaya Gazeta*. In the next period (1898-

1900), the movement made an enormous stride forward, but the attention of the leaders was wholly absorbed by local publications. If we compute the total number of the local papers that were published, we shall find that on the average one issue per month was published. [264] Does this not clearly illustrate our amateurism? Does this not clearly show that our revolutionary organisation lags behind the spontaneous growth of the movement? If *the same number* of issues had been published, not by scattered local groups, but by a single organisation, we would not only have saved an enormous amount of effort, but we would have secured immeasurably greater stability and continuity in our work. This simple point is frequently lost sight of by those practical workers who work *actively* and almost exclusively on local publications (unfortunately this is true even now in the overwhelming majority of cases), as well as by the publicists who display an astonishing quixotism on this question. The practical workers usually rest content with the argument that "it is difficult" [265] for local workers to engage in the organisation of an all-Russia newspaper, and that local newspapers are better than no newspapers at all. This argument is, of course, perfectly just, and we, no less than any practical worker, appreciate the enormous importance and usefulness of local newspapers *in general.* But not this is the point. The point is, can we not overcome the fragmentation and primitiveness that are so glaringly expressed in the thirty issues of local newspapers that have been published throughout Russia in the course of two and a half years? Do not restrict yourselves to the indisputable, but too general, statement about the usefulness of local newspapers generally; have the courage frankly to admit their negative aspects revealed by the experience of two and a half years. This experience has shown that under the conditions in which we work, these local newspapers prove, in the majority of cases, to be unstable in their principles, devoid of political significance, extremely costly in regard to expenditure of revolutionary forces, and totally unsatisfactory from a technical point of view (I have in mind, of course, not the technique of printing, but the frequency and regularity of publication). These defects are riot accidental; they are the inevitable outcome of the fragmentation which, on the one hand, explains the predominance of local newspapers in the period under review, and, on the other, is *fostered by* this predominance. It is positively beyond the strength of a separate local organisation to raise its newspaper to the level of a political organ maintaining stability of principles; it is *beyond its strength* to collect and utilize sufficient material to shed light on the whole of our political life. The argument usually advanced to support the need for numerous local newspapers in free countries that the cost of printing by local workers is low and that the people can be kept more fully and quickly informed — this argument as experience has shown, speaks *against* local newspapers in Russia. They turn out to be excessively costly in regard to the expenditure of revolutionary forces, and appear very rarely, for the simple reason that the publication of an *illegal* newspaper, however small its size, requires an extensive secret apparatus, such as is possible with large-scale factory production; for this apparatus cannot be created in a small, handicraft workshop.

[264] See Report to the Paris Congress, p. 14. From that time (1897) to the spring of 1900, thirty issues of various papers were published in various places.... On an average, over one issue per month was published". —Lenin

[265] This difficulty is more apparent than real. In fact, there is not a single local study circle that lacks the opportunity of taking up some function or other in connection with all-Russia work. "Don't say, I can't; say, I won't." —Lenin

Very frequently, the primitiveness of the secret apparatus (every practical worker can cite numerous cases) enables the police to take advantage of the publication and distribution of one or two issues to make *mass* arrests, which result in such a clean sweep that it becomes necessary to start all over again. A well-organized secret apparatus requires professionally well-trained revolutionaries and a division of labor applied with the greatest consistency, but both these requirements are beyond the strength of a separate local organisation, however strong it may be at any given moment. Not only the general interests of our movement as a whole (training of the workers in consistent socialist and political principles) but also specifically local interests are *better served by non-local newspapers*. This may seem paradoxical at first sight, but it has been proved to the hilt by the two and a half years of experience referred to. Everyone will agree that had all the local forces that were engaged in the publication of the thirty issues of newspapers worked on a single newspaper, sixty, if not a hundred, issues could easily have been published, with a fuller expression, in consequence, of all the specifically local features of the movement. True, it is no easy matter to attain such a degree of organisation, but we must realize the need for it. Every local study circle must think about it and *work actively* to achieve it, without waiting for an impetus from outside, without being tempted by the popularity and closer proximity of a local newspaper which, as our revolutionary experience has shown, proves to a large extent to be illusory.

And it is a bad service indeed those publicists render to the practical work who, thinking themselves particularly (close to the practical workers, fail to see this illusoriness, and make shift with the astoundingly hollow and cheap argument that we must have local newspapers, we must have district newspapers, and we must have all-Russia newspapers. Generally speaking, of course, all these are necessary, but once the solution of a concrete organisational problem is undertaken, surely time and circumstances must be taken into consideration. Is it not quixotic for *Svoboda* (No. 1, p. 68) to write in a special article "dealing with *the question of a newspaper*": "It seems to us that every locality, with any appreciable number of workers, should have its own workers' newspaper; not a newspaper imported from somewhere, but its very own." If the publicist who wrote these words refuses to think of their meaning, then at least the reader may do it for him. How many scores, if not hundreds, of "localities" with any appreciable number of workers there are in Russia, and what a perpetuation of our amateurish methods this would mean if indeed every local organisation set about publishing its own. newspaper! How this diffusion would facilitate the gendarmerie's task of netting — and without "any appreciable" effort — the local revolutionary workers at the very outset of their activity and of preventing them from developing into real revolutionaries. A reader of an all-Russia newspaper, continues the author, would find little interest in the descriptions of the. malpractices of the factory owners and the "details of factory life in various towns not his own". But "an inhabitant of Orel would not find Orel affairs dull reading. In every issue he would learn who had been 'picked for a lambasting' and who had been 'flayed', and he would be in high spirits" (p. 69). Certainly, the Orel reader is in high spirits, but our publicist's flights of imagination are also high — too high. He should have asked himself whether such concern with trivialities is tactically in order. We are second

to none in appreciating the importance and necessity of factory exposures, but it must be borne in mind that we have reached a stage when St. Petersburg folk find it dull reading the St. Petersburg correspondence of the St. Petersburg *Rabochaya Mysl*. Leaflets are the medium through which local factory exposures have always been *and must continue* to be made, but we must raise the level of the *newspaper*, not lower it to the level of a factory leaflet. What we ask of a newspaper is not so much "petty" exposures, as exposures of the major, typical evils of factory life, exposures based on especially striking facts and capable, therefore, of arousing the interest of all workers and all leaders of the movement, of really enriching their knowledge, broadening their outlook, and serving as a starting-point for awakening new districts and workers from ever-newer trade areas.

"Moreover, in a local newspaper, all the malpractices of the factory administration and other authorities may he denounced then and there. In the case of a general, distant newspaper, however, by the time the news reaches it the facts will have been forgotten in the source localities. The reader, on getting the paper, will exclaim: 'When was that-who remembers it?'" (*ibid*.). Precisely — who remembers it! From the same source we learn that the 30 issues of newspapers which appeared in the course of two and a half years were published in six cities. This averages *one issue per city per half-year*! And even if our frivolous publicist *trebled* his estimate of the productivity of local work (which would be wrong in the case of an average town, since it is impossible to increase productivity to any considerable extent by our rule-of-thumb methods), we would still get only one issue every two months, i.e., nothing at all like "denouncing then and there". It would suffice, however, for ten local organisations to combine and send their delegates to take an active part in organizing a general newspaper, to enable us every fortnight to "denounce", over the *whole of Russia*, not petty, but really outstanding and typical evils. No one who knows the state of affairs in our organisations can have the slightest doubt on that score. As for catching the enemy red-handed — if we mean it seriously and not merely as a pretty phrase — that is quite beyond the ability of an illegal paper generally. It can be done only by a leaflet, because the time limit for exposures of that nature can be a day or two at the most (e.g., the usual brief strikes, violent factory clashes, demonstrations, etc.).

"The workers live not only at the factory, but also in the city," continues our author, rising from the particular to the general, with a strict consistency that would have done honor to Boris Krichevsky himself; and he refers to matters like municipal councils, municipal hospitals, municipal schools, and demands that workers' newspapers should not ignore municipal affairs in general.

This demand — excellent in itself — serves as a particularly vivid illustration of the empty abstraction to which discussions of local newspapers are all too frequently limited. In the first place, if indeed newspapers appeared "in every locality with any appreciable number of workers" with such detailed information on municipal affairs as *Svoboda* desires, this would, under our Russian conditions, inevitably degenerate into actual concern with trivialities, lead to a weakening of the consciousness of the importance of an all-Russia revolutionary assault upon the tsarist autocracy, and strengthen the extremely virile shoots — not uprooted but rather hidden or temporarily suppressed

— of the tendency that has become noted as a result of the famous remark about revolutionaries who talk a great deal about non-existent parliaments and too little about existent municipal councils. We say "inevitably", in order to emphasize that *Svoboda* obviously does not desire this, but the contrary, to come about. But good intentions are not enough. For municipal affairs to be dealt with in their proper perspective, in relation to our entire work, this perspective must *first* be clearly conceived, firmly established, not only by argument, but by numerous examples, so that it may acquire the stability of a *tradition*. This is still far from being the case with us. Yet this must be done *first*, before we can allow ourselves to think and talk about an extensive local press.

Secondly, to write really well and interestingly about municipal affairs, one must have first-hand knowledge, not book knowledge, of the issues. But there are hardly any Social-Democrats *anywhere in Russia* who possess such knowledge. To be able to write in newspapers (not in popular pamphlets) about municipal and state affairs, one must have fresh and varied material gathered and written up by able people. And in order to be able to gather and write up such material, we must have something more than the "primitive democracy" of a primitive circle, in which everybody does everything and all entertain themselves by playing at referendums. It is necessary to have a staff of expert writers and correspondents, an army of Social-Democratic reporters who establish contacts far and wide, who are able to fathom all sorts of "state secrets" (the knowledge of which makes the Russian government official so puffed up, but the blabbing of which is such an easy matter to him), who are able to penetrate "behind the scenes" — an army of' people who must, as their "official duty", be ubiquitous and omniscient. And we, the Party that fights against all economic, political, social, and national oppression, can and must find, gather, train, mobilize, and set into motion such an army of omniscient people — all of which requires still to be done. Not only has not a single step in this direction been taken in the overwhelming majority of localities, but even the recognition of its necessity is very often lacking. One will search in vain in our Social-Democratic press for lively and interesting articles, correspondence, and exposures dealing with our big and little affairs — diplomatic, military, ecclesiastical, municipal, financial, etc., etc. There is *almost nothing*, or very little, about these matters. [266] That is why "it always annoys me frightfully when a man comes to me, utters beautiful and charming words" about the need for newspapers in "every locality with any appreciable number of workers" that will expose factory, municipal, and government evils.

The predominance of the local papers over a central press may be a sign of either poverty or luxury. Of poverty, when the movement has not yet developed the forces for large-scale production,

[266] That is why even examples of exceptionally good local newspapers fully confirm our point of view. For example, Yuzhny Rabochy is an excellent newspaper, entirely free of instability of principle. But it has been unable to provide what it desired for the local movement, owing to the infrequency of its publication and to extensive police raids. Principled presentation of the fundamental questions of the movement and wide political agitation, which our Party most urgently requires at the present time, has proved too big a job for the local newspaper. The material of particular value it has published, like the articles on the mine owners' convention and on unemployment, was not strictly local material, it was required for the whole of Russia, not for the South alone. No such articles have appeared in any of our Social-Democratic newspapers.—Lenin

continues to flounder in amateurism, and is all but swamped with "the petty details of factory life". Of luxury, when the movement *has fully mastered* the task of comprehensive exposure and comprehensive agitation, and it becomes necessary to publish numerous local newspapers in addition to the central organ. Let each decide for himself what the predominance of local newspapers implies in present-day Russia. I shall limit myself to a precise formulation of my own conclusion, to leave no grounds for misunderstanding. Hitherto, the majority of our local organisations have thought almost exclusively in terms of local newspapers, and have devoted almost all their activities to this work. This is abnormal; the very opposite should have been the case. The majority of the local organisations should think principally of the publication of an all-Russia newspaper and devote their activities chiefly to it. Until this is done, we shall not be able to establish a *single* newspaper capable, to any degree, of serving the movement with *comprehensive* press agitation. When this is done, however, normal relations between the necessary central newspaper and the necessary local newspapers will be established automatically.

* *
*

It would seem at first glance that the conclusion on the necessity for shifting the centre of gravity from local to all-Russia work does not apply to the sphere of the specifically economic struggle. In this struggle, the immediate enemies of the workers are the individual employers or groups of employers, who are not bound by any organisation having even the remotest resemblance to the purely military, strictly centralized organisation of the Russian Government — our immediate enemy in the political struggle — which is led in all its minutest details by a single will.

But that is not the case. As we have repeatedly pointed out, the economic struggle is a trade struggle, and for that reason it requires that the workers be organized according to trades, not only according to place of employment. Organisation by trades becomes all the more urgently necessary, the more rapidly our employers organize in all sorts of companies and syndicates. Our fragmentation and our amateurism are an outright hindrance to this work of organisation which requires the existence of a single, all-Russia body of revolutionaries capable of giving leadership to the all-Russia trade unions. We have described above the type of organisation that is needed for this purpose; we shall now add but a few words on the question of our press in this connection.

Hardly anyone will doubt the necessity for every Social-Democratic newspaper to have a *special department* devoted to the trade union (economic) struggle. But the growth of the trade union movement compels us to think about the creation of a trade union press. It seems to us, however, that with rare exceptions, there can be no question of trade union newspapers in Russia at the present time; they would be a luxury, and many a time we lack even our daily bread. The form of trade union press that would suit the conditions of our illegal work and is already required at the present time is *trade union pamphlets.* In these pamphlets, *legal* and illegal material should be gathered and grouped systematically, on the working conditions in a given trade, on the differences in this respect in the

various parts of, Russia; on the main demands advanced by the workers in the given trade; on the inadequacies of legislation affecting that trade; on outstanding instances of economic struggle by the workers in the trade; on the beginnings, the present state, and the requirements of their trade union organisation, etc. Such pamphlets would, in the first place, relieve our Social-Democratic press of a mass of trade details that are of interest only to workers in the given trade. Secondly, they would record the results of our experience in the trade union struggle, they would preserve the gathered material, which now literally gets lost in a mass of leaflets and fragmentary correspondence; and they would summaries this material. Thirdly, they could serve as guides for agitators, because working conditions change relatively slowly and the main demands of the workers in a given trade are extremely stable (cf., for example, the demands advanced by the weavers in the Moscow district in 1885 and in the St. Petersburg district in 1896). A compilation of such demands and needs might serve for years as an excellent handbook for agitators on economic questions in backward localities or among the backward strata of the workers. Examples of successful strikes in a given region, information on higher living standards, on improved working conditions, in one locality, would encourage the workers in other localities to take up the fight again and again. Fourthly, having made a start in generalizing the trade union struggle and in this way strengthening the link between the Russian trade union movement and socialism, the Social-Democrats would at the same time see to it that our trade union work occupied neither too small nor too large a place in our Social-Democratic work as a whole. A local organisation that is cut off from organisations in other towns finds it very difficult, sometimes almost impossible, to maintain a correct sense of pro portion (the example of *Rabochaya Mysl* shows what a monstrous exaggeration can be made in the direction of trade-unionism) But an all-Russia organisation of revolutionaries that stands undeviatingly on the basis of Marxism, that leads the entire political struggle and possesses a staff of professional agitators, will never find it difficult to determine the proper proportion.

Lenin: Conditions of Admission to the III International

The First, Inaugural Congress of the Communist International did not draw up precise conditions for the admission of parties into the Third International. When the First Congress was convened, only communist *trends* and *groups* existed in most countries.

It is in a different situation that the Second World Congress of the Communist International is meeting. In most countries, Communist *parties* and *organisations*, not merely trends, now exist.

Parties and groups only recently affiliated to the Second International are more and more frequently applying for membership in the Third International, though they have not become really Communist. The Second International has definitely been smashed. Aware that the Second International is beyond hope, the intermediate parties and groups of the "Centre" are trying to lean on the Communist International, which is steadily gaining in strength. At the same time, however, they hope to retain a degree of "autonomy" that will enable them to pursue their previous

opportunist or "Centrist" policies. The Communist International is, to a certain extent, becoming the vogue.

The desire of certain leading "Centre" groups to join the Third International provides oblique confirmation that it has won the sympathy of the vast majority of class-conscious workers throughout the world, and is becoming a more powerful force with each day.

In certain circumstances, the Communist International may be faced with the danger of dilution by the influx of wavering and irresolute groups that have not as yet broken with their Second International ideology.

Besides, some of the big parties (Italy, Sweden), in which the majority have adopted the communist standpoint, still contain a strong reformist and social-pacifist wing that is only waiting for an opportune moment to raise its head again, begin active sabotage of the proletarian revolution, and thereby help the bourgeoisie and the Second International.

No Communist should forget the lessons of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. The Hungarian proletariat paid dearly for the Hungarian Communists having united with the reformists.

In view of all this, the Second World Congress deems it necessary to lay down absolutely precise terms for the admission of new parties, and also to set forth the obligations incurred by the parties already affiliated.

The Second Congress of the Communist International resolves that the following are the terms of Comintern membership:

1. Day-by-day propaganda and agitation must be genuinely communist in character. All press organs belonging to the parties must be edited by reliable Communists who have given proof of their devotion to the cause of the proletarian revolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat should not be discussed merely as a stock phrase to be learned by rote; it should be popularized in such a way that the practical facts systematically dealt with in our press day by day will drive home to every rank-and-file working man and working woman, every soldier and peasant, that it is indispensable to them. Third International supporters should use all media to which they have access—the press, public meetings, trade unions, and co-operative societies—to expose systematically and relentlessly, not only the bourgeoisie but also its accomplices—the reformists of every shade.
2. Any organisation that wishes to join the Communist International must consistently and systematically dismiss reformists and "Centrists" from positions of any responsibility in the working-class movement (party organisations, editorial boards, trade unions, parliamentary groups, co-operative societies, municipal councils, etc.), replacing them by reliable Communists. The fact that in some cases rank-and-file workers may at first have to replace "experienced" leaders should be no deterrent.

3. In countries where a state of siege or emergency legislation makes it impossible for Communists to conduct their activities legally, it is absolutely essential that legal and illegal work should be combined. In almost all the countries of Europe and America, the class struggle is entering the phase of civil war. In these conditions, Communists can place no trust in bourgeois legality. They must everywhere build up a parallel illegal organisation, which, at the decisive moment, will be in a position to help the Party fulfil its duty to the revolution.
4. Persistent and systematic propaganda and agitation must be conducted in the armed forces, and Communist cells formed in every military unit. In the main Communists will have to do this work illegally; failure to engage in it would be tantamount to a betrayal of their revolutionary duty and incompatible with membership in the Third International.
5. Regular and systematic agitation is indispensable in the countryside. The working class cannot consolidate its victory without support from at least a section of the farm laborers and poor peasants, and without neutralizing, through its policy, part of the rest of the rural population. In the present period communist activity in the countryside is of primary importance. It should be conducted, in the main, through revolutionary *worker*-Communists who have contacts with the rural areas. To forgo this work or entrust it to unreliable semi-reformist elements is tantamount to renouncing the proletarian revolution.
6. It is the duty of any party wishing to belong to the Third International to expose, not only avowed social-patriotism, but also the falsehood and hypocrisy of social-pacifism. It must systematically demonstrate to the workers that, without the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, no international arbitration courts, no talk about a reduction of armaments, no "democratic" reorganization of the League of Nations will save mankind from new imperialist wars.
7. It is the duty of parties wishing to belong to the Communist International to recognize the need for a complete and absolute break with reformism and "Centrist" policy, and to conduct propaganda among the party membership for that break. Without this, a consistent communist policy is impossible.

   The Communist International demands imperatively and uncompromisingly that this break be affected at the earliest possible date. It cannot tolerate a situation in which avowed reformists, such as Turati, Modigliani and others, are entitled to consider themselves members of the Third International. Such a state of affairs would lead to the Third International strongly resembling the defunct Second International.
8. Parties in countries whose bourgeoisie possess colonies and oppress other nations must pursue a most well-defined and clear-cut policy in respect of colonies and oppressed nations. Any party wishing to join the Third International must ruthlessly expose the colonial machinations of the imperialists of its "own" country, must support—in deed, not merely in word—every colonial liberation movement, demand the expulsion of its

compatriot imperialists from the colonies, inculcate in the hearts of the workers of its own country an attitude of true brotherhood with the working population of the colonies and the oppressed nations, and conduct systematic agitation among the armed forces against all oppression of the colonial peoples.

9. It is the duty of any party wishing to join the Communist International to conduct systematic and unflagging communist work in the trade unions, co-operative societies and other mass workers' organisations. Communist cells should be formed in the trade unions, and, by their sustained and unflagging work, win the unions over to the communist cause. In every phase of their day-by-day activity these cells must unmask the treachery of the social-patriots and the vacillation of the "Centrists". The cells must be completely subordinate to the party as a whole.
10. It is the duty of any party belonging to the Communist International to wage a determined struggle against the Amsterdam "International" of yellow trade unions. Its indefatigable propaganda should show the organized workers the need to break with the yellow Amsterdam International. It must give every support to the emerging international federation of Red trade unions which are associated with the Communist International.
11. It is the duty of parties wishing to join the Third International to re-examine the composition of their parliamentary groups, eliminate unreliable elements and effectively subordinate these groups to the Party Central Committees. They must demand that every Communist proletarian should subordinate all his activities to the interests of truly revolutionary propaganda and agitation.
12. The periodical and non-periodical press, and all publishing enterprises, must likewise be fully subordinate to the Party Central Committee, whether the party as a whole is legal or illegal at the time. Publishing enterprises should not be allowed to abuse their autonomy and pursue any policies that are not in full accord with that of the Party.
13. Parties belonging to the Communist International must be organized on the principle of democratic centralism. In this period of acute civil war, the Communist parties can perform their duty only if they are organized in a most centralized manner, are marked by an iron discipline bordering on military discipline, and have strong and authoritative party centers invested with wide powers and enjoying the unanimous confidence of the membership.
14. Communist parties in countries where Communists can conduct their work legally must carry out periodic membership purges (re-registrations) with the aim of systematically ridding the party of petty-bourgeois elements that inevitably percolate into them.
15. It is the duty of any party wishing to join the Communist International selflessly to help any Soviet republic in its struggle against counter-revolutionary forces. Communist parties must conduct incessant propaganda urging the workers to refuse to transport war materials destined for the enemies of the Soviet republics; they must conduct legal or illegal propaganda in the armed forces dispatched to strangle the workers' republics, etc.

16. It is the duty of parties which have still kept their old Social-Democratic programs to revise them as speedily as possible and draw up new communist programs in conformity with the specific conditions in their respective countries, and in the spirit of (Communist International decisions. As a rule, the programs of all parties belonging to the Communist International must be approved by a regular Congress of the Communist International or by its Executive Committee. In the event of the Executive Committee withholding approval, the party is entitled to appeal to the Congress of the Communist International.
17. All decisions of the Communist International 's congresses and of its Executive Committee are binding on all affiliated parties. Operating in conditions of acute civil war, the Communist International must be far more centralized than the Second International was. It stands to reason, however, that in every aspect of their work the Communist International and its Executive Committee must take into account the diversity of conditions in which the respective parties have to fight and work, and adopt decisions binding on all parties only on matters in which such decisions are possible.
18. In view of the foregoing, parties wishing to join the Communist International must change their name. Any party seeking affiliation must call itself the Communist Party of the country in question (Section of the Third, Communist International). The question of a party's name is not merely a formality, but a matter of major political importance. The Communist International has declared a resolute war on the bourgeois world and all yellow Social-Democratic parties. The difference between the Communist parties and the old and official "Social-Democratic", or "socialist", parties, which have betrayed the banner of the working class, must be made absolutely clear to every rank-and-file worker.
19. After the conclusion of the proceedings of the Second World Congress of the Communist International, any party wishing to join the Communist International must at the earliest date convene an extraordinary congress for official acceptance of the above obligations on behalf of the entire party.

Mao Zedong: Quotations from Mao Zedong

Chapter 1: The Communist Party

The force at the core leading our cause forward is the Chinese Communist Party. The theoretical basis guiding our thinking is Marxism-Leninism.

Opening address at the First Session of the First National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China (September 15, 1954).

If there is to be revolution, there must be a revolutionary party. Without a revolutionary party, without a party built on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and in the Marxist-Leninist

revolutionary style, it is impossible to lead the working class and the broad masses of the people in defeating imperialism and its running dogs.

"Revolutionary Forces of the World Unite, Fight Against Imperialist Aggression!" (November 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 284.*

Without the efforts of the Chinese Communist Party, without the Chinese Communists as the mainstay of the Chinese people, China can never achieve independence and liberation, or industrialization and the modernization of her agriculture.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 318.*

The Chinese Communist Party is the core of leadership of the whole Chinese people. Without this core, the cause of socialism cannot be victorious.

Talk at the general reception for the delegates to the Third National Congress of the New Democratic Youth League of China (May 25, 1957).

A well-disciplined Party armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, using the method of self-criticism and linked with the masses of the people; an army under the leadership of such a Party; a united front of all revolutionary classes and all revolutionary groups under the leadership of such a Party - these are the three main weapons with which we have defeated the enemy.

"On the People's Democratic Dictatorship" (June 30, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 422.

We must have faith in the masses and we must have faith in the Party. These are two cardinal principles. If we doubt these principles, we shall accomplish nothing.

On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation (.July 31, 1955), 3rd ed., p. 7.*

Armed with Marxist-Leninist theory and ideology, the Communist Party of China has brought a new style of work to the Chinese people. A style of work which essentially entails integrating theory with practice, forging close links with the masses and practicing self-criticism.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 314. *

No political party can possibly lead a great revolutionary movement to victory unless it possesses revolutionary theory and knowledge of history and has a profound grasp of the practical movement.

"The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War" (October 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 208.

As we used to say, the rectification movement is "a widespread movement of Marxist education". Rectification means the whole Party studying Marxism through criticism and self-criticism. We can certainly learn more about Marxism in the course of the rectification movement.

Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work (March 12, l957), 1st pocket ed., p. 14.

It is an arduous task to ensure a better life for the several hundred million people of China and to build our economically and culturally backward country into a prosperous and powerful one with a high level of culture. And it is precisely in order to be able to shoulder this task more competently and work better together with all non-Party people who are actuated by high ideals and determined

to institute reforms that we must conduct rectification movements both now and, in the future, and constantly rid ourselves of whatever is wrong.

Ibid., pp. 15-16.*

Policy is the starting-point of all the practical actions of a revolutionary party and manifests itself in the process and the end-result of that party's actions. A revolutionary party is carrying out a policy whenever it takes any action. If it is not carrying out a correct policy, it is carrying out a wrong policy; if it is not carrying out a given policy consciously, it is doing so blindly. What we call experience is the process and the end-result of carrying out a policy. Only through the practice of the people, that is, through experience, can we verify whether a policy is correct or wrong and determine to what extent it is correct or wrong. However, people's practice, especially the practice of a revolutionary party and the revolutionary masses, cannot but be bound up with one policy or another. Therefore, before any action is taken, we must explain the policy, which we have formulated in the light of the given circumstances, to Party members and to the masses. Otherwise, Party members and the masses will depart from the guidance of our policy, act blindly and carry out a wrong policy.

"On the Policy Concerning Industry and Commerce" (February 27, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV. Pp. 204-05. *

Our Party has laid down the general line and general policy of the Chinese revolution as well as various specific lines for work and specific policies. However, while many comrades remember our Party's specific lines for work and specific policies, they often forget its general line and general policy. If we actually forget the Party's general line and general policy, then we shall be blind, half-baked, muddle-headed revolutionaries, and when we carry out a specific line for work and a specific policy, we shall lose our bearings and vacillate now to the left and now to the right, and the work will suffer.

"Speech at a Conference of Cadres in the Shansi-Suiyuan Liberated Area" (April 1, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 238. *

Policy and tactics are the life of the Party; leading comrades at all levels must give them full attention and must never on any account be negligent.

"A Circular on the Situation" (March 20, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 220.

Chapter 10: Leadership of Party Committees

The Party committee system is an important Party institution for ensuring collective leadership and preventing any individual from monopolizing the conduct of affairs. It has recently been found that in some (of course not all) leading bodies it is the habitual practice for one individual to monopolize the conduct of affairs and decide important problems. Solutions to important problems are decided not by Party committee meetings but by one individual, and membership in the Party committee has become nominal. Differences of opinion among committee members cannot be resolved and are left unresolved for a long time. Members of the Party committee maintain only formal, not real, unity among themselves. This situation must be changed. From now on, a sound system of Party committee meetings must be instituted in all leading bodies, from the regional bureaus of the Central

Committee to the prefectural Party committees; from the Party committees of the fronts to the Party committees of brigades and military areas (sub-commissions of the Revolutionary Military Commission or leading groups); and the leading Party members' groups in government bodies, people's organizations the news agency and the newspaper offices. All-important problems (of course, not the unimportant, trivial problems, or problems whose solutions have already been decided after discussion at meetings and need only be carried out) must be submitted to the committee for discussion, and the committee members present should express their views fully and reach definite decisions which should then be carried out by the members concerned.... Party committee meetings must be divided into two categories, standing committee meetings and plenary sessions, and the two should not be confused. Furthermore, we must take care that neither collective leadership nor personal responsibility is overemphasized to the neglect of the other. In the army, the person in command has the right to make emergency decisions during battle and when circumstances require.

"On Strengthening the Party Committee System" (September 20, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, pp. 267-68.*

The secretary of a Party committee must be good at being a "squad leader". A Party committee has ten to twenty members; it is like a squad in the army, and the secretary is like the "squad leader". It is indeed not easy to lead this squad well. Each regional bureau or sub-regional bureau of the Central Committee now leads a vast area and shoulders very heavy responsibilities. To lead means not only to decide general and specific policies but also to devise correct methods of work. Even with correct general and specific policies, troubles may still arise if methods of work are neglected. To fulfil its task of exercising leadership, a Party committee must rely on its "squad members" and enable them to play their parts to the full. To be a good "squad leader", the secretary should study hard and investigate thoroughly. A secretary or deputy secretary will find it difficult to direct his "squad" well if he does not take care to do propaganda and organizational work among his own "squad members'', is not good at handling his relations with committee members or does not study how to run meetings successfully. If the "squad members" do not march in step, they can never expect to lead tens of millions of people in fighting and construction. Of course, the relation between the secretary and the committee members is one in which the minority must obey the majority, so it is different from the relation between a squad leader and his men. Here we speak only by way of analogy.

"Methods of Work of Party Committees" (March 13, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 377.*

Place problems on the table. This should be done not only by the "squad leader" but by the committee members too. Do not talk behind people's backs. Whenever problems arise, call a meeting, place the problems on the table for discussion, take some decisions and the problems will be solved. If problems exist and are not placed on the table, they will remain unsolved for a long time and even drag on for years. The "squad leader" and the committee members should show understanding in their relations with each other. Nothing is more important than mutual understanding, support and

friendship between the secretary and the committee members, between the Central Committee and its regional bureaus and between the regional bureaus and the area Party committees.

Ibid., pp. 377-78.

"Exchange information." This means that members of a Party committee should keep each other informed and exchange views on matters that have come to their attention. This is of great importance in achieving a common language. Some fail to do so and, like the people described by Lao Tzu, "do not visit each other all their lives, though the crowing of their cocks and the barking of their dogs are within hearing of each other". The result is that they lack a common language.

Ibid., P. 378.

Ask your subordinates about matters you do not understand or do not know, and do not lightly express your approval or disapproval.... We should never pretend to know what we do not know, we should "not feel ashamed to ask and learn from people below" and we should listen carefully to the views of the cadres at the lower levels. Be a pupil before you become a teacher; learn from the cadres at the lower levels before you issue orders.... What the cadres at the lower levels say may or may not be correct; after hearing it, we must analyze it. We must heed the correct views and act upon them.... Listen also to the mistaken views from below, it is wrong not to listen to them at all. Such views, however, are not to be acted upon but to be criticized.

Ibid., pp. 378-79 *

Learn to "play the piano". In playing the piano, all ten fingers are in motion; it will not do to move some fingers only and not others. However, if all ten fingers press down at once, there is no melody. To produce good music, the ten fingers should move rhythmically and in co-ordination. A Party committee should keep a firm grasp on its central task and at the same time, around the central task, it should unfold the work in other fields. At present, we have to take care of many fields; we must look after the work in all the areas, armed units and departments, and not give all our attention to a few problems, to the exclusion of others. Wherever there is a problem, we must put our finger on it, and this is a method we must master. Some play the piano well and some badly, and there is a great difference in the melodies they produce. Members of Party committees must learn to "play the piano" well.

Ibid., p. 379.

"Grasp firmly." That is to say, the Party committee must not merely "grasp", but must "grasp firmly", its main tasks. One can get a grip on something only when it is grasped firmly, without the slightest slackening. Not to grasp firmly is not to grasp at all. Naturally, one cannot get a grip on something with an open hand. When the hand is clenched as if grasping something but is not clenched tightly, there is still no grip. Some of our comrades do grasp the main tasks, but their grasp is not firm and so they cannot make a success of their work. It will not do to have no grasp at all, nor will it do if the grasp is not firm.

Ibid.

"Have a head for figures." That is to say, we must attend to the quantitative aspect of a situation or problem and make a basic quantitative analysis. Every quality manifest itself in a certain quantity, and without quantity, there can be no quality. To this day many of our comrades still do not understand that they must attend to the quantitative aspect of things - the basic statistics, the main percentages and the quantitative limits that determine the qualities of things. They have no "figures" in their heads and therefore cannot help making mistakes.

Ibid., pp. 379-80.

"Notice to Reassure the Public." Notice of meetings should be given beforehand; this is like issuing a "Notice to Reassure the Public", so that everybody will know what is going to be discussed and what problems are to be solved and can make timely preparations. In some places, meetings of cadres are called without first preparing reports and draft resolutions, and only when people have arrived for the meeting are makeshifts improvised; this is just like the saying, "Troops and horses have arrived, but food and fodder are not ready", and that is no good. Do not call a meeting in a hurry if the preparations are not completed.

Ibid., p. 380.

"Fewer and better troops and simpler administration." Talks, speeches, articles and resolutions should all be concise and to the point. Meetings also should not go on too long.

Ibid.

Pay attention to uniting and working with comrades who differ with you. This should be borne in mind both in the localities and in the army. It also applies to relations with people outside the Party. We have come together from every corner of the country and should be good at uniting in our work not only with comrades who hold the same views as we but also with those who hold different views.

Ibid.

Guard against arrogance. For anyone in a leading position, this is a matter of principle and an important condition for maintaining unity. Even those who have made no serious mistakes and have achieved very great success in their work should not be arrogant.

Ibid.

Draw two lines of distinction. First, between revolution and counter-revolution, between Yenan and Sian. Some do not understand that they must draw this line of distinction. For example, when they combat bureaucracy, they speak of Yenan as though "nothing is right" there and fail to make a comparison and distinguish between the bureaucracy in Yenan and the bureaucracy in Sian. This is fundamentally wrong. Secondly, within the revolutionary ranks, it is necessary to make a clear distinction between right and wrong, between achievements and shortcomings and to make clear

which of the two is primary and which secondary. For instance, do the achievements amount to 30 per cent or to 70 per cent of the whole? It will not do either to understate or to overstate. We must have a fundamental evaluation of a person's work and establish whether his achievements amount to 30 per cent and his mistakes to 70 per cent, or vice versa. If his achievements amount to 70 per cent of the whole, then his work should in approve the main. It would be entirely wrong to describe work in which the achievements are primary as work in which the mistakes are primary. In our approach to problems, we must not forget to draw these two lines of distinction, between revolution and counter-revolution and between achievements and shortcomings. We shall be able to handle things well if we bear these two distinctions in mind; otherwise, we shall confuse the nature of the problems. To draw these distinctions well, careful study and analysis are of course necessary. Our attitude towards every person and every matter should be one of analysis and study.

Ibid., p. 381.

In the sphere of organization, ensure democracy under centralized guidance. It should be done on the following lines:

(1) The leading bodies of the Party must give a correct line of guidance and find solutions when problems arise, in order to establish themselves as centers of leadership.

(2) The higher bodies must be familiar with the situation in the lower bodies and with the life of the masses to have an objective basis for correct guidance.

(3) No Party organization at any level should make casual decisions in solving problems. Once a decision is reached, it must be firmly carried out.

(4) All decisions of any importance made by the Party's higher bodies must be promptly transmitted to the lower bodies and the Party ordinary people....

(5) The lower bodies of the Party and the Party ordinary people must discuss the higher bodies' directives in detail in order to understand their meaning thoroughly and decide on the methods of carrying them out.

"On Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party" (December 1929), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 109.*

Chapter 11: The Mass Line

The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 257.*

The masses are the real heroes, while we ourselves are often childish and ignorant, and without this understanding, it is impossible to acquire even the most rudimentary knowledge.

"Preface and Postscript to Rural Surveys" (March and April 1941), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 12. *

The masses have boundless creative power. They can organize themselves and concentrate on places and branches of work where they can give full play to their energy; they can concentrate on production in breadth and depth and create more and more undertakings for their own well-being.

Introductory note to "Surplus Labor Has Found a Way Out" (1955), The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside, Chinese ed., Vol. II.

The present upsurge of the peasant movement is a colossal event. In a very short time, in China's central, southern and northern provinces, several hundred million peasants will rise like a mighty storm, like a hurricane, a force so swift and violent that no power, however great, will be able to hold it back. They will smash all the trammels that bind them and rush forward along the road to liberation. They will sweep all the imperialists, warlords, corrupt officials, local tyrants and evil gentry into their graves. Every revolutionary party and every revolutionary comrade will be put to the test, to be accepted or rejected as they decide. There are three alternatives. To march at their head and lead them? To trail behind them, gesticulating and criticizing? Or to stand in their way and oppose them? Every Chinese is free to choose, but events will force you to make the choice quickly.

"Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan" (March 1927), Selected Works, Vol. I, pp. 23-24. *

The high tide of social transformation in the countryside, the high tide of co-operation, has already reached some places and will soon sweep over the whole country. It is a vast socialist revolutionary movement involving a rural population of more than 800 million, and it has extremely great and worldwide significance. We should give this movement active, enthusiastic and systematic leadership, and not drag it back by one means or another. Some errors are unavoidable in the process; this is understandable, and they will not be hard to correct. Shortcomings or mistakes found among the cadres and the peasants can be remedied or overcome provided we give them positive help.

On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation (July 31, 1955), 3rd ed., p. 1. *

The masses have a potentially inexhaustible enthusiasm for socialism. Those who can only follow the old routine in a revolutionary period are utterly incapable of seeing this enthusiasm. They are blind and all is dark ahead of them. At times they go so far as to confound right and wrong and turn things upside down. Haven't we come across enough persons of this type? Those who simply follow the old routine invariably underestimate the people's enthusiasm. Let something new appear and they always disapprove and rush to oppose it. Afterwards, they have to admit defeat and do a little self-criticism. But the next time something new appears, they go through the same process all over again. This is their pattern of behavior in regard to anything and everything new. Such people are always passive, always fail to move forward at the critical moment, and always have to be given a shove in the back before they move a step.

Introductory note to "This Township Went Co-operative in Two Years" (1955), The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside, Chinese ed., Vol. II.

For over twenty years our Party has carried on mass work every day, and for the past dozen years it has talked about the mass line every day. We have always maintained that the revolution must rely on the masses of the people, on everybody's taking a hand, and have opposed relying merely on a few persons issuing orders. The mass line, however, is still not being thoroughly carried out in the work of some comrades; they still rely solely on a handful of people working in solitude. One reason is that, whatever they do, they are always reluctant to explain it to the people they lead and that they do not understand why or how to give play to the initiative and creative energy of those they lead. Subjectively, they too want everyone to take a hand in the work, but they do not let other people know what is to be done or how to do it. That being the case, how can everyone be expected to get moving and how can anything be done well? To solve this problem the basic thing is, of course, to carry out ideological education on the mass line, but at the same time we must teach these comrades many concrete methods of work.

"A Talk to the Editorial Staff of the Shansi-Suiyuan Daily" (April 2, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, pp. 241-42. *

Twenty-four years of experience tell us that the right task, policy and style of work invariably conform with the demands of the masses at a given time and place and invariably strengthen our ties with the masses, and the wrong task, policy and style of work invariably disagree with the demands of the masses at a given time and place and invariably alienate us from the masses. The reason why such evils as dogmatism, empiricism, commandism, tailism, sectarianism, bureaucracy and an arrogant attitude in work are definitely harmful and intolerable, and why anyone suffering from these maladies must overcome them, is that they alienate us from the masses.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 315.

To link oneself with the masses, one must act in accordance with the needs and wishes of the masses. All work done for the masses must start from their needs and not from the desire of any individual, however well-intentioned. It often happens that objectively the masses need a certain change, but subjectively they are not yet conscious of the need, not yet willing or determined to make the change. In such cases, we should wait patiently. We should not make the change until, through our work, most of the masses have become conscious of the need and are willing and determined to carry it out. Otherwise, we shall isolate ourselves from the masses. Unless they are conscious and willing, any kind of work that requires their participation will turn out to be a mere formality and will fail.... There are two principles here: one is the actual needs of the masses rather than what we fancy they need, and the other is the wishes of the masses, who must make up their own minds instead of our making up their minds for them.

"The United Front in Cultural Work" (October 30, 1944), Selected Works, Vol. III, pp. 236-37. *

Our congress should call upon the whole Party to be vigilant and to see that no comrade at any post is divorced from the masses. It should teach every comrade to love the people and listen attentively to the voice of the masses; to identify himself with the masses wherever he goes and, instead of standing above them, to immerse himself among them; and, according to their present level, to

awaken them or raise their political consciousness and help them gradually to organize themselves voluntarily and to set going all essential struggles permitted by the internal and external circumstances of the given time and place.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, pp. 315-I6.

If we tried to go on the offensive when the masses are not yet awakened, that would be adventurism. If we insisted on leading the masses to do anything against their will, we would certainly fail. If we did not advance when the masses demand advance, that would be Right opportunism.

"A Talk to the Editorial Staff of the Shansi-Suiyuan Daily" (April 2, I948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 243.

Commandism is wrong in any type of work, because in overstepping the level of political consciousness of the masses and violating the principle of voluntary mass action it reflects the disease of impetuosity. Our comrades must not assume that everything they themselves understand is understood by the masses. Whether the masses understand it and are ready to take action can be discovered only by going into their midst and making investigations. If we do so, we can avoid commandism. Tailism in any type of work is also wrong, because in falling below the level of political consciousness of the masses and violating the principle of leading the masses forward it reflects the disease of dilatoriness. Our comrades must not assume that the masses have no understanding of what they do not yet understand. It often happens that the masses outstrip us and are eager to advance a step and that nevertheless our comrades fail to act as leaders of the masses and tail behind certain backward elements, reflecting their views and, moreover, mistaking them for those of the broad masses.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 316. *

Take the ideas of the masses and concentrate them, then go to the masses, persevere in the ideas and carry them through, so as to form correct ideas of leadership - such is the basic method of leadership.

"Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership" (June 1, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 120.

In all the practical work of our Party, all correct leadership is necessarily "from the masses, to the masses". This means: take the ideas of the masses (scattered and unsystematic ideas) and concentrate them (through study turn them into concentrated and systematic ideas), then go to the masses and propagate and explain these ideas until the masses embrace them as their own, hold fast to them and translate them into action, and test the correctness of these ideas in such action. Then once again concentrate ideas from the masses and once again go to the masses so that the ideas are persevered in and carried through. And so on, over and over again in an endless spiral, with the ideas becoming more correct, more vital and richer each time. Such is the Marxist theory of knowledge.

Ibid., p. 119.

We should go to the masses and learn from them, synthesize their experience into better, articulated principles and methods, then do propaganda among the masses, and call upon them to put these

principles and methods into practice so as to solve their problems and help them achieve liberation and happiness.

"Get Organized!" (November 29, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 158.

There are people in our leading organs in some places that think that it is enough for the leaders alone to know the Party's policies and that there is no need to let the masses know them. This is one of the basic reasons why some of our work cannot be done well.

"A Talk to the Editorial Staff of the Shansi-Suiyuan Daily" (April 2, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 241.

In all mass movements we must make a basic investigation and analysis of the number of active supporters, opponents and neutrals and must not decide problems subjectively and without basis.

"Methods of Work of Party Committees" (March 13, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 380.

The masses in any given place are generally composed of three parts, the relatively active, the intermediate and the relatively backward. The leaders must therefore be skilled in uniting the small number of active elements around the leadership and must rely on them to raise the level of the intermediate elements and to win over the backward elements.

"Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership" (June 1, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 118.

To be good at translating the Party's policy into action of the masses, to be good at getting not only the leading cadres but also the broad masses to understand and master every movement and every struggle we launch - this is an art of Marxist-Leninist leadership. It is also the dividing line that determines whether or not we make mistakes in our work.

"A Talk to the Editorial Staff of the Shansi-Suiyuan Daily" (April 2, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, PP 242-43.

However active the leading group may be, its activity will amount to fruitless effort by a handful of people unless combined with the activity of the masses. On the other hand, if the masses alone are active without a strong leading group to organize their activity properly, such activity cannot be sustained for long, or carried forward in the right direction, or raised to a high level.

"Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership" (June 1, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 118.

Production by the masses, the interests of the masses, the experiences and feelings of the masses - to these the leading cadres should pay constant attention.

Inscription for a production exhibition sponsored by organizations directly under the Central Committee of the Party and the General Headquarters of the Eighth Route Army, Liberation Daily of Yenan, November 24, 1943.

We should pay close attention to the well-being of the masses, from the problems of land and labor to those of fuel, rice, cooking oil and salt.... All such problems concerning the well-being of the masses should be placed on our agenda. We should discuss them, adopt and carry out decisions and check up on the results. We should help the masses to realize that we represent their interests and that our

lives are intimately bound up with theirs. We should help them to proceed from these things to an understanding of the higher tasks which we have put forward, the tasks of the revolutionary war, so that they will support the revolution and spread it throughout the country, respond to our political appeals and fight to the end for victory in the revolution.

"Be Concerned with the Well-Being of the Masses, Pay Attention to Methods of Work" (January 27, 1934), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 149. *

Chapter 12: Political Work

The system of Party representatives and of political departments, adopted for the first time in China, entirely changed the complexion of these armed forces. The Red Army, which was founded in 1927 and the Eighth Route Army of today have inherited this system and developed it.

"Interview with the British Journalist James Bertram" (October 25, 1937), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 54.

The People's Liberation Army has developed its vigorous revolutionary political work, which is an important factor in winning victory over the enemy, on the basis of a people's war and of the principles of unity between army and people, of unity between commanders and fighters and of disintegrating the enemy troops.

"The Present Situation and Our Tasks" (December 25, 1947), Selected Military Writings, 2nd ed., p. 350.

This army has built up a system of political work which is essential for the people's war and is aimed at promoting unity in its own ranks, unity with the friendly armies and unity with the people, and at disintegrating the enemy forces and ensuring victory in battle.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 265. *

Political work is the life-blood of all economic work. This is particularly true at a time when the social and economic system is undergoing fundamental change.

Introductory note to "A Serious Lesson" (1955), The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside, Chinese ed., Vol. I.

"The Party branch is organized on a company basis"; this is an important reason why the Red Army has been able to carry on such arduous fighting without falling apart.

"The Struggle in the Chingkang Mountains" (November 25, 1928), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 84.

The political work of the Eighth Route Army is guided by three basic principles. First, the principle of unity between officers and men, which means eradicating feudal practices in the army, prohibiting beating and abuse, building up a conscious discipline, and sharing weal and woe - as a result of which the entire army is closely united. Second, the principle of unity between the army and the people, which means maintaining a discipline that forbids the slightest violation of the people's interests, conducting propaganda among the masses, organizing and arming them, lightening their economic burdens and suppressing the traitors and collaborators who do harm to the army and the people - as a result of which the army is closely united with the people and welcomed everywhere. Third, the principle of disintegrating the enemy troops and giving lenient treatment to prisoners of

war. Our victory depends not only upon our military operations but also upon the disintegration of the enemy troops.

"Interview with the British Journalist James Bertram" (October 25, 1937), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 53. *

Our troops must observe the correct principles that govern relations between the army and the people, between the army and the government, between the army and the Party, between officers and men, and between military work and political work, and relations among the cadres, and must never commit the errors of warlordism. Officers must cherish their men and must not be indifferent to their well-being or resort to corporal punishment; the army must cherish the people and never encroach upon their interests; the army must respect the government and the Party and never "assert independence".

"Get Organized!" (November 29, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, pp. 158-59.

Our policy towards prisoners captured from the Japanese, puppet or anti-Communist troops is to set them all free, except for those who have incurred the bitter hatred of the masses and must receive capital punishment and whose death sentence has been approved by the higher authorities. Among the prisoners, those who were coerced into joining the reactionary forces but who are more or less inclined towards the revolution should be won over in large numbers to work for our army. The rest should be released and, if they fight us and are captured again, should again be set free. We should not insult them, take away their personal effects or try to exact recant taxation from them, but without exception should treat them sincerely and kindly. This should be our policy, however reactionary they may be. It is a very effective way of isolating the camp of reaction.

"On Policy" (December 25, 1940), Selected Works, Vol. II, pp. 446-47. *

Weapons are an important factor in war, but not the decisive factor; it is people, not things that are decisive. The contest of strength is not only a contest of military and economic power, but also a contest of human power and morale. People necessarily wield military and economic power.

"On Protracted War" (May 1958), Selected Works, Vol. II, pp. 143-44.

The atom bomb is a paper tiger that the U.S. reactionaries use to scare people. It looks terrible, but in fact it isn't. Of course, the atom bomb is a weapon of mass slaughter, but the people decide the outcome of a war, not by one or two new types of weapons.

"Talk with the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong" (August 1946), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 100.

Soldiers are the foundation of an army; unless they are imbued with a progressive political spirit, and unless such a spirit is fostered through progressive political work, it will be impossible to achieve genuine unity between officers and men, impossible to arouse their enthusiasm for the War of Resistance to the full, and impossible to provide an excellent basis for the most effective use of all our technical equipment and tactics.

"On Protracted War" (May 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 185. *

The purely military viewpoint is very highly developed among a number of comrades in the Red Army. It manifests itself as follows: 1. These comrades regard military affairs and politics as opposed to each other and refuse to recognize that military affairs are only one means of accomplishing political tasks. Some even say, "If you are good militarily, naturally you are good politically; if you are not good militarily, you cannot be any good politically" - this is to go a step further and give military affairs a leading position over politics.

"On Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party" (December 1929), Selected Works, Vol. I, pp. 105-06.

Ideological education is the key link to be grasped in uniting the whole Party for great political struggles. Unless this is done, the Party cannot accomplish any of its political tasks.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 315. *

Recently there has been a falling off in ideological and political work among students and intellectuals, and some unhealthy tendencies have appeared. Some people seem to think that there is no longer any need to concern oneself with politics or with the future of the motherland and the ideals of mankind. It seems as if Marxism was once all the rage but is currently not so much in fashion. To counter these tendencies, we must strengthen our ideological and political work. Both students and intellectuals should study hard. In addition to the study of their specialized subjects, they must make progress both ideologically and politically, which means that they should study Marxism, current events and politics. Not to have a correct political point of view is like having no soul . . .. All departments and organizations should shoulder their responsibilities in ideological and political work. This applies to the Communist Party, the Youth League, government departments in charge of this work, and especially to heads of educational institutions and teachers.

On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People (February 27, 1957); 1st pocket ed., pp. 43-44.*

After receiving political education, the Red Army soldiers have all become class-conscious and learned the essentials of distributing land, setting up political power, arming the workers and peasants, etc., and they all know they are fighting for themselves, for the working class and the peasantry. Hence, they can endure the hardships of the bitter struggle without complaint. Each company, battalion or regiment has its soldiers' committee that represents the interests of the soldiers and carries on political and mass work.

"The Struggle in the Chingkang Mountains" (November 25, 1928), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 81.*

The correct unfolding of the movement for pouring out grievances (the wrongs done to the laboring people by the old society and by the reactionaries) and the three check-ups (on class origin, performance of duty and will to fight) greatly heightened the political consciousness of commanders and fighters throughout the army in the fight for the emancipation of the exploited working masses, for nationwide land reform and for the destruction of the common enemy of the people, the Chiang Kai-shek bandit gang. It also greatly strengthened the firm unity of all commanders and fighters under the leadership of the Communist Party. On this basis, the army achieved greater purity in its

ranks, strengthened discipline, unfolded a mass movement for training, and further developed its political, economic and military democracy in a completely well led and orderly way. Thus, the army has become united as one man, with everybody contributing his ideas and his strength, an army fearless of sacrifice and capable of overcoming material difficulties, which displays mass heroism and daring in destroying the enemy. Such an army will be invincible.

"On the Great Victory in the Northwest and on the New Type of Ideological Education Movement in the Liberation Army" (March 7, 1948), Selected Military Writings, 2nd ed., pp. 358-59.

In the last few months almost all the People's Liberation Army has made use of the intervals between battles for large-scale training and consolidation. This has been carried out in a fully guided, orderly and democratic way. It has therefore aroused the revolutionary fervor of the great masses of commanders and fighters, enabled them clearly to comprehend the aim of the war, eliminated certain incorrect ideological tendencies and undesirable manifestations in the army, educated the cadres and fighters and greatly enhanced the combat effectiveness of the army. From now on, we must continue to carry on this new type of ideological education movement in the army, a movement that has a democratic and mass character.

"Speech at a Conference of Cadres in the Shansi-Suiyuan Liberated Area" (April 1, 1948), Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 234.

The educational policy of the college [the Anti-Japanese Military and Political College] is to cultivate a firm and correct political orientation, an industrious and simple style of work, and flexible strategy and tactics. These are the three essentials in the making of an anti-Japanese revolutionary soldier. It is in accordance with these essentials that the staff teaches and the students study.

To Be Attacked by the Enemy Is Not a Bad Thing but a Good Thing (May 26, 1939), 1st pocket ed., p. 3.

Our nation has always had a traditional style of hard struggle, which we should develop.... What is more, the Communist Party has always advocated a firm and correct political orientation.... This orientation is inseparable from a style of hard struggle. Without a firm and correct political orientation, it is impossible to promote a style of hard struggle. Without the style of hard struggle, it is impossible to maintain a firm and correct political orientation.

"Speech at the Yenan Rally in Celebration of International Labor Day" (May 1, 1939).

Be united, alert, earnest and lively.

Motto for the Anti-Japanese Military and Political College.

What really counts in the world is conscientiousness, and the Communist Party is most particular about being conscientious.

Talk at a meeting with Chinese students and trainees in Moscow (November 17, 1957).

Chapter 25: Unity

The unification of our country, the unity of our people and the unity of our various nationalities - these are the basic guarantees of the sure triumph of our cause.

On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People (February 27, 1957). 1st pocket ed., pp. 1-2.

It is only through the unity of the Communist Party that the unity of the whole class and the whole nation can be achieved, and it is only through the unity of the whole class and the whole nation that the enemy can be defeated and the national and democratic revolution accomplished.

"Win the Masses in Their Millions for the Anti-Japanese National United Front" (May 7, 1937), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 292.*

We shall solidly unite all the forces of our Party on democratic centralist principles of organization and discipline. We shall unite with any comrade if he abides by the Party's Program, Constitution and decisions.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 317.*

This democratic method of resolving contradictions among the people was epitomized in 1942 in the formula "unity, criticism, unity". To elaborate, it means starting from the desire for unity, resolving contradictions through criticism or struggle and arriving at a new unity on a new basis. In our experience this is the correct method of resolving contradictions among the people.

On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People (February 27, 1957), 1st pocket ed., p. 12.

This [our] army has achieved remarkable unity in its own ranks and with those outside its ranks. Internally, there is unity between officers and men, between the higher and lower ranks, and between military work, political work and rear service work; and externally, there is unity between the army and the people, between the army and government organizations, and between our army and the friendly armies. It is imperative to overcome anything that impairs this unity.

"On Coalition Government" (April 24, 1945), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 264.*

Chapter 29: Cadres

In order to guarantee that our Party and country do not change their color, we must not only have a correct line and correct policies but must train and bring up millions of successors who will carry on the cause of proletarian revolution. In the final analysis, the question of training successors for the revolutionary cause of the proletariat is one of whether or not there will be people who can carry on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary cause started by the older generation of proletarian revolutionaries, whether or not the leadership of our Party and state will remain in the hands of proletarian revolutionaries, whether or not our descendants will continue to march along the correct road laid down by Marxism-Leninism, or, in other words, whether or not we can successfully prevent the emergence of Khrushchev's revisionism in China. In short, it is an extremely important question, a matter of life and death for our Party and our country. It is a question of fundamental importance to the proletarian revolutionary cause for a hundred, a thousand, nay ten thousand years. Basing themselves on the changes in the Soviet Union, the imperialist prophets are pinning their hopes of "peaceful evolution" on the third or fourth generation of the Chinese Party. We must shatter these imperialist prophecies. From our highest organizations down to the grass-roots, we must everywhere give constant attention to the training and upbringing of successors to the revolutionary cause. What

are the requirements for worthy successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat? They must be genuine Marxist-Leninists and not revisionists like Khrushchev wearing the cloak of Marxism-Leninism. They must be revolutionaries who wholeheartedly serve the overwhelming majority of the people of China and the whole world, and must not be like Khrushchev who serves both the interests of the handful of members of the privileged bourgeois stratum in his own country and those of foreign imperialism and reaction. They must be proletarian statesmen capable of uniting and working together with the overwhelming majority. Not only must they unite with those who agree with them, they must also be good at uniting with those who disagree and even with those who formerly opposed them and have since been proved wrong in practice. But they must especially watch out for careerists and conspirators like Khrushchev and prevent such bad elements from usurping the leadership of the Party and the state at any level. They must be models in applying the Party's democratic centralism, must master the method of leadership based on the principle of "from the masses, to the masses", and must cultivate a democratic style and be good at listening to the masses. They must not be despotic like Khrushchev and violate the Party's democratic centralism, make surprise attacks on comrades or act arbitrarily and dictatorially. They must be modest and prudent and guard against arrogance and impetuosity; they must be imbued with the spirit of self-criticism and have the courage to correct mistakes and shortcomings in their work. They must never cover up their errors like Khrushchev, and claim all the credit for themselves and shift all the blame on others. Successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat come forward in mass struggles and are tempered in the great storms of revolution. It is essential to test and judge cadres and choose and train successors in the long course of mass struggle.

Quoted in On Khrushchev's Phony Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World (July 14,1964), pp. 72-74.*

Our Party organizations must be extended all over the country and we must purposefully train tens of thousands of cadres and hundreds of first-rate mass leaders. They must be cadres and leaders versed in Marxism-Leninism, politically far-sighted, competent in work, full of the spirit of self-sacrifice, capable of tackling problems on their own, steadfast in the midst of difficulties and loyal and devoted in serving the nation, the class and the Party. It is on these cadres and leaders that the Party relies for its links with the membership and the masses, and it is by relying on their firm leadership of the masses that the Party can succeed in defeating the enemy. Such cadres and leaders must be free from selfishness, from individualistic heroism, ostentation, sloth, passivity, and arrogant sectarianism, and they must be selfless national and class heroes; such are the qualities and the style of work demanded of the members, cadres and leaders of our Party.

"Win the Masses in Their Millions for the Anti-Japanese National United Front" (May 7, 1937), Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 291.*

Cadres are a decisive factor, once the political line is determined. Therefore, it is our fighting task to train large numbers of new cadres in a planned way.

"The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War" (October 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 202.

The criterion the Communist Party should apply in its cadres policy is whether or not a cadre is resolute in carrying out the Party line, keeps to Party discipline, has close ties with the masses, has the ability to find his bearings independently, and is active, hardworking and unselfish. This is what "appointing people on their merit" means.

Ibid.

It is necessary to maintain the system of cadre participation in collective productive labor. The cadres of our Party and state are ordinary workers and not overlords sitting on the backs of the people. By taking part in collective productive labor, the cadres maintain extensive, constant and close ties with the working people. This is a major measure of fundamental importance for a socialist system; it helps to overcome bureaucracy and to prevent revisionism and dogmatism.

Quoted in On Khrushchev's Phony Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World (July 14, 1964), pp. 68-69.*

We must know how to judge cadres. We must not confine our judgement to a short period or a single incident in a cadre's life, but should consider his life and work as a whole. This is the principal method of judging cadres.

"The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War" (October 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 202.

We must, know how to use cadres well. In the final analysis, leadership involves two main responsibilities: to work out ideas, and to use cadres well. Such things as drawing up plans, making decisions, and giving orders and directives, are all in the category of "working out ideas". To put the ideas into practice, we must weld the cadres together and encourage them to go into action; this comes into the category of "using the cadres well".

Ibid.

We must know how to take good care of cadres. There are several ways of doing so. First, give them guidance. This means allowing them a free hand in their work so that they have the courage to assume responsibility and, at the same time, giving them timely instructions so that, guided by the Party's political line, they are able to make full use of their initiative. Second, raise their level. This means educating them by giving them the opportunity to study so that they can enhance their theoretical understanding and their working ability. Third, check up on their work, and help them sum up their experience, carry forward their achievements and correct their mistakes. To assign work without checking up and to take notice only when serious mistakes are made - that is not the way to take care of cadres. Fourth, in general, use the method of persuasion with cadres who have made mistakes, and help them correct their mistakes. The method of struggle should be confined to those who make serious mistakes and nevertheless refuse to accept guidance. Here patience is essential. It is wrong lightly to label people "opportunists" or lightly to begin "waging struggles" against them. Fifth, help them with their difficulties. When cadres are in difficulty as a result of illness, straitened means or domestic or other troubles, we must be sure to give them as much care as possible. This is how to take good care of cadres.

Ibid., p. 203.

A leading group that is genuinely united and is linked with the masses can gradually be formed only in the process of mass struggle, and not in isolation from it. In the process of a great struggle, the composition of the leading group in most cases should not and cannot remain entirely unchanged throughout the initial, middle and final stages; the activists who come forward in the course of the struggle must constantly be promoted to replace those original members of the leading group who are inferior by comparison or who have degenerated.

"Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership" (June 1, 1943), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 118.*

If our Party does not have a great many new cadres working in unity and cooperation with the old cadres, our cause will come to a stop. All old cadres, therefore, should welcome the new ones with the utmost enthusiasm and show them the warmest solicitude. True, new cadres have their shortcomings. They have not been long in the revolution and lack experience, and unavoidably some have brought with them vestiges of the unwholesome ideology of the old society, remnants of the ideology of petty-bourgeois individualism. But such shortcomings can be gradually eliminated through education and tempering in the revolution. The strong point of the new cadres, as Stalin has said, is that they are acutely sensitive to what is new and are therefore enthusiastic and active to a high degree - the very qualities which some of the old cadres lack. Cadres, new and old, should respect each other, learn from each other and overcome their own shortcomings by learning from each other's strong points, so as to unite as one in the common cause and guard against sectarian tendencies.

"Rectify the Party's Style of Work" (February 1, 1942), Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 47.

Our concern should extend to non-Party cadres as well as to Party cadres. There are many capable people outside the Party whom we must not ignore. The duty of every Communist is to rid himself of aloofness and arrogance and to work well with non-Party cadres, give them sincere help, have a warm, comradely attitude towards them and enlist their initiative in the great cause of resisting Japan and reconstructing the nation.

"The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War" (October 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 202.

Jose Carlos Mariátegui: Act of Constitution of the Peruvian Socialist Party

The following declares that a committee has been formed that proposes to work among the masses of workers and peasants according to the following concepts:

1. The organization of the workers and peasants with a purely class character constitutes the object of our efforts and our propaganda, and the basis of the struggle against foreign imperialism and the national bourgeoisie.
2. For the defense of the interests of the workers of the city and the countryside, the Committee shall actively promote the formation of factory unions, farm unions, etc.; the federation of these into industrial unions and their confederation into a national center.

3. The political struggle demands the creation of a class party, in whose formation and orientation it will strive tenaciously to make its revolutionary class views prevail. In accordance with the present concrete conditions of Peru, the Committee shall concur in the constitution of a Socialist Party, based on the organized masses of workers and peasants.
4. To guard against repression and demoralizing persecutions, the workers' and peasants' unions shall seek recognition by the Labor Section. In its Statute, its declaration of principles will be limited to the affirmation of its class character and its duty to contribute to the foundation and maintenance of a general confederation of labor.
5. The trade union organization and the Socialist party, for whose formation we shall work, shall contingently accept a tactic of united front or alliance with organizations or groups of the petty bourgeoisie, provided that these effectively represent a mass movement and with concretely determined objectives and demands.
6. The Committee shall proceed to the formation of committees throughout the Republic and of cells in all work centers, with strictly disciplined relations.

Karl Marx: General Statutes of the International Workingmen's Association

Considering,

That the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves, that the struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies, but for equal rights and duties, and the abolition of all class rule;

That the economical subjection of the man of labor to the monopolizer of the means of labor — that is, the source of life — lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation, and political dependence;

That the economical emancipation of the working classes is therefore the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means;

That all efforts aiming at the great end hitherto failed from the want of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labor in each country, and from the absence of a fraternal bond of union between the working classes of different countries;

That the emancipation of labor is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem, embracing all countries in which modern society exists, and depending for its solution on the concurrence, practical and theoretical, of the most advanced countries;

That the present revival of the working classes in the most industrious countries of Europe, while it raises a new hope, gives solemn warning against a relapse into the old errors, and calls for the immediate combination of the still disconnected movements;

For these reasons —

The International Working Men's Association has been founded.

It declares:

That all societies and individuals adhering to it will acknowledge truth, justice, and morality as the basis of their conduct toward each other and toward all men, without regard to color, creed, or nationality;

That it acknowledges *no rights without duties*, *no duties without rights*;

And, in this spirit, the following Rules have been drawn up.

1. This Association is established to afford a central medium of communication and co-operation between workingmen's societies existing in different countries and aiming at the same end; viz., the protection, advancement, and complete emancipation of the working classes.
2. The name of the society shall be "The International Working Men's Association."
3. There shall annually meet a General Working Men's Congress, consisting of delegates of the branches of the Association. The Congress will have to proclaim the common aspirations of the working class, take the measures required for the successful working of the International Association, and appoint the General Council of the society.
4. Each Congress appoints the time and place of meeting for the next Congress. The delegates assemble at the appointed time and place, without any special invitation. The General Council may, in case of need, change the place, but has no power to postpone the time of the General Council annually. The Congress appoints the seat and elects the members of the General Council annually. The General Council thus elected shall have power to add to the number of its members.

   On its annual meetings, the General Congress shall receive a public account of the annual transactions of the General Council. The latter may, in case of emergency, convoke the General Congress before the regular yearly term.
5. The General Council shall consist of workingmen from the different countries represented in the International Association. It shall, from its own members, elect the officers necessary for the transaction of business, such as a treasurer, a general secretary, corresponding secretaries for the different countries, etc.
6. The General Council shall form an international agency between the different and local groups of the Association, so that the workingmen in one country be consistently informed of the movements of their class in every other country; that an inquiry into the social state of the different countries of Europe be made simultaneously, and under a common direction; that the questions of general interest mooted in one society be ventilated by all; and that when immediate practical steps should be needed — as, for instance, in case of international quarrels — the action of the associated societies be simultaneous and uniform. Whenever it seems

opportune, the General Council shall take the initiative of proposals to be laid before the different national or local societies. To facilitate the communications, the General Council shall publish periodical reports.

7. Since the success of the workingmen's movement in each country cannot be secured but by the power of union and combination, while, on the other hand, the usefulness of the International General Council must greatly depend on the circumstance whether it has to deal with a few national centers of workingmen's associations, or with a great number of small and disconnected local societies — the members of the International Association shall use their utmost efforts to combine the disconnected workingmen's societies of their respective countries into national bodies, represented by central national organs. It is self-understood, however, that the appliance of this rule will depend upon the peculiar laws of each country, and that, apart from legal obstacles, no independent local society shall be precluded from corresponding directly with the General Council.
8. Every section has the right to appoint its own secretary corresponding directly with the General Council.
9. Everybody who acknowledges and defends the principles of the International Working Men's Association is eligible to become a member. Every branch is responsible for the integrity of the members it admits.
10. Each member of the International Association, on removing his domicile from one country to another, will receive the fraternal support of the Associated Working Men.
11. While united in a perpetual bond of fraternal co-operation, the workingmen's societies joining the International Association will preserve their existent organizations intact.
12. The present Rules may be revised by each Congress, provided that two-thirds of the delegates present are in favor of such revision.
13. Everything not provided for in the present Rules will be supplied by special Regulations, subject to the revision of every Congress.

CPSU(b): History of the CPSU(b)

Chapter 2

Section 4: Splitting Activities of the Menshevik Leaders and Sharpening of the Struggle Within the Party After the Second Congress. Opportunism Of the Mensheviks. Lenin's Book "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back." Organizational Principles of the Marxist Party

After the Second Congress the struggle within the Party became even more acute. The Mensheviks did their utmost to frustrate the decisions of the Second Congress and to seize the central institutions of the Party. They demanded that their representatives be included in the editorial board of *Iskra* and in the Central Committee in such numbers as would give them a majority on the editorial board and parity with the Bolsheviks on the Central Committee. As this ran directly counter to the decisions of the Second Congress, the Bolsheviks rejected the Menshevik's demand. Thereupon the

Mensheviks, secretly from the Party, created their own anti-Party factional organization, headed by Martov, Trotsky and Axelrod, and, as Martov wrote, "broke into revolt against Leninism." The methods they adopted for combating the Party were, as Lenin expressed it, "to disorganize the whole Party work, damage the cause, and hamper all and everything." They entrenched themselves in the Foreign League of Russian Social-Democrats, nine-tenths of whom were emigre intellectuals isolated from the work in Russia, and from this position they opened fire on the Party, on Lenin and the Leninists.

The Mensheviks received considerable help from Plekhanov. At the Second Congress Plekhanov sided with Lenin. But after the Second Congress he allowed the Mensheviks to intimidate him with threats of a split. He decided to "make peace" with the Mensheviks at all costs. It was the deadweight of his earlier opportunist mistakes that dragged Plekhanov down to the Mensheviks. From an advocate of reconciliation with the opportunist Mensheviks he soon became a Menshevik himself. Plekhanov demanded that all the former Menshevik editors of the Iskra who had been rejected by the congress be included in the editorial board. Lenin, of course, could not agree to this and resigned from the *Iskra* editorial board in order to entrench himself in the Central Committee of the Party and to strike at the opportunists from this position. Acting by himself, and in defiance of the will of the congress, Plekhanov co-opted the former Menshevik editors to the editorial board of *Iskra*. From that moment on, beginning with the 52nd issue of *Iskra*, the Mensheviks converted it into their own organ and began to propagate their opportunist views in its columns.

Ever since then Lenin's Bolshevik *Iskra* has been known in the Party as the *old Iskra*, and the Menshevik, opportunist *Iskra* as the new Iskra.

When it passed into the hands of the Mensheviks, *Iskra* became a weapon in the fight against Lenin and the Bolsheviks, and an organ for the propaganda of Menshevik opportunism, primarily on questions of organization. Joining forces with the "Economists" and the Bundists, the Mensheviks started a campaign in the columns of *Iskra*, as they said, against Leninism. Plekhanov could not stick to his position as an advocate of conciliation, and soon he too joined the campaign. This was bound to happen by the very logic of things: whoever insists on a conciliatory attitude towards opportunists is bound to sink to opportunism himself. There began to flow from the columns of the new *Iskra*, as from a cornucopia, articles and statements claiming that the Party ought not to be an organized whole; that free groups and individuals should be allowed within its ranks without any obligation to submit to the decisions of its organs; that every intellectual who sympathized with the Party, as well as "every striker" and "every participant in a demonstration," should be allowed to declare himself a Party member; that the demand for obedience to all the decisions of the Party was "formal and bureaucratic"; that the demand that the minority must submit to the majority meant the "mechanical suppression" of the will of Party members; that the demand that all Party members—both leaders and rank-and-filers— should equally observe Party discipline meant establishing "serfdom" within

the Party; that what "we" needed in the Party was not centralism but anarchist "autonomism" which would permit individuals and Party organizations not to obey the decisions of the Party.

This was unbridled propaganda of organizational license, which would undermine the Party principle and Party discipline; it was glorification of the individualism of the intelligentsia, and a justification of the anarchist contempt of discipline.

The Mensheviks were obviously trying to drag the Party back from the Second Congress to the old organizational disunity, to the old parochial outlook of the circles and the old amateurish methods.

A vigorous rebuff had to be given the Mensheviks.

This rebuff was administered by Lenin in his celebrated book, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back,* published in May 1904.

The following are the main organizational principles which Lenin expounded in his book, and which afterwards came to form the organizational foundations of the Bolshevik Party.

1) The Marxist Party is a part, a detachment, of the working class. But the working class has many detachments, and hence not every detachment of the working class can be called a party of the working class. The Party differs from other detachments of the working class primarily by the fact that it is not an ordinary detachment, but the *vanguard* detachment, a *class-conscious* detachment, a *Marxist* detachment of the working class, armed with a knowledge of the life of society, of the laws of its development and of the laws of the class struggle, and for this reason able to lead the working class and to direct its struggle. The Party must therefore not be confused with the working class, as the part must not be confused with the whole. One cannot demand that every striker be allowed to call himself a member of the Party, for whoever confuses Party and class lowers the level of consciousness of the Party to that of "every striker," destroys the Party as the class-conscious vanguard of the working class. It is not the task of the Party to *lower* its level to that of "every striker," but to *elevate* the masses of the workers, to *elevate* "every striker" to the level of the Party.

> "We are the party of a class," Lenin wrote, "and therefore *almost the entire class* (and in times of war, in the period of civil war, the entire class) should act under the leadership of our Party, should adhere to our Party as closely as possible. But it would be Manilovism (smug complacency) and *'khvostism'* (following in the tail) to think that at any time under capitalism the entire class, or almost the entire class, would be able to rise to the level of consciousness and activity of its vanguard, of its Social-Democratic Party. No sensible Social-Democrat has ever yet doubted that under capitalism even the trade union organizations (which are more primitive and more comprehensible to the undeveloped strata) are unable to embrace the entire, or almost the entire working class. To forget the distinction between the vanguard and the whole of the masses which gravitate towards it, to forget the constant duty of the vanguard to *raise* ever wider strata to this most advanced level, means merely to deceive oneself, to shut

one's eyes to the immensity of our tasks, and to narrow down these tasks." (Lenin, *Collected Works,* Russ. ed., Vol. VI, pp. 205-06.)

2) The Party is not only the vanguard, the class-conscious detachment of the working class, but also an *organized* detachment of the working class, with its own discipline, which is binding on its members. Hence Party members must necessarily be members of some organization of the Party. If the Party were not an *organized* detachment of the class, not a *system of organization*, but a mere agglomeration of persons who declare themselves to be Party members but do not belong to any Party organization and therefore are *not organized*, hence not obliged to obey Party decisions, the Party would never have a united will, it could never achieve the united action of its members, and, consequently, it would be unable to direct the struggle of the working class. The Party can lead the practical struggle of the working class and direct it towards one aim only if all its members are *organized* in one common detachment, welded together by unity of will, unity of action and unity of discipline.

The objection raised by the Mensheviks that in that case many intellectuals—for example, professors, university and high school students, etc.—would remain outside the ranks of the Party, since they would not want to join any of the organizations of the Party, either because they shrink from Party discipline, or, as Plekhanov said at the Second Congress, because they consider it "beneath their dignity to join some local organization"—this Menshevik objection recoiled on the heads of the Mensheviks themselves; for the Party does not need members who shrink from Party discipline and fear to join the Party organization. Workers did not fear discipline and organization, and they willingly join the organization if they have made up their minds to be Party members. It is the individualistic intellectuals who fear discipline and organization, and they would indeed remain outside the ranks of the Party. But that was all to the good, for the Party would be spared that influx of unstable elements, which had become particularly marked at that time, when the bourgeois democratic revolution was on the upgrade.

"When I say," Lenin wrote, "that the Party should be a *sum* (and not a mere arithmetical sum, but a complex) of *organizations*. . . I thereby express clearly and precisely my wish, my demand, that the Party, as the vanguard of the class, should be as *organized* as possible, that the Party should admit to its ranks only such elements *as lend themselves to at least a minimum of organization*. . . ." (*Ibid*., p. 203.)

And further:

"Martov's formulation *ostensibly* defends the interests of the broad strata of the proletariat, but in *fact,* it serves the interests of the *bourgeois intellectuals,* who fight shy of proletarian discipline and organization. No one will undertake to deny that it is *precisely its individualism* and incapacity for discipline and organization that in general distinguish *the intelligentsia as a separate stratum* of modern capitalist society." (*Ibid*., p. 212.)

And again:

> "The proletariat is not afraid of organization and discipline. . . . The proletariat will do nothing to have the worthy professors and high school students, who do not want to join an organization, recognized as Party members merely because they work under the control of an organization. . . . It is not the proletariat, but *certain intellectuals* in our Party who lack self-training in the spirit of organization and discipline." (*Ibid*., p. 307.)

3) The Party is not merely an organized detachment, but "*the highest of all forms of organization*" of the working class, and it is its mission to guide all the other organizations of the working class. As the highest form of organization, consisting of the finest members of the class, armed with an advanced theory, with knowledge of the laws of the class struggle and with the experience of the revolutionary movement, the Party has every opportunity of guiding—and is obliged to guide—all the other organizations of the working class. The attempt of the Mensheviks to belittle and depreciate the leading role of the Party tends to weaken all the other organizations of the proletariat which are guided by the Party, and, consequently, to weaken and disarm the proletariat, for "in its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organization." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 466.)

4) The Party is an *embodiment of the connection* of the vanguard of the working class with the *working-class millions*. However fine a vanguard the Party may be, and however well it may be organized, it cannot exist and develop without connections with the non-Party masses, and without multiplying and strengthening these connections. A party which shuts itself up in its own shell, isolates itself from the masses, and loses, or even relaxes, its connections with its class is bound to lose the confidence and support of the masses, and, consequently, is surely bound to perish. In order to live to the full and to develop, the Party must multiply its connections with the masses and win the confidence of the millions of its class.

> "In order to be a Social-Democratic *party,*" Lenin said, "we must win the *support* precisely of the *class*." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. VI, p. 208.)

5) In order to function properly and to guide the masses systematically, the Party must be organized on the principle of *centralism*, having one set of rules and uniform Party discipline, one leading organ— the Party Congress, and in the intervals between congresses—the Central Committee of the Party; the minority must submit to the majority, the various organizations must submit to the centre, and lower organizations to higher organizations. Falling these conditions, the party of the working class cannot be a real party and cannot carry out its tasks in guiding the class.

Of course, as under the tsarist autocracy the Party existed illegally the Party organizations could not in those days be built up on the principle of election from below, and as a consequence, the Party had to be strictly conspiratorial. But Lenin considered that this *temporary* feature in the life of our Party would at once lapse with the elimination of tsardom, when the Party would become open

and legal, and the Party organizations would be built up on the principles of democratic elections, of *democratic centralism.*

> "*Formerly,*" Lenin wrote, "our Party was not a formally organized whole, but only the sum of separate groups, and, therefore, no other relations except those of ideological influence were possible between these groups. *Now* we have become an organized Party, and this implies the establishment of authority, the transformation of the power of ideas into the power of authority, the subordination of lower Party bodies to higher Party bodies." (*Ibid*., p. 291.)

Accusing the Mensheviks of organizational nihilism and of aristocratic anarchism which would not submit to the authority of the Party and its discipline, Lenin wrote:

"This aristocratic anarchism is particularly characteristic of the Russian nihilist. He thinks of the Party organization as a monstrous 'factory'; he regards the subordination of the part to the whole and of the minority to the majority as 'serfdom' . . . division of labor under the direction of a centre evokes from him a tragicomical outcry against people being transformed into 'wheels and cogs' (to turn editors into contributors being considered a particularly atrocious species of such transformation); mention of the organizational rules of the Party calls forth a contemptuous grimace and the disdainful remark (intended for the 'formalists') that one could very well dispense with rules altogether." (Lenin, *Selected Works,* Vol. II, pp. 442-43.)

6) In its practical work, if it wants to preserve the unity of its ranks, the Party must impose a *common* proletarian discipline, *equally* binding on all Party members, both leaders and rank-and-file. Therefore, there should be no division within the Party into the "chosen few," on whom discipline is not binding, and the "many," on whom discipline is binding. If this condition is not observed, the integrity of the Party and the unity of its ranks cannot be maintained.

> "The complete absence of *sensible* arguments on the part of Martov and Co. against the editorial board appointed by the congress," Lenin wrote, "is best of all shown by their own catchword: 'We are not serfs!' . . . The mentality of the bourgeois intellectual, who regards himself as one of the 'chosen few' standing above mass organization and mass discipline, is expressed here with remarkable clarity. . . . It seems to the individualism of the intelligentsia . . . that all proletarian organization and discipline is *serfdom*." (Lenin, *Collected Works,* Russ. ed., Vol. VI, p. 282.)
>
> And further:
>
> "As we proceed with the building of a *real* party, the class-conscious worker must learn to distinguish the mentality of the soldier of the proletarian army from the mentality of the bourgeois intellectual who makes a display of anarchist phraseology, he must learn to demand that the duties of a Party member be fulfilled not only by the rank-and-filers, but by the 'people at the top' as well." (Lenin, *Selected Works,* Vol. II, pp. 445-46.)

Summing up his analysis of the differences, and defining the position of the Mensheviks as "opportunism in matters of organization," Lenin considered that one of the gravest sins of Menshevism lay in its underestimation of the importance of party *organization* as a weapon of the proletariat in the struggle for its emancipation. The Mensheviks held that the party *organization* of the proletariat was of no great importance for the victory of the revolution. Contrary to the Mensheviks, Lenin held that the *ideological* unity of the proletariat alone was *not enough* for victory; if victory was to be won, ideological unity would have to be "*consolidated*" by the "material unity of *organization*" of the proletariat. Only on this condition, Lenin considered, could the proletariat become an invincible force.

> "In its struggle for power," Lenin wrote, "the proletariat has no other weapon but organization. Disunited by the rule of anarchic competition in the bourgeois world, ground down by forced labor for capital, constantly thrust back to the 'lower depths' of utter destitution, savagery and degeneration, the proletariat can become, and inevitably will become, an invincible force only when its ideological unification by the principles of Marxism is consolidated by the material unity of an organization which will weld millions of toilers into an army of the working class. Neither the decrepit rule of Russian tsardom, nor the senile rule of international capital will be able to withstand this army." (*Ibid*., p. 466.)

With these prophetic words Lenin concludes his book.

Such were the fundamental organizational principles set forth by Lenin in his famous book, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back.*

The importance of this book lies primarily in the fact that it successfully upheld the Party principle against the circle principle, and the Party against the disorganizers; that it smashed the opportunism of the Mensheviks on questions of organization, and laid the organizational foundations of the Bolshevik Party.

But this does not exhaust its significance. Its historic significance lies in the fact that in it Lenin, for the first time in the history of Marxism, elaborated the *doctrine of the Party* as the leading *organization* of the proletariat, as the principal *weapon* of the proletariat, without which the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be won.

The circulation of Lenin's book, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, among the Party workers led the majority of the local organizations to rally to the side of Lenin.

But the more closely the organizations rallied around the Bolsheviks, the more malicious became the behavior of the Menshevik leaders.

In the summer of 1904, thanks to Plekhanov's assistance and the treachery of Krassin and Noskov, two demoralized Bolsheviks, the Mensheviks captured the majority on the Central Committee. It was obvious that the Mensheviks were working for a split. The loss of *Iskra* and of the

Central Committee put the Bolsheviks in a difficult position. It became necessary for them to organize their own Bolshevik newspaper.

It became necessary to make arrangements for a new Party congress, the Third Congress, so as to set up a new Central Committee and to settle accounts with the Mensheviks.

And this is what the Bolsheviks, headed by Lenin, set to work to do.

The Bolsheviks started a campaign for the summoning of the Third-Party Congress. In August 1904, under Lenin's guidance, a conference of twenty-two Bolsheviks was held in Switzerland. The conference adopted an appeal addressed "To the Party." This appeal served the Bolsheviks as a program in their struggle for the summoning of the Third Congress.

At three regional conferences of Bolshevik Committees (Southern, Caucasian and Northern), a Bureau of Committees of the Majority was elected, which undertook the practical preparations for the Third-Party Congress.

On January 4, 1905, the first issue of the Bolshevik newspaper *Vperyod (Forward)* appeared.

Thus, two separate groups arose within the Party, the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, each with its own central body and its own press.

Stalin: Foundations of Leninism

Chapter 8: The Party

In the pre-revolutionary period, the period of more or less peaceful development, when the parties of the Second International were the predominant force in the working-class movement and parliamentary forms of struggle were regarded as the principal forms--under these conditions the Party neither had nor could have had that great and decisive importance which it acquired afterwards, under conditions of open revolutionary clashes. Defending the Second International against attacks made upon it, Kautsky says that the parties of the Second International are an instrument of peace and not of war, and that for this very reason they were powerless to take any important steps during the war, during the period of revolutionary action by the proletariat. That is quite true. But what does it mean? It means that the parties of the Second International are unfit for the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, that they are not militant parties of the proletariat, leading the workers to power, but election machines adapted for parliamentary elections and parliamentary struggle. This, in fact, explains why, in the days when the opportunists of the Second International were in the ascendancy, it was not the party but its parliamentary group that was the chief political organisation of the proletariat. It is well known that the party at that time was really an appendage and subsidiary of the parliamentary group. It scarcely needs proof that under such circumstances and with such a party at the helm there could be no question of preparing the proletariat for revolution.

But matters have changed radically with the dawn of the new period. The new period is one of open class collisions, of revolutionary action by the proletariat, of proletarian revolution, a period when forces are being directly mustered for the overthrow of imperialism and the seizure of power by the proletariat. In this period the proletariat is confronted with new tasks, the tasks of reorganizing all party work on new, revolutionary lines; of educating the workers in the spirit of revolutionary struggle for power; of preparing and moving up reserves; of establishing an alliance with the proletarians of neighboring countries; of establishing firm ties with the liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries, etc., etc. To think that these new tasks can be performed by the old Social-Democratic parties, brought up as they were in the peaceful conditions of parliamentarism, is to doom oneself to hopeless despair, to inevitable defeat. If, with such tasks to shoulder, the proletariat remained under the leadership of the old parties, it would be completely unarmed. It scarcely needs proof that the proletariat could not consent to such a state of affairs.

Hence the necessity for a new party, a militant party, a revolutionary party, one bold enough to lead the proletarians in the struggle for power, sufficiently experienced to find its bearings amidst the complex conditions of a revolutionary situation, and sufficiently flexible to steer clear of all submerged rocks in the path to its goal.

Without such a party it is useless even to think of overthrowing imperialism, of achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This new party is the party of Leninism.

What are the specific features of this new party?

1) *The Party as the advanced detachment of the working class.* The Party must be, first of all, the *advanced* detachment of the working class. The Party must absorb all the best elements of the working class, their experience, their revolutionary spirit, their selfless devotion to the cause of the proletariat. But in order that it may really be the armed detachment, the Party must be armed with revolutionary theory, with a knowledge of the laws of the movement, with a knowledge of the laws of revolution. Without this it will be incapable of directing the struggle of the proletariat, of leading the proletariat. The Party cannot be a real party if it limits itself to registering what the masses of the working class feel and think, if it drags at the tail of the spontaneous movement, if it is unable to overcome the inertia and the political indifference of the spontaneous movement, if it is unable to rise above the momentary interests of the proletariat, if it is unable to raise the masses to the level of understanding the class interests of the proletariat. The Party must stand at the head of the working class; it must see farther than the working class; it must lead the proletariat, and not drag at the tail of the spontaneous movement. The parties of the Second International, which preach "khvostism," are vehicles of bourgeois policy, which condemns the proletariat to the role of a tool in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Only a party which adopts the standpoint of advanced detachment of the proletariat and is able to raise the masses to the level of understanding the class interest of the proletariat--only such a party

can divert the working class from the path of trade unionism and convert it into an independent political force.

The Party is the political leader of the working class.

I have already spoken of the difficulties of the struggle of the working class, of the complicated conditions of the struggle, of strategy and tactics, of reserves and maneuvering, of attack and retreat. These conditions are no less complicated, if not more so, than the conditions of war. Who can see clearly in these conditions, who can give correct guidance to the proletarian millions? No army at war can dispense with an experienced General Staff if it does not want to be doomed to defeat. Is it not clear that the proletariat can still less dispense with such a General Staff if it does not want to allow itself to be devoured by its mortal enemies? But where is this General Staff? Only the revolutionary party of the proletariat can serve as this General Staff. The working class without a revolutionary party is an army without a General Staff.

The Party is the General Staff of the proletariat.

But the Party cannot be only an *advanced* detachment. It must at the same time be a detachment of the *class*, part of the class, closely bound up with it by all the fibers of its being. The distinction between the advanced detachment and the rest of the working class, between Party members and non-Party people, cannot disappear until classes disappear; it will exist as long as the ranks of the proletariat continue to be replenished with former members of other classes, as long as the working class as a whole is not in a position to rise to the level of the advanced detachment. But the Party would cease to be a party of this distinction developed into a gap, if the Party turned in on itself and became divorced from the non-Party masses. The Party cannot lead the class if it is not connected with the non-Party masses, if there is no bond between the Party and the non-Party masses, if these masses do not accept its leadership, if the Party enjoys no moral and political credit among the masses.

Recently two hundred thousand new members from the ranks of the workers were admitted into our Party. The remarkable thing about this is the fact that these people did not merely join the Party themselves, but were rather sent there by all the rest of the non-Party workers, who took an active part in the admission of the new members, and without whose approval no new member was accepted. This fact shows that the broad masses of non-Party workers regard our Party as *their* Party, as a Party *near* and *dear* to them, in whose expansion and consolidation they are vitally interested and to whose leadership they voluntarily entrust their destiny. It scarcely needs proof that without these intangible moral threads which connect the Party with the non-Party masses, the Party could not have become the decisive force of its class.

The Party is an inseparable part of the working class.

"We," says Lenin, "are the Party of a class, and therefore *almost the whole class* (and in times of war, in the period of civil war, the whole class) should act under the leadership of our Party,

should adhere to our Party as closely as possible. But it would be Manilovism and 'khvostism' to think that at any time under capitalism almost the whole class, or the whole class, would be able to rise to the level of consciousness and activity of its advanced detachment, of its Social-Democratic Party. No sensible Social-Democrat has ever yet doubted that under capitalism even the trade union organisations (which are more primitive and more comprehensible to the undeveloped strata) are unable to embrace almost the whole, or the whole, working class. To forget the distinction between the advanced detachment and the whole of the masses which gravitate towards it, to forget the constant duty of the advanced detachment to *raise* ever wider strata to this most advanced level, means merely to deceive oneself, to shut one's eyes to the immensity of our tasks, and to narrow down these tasks" (see Vol. VI, pp. 205-06).

2) The Party as the organized detachment of the working class. The Party is not only the *advanced* detachment of the working class. If it desires really to direct the struggle of the class it must at the same time be the *organized* detachment of its class. The Party's tasks under the conditions of capitalism are immense and extremely varied. The Party must direct the struggle of the proletariat under the exceptionally difficult conditions of internal and external development; it must lead the proletariat in the offensive when the situation calls for an offensive; it must lead the proletariat so as to escape the blow of a powerful enemy when the situation calls for retreat; it must imbue the millions of unorganized non-Party workers with the spirit of organisation and endurance. But the Party can fulfil these tasks only if it is itself the embodiment of discipline and organisation, if it is itself the *organized* detachment of the proletariat. Without these conditions there can be no question of the Party really leading the vast masses of the proletariat.

The Party is the organized detachment of the working class.

The conception of the Party as an organized whole is embodied in Lenin's well-known formulation of the first paragraph of our Party Rules, in which the Party is regarded as the *sum total* of its organisations, and the Party member as a member of one of the organisations of the Party. The Mensheviks, who objected to this formulation as early as 1903, proposed to substitute for it a "system" of self-enrolment in the Party, a "system" of conferring the "title" of Party member upon every "professor" and "high-school student," upon every "sympathizer" and "striker" who supported the Party in one way or another, but who did not join and did not want to join any one of the Party organisations. It scarcely needs proof that had this singular "system" become entrenched in our Party it would inevitably have led to our Party becoming inundated with professors and high-school students and to its degeneration into a loose, amorphous, disorganized "formation," lost in a sea of "sympathizers," that would have obliterated the dividing line between the Party and the class and would have upset the Party's task of raising the unorganized masses to the level of the advanced detachment. Needless to say, under such an opportunist "system" our Party would have been unable to fulfil the role of the organizing core of the working class in the course of our revolution.

"From the point of view of Comrade Martov," says Lenin, "the border-line of the Party remains quite indefinite, for 'every striker' may 'proclaim himself a Party member.' What is the use of this vagueness? A wide extension of the 'title.' Its harm is that it introduces a *disorganizing* idea, the confusing of class and Party" (see Vol. VI, p. 211)

But the Party is not merely the *sum total* of Party organisations. The Party is at the same time a single *system* of these organisations, their formal union into a single whole, with higher and lower leading bodies, with subordination of the minority to the majority, with practical decisions binding on all members of the Party. Without these conditions the Party cannot be a single organized whole capable of exercising systematic and organized leadership in the struggle of the working class.

"*Formerly*," says Lenin, "our Party was not a formally organized whole, but only the sum of separate groups, and therefore no other relations except those of ideological influence were possible between these groups. *Now* we have become an organized Party, and this implies the establishment of authority, the transformation of the power of ideas into the power of authority, the subordination of lower Party bodies to higher Party bodies" (see Vol. VI, p. 291).

The principle of the minority submitting to the majority, the principle of directing Party work from a centre, not infrequently gives rise to attacks on the part of wavering elements, to accusations of "bureaucracy," "formalism," etc. It scarcely needs proof that systematic work by the Party as one whole, and the directing of the struggle of the working class, would be impossible without putting these principles into effect. Leninism in questions of organisation is the unswerving application of these applications of these principles. Lenin terms the fight against these principles "Russian nihilism" and "aristocratic anarchism," which deserves to be ridiculed and swept aside.

Here is what Lenin says about these wavering elements in his book *One Step Forward*:

"This aristocratic anarchism is particularly characteristic of the Russian nihilist. He thinks of the Party organisation as a monstrous 'factory'; he regards the subordination of the part to the whole and of the minority to the majority of 'serfdom'..., division of labor under the direction of a centre evokes from him a tragi-comical outcry against people being transformed into 'wheels and cogs'..., mention of the organisational rules of the Party calls forth a contemptuous grimace and the disdainful... remark that one could very well dispense with rules altogether."

"It is clear, I think, that the cries about this celebrated bureaucracy are just a screen for dissatisfaction with the personal composition of the central bodies, a fig leaf....You are a bureaucrat because you were appointed by the congress not by my will, but against it; you are a formalist because you rely on the formal decisions of the congress, and not on my consent; you are acting in a grossly mechanical way because you plead the 'mechanical' majority at the

Party Congress and pay no heed to my wish to be co-opted; you are an autocrat because you refuse to hand over the power to the old gang" [267] (see Vol. VI, pp. 310, 287).

3) *The Party as the highest form of class organisation of the proletariat*. The Party is the organized detachment of the working class. But the Party is not the only organisation of the working class. The proletariat has also a number of other organisations, without which it cannot wage a successful struggle against capital: trade unions, co-operatives, factory organisations, parliamentary groups, non-Party women's associations, the press, cultural and educational organisations, youth leagues, revolutionary fighting organisations (in times of open revolutionary action), Soviets of deputies as the form of state organisation (if the proletariat is in power), etc. The overwhelming majority of these organisations are non-Party, and only some of them adhere directly to the Party, or constitute offshoots from it. All these organisations, under certain conditions, are absolutely necessary for the working class, for without them it would be impossible to consolidate the class positions of the proletariat in the diverse spheres of struggle; for without them it would be impossible to steel the proletariat as the force whose mission it is to replace the bourgeois order by the socialist order. But how can single leadership be exercised with such an abundance or organisations? What guarantee is there that this multiplicity of organisations will not lead to divergency in leadership? It may be said that each of these organisations carries on its work in its own special field, and that therefore these organisations cannot hinder one another. That, of course, is true. But it is also true that all these organisations should work in one direction for they serve *one* class, the class of the proletarians. The question then arises: who is to determine the line, the general direction, along which the work of all these organisations is to be conducted? Where are the central organisations which is not only able, because it has the necessary experience, to work out such a general line, but, in addition, is in a position, because it has sufficient prestige, to induce all these organisations to carry out this line, so as to attain unity of leadership and to make hitches impossible?

That organisation is the Party of the proletariat.

The Party possesses all the necessary qualifications for this because, in the first place, it is the rallying centre of the finest elements in the working class, who have direct connections with the non-Party organisations of the proletariat and very frequently lead them; because, secondly, the Party, as the rallying centre of the finest members of the working class, is the best school for training leaders of the working class, capable of directing every form of organisation of their class; because, thirdly, the Party, as the best school for training leaders of the working class, is, by reason of its experience and prestige, the only organisation capable of centralizing the leadership of the struggle of the proletariat, thus transforming each and every non-Party organisation of the working class into an auxiliary body and transmission belt linking the Party with the class.

[267] The 'gang' here referred to is that of Axelrod, Martov, Potresov and others, who would not submit to the decisions of the Second Congress and who accused Lenin of being a "bureaucrat."-J. St.

The Party is the highest form of class organisation of the proletariat.

This does not mean, of course, that non-Party organisations, trade unions, co-operatives, etc., should be officially subordinated to the Party leadership. It only means that the members of the Party who belong to these organisations and are doubtlessly influential in them should do all they can to persuade these non-Party organisations to draw nearer to the Party of the proletariat in their work and voluntarily accept its political leadership.

That is why Lenin says that the Party is "the *highest form* of proletarian class association," whose political leadership must extend to every other form of organization of the proletariat. (see Vol. XXV, p. 194)

That is why the opportunist theory of the "independence" and "neutrality" of the non-Party organisations, which breeds *independent* members of parliament and journalists *isolated* from the Party, *narrow-minded* trade union leaders and *philistine* co-operative officials, is wholly incompatible with the theory and practice of Leninism.

4) *The Party as an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat.* The Party is the highest form of organisation of the proletariat. The Party is the principle guiding force within the class of the proletarians and among the organisations of that class. But it does not by any means follow from this that the Party can be regarded as an end in itself, as a self-sufficient force. The Party is not only the highest form of class association of the proletarians; it is at the same time an *instrument* in the hands of the proletariat *for* achieving the dictatorship, when that has not yet been achieved and *for* consolidating and expanding the dictatorship when it has already been achieved. The Party could not have risen so high in importance and could not have exerted its influence over all other forms of organisations of the proletariat, if the latter had not been confronted with the question of power, if the conditions of imperialism, the inevitability of wars, and the existence of a crisis had not yet demanded the concentration of all the forces of the proletariat at one point, the gathering of all the threads of the revolutionary movement in one spot in order to overthrow the bourgeoisie and to achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat. The proletariat needs the Party first of all as its General Staff, which it must have for the successful seizure of power. It scarcely needs proof that without a party capable of rallying around itself the mass organisations of the proletariat, and of centralizing the leadership of the entire movement during the progress of the struggle, the proletariat in Russia could not have established its revolutionary dictatorship.

But the proletariat needs the Party not only to achieve the dictatorship; it needs it still more to maintain the dictatorship, to consolidate and expand it in order to achieve the complete victory of socialism.

> "Certainly, almost everyone now realizes," says Lenin, "that the Bolsheviks could not have maintained themselves in power for two-and-a-half months, let alone two-and-a-half years, without the strictest, truly iron discipline in our Party, and without the fullest and unreserved

support of the latter by the whole mass of the working class, that is, by all its thinking, honest, self-sacrificing and influential elements, capable of leading or of carrying with them the backwards strata" (see Vol. XXV, p. 173).

Now, what does to "maintain" and "expand" the dictatorship mean? It means imbuing the millions of proletarians with the spirit of discipline and organisation; it means creating among the proletarian masses a cementing force and a bulwark against the corrosive influence of the petty-bourgeois elemental forces and petty-bourgeois habits; it means enhancing the organizing work of the proletarians in re-educating and remolding the petty-bourgeois strata; it means helping the masses of the proletarians to educate themselves as a force capable of abolishing classes and of preparing the conditions for the organisation of socialist production. But it is impossible to accomplish all this without a party which is strong by reason of its solidarity and discipline.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat," says Lenin, "is a stubborn struggle--bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative--against the forces and traditions of the old society. The force of habit of millions and tens of millions is a most terrible force. Without an iron party tempered in the struggle, without a party enjoying the confidence of all that is honest in the given class without a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, it is impossible to conduct such a strategy successfully" (see Vol. XXV, p. 190).

The proletariat needs the Party *for* the purpose of achieving and maintaining the dictatorship. The Party is an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But from this it follows that when classes disappear and the dictatorship of the proletariat withers away, the Party also will wither away.

5) *The Party as the embodiment of unity of will, unity incompatible with the existence of factions.* The achievement and maintenance of the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible without a party which is strong by reason of its solidarity and iron discipline. But iron discipline in the Party is inconceivable without unity of will, without complete and absolute unity of action on the part of all members of the Party. This does not mean, of course, that the possibility of conflicts of opinion within the Party is thereby precluded. On the contrary, iron discipline does not preclude but presupposes criticism and conflict of opinion within the Party. Least of all does it mean that discipline must be "blind." On the contrary, iron discipline does not preclude but presupposes conscious and voluntary submission, for only conscious discipline can be truly iron discipline. But after a conflict of opinion has been closed, after criticism has been exhausted and a decision has been arrived at, unity of will and unity of action of all Party members are the necessary conditions without which neither Party unity nor iron discipline in the Party is conceivable.

"In the present epoch of acute civil war," says Lenin, "the Communist Party will be able to perform its duty only if it is organized in the most centralized manner, if iron discipline

bordering on military discipline prevails in it, and if its Party centre is a powerful and authoritative organ, wielding wide powers and enjoying the universal confidence of the members of the Party" (see Vol. XXV, pp. 282-83).

This is the position in regard to discipline in the Party in the period of struggle preceding the achievement of the dictatorship.

The same, but to an even greater degree, must be said about discipline in the Party after the dictatorship has been achieved.

"Whoever," says Lenin, "weakens in the least the iron discipline of the Party of the proletariat (especially during the time of its dictatorship), actually aids the bourgeoisie against the proletariat" (see Vol. XXV, p. 190).

But from this it follows that the existence of factions is compatible neither with the Party's unity nor with its iron discipline. It scarcely needs proof that the existence of factions leads to the existence of a number of centers, and the existence of a number of centers means the absence of one common centre in the Party, the breaking up of unity of will, the weakening and disintegration of discipline, the weakening and disintegration of the dictatorship. Of course, the parties of the Second International, which are fighting against the dictatorship of the proletariat and have no desire to lead the proletarians to power, can afford such liberalism as freedom of factions, for they have no need at all for iron discipline. But the parties of the Communist International, whose activities are conditioned by the task of achieving and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, cannot afford to be "liberal" or to permit freedom of factions.

The Party represents unity of will, which precludes all factionalism and division of authority in the Party.

Hence Lenin's warning about the "danger of factionalism from the point of view of Party unity and of effecting the unity of will of the vanguard of the proletariat as the fundamental condition for the success of the dictatorship of the proletariat," which is embodied in the special resolution of the Tenth Congress of our Party "On Party Unity." [268]

Hence Lenin's demand for the "complete elimination of all factionalism" and the "immediate dissolution of all groups, without exemption, that have been formed on the basis of various platforms," on pain of "unconditional and immediate expulsion from the Party" (see the resolution "On Party Unity").

6) *The Party becomes strong by purging itself of opportunist elements*. The source of factionalism in the Party is its opportunists elements. The proletariat is not an isolated class. It is consistently

[268] The resolution "On Party Unity" was written by V.I. Lenin and adopted by the Tenth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), held on March 8-16, 1921 (see V.I. Lenin, Works, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 32, pp. 217-21, and also Resolutions and Decisions of C.P.S.U.(B.) Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee Plenums, Part I, 1941, pp. 364-66).

replenished by the influx of peasants, petty bourgeois and intellectuals proletarianized by the development of capitalism. At the same time the upper stratum of the proletariat, principally trade union leaders and members of parliament who are fed by the bourgeoisie out of the super-profits extracted from the colonies, is undergoing a process of decay. "This stratum of bourgeoisified workers, or the 'labor aristocracy,'" says Lenin, "who are quite philistine in their mode of life, in the size of their earnings and in their entire outlook, is the principal prop of the Second International, and, in our days, the principal *social* (not military) *prop of the bourgeoisie*. For they are real *agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class* movement, the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class..., real channels of reformism and chauvinism" (see Vol. XIX, p.77)

In one way or another, all these petty-bourgeois groups penetrate into the Party and introduce into it the spirit of hesitancy and opportunism, the spirit of demoralization and uncertainty. It is they, principally, that constitute the source of factionalism and disintegration, the source of disorganization and disruption of the Party from within. To fight imperialism with such "allies" in one's rear means to put oneself in the position of being caught between two fires, from the front and from the rear. Therefore, ruthless struggle against such elements, their expulsion from the Party, is a pre-requisite for the successful struggle against imperialism.

The theory of "defeating" opportunist elements by the ideological struggle within the Party, the theory of "overcoming" these elements within the confines of a single party, is a rotten and dangerous theory, which threatens to condemn the Party to paralysis and chronic infirmity, threatens to leave the Party a prey to opportunism, threatens to leave the proletariat without a revolutionary party, threatens to deprive the proletariat of its main weapon in the fight against imperialism. Our Party could not have emerged on to the broad highway, it could not have seized power and organized the dictatorship of the proletariat, it could not have emerged victorious from the civil war, if it had had within its ranks people like Martov and Dan, Potresov and Axelrod. Our Party succeeded in achieving internal unity and unexampled cohesion of its ranks primarily because it was able in good time to purge itself of the opportunist pollution, because it was able to rid its ranks of the Liquidators and Mensheviks. Proletarian parties develop and become strong by purging themselves of opportunists and reformists, social-imperialists and social-chauvinists, social-patriots and social-pacifists.

The Party becomes strong by purging itself of opportunist elements.

"With reformists, Mensheviks, in our ranks," says Lenin, "it is *impossible* to be victorious in the proletarian revolution, it is *impossible* to defend it. That is obvious in principle, and it has been strikingly confirmed by the experience of both Russia and Hungary.... In Russia, difficult situations have arisen *many times*, when the Soviet regime would *most certainly* have been overthrown had Mensheviks, reformists and petty-bourgeois democrats remained in our Party...in Italy, where, as is generally admitted, decisive battles between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie for the possession of state power are imminent. At such a moment it is not only

absolutely necessary to remove the Mensheviks, reformists, the Turatists from the Party, but it may even be useful to remove excellent Communists who are liable to waver, and who reveal a tendency to waver towards 'unity' with the reformists, to remove them from all responsible posts....On the eve of a revolution, and at a moment when a most fierce struggle is being waged for its victory, the slightest wavering in the ranks of the Party may *wreck everything*, frustrate the revolution, wrest the power from the hands of the proletariat; for this power is not yet consolidated, the attack upon it is still very strong. The desertion of wavering leaders at such a time does not weaken but strengthens the Party, the working-class movement and the revolution" (see Vol. XXV, pp. 462, 463, 464).

Unit 8. The World Revolution.

Things covered:

1. The world revolution and the importance of People's War.
    a. The 60s.
    b. Current struggles.
    c. Perspectives of the 70s.
2. Content of revisionism.
    a. Class struggle.
    b. Violent revolution.
    c. Dictatorship of the proletariat.
3. Development, character, and perspectives of revisionism

Bibliography:

- Lenin:
    - Marxism and Revisionism.
    - Imperialism and the Split in Socialism.
- Lin Piao:
    - Long Live the Victory of the People's War!: last three parts.
- CPCh:
    - A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement;
    - The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of The CPSU And Ourselves – Commentary I
    - Apologists Of Neo-Colonialism – Commentary IV
    - Two Different Lines on the Question of War and Peace – Commentary V
    - Peaceful Coexistence — Two Diametrically Opposed Policies – Commentary VI
    - The Leaders of the CPSU Are the Greatest Splitters of Our Times – Commentary VIII
    - On Khrushchev's Phony Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World – Commentary IX

    - Again, on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us. Chapter III and VII.
- Peking Review:
    - No.1 of 1970.
    - No. 21, 22, 23, 26 of 1971.
- Vo Nguyen Giap:
    - The South Vietnam People Will Win.
- Renmin Ribao:
    - Leninism or Social Imperialism?

Selection:

V. I. Lenin: Marxism and Revisionism

There is a well-known saying that if geometrical axioms affected human interests attempts would certainly be made to refute them. Theories of natural history which conflicted with the old prejudices of theology provoked, and still provoke, the most rabid opposition. No wonder, therefore, that the Marxian doctrine, which directly serves to enlighten and organize the advanced class in modern society, indicates the tasks facing this class and demonstrates the inevitable replacement (by virtue of economic development) of the present system by a new order—no wonder that this doctrine has had to fight for every step forward in the course of its life.

Needless to say, this applies to bourgeois science and philosophy, officially taught by official professors in order to befuddle the rising generation of the propertied classes and to "coach" it against internal and foreign enemies. This science will not even hear of Marxism, declaring that it has been refuted and annihilated. Marx is attacked with equal zest by young scholars who are making a career by refuting socialism, and by decrepit elders who are preserving the tradition of all kinds of outworn "systems". The progress of Marxism, the fact that its ideas are spreading and taking firm hold among the working class, inevitably increase the frequency and intensity of these bourgeois attacks on Marxism, which becomes stronger, more hardened and more vigorous every time it is "annihilated" by official science.

But even among doctrines connected with the struggle of the working class, and current mainly among the proletariat, Marxism by no means consolidated its position all at once. In the first half-century of its existence (from the 1840s on) Marxism was engaged in combating theories fundamentally hostile to it. In the early forties Marx and Engels settled accounts with the radical Young Hegelians whose viewpoint was that of philosophical idealism. At the end of the forties the struggle began in the field of economic doctrine, against Proudhonism. The fifties saw the completion of this struggle in criticism of the parties and doctrines which manifested themselves in the stormy year of 1848. In the sixties the struggle shifted from the field of general theory to one closer to the direct labor movement: the ejection of Bakuninism from the International. In the early seventies the stage in Germany was occupied for a short while by the Proudhonist Mühlberger, and in the late seventies by the positivist Dühring. But the influence of both on the proletariat was already

absolutely insignificant. Marxism was already gaining an unquestionable victory over all other ideologies in the labor movement.

By the nineties this victory was in the main completed. Even in the Latin countries, where the traditions of Proudhonism held their ground longest of all, the workers' parties in effect built their programs and their tactics on Marxist foundations. The revived international organisation of the labor movement—in the shape of periodical international congresses—from the outset, and almost without a struggle, adopted the Marxist standpoint in all essentials. But after Marxism had ousted all the more or less integral doctrines hostile to it, the tendencies expressed in those doctrines began to seek other channels. The forms and causes of the struggle changed, but the struggle continued. And the second half-century of the existence of Marxism began (in the nineties) with the struggle of a trend hostile to Marxism within Marxism itself.

Bernstein, a one-time orthodox Marxist, gave his name to this trend by coming forward with the most noise and with the most purposeful expression of amendments to Marx, revision of Marx, revisionism. Even in Russia where—owing to the economic backwardness of the country and the preponderance of a peasant population weighed down by the relics of serfdom—non-Marxist socialism has naturally held its ground longest of all, it is plainly passing into revisionism before our very eyes. Both in the agrarian question (the programme of the municipalisation of all land) and in general questions of programme and tactics, our Social-Narodniks are more and more substituting "amendments" to Marx for the moribund and obsolescent remnants of their old system, which in its own way was integral and fundamentally hostile to Marxism.

Pre-Marxist socialism has been defeated. It is continuing the struggle, no longer on its own independent ground, but on the general ground of Marxism, as revisionism. Let us, then, examine the ideological content of revisionism.

In the sphere of philosophy revisionism followed in the wake of bourgeois professorial "science". The professors went "back to Kant"—and revisionism dragged along after the neo-Kantians. The professors repeated the platitudes that priests have uttered a thousand times against philosophical materialism—and the revisionists, smiling indulgently, mumbled (word for word after the latest *Handbuch*) that materialism had been "refuted" long ago. The professors treated Hegel as a "dead dog",[269] and while themselves preaching idealism, only an idealism a thousand times pettier and more banal than Hegel's, contemptuously shrugged their shoulders at dialectics—and the revisionists floundered after them into the swamp of philosophical vulgarization of science, replacing "artful" (and revolutionary) dialectics by "simple" (and tranquil) "evolution". The professors earned their official salaries by adjusting both their idealist and their "critical" systems to the dominant medieval "philosophy" (i.e., to theology)—and the revisionists drew close to them, trying to make

[269] Lenin quotes from K. Marx's afterword to the second edition of Volume One of Capital (see K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I, Moscow, 1958, p. 456).

religion a "private affair", not in relation to the modern state, but in relation to the party of the advanced class.

What such "amendments" to Marx really meant in class terms need not be stated: it is self-evident. We shall simply note that the only Marxist in the international Social-Democratic movement to criticize the incredible platitudes of the revisionists from the standpoint of consistent dialectical materialism was Plekhanov. This must be stressed. all the more emphatically since profoundly mistaken attempts are being made at the present time to smuggle in old and reactionary philosophical rubbish disguised as a criticism of Plekhanov's tactical opportunism. [270]

Passing to political economy, it must be noted first of all that in this sphere the "amendments" of the revisionists were much more comprehensive and circumstantial; attempts were made to influence the public by "new data on economic development". It was said that concentration and the ousting of small-scale production by large-scale production do not occur in agriculture at all, while they proceed very slowly in commerce and industry. It was said that crises had now become rarer and weaker, and that cartels and trusts would probably enable capital to eliminate them altogether. It was said that the "theory of collapse" to which capitalism is heading was unsound, owing to the tendency of class antagonisms to become milder and less acute. It was said, finally, that it would not be amiss to correct Marx's theory of value, too, in accordance with Böhm-Bawerk. [271]

The fight against the revisionists on these questions resulted in as fruitful a revival of the theoretical thought in international socialism as did Engels's controversy with Dühring twenty years earlier. The arguments of the revisionists were analyzed with the help of facts and figures. It was proved that the revisionists were systematically painting a rose-colored picture of modern small-scale production. The technical and commercial superiority of large-scale *production* over small-scale production not only in industry, but also in agriculture, is proved by irrefutable facts. But commodity production is far less developed in agriculture, and modern statisticians and economists are, as a rule, not very skillful in picking out the special branches (sometimes even the operations) in agriculture which indicate that agriculture is being progressively drawn into the process of *exchange* in world economy. Small-scale production maintains itself on the ruins of natural economy by constant worsening of diet, by chronic starvation, by lengthening of the working day, by deterioration in the quality and the care of cattle, in a word, by the very methods whereby handicraft production maintained itself against capitalist manufacture. Every advance in science and technology inevitably and relentlessly undermines the foundations of small-scale production in capitalist society; and it is the task of socialist political economy to investigate this process in all its forms, often complicated and intricate, and to demonstrate to the small producer the impossibility of his holding his own

[270] See Studies in the Philosophy of Marxism by Bogdanov, Bazarov and others. This is not the place to discuss the book, and I must at present confine myself to stating that in the very near future I shall prove in a series of articles, or in a separate pamphlet, that everything I have said in the text about neo-Kantian revisionists essentially applies also to these "new" neo-Humist and neo-Berkeleyan revisionists. (See present edition, Vol. 14.—Ed.) —Lenin

[271] Böhm-Bawerk, E.—an Austrian bourgeois economist.

under capitalism, the hopelessness of peasant farming under capitalism, and the necessity for the peasant to adopt the standpoint of the proletarian. On this question the revisionists sinned, in the scientific sense, by superficial generalizations based on facts selected one-sidedly and without reference to the system of capitalism as a whole. From the political point of view, they sinned by the fact that they inevitably, whether they wanted to or not, invited or urged the peasant to adopt the attitude of a small proprietor (i.e., the attitude of the bourgeoisie) instead of urging him to adopt the point of view of the revolutionary proletarian.

The position of revisionism was even worse as regards the theory of crises and the theory of collapse. Only for a very short time could people, and then only the most short-sighted, think of refashioning the foundations of Marx's theory under the influence of a few years of industrial boom and prosperity. Realities very soon made it clear to the revisionists that crises were not a thing of the past: prosperity was followed by a crisis. The forms, the sequence, the picture of particular crises changed, but crises remained an inevitable component of the capitalist system. While uniting production, the cartels and trusts at the same time, and in a way that was obvious to all, aggravated the anarchy of production, the insecurity of existence of the proletariat and the oppression of capital, thereby intensifying class antagonisms to an unprecedented degree. That capitalism is heading for a break-down—in the sense both of individual political and economic crises and of the complete collapse of the entire capitalist system—has been made particularly clear, and on a particularly large scale, precisely by the new giant trusts. The recent financial crisis in America and the appalling increase of unemployment all over Europe, to say nothing of the impending industrial crisis to which many symptoms are pointing—all this has resulted in the recent "theories" of the revisionists having been forgotten by everybody, including, apparently, many of the revisionists themselves. But the lessons which this instability of the intellectuals had given the working class must not be forgotten.

As to the theory of value, it need only be said that apart from the vaguest of hints and sighs, *à la* Böhm-Bawerk, the revisionists have contributed absolutely nothing, and have therefore left no traces whatever on the development of scientific thought.

In the sphere of politics, revisionism did really try to revise the foundation of Marxism, namely, the doctrine of the class struggle. Political freedom, democracy and universal suffrage remove the ground for the class struggle—we were told—and render untrue the old proposition of the *Communist Manifesto* that the working men have no country. For, they said, since the "will of the majority" prevails in a democracy, one must neither regard the state as an organ of class rule, nor reject alliances with the progressive, social-reform bourgeoisie against the reactionaries.

It cannot be disputed that these arguments of the revisionists amounted to a fairly well-balanced system of views, namely, the old and well-known liberal-bourgeois views. The liberals have always said that bourgeois parliamentarism destroys classes and class divisions, since the right to vote and the right to participate in the government of the country are shared by all citizens without distinction. The whole history of Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century, and the whole

history of the Russian revolution in the early twentieth, clearly show how absurd such views are. Economic distinctions are not mitigated but aggravated and intensified under the freedom of "democratic" capitalism. Parliamentarism does not eliminate, but lays bare the innate character even of the most democratic bourgeois republics as organs of class oppression. By helping to enlighten and to organize immeasurably wider masses of the population than those which previously took an active part in political events, parliamentarism does not make for the elimination of crises and political revolutions, but for the maximum intensification of civil war during such revolutions. The events in Paris in the spring of 1871 and the events in Russia in the winter of 1905 showed as clearly as could be how inevitably this intensification comes about. The French bourgeoisie without a moment's hesitation made a deal with the enemy of the whole nation, with the foreign army which had ruined its country, in order to crush the proletarian movement. Whoever does not understand the inevitable inner dialectics of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy—which leads to an even sharper decision of the argument by mass violence than formerly—will never be able on the basis of this parliamentarism to conduct propaganda and agitation consistent in principle, really preparing the working-class masses for victorious participation in such "arguments". The experience of alliances, agreements and blocs with the social-reform liberals in the West and with the liberal reformists (Cadets) in the Russian revolution, has convincingly shown that these agreements only blunt the consciousness of the masses, that they do not enhance but weaken the actual significance of their struggle, by linking fighters with elements who are least capable of fighting and most vacillating and treacherous. Millerandism in France—the biggest experiment in applying revisionist political tactics on a wide, a really national scale—has provided a practical appraisal of revisionism that will never be forgotten by the proletariat all over the world.

A natural complement to the economic and political tendencies of revisionism was its attitude to the ultimate aim of the socialist movement. "The movement is everything, the ultimate aim is nothing"—this catch-phrase of Bernstein's expresses the substance of revisionism better than many long disquisitions. To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chopping and changing of petty politics, to forget the primary interests of the proletariat and the basic features of the whole capitalist system, of all capitalist evolution, to sacrifice these primary interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment—such is the policy of revisionism. And it patently follows from the very nature of this policy that it may assume an infinite variety of forms, and that every more or less "new" question, every more or less unexpected and unforeseen turn of events, even though it changes the basic line of development only to an insignificant degree and only for the briefest period, will always inevitably give rise to one variety of revisionism or another.

The inevitability of revisionism is determined by its class roots in modern society. Revisionism is an international phenomenon. No thinking socialist who is in the least informed can have the slightest doubt that the relation between the orthodox and the Bernsteinians in Germany, the Guesdists and the Jaurèsists (and now particularly the Broussists) in France, the Social Democratic

Federation and the Independent Labor Party in Great Britain, Brouckère and Vandervelde in Belgium, the Integralists and the Reformists in Italy, the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks in Russia, is everywhere essentially similar, notwithstanding the immense variety of national conditions and historical factors in the present state of all these countries. In reality, the "division" within the present international socialist movement is now proceeding along the *same* lines in all the various countries of the world, which testifies to a tremendous advance compared with thirty or forty years ago, when heterogeneous trends in the various countries were struggling within the one international socialist movement. And that "revisionism from the left" which has taken shape in the Latin countries as "revolutionary syndicalism", [272] is also adapting itself to Marxism, "amending" it: Labriola in Italy and Lagardelle in France frequently appeal from Marx who is understood wrongly to Marx who is understood rightly.

We cannot stop here to analyze the ideological content of *this* revisionism, which as yet is far from having developed to the same extent as opportunist revisionism: it has not yet become international, has not yet stood the test of a single big practical battle with a socialist party in any single country. We confine ourselves therefore to that "revisionism from the right" which was described above.

Wherein lies its inevitability in capitalist society? Why is it more profound than the differences of national peculiarities and of degrees of capitalist development? Because in every capitalist country, side by side with the proletariat, there are always broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie, small proprietors. Capitalism arose and is constantly arising out of small production. A number of new "middle strata" are inevitably brought into existence again and again by capitalism (appendages to the factory, work at home, small workshops scattered all over the country to meet the requirements of big industries, such as the bicycle and automobile industries, etc.). These new small producers are just as inevitably being cast again into the ranks of the proletariat. It is quite natural that the petty-bourgeois world-outlook should again and again crop up in the ranks of the broad workers' parties. It is quite natural that this should be so and always will be so, right up to the changes of fortune that will take place in the proletarian revolution. For it would be a profound mistake to think that the "complete" proletarianization of the majority of the population is essential for bringing about such a revolution. What we now frequently experience only in the domain of ideology, namely, disputes over theoretical amendments to Marx; what now crops up in practice only over individual side issues of the labor movement, as tactical differences with the revisionists and splits on this basis—is bound to be experienced by the working class on an incomparably larger scale when the proletarian revolution will sharpen all disputed issues, will focus all differences on points which are of the most

[272] "Revolutionary syndicalism"— a petty-bourgeois semi-anarchist trend that made its appearance in the labor movement of a number of West-European countries at the close of the nineteenth century.

The syndicalists saw no need for the working class to engage in political struggle, they repudiated the leading role of the Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They believed that by organizing a general strike of the workers the trade unions (in France—syndicates) could, without a revolution, overthrow capitalism and take over control of production.

immediate importance in determining the conduct of the masses, and will make it necessary in the heat of the fight to distinguish enemies from friends, and to cast out bad allies in order to deal decisive blows at the enemy.

The ideological struggle waged by revolutionary Marxism against revisionism at the end of the nineteenth century is but the prelude to the great revolutionary battles of the proletariat, which is marching forward to the complete victory of its cause despite all the waverings and weaknesses of the petty bourgeoisie.

V. I. Lenin: Imperialism and the Split in Socialism

Is there any connection between imperialism and the monstrous and disgusting victory opportunism (in the form of social-chauvinism) has gained over the labor movement in Europe?

This is the fundamental question of modern socialism. And having in our Party literature fully established, first, the imperialist character of our era and of the present, [273] and, second, the inseparable historical connection between social-chauvinism and opportunism, as well as the intrinsic similarity of their political ideology, we can and must proceed to analyze this fundamental question.

We have to begin with as precise and full a definition of imperialism as possible. Imperialism is a specific historical stage of capitalism. Its specific character is threefold: imperialism is monopoly capitalism; parasitic, or decaying capitalism; moribund capitalism. The supplanting of free competition by monopoly is the fundamental economic feature, the *quintessence* of imperialism. Monopoly manifests itself in five principal forms: (1) cartels, syndicates and trusts—the concentration of production has reached a degree which gives rise to these monopolistic associations of capitalists; (2) the monopolistic position of the big banks—three, four or five giant banks manipulate the whole economic life of America, France, Germany; (3) seizure of the sources of *raw material* by the trusts and the financial oligarchy (finance capital is monopoly industrial capital merged with bank capital); (4) the (economic) partition of the world by the international cartels has *begun*. There are already over *one hundred* such international cartels, which command the *entire* world market and divide it "amicably" among themselves—until war *re*divides it. The export of capital, as distinct from the export of commodities under non-monopoly capitalism, is a highly characteristic phenomenon and is closely linked with the economic and territorial-political partition of the world; (5) the territorial partition of the world (colonies) is *completed*.

Imperialism, as the highest stage of capitalism in America and Europe, and later in Asia, took final shape in the period 1898–1914. The Spanish-American War (1898), the Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902), the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05) and the economic crisis in Europe in 1900 are the chief historical landmarks in the new era of world history.

[273] Kautsky, National Problems, Russian ed.

The fact that imperialism is parasitic or decaying capitalism is manifested first of all in the tendency to decay, which is characteristic of *every* monopoly under the system of private ownership of the means of production. The difference between the democratic-republican and the reactionary-monarchist imperialist bourgeoisie is obliterated precisely because they are both rotting alive (which by no means precludes an extraordinarily rapid development of capitalism in individual branches of industry, in individual countries, and in individual periods). Secondly, the decay of capitalism is manifested in the creation of a huge stratum of rentiers, capitalists who live by "clipping coupons". In each of the four leading imperialist countries—England, U.S.A., France and Germany—capital in securities amounts to 100,000 or 150,000 *million* francs, from which each country derives an annual income of no less than five to eight thousand million. Thirdly, export of capital is parasitism raised to a high pitch. Fourthly, "finance capital strives for domination, not freedom". Political reaction *all along* the line is a characteristic feature of imperialism. Corruption, bribery on a huge scale and all kinds of fraud. Fifthly, the exploitation of oppressed nations—which is inseparably connected with annexations—and especially the exploitation of colonies by a handful of "Great" Powers, increasingly transforms the "civilized" world into a parasite on the body of hundreds of millions in the uncivilized nations. The Roman proletarian lived at the expense of society. Modern society lives at the expense of the modern proletarian. Marx specially stressed this profound observation of Sismondi. [274] Imperialism somewhat changes the situation. A privileged upper stratum of the proletariat in the imperialist countries lives partly at the expense of hundreds of millions in the uncivilized nations.

It is clear why imperialism is *moribund* capitalism, capitalism in *transition* to socialism: monopoly, which grows *out of* capitalism, is *already* dying capitalism, the beginning of its transition to socialism. The tremendous *socialization* of labor by imperialism (what its apologists-the bourgeois economists-call "interlocking") produces the same result.

Advancing this definition of imperialism brings us into complete contradiction to K. Kautsky, who refuses to regard imperialism as a "phase of capitalism" and defines it as a *policy* "preferred" by finance capital, a tendency of "industrial" countries to annex "agrarian" countries. [275] Kautsky's definition is thoroughly false from the theoretical standpoint. What distinguishes imperialism is the rule *not* of industrial capital, but of finance capital, the striving to annex *not* agrarian countries, particularly, but *every* kind of country. Kautsky *divorces* imperialist politics from imperialist economics, he divorces monopoly in politics from monopoly in economics in order to pave the way for his vulgar bourgeois reformism, such as "disarmament", "ultra-imperialism" and similar nonsense. The whole purpose and significance of this theoretical falsity is to obscure the *most profound* contradictions of imperialism and thus justify the theory of "unity" with the apologists of imperialism, the outright social-chauvinists and opportunists.

[274] Kautsky, Social-Democracy in War, in German.
[275] Kautsky, The Question of Defense and Social-Democracy, in German.

We have dealt at sufficient length with Kautsky's break with Marxism on this point in *Sotsial-Demokrat* and *Kommunist*. [276] Our Russian Kautskyites, the supporters of the Organizing Committee [277] (O.C.), headed by Axelrod and Spectator, including even Martov, and to a large degree Trotsky, preferred to maintain a discreet silence on the question of Kautskyism as a trend. They did not dare defend Kautsky's war-time writings, confining themselves simply to praising Kautsky (Axelrod in his German pamphlet, which the Organizing Committee has *promised* to publish in Russian) or to quoting Kautsky's private letters (Spectator), in which he says he belongs to the opposition and jesuitically tries to nullify his chauvinist declarations.

It should be noted that Kautsky's "conception" of imperialism—which is tantamount to embellishing imperialism—is a retrogression not only compared with Hilferding's *Finance Capital* (no matter how assiduously Hilferding now defends Kautsky and "unity" with the social-chauvinists!) but also compared with the *social-liberal* J. A. Hobson. This English economist, who in no way claims to be a Marxist, defines imperialism, and reveals its contradictions, much more profoundly in a book published in 1902. [278] This is what Hobson (in whose book may be found nearly all Kautsky's pacifist and "conciliatory" banalities) wrote on the highly important question of the parasitic nature of imperialism:

Two sets of circumstances, in Hobson's opinion, weakened the power of the old empires: (1) "economic parasitism", and (2) formation of armies from dependent peoples. "There is first the habit of economic parasitism, by which the ruling state has used its provinces, colonies, and dependencies in order to enrich its ruling class and to bribe its lower classes into acquiescence." Concerning the second circumstance, Hobson writes:

"One of the strangest symptoms of the blindness of imperialism [this song about the "blindness" of imperialists comes more appropriately from the social-liberal Hobson than from the "Marxist" Kautsky] is the reckless indifference with which Great Britain, France, and other imperial nations are embarking on this perilous dependence. Great Britain has gone farthest. Most of the fighting by which we have won our Indian Empire has been done by natives; in India, as more recently in Egypt, great standing armies are placed under British commanders; almost all the fighting associated with our African dominions, except in the southern part, has been done for us by natives."

The prospect of partitioning China elicited from Hobson the following economic appraisal: "The greater part of Western Europe might then assume the appearance and character already exhibited by tracts of country in the South of England, in the Riviera, and in the tourist-ridden or residential parts of Italy and Switzerland, little clusters of wealthy aristocrats drawing dividends and pensions from the Far East, with a somewhat larger group of professional retainers and tradesmen

[276] Kautsky "Preface to War and Democracy" in German.
[277] *Ibid*.
[278] Haase's speech on the question of imperialism at the Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party in Chemnitz, 1912, published in the Handbook of the Congress of the Social-Democratic Party in 1910-1913, Vol. II, in German.

and a larger body of personal servants and workers in the transport trade and in the final stages of production of the more perishable goods: all the main arterial industries would have disappeared, the staple foods and semi-manufactures flowing in as tribute from Asia and Africa.... We have foreshadowed the possibility of even a larger alliance of Western states, a European federation of Great Powers which, so far from forwarding the cause of world civilization, might introduce the gigantic peril of a Western parasitism, a group of advanced industrial nations, whose upper classes drew vast tribute from Asia and Africa, with which they supported great tame masses of retainers, no longer engaged in the staple industries of agriculture and manufacture, but kept in the performance of personal or minor industrial services under the control of a new financial aristocracy. Let those who would scout such a theory [he should have said: prospect] as undeserving of consideration examine the economic and social condition of districts in Southern England today which are already reduced to this condition, and reflect upon the vast extension of such a system which might be rendered feasible by the subjection of China to the economic control of similar groups of financiers, investors [rentiers] and political and business officials, draining the greatest potential reservoir of profit the world has ever known, in order to consume it in Europe. The situation is far too complex, the play of world forces far too incalculable, to render this or any other single interpretation of the future very probable; but the influences which govern the imperialism of Western Europe today are moving in this direction, and, unless counteracted or diverted, make towards such a consummation."

Hobson, the social-liberal, fails to see that this "counteraction" can be offered *only* by the revolutionary proletariat and *only* in the form of a social revolution. But then he is a social-liberal! Nevertheless, as early as 1902 he had an excellent insight into the meaning and significance of a "United States of Europe" (be it said for the benefit of Trotsky the Kautskyite!) and of all that is now being glossed over by the *hypocritical Kautskyites* of various countries, namely, that the *opportunists* (social-chauvinists) are working hand in glove with the imperialist bourgeoisie *precisely* towards creating an imperialist Europe on the backs of Asia and Africa, and that objectively the *opportunists* are a section of the petty bourgeoisie and of a certain strata of the working class who *have been bribed* out of imperialist super profits and converted to *watchdogs* of capitalism and *corruptors* of the labor movement.

Both in articles and in the resolutions of our Party, we have repeatedly pointed to this most profound connection, the economic connection, between the imperialist bourgeoisie and the opportunism which has triumphed (for long?) in the labor movement. And from this, incidentally, we concluded that a split with the social-chauvinists was inevitable. Our Kautskyites preferred to evade the question! Martov, for instance, uttered in his lectures a sophistry which in the *Bulletin of the Organizing Committee, Secretariat Abroad*[279] (No. 4, April 10, 1916) is expressed as follows:

[279] Kautsky, "A Catechism of Social-Democracy", in German.

"...The cause of revolutionary Social-Democracy would be in a sad, indeed hopeless, plight if those groups of workers who in mental development approach most closely to the 'intelligentsia' and who are the most highly skilled fatally drifted away from it towards opportunism...."

By means of the silly word "fatally" and a certain sleight-of-hand, the *fact* is *evaded* that *certain* groups of workers *have already drifted away* to opportunism and to the imperialist bourgeoisie! And that is the very fact the sophists of the O.C. want to *evade*! They confine themselves to the "official optimism" the Kautskyite Hilferding and many others now flaunt: objective conditions guarantee the unity of the proletariat and the victory of the revolutionary trend! We, forsooth, are "optimists" with regard to the proletariat!

But in reality, all these Kautskyites—Hilferding, the O.C. supporters, Martov and Co.—are *optimists*... with regard to *opportunism*. That is the whole point!

The proletariat is the child of capitalism—of world capitalism, and not only of European capitalism, or of imperialist capitalism. On a world scale, fifty years sooner or fifty years later—measured on a *world* scale, this is a minor point—the "proletariat" of course "will be" united, and revolutionary Social-Democracy will "inevitably" be victorious within it. But that is not the point, Messrs. Kautskyites. The point is that at the present time, in the imperialist countries of Europe, *you are fawning* on the opportunists, who are *alien* to the proletariat as a class, who are the servants, the agents of the bourgeoisie and the vehicles of its influence, and *unless* the labor movement *rids* itself of them, it will remain a *bourgeois labor movement*. By advocating "unity" with the opportunists, with the Legiens and Davids, the Plekhanovs, the Chkhenkelis and Potresovs, etc., you are, objectively, defending the *enslavement* of the workers by the imperialist bourgeoisie with the aid of its best agents in the labor movement. The victory of revolutionary Social-Democracy on a world scale is absolutely inevitable, only it is moving and will move, is proceeding and will proceed, *against* you, it will be a victory *over* you.

These two trends, one might even say *two* parties, in the present-day labor movement, which in 1914–16 so obviously parted ways all over the world, were *traced by Engels and Marx in England* throughout the course of *decades*, roughly from 1858 to 1892.

Neither Marx nor Engels lived to see the imperialist epoch of world capitalism, which began not earlier than 1898–1900. But it has been a peculiar feature of England that even in the middle of the nineteenth century she already revealed at least *two* major distinguishing features of imperialism: (1) vast colonies, and (2) monopoly profit (due to her monopoly position in the world market). In both respects England at that time was an exception among capitalist countries, and Engels and Marx, analyzing this exception, quite clearly and definitely indicated its *connection* with the (temporary) victory of opportunism in the English labor movement.

In a letter to Marx, dated October 7, 1858, Engels wrote: "...The English proletariat is actually becoming more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of all nations is apparently aiming

ultimately at the possession of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat *alongside* the bourgeoisie. For a nation which exploits the whole world this is of course to a certain extent justifiable." In a letter to Sorge, dated September 21, 1872, Engels informs him that Hales kicked up a big row in the Federal Council of the International and secured a vote of censure on Marx for saying that "the English labor leaders had sold themselves". Marx wrote to Sorge on August 4, 1874: "As to the urban workers here [in England], it is a pity that the whole pack of leaders did not get into Parliament. This would be the surest way of getting rid of the whole lot." In a letter to Marx, dated August 11, 1881, Engels speaks about "those very worst English trade unions which allow themselves to be led by men sold to, or at least paid by, the bourgeoisie." In a letter to Kautsky, dated September 12, 1882, Engels wrote: "You ask me what the English workers think about colonial policy. Well, exactly the same as they think about politics in general. There is no workers' party here, there are only Conservatives and Liberal-Radicals, and the workers gaily share the feast of England's monopoly of the world market and the colonies."

On December 7, 1889, Engels wrote to Sorge: "The most repulsive thing here [in England] is the bourgeois 'respectability', which has grown deep into the bones of the workers.... Even Tom Mann, whom I regard as the best of the lot, is fond of mentioning that he will be lunching with the Lord Mayor. If one compares this with the French, one realizes, what a revolution is good for, after all." [280] In a letter, dated April 19, 1890: "But *under* the surface the movement [of the working class in England] is going on, is embracing ever wider sections and mostly just among the hitherto stagnant *lowest* [Engels's italics] strata. The day is no longer far off when this mass *will* suddenly *find itself*, when it will dawn upon it that it itself is this colossal mass in motion." On March 4, 1891: "The failure of the collapsed Dockers' Union; the 'old' conservative trade unions, *rich* and therefore cowardly, remain lone on the field...." September 14, 1891: at the Newcastle Trade Union Congress the old unionists, opponents of the eight-hour day, were defeated "and the bourgeois papers recognize the defeat of the *bourgeois labor party*" (Engels's italics throughout)....

That these ideas, which were repeated by Engels over the course of decades, were so expressed by him publicly, in the press, is proved by his preface to the second edition of *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, 1892. Here he speaks of an "aristocracy among the working class", of a "privileged minority of the workers", in contradistinction to the "great mass of working people". "A small, privileged, protected minority" of the working class alone was "permanently benefited" by the privileged position of England in 1848–68, whereas "the great bulk of them experienced at best but a temporary improvement".... "With the break-down of that [England's industrial] monopoly, the English working class will lose that privileged position..." The members of the "new" unions, the unions of the unskilled workers, "had this immense advantage, that their minds were virgin soil, entirely free from the inherited 'respectable' bourgeois prejudices which hampered the brains of the

[280] Bernstein's speech on the question of disarmament at the Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party in Chemnitz, 1912, published in the Handbook of the Congress of the Social Democratic Party in 1910-1913,Vol.II, in German.

better situated 'old unionists'" .... "The so-called workers' representatives" in England are people "who are forgiven their being members of the working class because they themselves would like to drown their quality of being workers in the ocean of their liberalism..."

We have deliberately quoted the direct statements of Marx and Engels at rather great length in order that the reader may study them *as a whole*. And they should be studied; they are worth carefully pondering over. For they are the *pivot* of the tactics in the labor movement that are dictated by the objective conditions of the imperialist era.

Here, too, Kautsky has tried to "befog the issue" and substitute for Marxism sentimental conciliation with the opportunists. Arguing against the avowed and naive social-imperialists (men like Lensch) who justify Germany's participation in the war as a means of destroying England's monopoly, Kautsky "*corrects*" this obvious falsehood by another equally obvious falsehood. Instead of a cynical falsehood he employs a suave falsehood! The *industrial* monopoly of England, he says, has long ago been broken, has long ago been destroyed, and there is nothing left to destroy.

Why is this argument false?

Because, firstly, it overlooks England's *colonial* monopoly. Yet Engels, as we have seen, pointed to this very clearly as early as 1882, thirty-four years ago! Although England's industrial monopoly may have been destroyed, her colonial monopoly not only remains, but has become extremely accentuated, for the whole world is already divided up! By means of this suave lie Kautsky smuggles in the bourgeois-pacifist and opportunist-philistine idea that "there is nothing to fight about". On the contrary, not only have the *capitalists* something to fight about now, but they *cannot help* fighting if they want to preserve capitalism, for without a forcible redivision of colonies the *new* imperialist countries cannot obtain the privileges enjoyed by the older (*and weaker*) imperialist powers.

Secondly, why does England's monopoly explain the (temporary) victory of opportunism in England? Because monopoly yields *superprofits*, i.e., a surplus of profits over and above the capitalist profits that are normal and customary all over the world. The capitalists *can* devote a part (and not a small one, at that!) of these superprofits to bribe *their own* workers, to create something like an alliance (recall the celebrated "alliances" described by the Webbs of English trade unions and employers) between the workers of the given nation and their capitalists *against* the other countries. England's industrial monopoly was already destroyed by the end of the nineteenth century. That is beyond dispute. But *how* did this destruction take place? Did *all* monopoly disappear?

If that were so, Kautsky's "theory" of conciliation (with the opportunists) would to a certain extent be justified. But it is *not* so, and that is just the point. Imperialism *is* monopoly capitalism. Every cartel, trust, syndicate, every giant bank *is* a monopoly Superprofits have not disappeared; they still remain. The exploitation of *all* other countries by one privileged, financially wealthy country remains and has become more intense. A handful of wealthy countries—there are only four of them, if we mean independent, really gigantic, "modern" wealth: England, France, the United States and

Germany—have developed monopoly to vast proportions, they obtain *super*profits running into hundreds, if not thousands, of millions, they "ride on the backs" of hundreds and hundreds of millions of people in other countries and fight among themselves for the division of the particularly rich, particularly fat and particularly easy spoils.

This, in fact, is the economic and political essence of imperialism, the profound contradictions of which Kautsky glosses over instead of exposing.

The bourgeoisie of an imperialist "Great" Power *can economically* bribe the upper strata of "its" workers by spending on this a hundred million or so francs a year, for its *super*profits most likely amount to about a thousand million. And how this little sop is divided among the labor ministers, "labor representatives" (remember Engels's splendid analysis of the term), labor members of War Industries Committees, [281] labor officials, workers belonging to the narrow craft unions, office employees, etc., etc., is a secondary question.

Between 1848 and 1868, and to a certain extent even later, only England enjoyed a monopoly: *that is why* opportunism could prevail there for decades. *No* other countries possessed either very rich colonies or an industrial monopoly.

The last third of the nineteenth century saw the transition to the new, imperialist era. Finance capital *not* of one, but of several, though very few, Great Powers enjoys a monopoly. (In Japan and Russia, the monopoly of military power, vast territories, or special facilities for robbing minority nationalities, China, etc., partly supplements, partly takes the place of, the monopoly of modern, up-to-date finance capital.) This difference explains why England's monopoly position *could* remain *unchallenged* for decades. The monopoly of modern finance capital is being frantically challenged; the era of imperialist wars has begun. It was possible in those days to bribe and corrupt the working class of *one* country for decades. This is now improbable, if not impossible. But on the other hand, *every* imperialist "Great" Power can and does bribe *smaller* strata (than in England in 1848–68) of the "labor aristocracy". Formerly a "*bourgeois labor party*", to use Engels's remarkably profound expression, could arise only in one country, because it alone enjoyed a monopoly, but, on the other hand, it could exist for a long time. Now a "*bourgeois labor party*" *is inevitable* and typical in *all* imperialist countries; but in view of the desperate struggle, they are waging for the division of spoils it is improbable that such a party can prevail for long in a number of countries. For the trusts, the financial oligarchy, high prices, etc., while *enabling* the bribery of a handful in the top layers, are increasingly oppressing, crushing, ruining and torturing the *mass* of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat.

On the one hand, there is the tendency of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists to convert a handful of very rich and privileged nations into "eternal" parasites on the body of the rest of mankind, to "rest on the laurels" of the exploitation of Negroes, Indians, etc., keeping them in subjection with the aid of the excellent weapons of extermination provided by modern militarism. On

[281] Kautsky, "Preface to War and Democracy", in German.

the other hand, there is the tendency of the *masses*, who are more oppressed than before and who bear the whole brunt of imperialist wars, to cast off this yoke and to overthrow the bourgeoisie. It is in the struggle between these two tendencies that the history of the labor movement will now inevitably develop. For the first tendency is not accidental; it is "substantiated" economically. In *all* countries the bourgeoisie has already begotten, fostered and secured for itself "bourgeois labor parties" of social-chauvinists. The difference between a definitely formed party, like Bissolati's in Italy, for example, which is fully social-imperialist, and, say, the semi-formed near-party of the Potresovs, Gvozdyovs, Bulkins, Chkheidzes, Skobelevs and Co., is an immaterial difference. The important thing is that, economically, the desertion of a stratum of the labor aristocracy to the bourgeoisie has matured and become an accomplished fact; and this economic fact, this shift in class relations, will find political form, in one shape or another, without any particular "difficulty".

On the economic basis referred to above, the political institutions of modern capitalism—press, parliament associations, congresses etc.—have created *political* privileges and sops for the respectful, meek, reformist and patriotic office employees and workers, corresponding to the economic privileges and sops. Lucrative and soft jobs in the government or on the war industries committees, in parliament and on diverse committees, on the editorial staffs of "respectable", legally published newspapers or on the management councils of no less respectable and "bourgeois law-abiding" trade unions—this is the bait by which the imperialist bourgeoisie attracts and rewards the representatives and supporters of the "bourgeois labor parties".

The mechanics of political democracy works in the same direction. Nothing in our times can be done without elections; nothing can be done without the masses. And in this era of printing and parliamentarism it is *impossible* to gain the following of the masses without a widely ramified, systematically managed, well-equipped system of flattery, lies, fraud, juggling with fashionable and popular catchwords, and promising all manner of reforms and blessings to the workers right and left—as long as they renounce the revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of bourgeoisie. I would call this system Lloyd-Georgism, after the English Minister Lloyd George, one of the foremost and most dexterous representatives of this system in the classic land of the "bourgeois labor party". A first-class bourgeois manipulator, an astute politician, a popular orator who will deliver any speeches you like even r-r-revolutionary ones, to a labor audience, and a man who is capable of obtaining sizable sops for docile workers in the shape of social reforms (insurance, etc.), Lloyd George serves the bourgeoisie splendidly, [282] and serves it precisely *among* the workers, brings its influence *precisely* to the proletariat, to where the bourgeoisie needs it most and where it finds it most difficult to subject the masses morally.

And is there such a great difference between Lloyd George and the Scheidemanns, Legiens, Hendersons and Hyndmans, Plekhanovs, Renaudels and Co.? Of the latter, it may be objected, some

[282] Resolution on the League of Nations, adopted by the Berne Conference of the Socialist International in 1919, Russian ed.

will return to the revolutionary socialism of Marx. This is possible, but it is an insignificant difference in degree, if the question is regarded from its political, i.e., its mass aspect. Certain individuals among the present social-chauvinist leaders may return to the proletariat. But the social-chauvinist or (what is the same thing) opportunist *trend* can neither disappear nor "return" to the revolutionary proletariat. Wherever Marxism is popular among the workers, this political trend, this "bourgeois labor party", will swear by the name of Marx. It cannot be prohibited from doing this, just as a trading firm cannot be prohibited from using any particular label, sign or advertisement. It has always been the case in history that after the death of revolutionary leaders who were popular among the oppressed classes, their enemies have attempted to appropriate their names so as to deceive the oppressed classes.

The fact that is that "bourgeois labor parties," as a political phenomenon, have already been formed in *all* the foremost capitalist countries, and that unless determined and relentless struggle is waged all along the line against these parties—or groups, trends, etc., it is all the same—there can be no question of a struggle against imperialism, or of Marxism, or of a socialist labor movement. The Chkheidze faction, [283] *Nashe Dyelo* and *Golos Truda* [284] in Russia, and the O.C. supporters abroad are nothing but varieties of one *such* party. There is not the slightest reason for thinking that these parties will disappear *before* the social revolution. On the contrary, the nearer the revolution approaches, the more strongly it flares up and the more sudden and violent the transitions and leaps in its progress, the greater will be the part the struggle of the revolutionary mass stream against the opportunist petty-bourgeois stream will play in the labor movement. Kautskyism is not an independent trend, because it has no roots either in the masses or in the privileged stratum which has deserted to the bourgeoisie. But the danger of Kautskyism lies in the fact that, utilizing the ideology of the past, it endeavors to reconcile the proletariat with the "bourgeois labor party", to preserve the unity of the proletariat with that party and thereby enhance the latter's prestige. The masses no longer follow the avowed social-chauvinists: Lloyd George has been hissed down at workers' meetings in England; Hyndman has left the party; the Renaudels and Scheidemanns, the Potresovs and Gvozdyovs are protected by the police. The Kautskyites' masked defense of the social-chauvinists is much more dangerous.

One of the most common sophistries of Kautskyism is its reference to the "masses". We do not want, they say, to break away from the masses and mass organisations! But just think how Engels put the question. In the nineteenth century the "mass organisations" of the English trade unions were on the side of the bourgeois labor party. Marx and Engels did not reconcile themselves to it on this ground; they exposed it. They did not forget, firstly, that the trade union organisations directly embraced a *minority of the proletariat*. In England then, as in Germany now, not more than one-fifth of the proletariat was organized. No one can seriously think it possible to organize the majority of the

[283] Kautsky, "Once More on Disarmament", in German.
[284] Kautsky, The Question of Defense and Social-Democracy, in German.

proletariat under capitalism. Secondly—and this is the main point—it is not so much a question of the size of an organisation, as of the real, objective significance of its policy: does its policy represent the masses, does it serve them, i.e., does it aim at their liberation from capitalism, or does it represent the interests of the minority, the minority's reconciliation with capitalism? The latter was true of England in the nineteenth century, and it is true of Germany, etc., now.

Engels draws a distinction between the "bourgeois labor party" of the *old* trade unions—the privileged minority—and the "*lowest mass*", the real majority, and appeals to the latter, who are not infected by "bourgeois respectability". This is the essence of Marxist tactics!

Neither we nor anyone else can calculate precisely what portion of the proletariat is following and will follow the social-chauvinists and opportunists. This will be revealed only by the struggle; it will be definitely decided only by the socialist revolution. But we know for certain that the "defenders of the fatherland" in the imperialist war *represent* only a minority. And it is therefore our duty, if we wish to remain socialists to go down *lower and deeper*, to the real masses; this is the whole meaning and the whole purport of the struggle against opportunism. By exposing the fact that the opportunists and social-chauvinists are in reality betraying and selling the interests of the masses, that they are defending the temporary privileges of a minority of the workers, that they are the vehicles of bourgeois ideas and influences, that they are really allies and agents of the bourgeoisie, we teach the masses to appreciate their true political interests, to fight for socialism and for the revolution through all the long and painful vicissitudes of imperialist wars and imperialist armistices.

The only Marxist line in the world labor movement is to explain to the masses the inevitability and necessity of breaking with opportunism, to educate them for revolution by waging a relentless struggle against opportunism, to utilize the experience of the war to expose, not conceal, the utter vileness of national-liberal labor politics.

In the next article, we shall try to sum up the principal features that distinguish this line from Kautskyism.

Lin Biao [285]: Long Live the Victory of People's War!

The International Significance of Comrade Mao Zedong's Theory of People's War

The Chinese revolution is a continuation of the great October Revolution. The road of the October Revolution is the common road for all people's revolutions. The Chinese revolution and the October Revolution have in common the following basic characteristics:

1. Both were led by the working class with a Marxist-Leninist party as its nucleus.
2. Both were based on the worker-peasant alliance.

[285] Released before the exposure of Lin Bao as a secret enemy of the people, this article was nonetheless prepared under the personal direction of Chairman Mao and represents his line.

3. In both cases state power was seized through violent revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat was established.

4. In both cases the socialist system was built after victory in the revolution.

5. Both were component parts of the proletarian world revolution.

Naturally, the Chinese revolution had its own peculiar characteristics. The October Revolution took place in imperialist Russia, but the Chinese revolution broke out in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. The former was a proletarian socialist revolution, while the latter developed into a socialist revolution after the complete victory of the new-democratic revolution. The October Revolution began with armed uprisings in the cities and then spread to the countryside, while the Chinese revolution won nationwide victory through the encirclement of the cities from the rural areas and the final capture of the cities.

Comrade Mao Zedong's great merit lies in the fact that he has succeeded in integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution and has enriched and developed Marxism-Leninism by his masterly generalization and summation of the experience gained during the Chinese people's protracted revolutionary struggle.

Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of people's war has been proved by the long practice of the Chinese revolution to be in accord with the objective laws of such wars and to be invincible. It has not only been valid for China; it is a great contribution to the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples throughout the world.

The people's war led by the Chinese Communist Party, comprising the War of Resistance and the Revolutionary Civil Wars, lasted for twenty-two years. It constitutes the most drawn-out and most complex people's war led by the proletariat in modern history, and it has been the richest in experience.

In the last analysis, the Marxist-Leninist theory of proletarian revolution is the theory of the seizure of state power by revolutionary violence, the theory of countering war against the people by people's war. As Marx so aptly put it, "Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one."[286]

It was on the basis of the lessons derived from the people's wars in China that Comrade Mao Zedong, using the simplest and the most vivid language, advanced the famous thesis that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."[287]

He clearly pointed out:

> "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries."[288]

---

[286] Karl Marx, *Capital,* Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, Vol. I, p. 751.
[287] Mao Zedong, "Problems of War and Strategy," *Selected Works,* Eng. ed., FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. II, p. 224.
[288] Mao Zedong, "Problems of War and Strategy," *Selected Works,* Eng. e.g., FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. II, p. 224.

War is the product of imperialism and the system of exploitation of man by man. Lenin said that "war is always and everywhere begun by the exploiters themselves, by ruling and oppressing classes."[289] So long as imperialism and the system of exploitation of man by man exist, the imperialists and reactionaries will invariably rely on armed force to maintain their reactionary rule and impose war on the oppressed nations and peoples. This is an objective law independent of man's will.

In the world today, all the imperialists headed by the United States and their lackeys, without exception, are strengthening their state machinery, and especially their armed forces. U.S. imperialism, in particular, is carrying out armed aggression and suppression everywhere.

What should the oppressed nations and the oppressed people do in the face of wars of aggression and armed suppression by the imperialists and their lackeys? Should they submit and remain slaves in perpetuity? Or should they rise in resistance and fight for their liberation?

Comrade Mao Zedong answered this question in vivid terms. He said that after long investigation and study the Chinese people discovered that all the imperialists and their lackeys "have swords in their hands and are out to kill. The people have come to understand this and so act after the same fashion."[290] This is called doing unto them what they do unto us.

In the last analysis, whether one dares to wage a tit-for-tat struggle against armed aggression and suppression by the imperialists and their lackeys, whether one dares to fight a people's war against them, means whether one dares to embark on revolution. This is the most effective touchstone for distinguishing genuine from fake revolutionaries and Marxist-Leninists.

In view of the fact that some people were afflicted with the fear of the imperialists and reactionaries, Comrade Mao Zedong put forward his famous thesis that "the imperialists and all reactionaries are paper tigers." He said,

> "All reactionaries are paper tigers. In appearance, the reactionaries are terrifying, but in reality, they are not so powerful. From a long-term point of view, it is not the reactionaries but the people who are really powerful."[291]

The history of the peoples war in China and other countries provides conclusive evidence that the growth of the people's revolutionary forces from weak and small beginnings into strong and large forces is a universal law of development of people's war. A people's war inevitably meets with many difficulties, with ups and downs and setbacks in the course of its development, but no force can alter its general trend towards inevitable triumph.

Comrade Mao Zedong points out that we must despise the enemy strategically and take full account of him tactically.

---

[289] V.I. Lenin, "The Revolutionary Army and the Revolutionary Government," *Collected Works,* Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1962, Vol. VIII, p. 565.
[290] Mao Zedong, "The Situation and Our Policy After the Victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan," *Selected Works,* Eng. ed., FLP, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, pp. 14-15.
[291] Mao Zedong, "Talk with the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong," *Selected Works,* Eng. ed., FLP, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 100.

To despise the enemy strategically is an elementary requirement for a revolutionary. Without the courage to despise the enemy and without daring to win, it will be simply impossible to make revolution and wage a people's war, let alone to achieve victory.

It is also very important for revolutionaries to take full account of the enemy tactically. It is likewise impossible to win victory in a people's war without taking full account of the enemy tactically, and without examining the concrete conditions, without being prudent and giving great attention to the study of the art of struggle, and without adopting appropriate forms of struggle in the concrete practice of the revolution in each country and with regard to each concrete problem of struggle.

Dialectical and historical materialism teaches us that what is important is primarily is not that which at the given moment seems to be durable and yet is already beginning to die away, but that which is arising and developing, even though at the given moment it may not appear to be durable, for only that which is arising and developing is invincible.

Why can the apparently weak new-born forces always triumph over the decadent forces which appear so powerful? The reason is that truth is on their side and that the masses are on their side, while the reactionary classes are always divorced from the masses and set themselves against the masses.

This has been borne out by the victory of the Chinese revolution, by the history of all revolutions, the whole history of class struggle and the entire history of mankind.

The imperialists are extremely afraid of Comrade Mao Zedong's thesis that "imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers," and the revisionists are extremely hostile to it. They all oppose and attack this thesis and the philistines follow suit by ridiculing it. But all this cannot in the least diminish its importance. The light of truth cannot be dimmed by anybody.

Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of people's war solves not only the problem of daring to fight a people's war, but also that of how to wage it.

Comrade Mao Zedong is a great statesman and military scientist, proficient at directing war in accordance with its laws. By the line and policies, the strategy and tactics be formulated for people's war, he led the Chinese people in steering the ship of the people's war past all hidden reefs to the shores of victory in most complicated and difficult conditions.

It must be emphasized that Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of the establishment of rural revolutionary base areas and the encirclement of the cities from the countryside is of outstanding and universal practical importance for the present revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed nations and peoples, and particularly for the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America against imperialism and its lackeys.

Many countries and peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America are now being subjected to aggression and enslavement on a serious scale by the imperialists headed by the United States and their lackeys. The basic political and economic conditions in many of these countries have many similarities to those that prevailed in old China. As in China, the peasant question is extremely important in these regions. The peasants constitute the main force of the national-democratic

revolution against the imperialists and their lackeys. In committing aggression against these countries, the imperialists usually begin by seizing the big cities and the main lines of communication, but they are unable to bring the vast countryside completely under their control. The countryside, and the countryside alone, can provide the broad areas in which the revolutionaries can maneuver freely. The countryside, and the countryside alone, can provide the revolutionary bases from which the revolutionaries can go forward to final victory. Precisely for this reason, Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of establishing revolutionary base areas in the rural districts and encircling the cities from the countryside is attracting more and more attention among the people in these regions.

Taking the entire globe, if North America and Western Europe can be called "the cities of the world," then Asia, Africa and Latin America constitute "the rural areas of the world." Since World War II, the proletarian revolutionary movement has for various reasons been temporarily held back in the North American and West European capitalist countries, while the people's revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America has been growing vigorously. In a sense, the contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas. In the final analysis, the whole cause of world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples who make up the overwhelming majority of the world's population. The socialist countries should regard it as their internationalist duty to support the people's revolutionary struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The October Revolution opened up a new era in the revolution of the oppressed nations. The victory of the October Revolution built a bridge between the socialist revolution of the proletariat of the West and the national-democratic revolution of the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the East. The Chinese revolution has successfully solved the problem of how to link up the national-democratic with the socialist revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Comrade Mao Zedong has pointed out that, in the epoch since the October Revolution, anti-imperialist revolution in any colonial or semi-colonial country is no longer part of the old bourgeois, or capitalist world revolution, but is part of the new world revolution, the proletariat-socialist world revolution.

Comrade Mao Zedong has formulated a complete theory of the new-democratic revolution. He indicated that this revolution, which is different from all others, can only be, nay must be, a revolution against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism waged by the broad masses of the people under the leadership of the proletariat.

This means that the revolution can only be, nay must be, led by the proletariat and the genuinely revolutionary party armed with Marxism-Leninism, and by no other class or party.

This means that the revolution embraces in its ranks not only the workers, peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie, but also the national bourgeoisie and other patriotic and anti-imperialist democrats.

This means, finally, that the revolution is directed against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism.

The new-democratic revolution leads to socialism, and not to capitalism.

Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of the new-democratic revolution is the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution by stages as well as the Marxist-Leninist theory of uninterrupted revolution.

Comrade Mao Zedong made a correct distinction between the two revolutionary stages, i.e., the national-democratic and the socialist revolutions; at the same time, he correctly and closely linked the two. The national-democratic revolution is the necessary preparation for the socialist revolution, and the socialist revolution is the inevitable sequel to the national-democratic revolution. There is no Great Wall between the two revolutionary stages. But the socialist revolution is only possible after the completion of the national-democratic revolution. The more thorough the national-democratic revolution, the better the conditions for the socialist revolution.

The experience of the Chinese revolution shows that the tasks of the national-democratic revolution can be fulfilled only through long and tortuous struggles. In this stage of revolution, imperialism and its lackeys are the principal enemy. In the struggle against imperialism and its lackeys, it is necessary to rally all anti-imperialist patriotic forces, including the national bourgeoisie and all patriotic personages. All those patriotic personages from among the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes who join the anti-imperialist struggle play a progressive historical role; they are not tolerated by imperialism but welcomed by the proletariat.

It is very harmful to confuse the two stages, that is, the national-democratic and the socialist revolutions. Comrade Mao Zedong criticized the wrong idea of "accomplishing both at one stroke," and pointed out that this utopian idea could only weaken the struggle against imperialism and its lackeys, the most urgent task at that time. The Kuomintang reactionaries and the Trotskyites they hired during the War of Resistance deliberately confused these two stages of the Chinese revolution, proclaiming the "theory of a single revolution" and preaching so-called "socialism" without any Communist Party, wipe out any revolution and prevent the advance of the national-democratic revolution, and they used it as a pretext for their non-resistance and capitulation to imperialism. This reactionary theory was buried long ago by the history of the Chinese revolution.

The Khrushchev revisionists are now actively preaching that socialism can be built without the proletariat and without a genuinely revolutionary party armed with the advanced proletarian ideology, and they have cast the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism to the four winds. The revisionists' purpose is solely to divert the oppressed nations from their struggle against imperialism and sabotage their national-democratic revolution, all in the service of imperialism.

The Chinese revolution provides a successful lesson for making a thoroughgoing national-democratic revolution under the leadership of the proletariat; it likewise provides a successful lesson for the timely transition from the national-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution under the leadership of the proletariat.

Mao Zedong's thought has been the guide to the victory of the Chinese revolution. It has integrated the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution and creatively developed Marxism-Leninism, thus adding new weapons to the arsenal of Marxism-Leninism.

Ours is the epoch in which world capitalism and imperialism are heading for their doom and socialism and communism are marching to victory. Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of people's war is not only a product of the Chinese revolution, but has also the characteristics of our epoch. The new

experience gained in the people's revolutionary struggles in various countries since World War II has provided continuous evidence that Mao Zedong's thought is a common asset of the revolutionary people of the whole world. This is the great international significance of the thought of Mao Zedong.

Defeat U.S. Imperialism and Its Lackeys by People's War

Since World War II, U.S. imperialism has stepped into the shoes of German, Japanese and Italian fascism and has been trying to build a great American empire by dominating and enslaving the whole world. It is actively fostering Japanese and West German militarism as its chief accomplices in unleashing a world war. Like a vicious world, it is bullying and enslaving various peoples, plundering their wealth, encroaching upon their countries' sovereignty and interfering in their internal affairs. It is the most rabid aggressor in human history and the most ferocious common enemy of the people of the world. Every people or country in the world that wants revolution, independence and peace cannot but direct the spearhead of its struggle against U.S. imperialism.

Just as the Japanese imperialists' policy of subjugating China made it possible for the Chinese people to form the broadest possible united front against them, so the U.S. imperialists' policy of seeking world domination makes it possible for the people throughout the world to unite all the forces that can be united and form the broadest possible united front for a converging attack on U.S. imperialism.

At present, the main battlefield of the fierce struggle between the people of the world on one side and U.S. imperialism and its lackeys on the other is the vast area of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the world as a whole, this is the area where the people suffer worst from imperialist oppression and where imperialist rule is most vulnerable. Since World War II, revolutionary storms have been rising in this area, and today they have become the most important force directly pounding U.S. imperialism. The contradiction between the revolutionary peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the imperialists headed by the United States is the principal contradiction in the contemporary world. The development of this contradiction is promoting the struggle of the people of the whole world against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

Since World War II, people's war has increasingly demonstrated its power in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The peoples of China, Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Cuba, Indonesia, Algeria and other countries have waged people's wars against the imperialists and their lackeys and won great victories. The classes leading these people's wars may vary, and so may the breadth and depth of mass mobilization and the extent of victory, but the victories in these people's wars have very much weakened and pinned down the forces of imperialism, upset the U.S. imperialist plan to launch a world war, and become mighty factors defending world peace.

Today, the conditions are more favorable than ever before the waging of people's wars by the revolutionary peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

Since World War II and the succeeding years of revolutionary upsurge, there has been a great rise in the level of political consciousness and the degree of organization of the people in all countries, and the resources available to them for mutual support and aid have greatly increased. The whole capitalist-imperialist system has become drastically weaker and is in the process of increasing convulsion and disintegration. After World War I, the imperialists lacked the power to destroy the

new-born socialist Soviet state, but they were still able to suppress the people's revolutionary movements in some countries in the parts of the world under their own rule and so maintain a short period of comparative stability. Since World War II, however, not only have they been unable to stop a number of countries from taking the socialist road, but they are no longer capable of holding back the surging tide of the people's revolutionary movements in the areas under their own rule.

U.S. imperialism is stronger, but also more vulnerable, than any imperialism of the past. It sets itself against the people of the whole world, including the people of the United States. Its human, military, material and financial resources are far from sufficient for the realization of its ambition of dominating the whole world. U.S. imperialism has further weakened itself by occupying so many places in the world, over-reaching itself, stretching its fingers out wide and dispersing its strength, with its rear so far away and its supply lines so long. As Comrade Mao Zedong has said, "Wherever it commits aggression, it puts a new noose around its neck. It is besieged ring upon ring by the people of the whole world."[292]

When committing aggression in a foreign country, U.S. imperialism can only employ part of its forces, which are sent to fight an unjust war far from their native land and therefore have a low morale, and so U.S. imperialism is beset with great difficulties. The people subjected to its aggression are having a trial of strength with U.S. imperialism neither in Washington or New York, neither in Honolulu nor Florida, but are fighting for independence and freedom on their own soil. Once they are mobilized on a broad scale, they will have inexhaustible strength. Thus, superiority will belong not to the United States but to the people subjected to its aggression. The latter, though apparently weak and small, are really more powerful than U.S. imperialism.

The struggles waged by the different peoples against U.S. imperialism reinforce each other and merge into a torrential world-wide tide of opposition to U.S. imperialism. The more successful the development of people's war in a given region, the larger the number of U.S. imperialist forces that can be pinned down and depleted there. When the U.S. aggressors are hard pressed in one place, they have no alternative but to loosen their grip on others. Therefore, the conditions become more favorable for the people elsewhere to wage struggles against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

Everything is divisible. And so is this colossus of U.S. imperialism. It can be split up and defeated. The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and other regions can destroy it piece by piece, some striking at its head and others at its feet. That is why the greatest fear of U.S. imperialism is that people's wars will be launched in different parts of the world, and particularly in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and why it regards people's war as a mortal danger.

U.S. imperialism relies solely on its nuclear weapons to intimidate people. But these weapons cannot save U.S. imperialism from its doom. Nuclear weapons cannot be used lightly. U.S. imperialism has been condemned by the people of the world for its towering crime of dropping two atom bombs on Japan. If it uses nuclear weapons again, it will become isolated in the extreme. Moreover, the U.S. monopoly of nuclear weapons has long been broken; U.S. imperialism has these weapons, but others have them too. If it threatens other countries with nuclear weapons, U.S. imperialism will expose its own country to the same threat. For this reason, it will meet with strong opposition not only from the people elsewhere but also inevitably from the people in its own country.

[292] Mao Zedong, *Statement Supporting the People of the Congo (Leopoldville) Against U.S. Aggression,* November 28, 1964.

Even if U.S. imperialism brazenly uses nuclear weapons, it cannot conquer the people, who are indomitable.

However highly developed modern weapons and technical equipment may be and however complicated the methods of modern warfare, in the final analysis the outcome of a war will be decided by the sustained fighting of the ground forces, by the fighting at close quarters on battlefields, by the political consciousness of the men, by their courage and spirit of sacrifice. Here the weak points of U.S. imperialism will be completely laid bare, while the superiority of the revolutionary people will be brought into full play. The reactionary troops of U.S. imperialism cannot possibly be endowed with the courage and the spirit of sacrifice possessed by the revolutionary people. The spiritual atom bomb which the revolutionary people possess is a far more powerful and useful weapon than the physical atom bomb.

Vietnam is the most convincing current example of a victim of aggression defeating U.S. imperialism by a people's war. The United States has made South Vietnam a testing ground for the suppression of people's war. It has carried on this experiment for many years, and everybody can now see that the U.S. aggressors are unable to find a way of coping with people's war. On the other hand, the Vietnamese people have brought the power of people's war into full play in their struggle against the U.S. aggressors. The U.S. aggressors are in danger of being swamped in the people's war in Vietnam. They are deeply worried that their defeat in Vietnam will lead to a chain reaction. They are expanding the war in an attempt to save themselves from defeat. But the more they expand the war, the greater will be the chain reaction. The more they escalate the war, the heavier will be their fall and the more disastrous their defeat. The people in other parts of the world will see still more clearly that U.S. imperialism can be defeated, and that what the Vietnamese people can do, they can do too.

History has proved and will go on proving that people's war is the most effective weapon against U.S imperialism and its lackeys. All revolutionary people will learn to wage people's war against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys. They will take up arms, learn to fight battles and become skilled in waging people's war, though they have not done so before. U.S. imperialism like a mad bull dashing from place to place, will finally be burned to ashes in the blazing fires of the people's wars it has provoked by its own actions.

The Khrushchev Revisionists are Betrayers of People's War

The Khrushchev revisionists have come to the rescue of U.S. imperialism just when it is most panic-stricken and helpless in its efforts to cope with people's war. Working hand in glove with the U.S. imperialists, they are doing their utmost to spread all kinds of arguments against people's war and, wherever they can, they are scheming to undermine it by overt or covert means.

The fundamental reason why the Khrushchev revisionists are opposed to people's war is that they have no faith in the masses and are afraid of U.S. imperialism, of war and of revolution. Like all other opportunists, they are blind to the power of the masses and do not believe that the revolutionary people are capable of defeating imperialism. They submit to the nuclear blackmail of the U.S. imperialists and are afraid that, if the oppressed peoples and nations rise up to fight people's wars of the people of socialist countries repulse U.S. imperialist aggression, U.S. imperialism will

become incensed, they themselves will become involved and their fond dream of Soviet-U.S. co-operation to dominate the world will be spoiled.

Ever since Lenin led the great October Revolution to victory, the experience of innumerable revolutionary wars has borne out the truth that a revolutionary people who rise up with only their bare hands at the outset finally succeed in defeating the ruling classes who are armed to the teeth. The poorly armed have defeated the better armed. People's armed forces, beginning with only primitive swords, spears, rifles and hand-grenades, have in the end defeated the imperialist forces armed with modern aeroplanes, tanks, heavy artillery and atom bombs. Guerrilla forces have ultimately defeated regular armies. "Amateurs" who were never trained in any military schools have eventually defeated "professionals" graduated from military academies. And so on and so forth. Things stubbornly develop in a way that runs counter to the assertions of the revisionists, and facts are slapping them in the face.

The Khrushchev revisionists insist that a nation without nuclear weapons is incapable of defeating an enemy with nuclear weapons, whatever methods of fighting it may adopt. This is tantamount to saying that anyone without nuclear weapons is destined to come to grief, destined to be bullied and annihilated, and must either capitulate to the enemy when confronted with his nuclear weapons or some under the "protection" of some other nuclear power and submit to its beck and call. Isn't this the jungle law of survival par excellence? Isn't this helping the imperialists in their nuclear blackmail? Isn't this openly forbidding people to make revolution?

The Khrushchev revisionists assert that nuclear weapons and strategic rocket units are decisive while conventional forces are insignificant, and that a militia is just a heap of human flesh. For ridiculous reasons such as these, they oppose the mobilization of and reliance on the masses in socialist countries to get prepared to use people's war against imperialist aggression. They have staked the whole future of their country on nuclear weapons and are engaged in a nuclear gamble with U.S. imperialism, with which they are trying to strike a political deal. Their theory of military strategy is the theory that nuclear weapons decide everything. Their line in army building is the bourgeois line which ignores the human factor and sees only the material factor and which regards technique as everything and politics as nothing.

The Khrushchev revisionists maintain that a single spark in any part of the world may touch off a world nuclear conflagration and bring destruction to mankind. If this were true, our planet would have been destroyed time and time again. There have been wars of national liberation throughout the twenty years since World War II. But has any single one of them developed into a world war? Isn't it true that the U.S. imperialists' plans for a world war have been upset precisely thanks to the wars in Asia, Africa, and Latin America? By contrast, those who have done their utmost to stamp out the "sparks" of people's war have in fact encouraged U.S. imperialism in its aggression and wars.

The Khrushchev revisionists claim that if their general line of "peaceful coexistence, peaceful transition and peaceful competition" is followed, the oppressed will be liberated and "a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars" will come into being. But the inexorable fact is that imperialism and reaction headed by the United States are zealously priming their war machine and are daily engaged in sanguinary suppression of the revolutionary peoples and in the threat and use of armed force against independent forces. The kind of rubbish peddled by the

Khrushchev revisionists has already taken a great toll of lives in a number of countries. Are these painful lessons, paid for in blood, still insufficient? The essence of the general line of the Khrushchev revisionists is nothing other than the demand that all the oppressed peoples and nations and all the countries which have won independence should lay down their arms and place themselves at the mercy of the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys who are armed to the teeth.

"While magistrates are allowed to burn down houses, the common people are forbidden even to light lamps." Such is the way of the imperialists and reactionaries. Subscribing to this imperialist philosophy, the Khrushchev revisionists shout at the Chinese people standing in the forefront of the fight for world peace: "You are bellicose!" Gentlemen, your abuse adds to our credit. It is this very "bellicosity" of ours that helps to prevent imperialism from unleashing a world war. The people are "bellicose" because they have to defend themselves and because the imperialists and reactionaries force them to be so. It is also the imperialists and reactionaries who have taught the people the arts of war. We are simply using revolutionary "bellicosity" to cope with counter-revolutionary bellicosity. How can it be argued that the imperialists and their lackeys may kill people everywhere, while the people must not strike back in self-defense or help one another? What kind of logic is this? The Khrushchev revisionists regard the imperialists like Kennedy and Johnson as "sensible" and describe us together with all those who dare to carry out armed defense against imperialist aggression as "bellicose." This has revealed the Khrushchev revisionists in their true colors as the accomplices of imperialist gangsters.

We know that war brings destruction, sacrifice and suffering on the people. But the destruction, sacrifice and suffering will be much greater if no resistance is offered to imperialist armed aggression and the people become willing slaves. The sacrifice of a small number of people in revolutionary wars is repaid by security for whole nations, whole countries and even the whole of mankind; temporary suffering is repaid by lasting of even perpetual peace and happiness. War can temper the people and push history forward. In this sense, war is a great school.

When discussing World War I, Lenin said,

> "The war has brought hunger to the most civilized countries, to those most culturally developed. On the other hand, the war, as a tremendous historical process, has accelerated social development to an unheard-of degree."[293]

He added,

> "War has shaken up the masses; its untold horrors and suffering have awakened them. War has given history momentum and it is now flying with locomotive speed."[294]

If the arguments of the Khrushchev revisionists are to be believed, would not that make Lenin the worst of all "bellicose elements"?

In diametrical opposition to the Khrushchev revisionists, the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people never take a gloomy view of war. Our attitude towards imperialist wars of aggression has always been clear-cut. First, we are against them, and secondly, and secondly, we are

[293] V.I. Lenin, "For Bread and Peace," *Collected Works,* Eng. ed., Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, Vol. XXVI, p. 386.
[294] V.I. Lenin, "The Chief Task of Our Day," *Collected Works,* Eng. ed., Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, Vol. XXVII, p. 162.

not afraid of them. We will destroy whoever attacks us. As for revolutionary wars waged by the oppressed nations and peoples, so far from opposing them, we invariably give them firm support and active aid. It has been so in the past, it remains so in the present and, when we grow in strength as time goes on, we will give them still more support and aid in the future. It is sheer day-dreaming for anyone to think that, since our revolution has been victorious, our national construction is forging ahead, our national wealth is increasing and our living conditions are improving, we too will lose our revolutionary fighting will, abandon the cause of world revolution and discard Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Of course, every revolution in a country stems from the demands of its own people. Only when the people in a country are awakened, mobilized, organized and armed can they overthrow the reactionary rule of imperialism and its lackeys through struggle; their role cannot be replaced or taken over by any people from outside. In this sense, revolution cannot be imported. But this does not exclude mutual sympathy and support on the part of revolutionary peoples in their struggles against the imperialists and their lackeys. Our support and aid to other revolutionary peoples serves precisely to help their self-reliant struggle.

The propaganda of the Khrushchev revisionists against people's war and the publicity they give to defeatism and capitulationism tend to demoralize and spiritually disarm revolutionary people everywhere. These revisionists are doing what the U.S. imperialists are unable to do themselves and are rendering them great service. They have greatly - encouraged U.S. imperialism in its war adventures. They have completely betrayed the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory of war and have become betrayers of people's war.

To win the struggle against U.S. imperialism and carry people's wars to victory, the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people throughout the world must resolutely oppose Khrushchev revisionism.

Today, Khrushchev revisionism has a dwindling audience among the revolutionary people of the world. Wherever there is armed aggression and suppression by imperialism and its lackeys, there are bound to be people's wars against aggression and oppression. It is certain that such wars will develop vigorously. This is an objective law independent of the will of either the U.S. imperialists or the Khrushchev revisionists. The revolutionary people of the world will sweep away everything that stands in the way of their advance. Khrushchev is finished. And the successors to Khrushchev revisionism will fare no better. The imperialists, the reactionaries and the Khrushchev revisionists, who have all set themselves against people's war, will be swept like dust from the stage of history by the mighty broom of the revolutionary people.

Great changes have taken place in China and the world in the twenty years since the victory of the War of Resistance Against Japan, changes that have made the situation more favorable than ever for the revolutionary people of the world and more unfavorable than ever for imperialism and its lackeys.

When Japanese imperialism launched its war of aggression against China, the Chinese people had only a very small people's army and a very small revolutionary base area, and they were up against the biggest military despot of the East. Yet even then, Comrade Mao Zedong said that the Chinese people's war could be won and that Japanese imperialism could be defeated. Today, the revolutionary base areas of the peoples of the world have grown to unprecedented proportions, their revolutionary movement is surging as never before, imperialism is weaker than ever, and U.S.

imperialism, the chieftain of world imperialism, is suffering one defeat after another. We can say with even greater confidence that the people's wars can be won and U.S. imperialism can be defeated in all countries.

The peoples of the world now have the lessons of the October Revolution, the Anti-Fascist War, the Chinese people's War of Resistance and War of Liberation, the Korean people's War of Resistance to U.S. Aggression, the Vietnamese people's War of Liberation and their War of Resistance to U.S. Aggression, and the people's revolutionary armed struggles in many other countries. Provided each people studies these lessons well and creatively integrates them with the concrete practice of revolution in their own country, there is no doubt that the revolutionary peoples of the world will stage still more powerful and splendid dramas in the theatre of people's war in their countries and that they will wipe off the earth once and for all the common enemy of all the people's, U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

The struggle of the Vietnamese people against U.S. aggression and for natural salvation is now the focus of the struggle of the people of the world against U.S. aggression. The determination of the Chinese people to support and aid the Vietnamese people in their struggle against U.S. aggression and for natural salvation is unshakable. No matter what U.S. imperialism may do to expand its war adventure, the Chinese people will do everything in their power to support the Vietnamese people until every single one of the U.S. aggressors is driven out of Vietnam.

The U.S. imperialists are now clamoring for another trial of strength with the Chinese people, for another large-scale ground war on the Asian mainland. If they insist on following in the footsteps of the Japanese fascists, well then, they may do so, if they please. The Chinese people definitely have ways of their own for coping with a U.S. imperialist war of aggression. Our methods are no secret. The most important one is still mobilization of the people, reliance on the people, making every one a soldier and waging a people's war.

We want to tell the U.S. imperialists once again that the vast ocean of several hundred million Chinese people in arms will be more than enough to submerge your few million aggressor troops. If you dare to impose war on us, we shall gain freedom of action. It will then not be up to you to decide how the war will be fought. We shall fight in the ways most advantageous to us to destroy the enemy and wherever the enemy can be most easily destroyed. Since the Chinese people were able to destroy the Japanese aggressors twenty years ago, they are certainly still more capable finishing off the U.S. aggressors today. The naval and air superiority you boast about cannot intimidate the Chinese people, and neither can the atom bomb you brandish at us. If you want to send troops, go ahead, the more the better. They will annihilate as many as you can send, and can even give you receipts. The Chinese people are a great, valiant people. We have the courage to shoulder the heavy burden of combating U.S. imperialism and to contribute our share in the struggle for final victory over this most ferocious enemy of the people of the world.

It must be pointed out in all seriousness that after the victory of the War of Resistance Taiwan was returned to China. The occupation of Taiwan by U.S. imperialism is absolutely unjustified. Taiwan province is an inalienable part of Chinese territory. The U.S. imperialists must get out of Taiwan. The Chinese people are determined to liberate Taiwan.

In commemorating the 20th anniversary of victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan, we must also point out in all solemnity that the Japanese militarists fostered by U.S. imperialism will certainly receive still severer punishment if they ignore the firm opposition of the Japanese people and the people of Asia, again indulge in their pipe-dreams and resume their old road of aggression in Asia.

U.S. imperialism is preparing a world war. But can this save it from its doom? World War I was followed by the birth of the socialist Soviet Union. World War II was followed by the emergence of a series of socialist countries and many nationally independent countries. If the U.S. imperialists should insist on launching a third world war, it can be stated categorically that many more hundreds of millions of people will turn to socialism; the imperialists will then have little room left on the globe; and it is possible that the whole structure of imperialism will collapse.

We are optimistic about the future of the world. We are confident that the people will bring to an end the epoch of wars in human history. Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out long ago that war, this monster, "will be finally be eliminated by the progress of human society, and in the not-too-distant future too. But there is only one way to eliminate it, and that is to oppose war with war, to oppose counter-revolutionary war with revolutionary war."[295]

All people's suffering from U.S. imperialist aggression, oppression and plunder, unite! Hold aloft the just banner of people's war and fight for the cause of world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism! Victory will certainly go to the people of the world!

Long live the victory of people's war!

CPCh: A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has studied the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union of March 30, 1963.

All who have the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement at heart are deeply concerned about the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and hope that our talks will help to eliminate differences, strengthen unity and create favorable conditions for convening a meeting of representatives of all the Communist and Workers' Parties.

It is the common and sacred duty of the Communist and Workers' Parties of all countries to uphold and strengthen the unity of the international communist movement. The Chinese and Soviet Parties bear a heavier responsibility for the unity of the entire socialist camp and international communist movement and should of course make commensurately greater efforts.

[295] Mao Zedong, "Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War," *Selected Works,* Eng. ed., FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. I, p. 182.

A number of major differences of principle now exist in the international communist movement. But however serious these differences, we should exercise sufficient patience and find ways to eliminate them so that we can unite our forces and strengthen the struggle against our common enemy.

It is with this sincere desire that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China approaches the forthcoming talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties.

In its letter of March 30, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. systematically presents its views on questions that need to be discussed in the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties, and in particular raises the question of the general line of the international communist movement. In this letter we too would like to express our views, which constitute our proposal on the general line of the international communist movement and on some related questions of principle.

We hope that this exposition of views will be conducive to mutual understanding by our two Parties and to a detailed, point-by-point discussion in the talks.

We also hope that this will be conducive to the understanding of our views her the fraternal Parties and to a full exchange of ideas at an international meeting of fraternal Parties.

(1) The general line of the international communist movement must take as its guiding principle the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory concerning the historical mission of the proletariat and must not depart from it.

The Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960 adopted the Declaration and the Statement respectively after a full exchange of views and in accordance with the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation. The two documents point out the characteristics of our epoch and the common laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction, and day down the common line of all the Communist and Workers' Parties. They are the common programme of the international communist movement.

It is true that for several years there have been differences within the international communist movement in the understanding of, and the attitude towards, the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960. The central issue here is whether or not to accept the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement. In the last analysis, it is a question of whether or not to accept the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, whether or not to recognize the universal significance of the road of the October Revolution, whether or not to accept the fact that the people still living under the imperialist and capitalist system, who comprise two-thirds of the world's population, need to make revolution, and whether or not to accept the fact that the people already on the socialist road, who comprise one-third of the world's population, need to carry their revolution forward to the end.

It has become an urgent and vital task of the international communist movement resolutely to defend the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

Only by strictly following the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the general road of the October revolution is it possible to have a correct understanding of the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement and a correct attitude towards them.

(2) What are the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement? They may be summarized as follows:

Workers of all countries, unite; workers of the world, unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations; oppose imperialism and reaction in all countries; strive for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism; consolidate and expand the socialist camp; bring the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory; and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the exploitation of mall by man.

This, in our view, is the general line of the international communist movement at the present stage.

(3) This general line proceeds from the actual world situation taken as a whole and from a class analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world, and is directed against the counter-revolutionary global strategy of U.S. imperialism.

This general line is one of forming a broad united front, with the socialist camp and the international proletariat as its nucleus, to oppose the imperialists and reactionaries headed by the United States; it is a line of boldly arousing the masses, expanding the revolutionary forces, winning over the middle forces and isolating the reactionary forces.

This general line is one of resolute revolutionary struggle by the people of all countries and of carrying; the proletarian world revolution forward to the end; it is the line that most effectively combats imperialism and defends world peace.

If the general line of the international communist movement is one-sidedly reduced to "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition," and "peaceful transition" this is to violate the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, to discard the historical mission of proletarian world revolution, and to depart from the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism.

The general line of the international communist movement should reflect the general law of development of world history. The revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the people in various countries go through different stages and they all have their own characteristics but they will not transcend the general law of development of world history. The general line should point out the basic direction for the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and people of all countries.

While working out its specific line and policies, it is most important for each Communist or Workers' Party to adhere to the principle of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution and construction in its own country.

(4) In defining the general line of the international communist movement, the starting point is the concrete class analysis of world politics and economics as a whole and of actual world conditions, that is to say, of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world.

If one avoids a concrete class analysis, seizes at random on certain superficial phenomena, and draws subjective and groundless conclusions, one cannot possibly reach correct conclusions with regard to the general line of the international communist movement but will inevitably slide onto a track entirely different from that of Marxism-Leninism. What are the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world? Marxist-Leninists consistently hold that they are:

the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp;

the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries;

the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism; and

the contradictions among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

The contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp is a contradiction between two fundamentally different social systems, socialism and capitalism. It is undoubtedly very sharp. But Marxist-Leninists must not regard the contradictions in the world as consisting solely and simply of the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp. The international balance of forces has changed and has become increasingly favorable to socialism and to all the oppressed peoples and nations of the world, and most unfavorable to imperialism and the reactionaries of all countries. Nevertheless, the contradictions enumerated above still objectively exist.

These contradictions and the struggles to which they give rise are interrelated and influence each other. Nobody can obliterate any of these fundamental contradictions or subjectively substitute one for all the rest.

It is inevitable that these contradictions will give rise to popular revolutions, which alone can resolve them.

(5) The following erroneous views should be repudiated on the question of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world:

a) the view which blots out the class content of the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps and fails to see this contradiction as one between states under the dictatorship of the proletariat and states under the dictatorship of the monopoly capitalists

b) the view which recognizes only the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps, while neglecting or underestimating the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist world between the oppressed nations and imperialism, among the

imperialist countries and among the monopoly capitalist groups, and the struggles to which these contradictions give rise;

c) the view which maintains with regard to the capitalist world that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie can be resolved without a proletarian revolution in each country and that the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism can be resolved without revolution by the oppressed nations;

d) the view which denies that the development of the inherent contradictions in the contemporary capitalist world inevitably leads to a new situation in which the imperialist countries are locked in an intense struggle and asserts that the contradictions among the imperialist countries can be reconciled, or even eliminated, by "international agreements among the big monopolies"; and

e) the view which maintains that the contradiction between the two world systems of socialism and capitalism will automatically disappear in the course of "economic competition", that the other fundamental world contradictions will automatically do so with the disappearance of the contradiction between the two systems, and that a "world without wars", a new world of "all-round co-operation", will appear.

It is obvious that these erroneous views inevitably lead to erroneous and harmful policies and hence to setbacks and losses of one kind or another to the cause of the people and of socialism.

(6) The balance of forces between imperialism and socialism has undergone a fundamental change since World War II. The main indication of this change is that the world now has not just one socialist country but a number of socialist countries forming the mighty socialist camp, and that the people who have taken the socialist road now number not two hundred million but a thousand million, or a third of the world's population.

The socialist camp is the outcome of the struggles of the international proletariat and working people. It belongs to the international proletariat and working people as well as to the people of the socialist countries.

The main common demands of the people of the countries in the socialist camp and the international proletariat and working people are that all the Communist and Workers' Parties in the socialist camp should:

Adhere to the Marxist-Leninist line and pursue correct Marxist-Leninist domestic and foreign policies;

Consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and the worker-peasant alliance led by the proletariat and carry the socialist revolution forward to the end on the economic, political and ideological fronts;

Promote the initiative and creativeness of the broad masses, carry out socialist construction in a planned way, develop production, improve the people's livelihood and strengthen national defense;

Strengthen the unity of the socialist camp on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, and support other socialist countries on the basis of proletarian internationalism;

Oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war, and defend world peace;

Oppose the anti-Communist, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary policies of the reactionaries of all countries; and

Help the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed classes and nations of the world.

All Communist and Workers' Parties in the socialist camp owe it to their own people and to the international proletariat and working people to fulfil these demands.

By fulfilling these demands the socialist camp will exert a decisive influence on the course of human history. For this very reason, the imperialists and reactionaries invariably try in a thousand and one ways to influence the domestic and foreign policies of the countries in the socialist camp, to undermine the camp and break up the unity of the socialist countries and particularly the unity of China and the Soviet Union. They invariably try to infiltrate and subvert the socialist countries and even entertain the extravagant hope of destroying the socialist camp.

The question of what is the correct attitude towards the socialist camp is a most important question of principle confronting all Communist and Workers' Parties.

It is under new historical conditions that the Communist and Workers' Parties are now carrying on the task of proletarian internationalist unity and struggle. When only one socialist country existed and when this country was faced with hostility and jeopardized by all the imperialists and reactionaries because it firmly pursued the correct Marxist-Leninist line and policies, the touchstone of proletarian internationalism for every Communist Party was whether or not it resolutely defended the only socialist country. Now there is a socialist camp consisting of thirteen countries, Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Under these circumstances, the touchstone of proletarian internationalism for every Communist Party is whether or not it resolutely defends the whole of the socialist camp, whether or not it defends the unity of all the countries in the camp on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and whether or not it defends the Marxist-Leninist line and policies which the socialist countries ought to pursue.

If anybody does not pursue the correct Marxist-Leninist line and policies, does not defend the unity of the socialist camp but on the contrary creates tension and splits within it, or even follows the policies of the Yugoslav revisionists, tries to liquidate the socialist camp or helps capitalist countries

to attack fraternal socialist countries, then he is betraying the interests of the entire international proletariat and the people of the world.

If anybody, following in the footsteps of others, defends the erroneous opportunist line and policies pursued by a certain socialist country instead of upholding the correct Marxist-Leninist line and policies which the socialist countries ought to pursue, defends the policy of split instead of upholding the policy of unity, then he is departing from Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

(7) Taking advantage of the situation after World War II, the U.S. imperialists stepped into the shoes of the German, Italian and Japanese fascists, and have been trying to erect a huge world empire such as has never been known before. The strategic objectives of U.S. imperialism have been to grab and dominate the intermediate zone lying between the United States and the socialist camp, put down the revolutions of the oppressed peoples and nations, proceed to destroy the socialist countries, and thus to subject all the peoples and countries of the world, including its allies, to domination and enslavement by U.S. monopoly capital.

Ever since World War II, the U.S. imperialists have been conducting propaganda for war against the Soviet Union and the socialist camp. There are two aspects to this propaganda. While the U.S. imperialists are actually preparing such a war, they also use this propaganda as a smokescreen for their oppression of the American people and for the extension of their aggression against the rest of the capitalist world.

The 1960 Statement points out:

"U.S. imperialism has become the biggest international exploiter."

"The United States is the mainstay of colonialism today."

"U.S. imperialism is the main force of aggression and war."

"International developments in recent years have furnished many new proofs of the fact that U.S. imperialism is the chief bulwark of world reaction and an international gendarme, that it has become an enemy of the peoples of the whole world."

U.S. imperialism is pressing its policies of aggression and war all over the world, but the outcome is bound to be the opposite of that intended--it will only be to hasten the awakening of the people in all countries and to hasten their revolutions.

The U.S. imperialists have thus placed themselves in opposition to the people of the whole world and have become encircled by them. The international proletariat must and can unite all the forces that can be united, make use of the internal contradictions in the enemy camp and establish the broadest united front against the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys.

The realistic and correct course is to entrust the fate of the people and of mankind to the unity and struggle of the world proletariat and to the unity and struggle of the people in all countries.

Conversely, to make no distinction between enemies, friends and ourselves and to entrust the fate of the people and of mankind to collaboration with U.S. imperialism is to lead people astray. The events of the last few years have exploded this illusion.

(8) The various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America; these are the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm centers of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism.

The national democratic revolutionary movement in these areas and the international socialist revolutionary movement are the two great historical currents of our time.

The national democratic revolution in these areas is an important component of the contemporary proletarian world revolution.

The anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America are pounding and undermining the foundations of the rule of imperialism and colonialism, old and new, and are now a mighty force in defense of world peace.

In a sense, therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population.

Therefore, the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America is definitely not merely a matter of regional significance but one of overall importance for the whole cause of proletarian world revolution.

Certain persons now go so far as to deny the great international significance of the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples and, on the pretext of breaking down the barriers of nationality, color and geographical location, are trying their best to efface the line of demarcation between oppressed and oppressor nations and between oppressed and oppressor countries and to hold down the revolutionary struggles of the peoples in these areas. In fact, they cater to the needs of imperialism and create a new "theory" to justify the rule of imperialism in these areas and the promotion of its policies of old and new colonialism. Actually, this "theory" seeks not to break down the barriers of nationality, color and geographical location but to maintain the rule of the "superior nations" over the oppressed nations. It is only natural that this fraudulent "theory" is rejected by the people in these areas.

The working class in every socialist country and in every capitalist country must truly put into effect the fighting slogans, "Workers of all countries, unite!" and "Workers and oppressed nations of the world, unite!"; it must study the revolutionary experience of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, firmly support their revolutionary actions and regard the cause of their liberation as a most

dependable support for itself and as directly in accord with its own interests. This is the only effective way to break down the barriers of nationality, color and geographical location and this is the only genuine proletarian internationalism.

It is impossible for the working class in the European and American capitalist countries to liberate itself unless it unites with the oppressed nations and unless those nations are liberated. Lenin rightly said,

> "The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would actually be a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and America were not closely and completely united with the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of "colonial" slaves who are oppressed by capital." [296]

Certain persons in the international communist movement are now taking a passive or scornful or negative attitude towards the struggles of the oppressed nations for liberation. They are in fact protecting the interests of monopoly capital, betraying those of the proletariat, and degenerating into social democrats.

The attitude taken towards the revolutionary struggles of the people in the Asian, African and Latin American countries is an important criterion for differentiating those who want revolution from those who do not and those who are truly defending world peace from those who are abetting the forces of aggression and war.

(9) The oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are faced with the urgent task of fighting imperialism and its lackeys.

History has entrusted to the proletarian parties in these areas the glorious mission of holding high the banner of struggle against imperialism, against old and new colonialism and for national independence and people's democracy, of standing in the forefront of the national democratic revolutionary movement and striving for a socialist future.

In these areas, extremely broad sections of the population refuse to be slaves of imperialism. They include not only the workers, peasants, intellectuals and petty bourgeoisie, but also the patriotic national bourgeoisie and even certain kings, princes and aristocrats, who are patriotic.

The proletariat and its party must have confidence in the strength of the masses and, above all, must unite with the peasants and establish a solid worker-peasant alliance. It is of primary importance for advanced members of the proletariat to work in the rural areas, help the peasants to act organized, and raise their class consciousness and their national self-respect and self-confidence.

[296] Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", Selected Works, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 472-73.

On the basis of the worker-peasant alliance the proletariat and its party must unite all the strata that can be united and organize a broad united front against imperialism and its lackeys. In order to consolidate and expand this united front it is necessary that the proletarian party should maintain its ideological, political and organizational independence and insist on the leadership of the revolution.

The proletarian party and the revolutionary people must learn to master all forms of struggle, including armed struggle. They must defeat counter-revolutionary armed force with revolutionary armed force whenever imperialism and its lackeys resort to armed suppression.

The nationalist countries which have recently won political independence are still confronted with the arduous tasks of consolidating it, liquidating the forces of imperialism and domestic reaction, carrying out agrarian and other social reforms and developing their national economy and culture. It is of practical and vital importance for these countries to guard and fight against the neo-colonialist policies which the old colonialists adopt to preserve their interests, and especially against the neo-colonialism of U.S. imperialism.

In some of these countries, the patriotic national bourgeoisie continue to stand with the masses in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism and introduce certain measures of social progress. This requires the proletarian party to make a full appraisal of the progressive role of the patriotic national bourgeoisie and strengthen unity with them.

As the internal social contradictions and the international class struggle sharpen, the bourgeoisie, and particularly the big bourgeoisie, in some newly independent countries increasingly tend to become retainers of imperialism and to pursue anti-popular, anti-Communist and counter-revolutionary policies. It is necessary for the proletarian party resolutely to oppose these reactionary policies.

Generally speaking, the bourgeoisie in these countries have a dual character. When a united front is formed with the bourgeoisie, the policy of the proletarian party should be one of both unity and struggle. The policy should be to unite with the bourgeoisie, in so far as they tend to be progressive, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal, but to struggle against their reactionary tendencies to compromise and collaborate with imperialism and the forces of feudalism.

On the national question the world outlook of the proletarian party is internationalism, and not nationalism. In the revolutionary struggle it supports progressive nationalism and opposes reactionary nationalism. It must always draw a clear line of demarcation between itself and bourgeois nationalism, to which it must never fall captive.

The 1960 Statement says,

Communists expose attempts by the reactionary section of the bourgeoisie to represent its selfish, narrow class interests as those of the entire nation; they expose the demagogic use by bourgeois politicians of socialist slogans for the same purpose. . . .

If the proletariat becomes the tail of the landlords and bourgeoisie in the revolution, no real or thorough victory in the national democratic revolution is possible, and even if victory of a kind is gained, it will be impossible to consolidate it.

In the course of the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples, the proletarian party must put forward a programme of its own which is thoroughly against imperialism and domestic reaction and for national independence and people's democracy, and it must work independently among the masses, constantly expand the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the reactionary forces; only thus can it carry the national democratic revolution through to the end and guide the revolution on to the road of socialism.

(10) In the imperialist and the capitalist countries, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are essential for the thorough resolution of the contradictions of capitalist society.

In striving to accomplish this task the proletarian party must under the present circumstances actively lead the working class and the working people in struggles to oppose monopoly capital, to defend democratic rights, to oppose the menace of fascism, to improve living conditions, to oppose imperialist arms expansion and war preparations, to defend world peace and actively to support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations.

In the capitalist countries which U.S. imperialism controls or is trying to control, the working class and the people should direct their attacks mainly against U.S. imperialism, but also against their own monopoly capitalists and other reactionary forces who are betraying the national interests.

Large-scale mass struggles in the capitalist countries in recent years have shown that the working class and working people are experiencing a new awakening. Their struggles, which are dealing blows at monopoly capital and reaction, have opened bright prospects for the revolutionary cause in their own countries and are also a powerful support for the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples and for the countries of the socialist camp.

The proletarian parties in imperialist or capitalist countries must maintain their own ideological, political and organizational independence in leading revolutionary struggles. At the same time, they must unite all the forces that can be united and build a broad united front against monopoly capital and against the imperialist policies of aggression and war.

While actively leading immediate struggles, Communists in the capitalist countries should link them with the struggle for long-range and general interests, educate the masses in a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary spirit, ceaselessly raise their political consciousness and undertake the historical task of

the proletarian revolution. If they fail to do so, if they regard the immediate movement as everything, determine their conduct from case to case, adapt themselves to the events of the day and sacrifice the basic interests of the proletariat, that is out-and-out social democracy.

Social democracy is a bourgeois ideological trend. Lenin pointed out long ago that the social democratic parties are political detachments of the bourgeoisie, its agents in the working-class movement and its principal social prop. Communists must at all times draw a clear line of demarcation between themselves and social democratic parties on the basic question of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and liquidate the ideological influence of social democracy in the international working-class movement and among the working people. Beyond any shadow of doubt, Communists must win over the masses under the influence of the social democratic parties and must win over those left and middle elements in the social democratic parties who are willing to oppose domestic monopoly capital and domination by foreign imperialism and must unite with them in extensive joint action in the day-to-day struggle of the working-class movement and in the struggle to defend world peace.

In order to lead the proletariat and working people in revolution, Marxist-Leninist Parties must master all forms of struggle and be able to substitute one form for another quickly as the conditions of struggle change. The vanguard of the proletariat will remain unconquerable in all circumstances only if it masters all forms of struggle--peaceful and armed, open and secret, legal and illegal, parliamentary struggle and mass struggle, etc. It is wrong to refuse to use parliamentary and other legal forms of struggle when they can and should be used. However, if a Marxist-Leninist Party falls into legalism or parliamentary cretinism, confining the struggle within the limits permitted by the bourgeoisie, this will inevitably lead to renouncing the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

(11) On the question of transition from capitalism to socialism, the proletarian party must proceed from the stand of class struggle and revolution and base itself on the Marxist-Leninist teachings concerning the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Communists would always prefer to bring about the transition to socialism by peaceful means. But can peaceful transition be made into a new world-wide strategic principle for the international communist movement? Absolutely not.

Marxism-Leninism consistently holds that the fundamental question in all revolutions is that of state power. The 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement both clearly point out, "Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily." The old government never topples even in a period of crisis, unless it is pushed. This is a universal law of class struggle.

In specific historical conditions, Marx and Lenin did raise the possibility that revolution may develop peacefully. But, as Lenin pointed out, the peaceful development of revolution is an opportunity "very seldom to be met with in the history of revolutions".

As a matter of fact, there is no historical precedent for peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism.

Certain persons say there was no precedent when Marx foretold that socialism would inevitably replace capitalism. Then why can we not predict a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism despite the absence of a precedent? This parallel is absurd. Employing dialectical and historical materialism, Marx analyzed the contradictions of capitalism, discovered the objective laws of development of human society and arrived at a scientific conclusion, whereas the prophets who pin all their hopes on "peaceful transition" proceed from historical idealism, ignore the most fundamental contradictions of capitalism, repudiate the Marxist-Leninist teachings on class struggle, and arrive at a subjective and groundless conclusion. How can people who repudiate Marxism get any help from Marx?

It is plain to everyone that the capitalist countries are strengthening their state machinery--and especially their military apparatus--the primary purpose of which is to suppress the people in their own countries.

The proletarian party must never base its thinking, its policies for revolution and its entire work on the assumption that the imperialists and reactionaries will accept peaceful transformation.

The proletarian party must prepare itself for two eventualities--while preparing for a peaceful development of the revolution, it must also fully prepare for a non-peaceful development. It should concentrate on the painstaking work of accumulating revolutionary strength, so that it will be ready to seize victory when the conditions for revolution are ripe or to strike powerful blows at the imperialists and the reactionaries when they launch surprise attacks and armed assaults.

If it fails to make such preparations, the proletarian party will paralyze the revolutionary will of the proletariat, disarm itself ideologically and sink into a totally passive state of unpreparedness both politically and organizationally, and the result will be to bury the proletarian revolutionary cause.

(12) All social revolutions in the various stages of the history of mankind are historically inevitable and are governed by objective laws independent of man's will. Moreover, history shows that there never was a revolution which was able to achieve victory without zigzags and sacrifices.

With Marxist-Leninist theory as the basis, the task of the Proletarian party is to analyze the concrete historical conditions, put forward the correct strategy and tactics, and guide the masses in bypassing hidden reefs, avoiding unnecessary sacrifices and reaching the goal step by step. Is it possible to avoid sacrifices altogether? Such is not the case with the slave revolutions, the serf revolutions, the bourgeois revolutions, or the national revolutions; nor is it the case with proletarian

revolutions. Even if the guiding line of the revolution is correct, it it's impossible to have a sure guarantee against setbacks and sacrifices in the course of the revolution. So long as a correct line is adhered to, the revolution is bound to triumph in the end. To abandon revolution on the pretext of avoiding sacrifices is in reality to demand that the people should forever remain slaves and endure infinite pain and sacrifice.

Elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism tells us that the birth pangs of a revolution are far less painful than the chronic agony of the old society. Lenin rightly said that "even with the most peaceful course of events, the present [capitalist] system always and inevitably exacts countless sacrifices from the working class". [297]

Whoever considers a revolution can be made only if everything is plain sailing, only if there is an advance guarantee against sacrifices and failure, is certainly no revolutionary.

However difficult the conditions and whatever sacrifices and defeats the revolution may suffer, proletarian revolutionaries should educate the masses in the spirit of revolution and hold aloft the banner of revolution and not abandon it

It would be "Left" adventurism if the proletarian party should rashly launch a revolution before the objective conditions are ripe. But it would be Right opportunism if the proletarian party should not dare to lead a revolution and to seize state power when the objective conditions are ripe.

Even in ordinary times, when it is leading the masses in the day-to-day struggle, the proletarian party should ideologically, politically and organizationally prepare its own ranks and the masses for revolution and promote revolutionary struggles, so that it will not miss the opportunity to overthrow the reactionary regime and establish a new state power when the conditions for revolution are ripe. Otherwise, when the objective conditions are ripe, the proletarian party will simply throw away the opportunity of seizing victory.

The proletarian party must be flexible as well as highly principled, and on occasion it must make such compromises as are necessary in the interests of the revolution. But it must never abandon principled policies and the goal of revolution on the pretext of flexibility and of necessary compromises.

The proletarian party must lead the masses in waging struggles against the enemies, and it must know how to utilize the contradictions among those enemies. But the purpose of using these contradictions is to make it easier to attain the goal of the people's revolutionary struggles and not to liquidate these struggles.

Countless facts have proved that, wherever the dark rule of imperialism and reaction exists, the people who form over ninety per cent of the population will sooner or later rise in revolution.

[297] Lenin, "Another Massacre", Collected Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1961, Vol. V. p. 25.

If Communists isolate themselves from the revolutionary demands of the masses, they are bound to lose the confidence of the masses and will be tossed to the rear by the revolutionary current.

If the leading group in any Party adopt a non-revolutionary line and convert it into a reformist party, then Marxist-Leninists inside and outside the Party will replace them and lead the people in making revolution. In another kind of situation, the bourgeois revolutionaries will come forward to lead the revolution and the party of the proletariat will forfeit its leadership of the revolution. When the reactionary bourgeoisie betray the revolution and suppress the people, an opportunist line will cause tragic and unnecessary losses to the Communists and the revolutionary masses.

If Communists slide down the path of opportunism they will degenerate into bourgeois nationalists and become appendages of the imperialists and the reactionary bourgeoisie.

There are certain persons who assert that they have made the greatest creative contributions to revolutionary theory since Lenin and that they alone are correct. But it is very dubious whether they have ever really given consideration to the extensive experience of the entire world communist movement, whether they have ever really considered the interests, the goal and tasks of the international proletarian movement as a whole, and whether they really have a general line for the international communist movement which conforms with Marxism-Leninism.

In the last few years, the international communist movement and the national liberation movement have had many experiences and many lessons. There are experiences which people should praise and there are experiences which make people grieve. Communists and revolutionaries in all countries should ponder and seriously study these experiences of success and failure, so as to draw correct conclusions and useful lessons from them.

(13) The socialist countries and the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations support and assist each other.

The national liberation movements of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the revolutionary movements of the people in the capitalist countries are a strong support to the socialist countries. It is completely wrong to deny this.

The only attitude for the socialist countries to adopt towards the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations is one of warm sympathy and active support; they must not adopt a perfunctory attitude, or one of national selfishness or of great-power chauvinism.

Lenin said, "Alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all the oppressed peoples against any and all the imperialists--such is the external policy of the proletariat." [298]

[298] Lenin, "The External Policy of the Russian Revolution", Collected Works, 4th Russian edition, State Publishing House for Political literature, 1949, Moscow. Vol. XXV, p. 69.

Whoever fails to understand this point and considers that the support and aid given by the socialist countries to the oppressed peoples and nations are a burden or charity is going counter to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The superiority of the socialist system and the achievements of the socialist countries in construction play an exemplary role and are an inspiration to the oppressed peoples and the oppressed nations.

But this exemplary role and inspiration can never replace the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations. No oppressed people or nation can win liberation except through its own staunch revolutionary struggle.

Certain persons have one-sidedly exaggerated the role of peaceful competition between socialist and imperialist countries in their attempt to substitute peaceful competition for the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations. According to their preaching, it would seem that imperialism will automatically collapse in the course of this peaceful competition and that the only thing the oppressed peoples and nations have to do is to wait quietly for the advent of this day. What does this have in common with Marxist-Leninist views?

Moreover, certain persons have concocted the strange tale that China and some other socialist countries want "to unleash wars" and to spread socialism by "wars between states". As the Statement of 1960 points out, such tales are nothing but imperialist and reactionary slanders. To put it bluntly, the purpose of those who repeat these slanders is to hide the fact that they are opposed to revolutions by the oppressed peoples and nations of the world and opposed to others supporting such revolutions.

(14) In the last few years much--in fact a great deal--has been said on the question of war and peace. Our views and policies on this question are known to the world, and no one can distort them.

It is a pity that although certain persons in the international communist movement talk about how much they love peace and hate war, they are unwilling to acquire even a faint understanding of the simple truth on war pointed out by Lenin.

Lenin said,

> "It seems to me that the main thing that is usually forgotten on the question of war, which receives inadequate attention, the main reason why there is so much controversy, and, I would say, futile, hopeless and aimless controversy, is that people forget the fundamental question of the class character of the war; why the war broke out; the classes that are waging it; the historical and historico-economic conditions that gave rise to it." [299]

[299] Lenin, "War and Revolution", Collected Works, 4th Russian edition, SPHPL, Moscow, 1949, Vol. XXIV, p. 362

As Marxist-Leninists see it, war is the continuation of politics by other means, and every war is inseparable from the political system and the political struggles which give rise to it. If one departs from this scientific Marxist-Leninist proposition which has been confirmed by the entire history of class struggle, one will never be able to understand either the question of war or the question of peace.

There are different types of peace and different types of war. Marxist-Leninists must be clear about what type of peace or what type of war is in question. Lumping just wars and unjust wars together and opposing all of them undiscriminatingly is a bourgeois pacifist and not a Marxist-Leninist approach.

Certain persons say that revolutions are entirely possible without war. Now which type of war are they referring to--is it a war of national liberation or a revolutionary civil war, or is it a world war?

It they are referring to a war of national liberation or a revolutionary civil war, then this formulation is, in effect, opposed to revolutionary wars and to revolution.

If they are referring to a world war, then they are shooting at a non-existent target. Although Marxist-Leninists have pointed out, on the basis of the history of the two world wars, that world wars inevitably lead to revolution, no Marxist-Leninist ever has held or ever will hold that revolution must be made through world war.

Marxist-Leninists take the abolition of war as their ideal and believe that war can be abolished.

But how can war be abolished?

This is how Lenin viewed it:

> ". . . our object is to achieve the socialist system of society, which, by abolishing the division of mankind into classes, by abolishing all exploitation of man by man, and of one nation by other nations, will inevitably abolish all possibility of war. " [300]

The Statement of 1960 also puts it very clearly, "The victory of socialism all over the world will completely remove the social and national causes of all wars."

However, certain persons now actually hold that it is possible to bring about "a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars" through "general and complete disarmament" while the system of imperialism and of the exploitation of man by man still exists. This is sheer illusion.

[300] *Ibid*., p. 363

An elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism tells us that the armed forces are the principal part of the state machine and that a so-called world without weapons and without armed forces can only be a world without states. Lenin said:

> "Only *after* the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world-historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap heap; and the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but *only when this condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before.*" [301]

What are the facts in the world today? Is there a shadow of evidence that the imperialist countries headed by the United States are ready to carry out general and complete disarmament? Are they not each and all engaged in general and complete arms expansion?

We have always maintained that, in order to expose and combat the imperialists' arms expansion and war preparations, it is necessary to put forward the proposal for general disarmament. Furthermore, it is possible to compel imperialism to accept some kind of agreement on disarmament, through the combined struggle of the socialist countries and the people of the whole world.

If one regards general and complete disarmament as the fundamental road to world peace, spreads the illusion that imperialism will automatically lay down its arms and tries to liquidate the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations on the pretext of disarmament, then this is deliberately to deceive the people of the world and help the imperialists in their policies of aggression and war.

In order to overcome the present ideological confusion in the international working-class movement on the question of war and peace, we consider that Lenin's thesis, which has been discarded by the modern revisionists, must be restored in the interest of combating the imperialist policies of aggression and war and defending world peace.

The people of the world universally demand the prevention of a new world war. And it is possible to prevent a new world war.

The question then is, what is the way to secure world peace? According to the Leninist viewpoint, world peace can be won only by the struggles of the people in all countries and not by begging the imperialists for it. World peace can only be effectively defended by relying on the development of the forces of the socialist camp, on the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and working people of all countries, on the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations and on the struggles of all peace-loving people and countries.

Such is the Leninist policy. Any policy to the contrary definitely will not lead to world peace but will only encourage the ambitions of the imperialists and increase the danger of world war.

---

[301] Lenin, "The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution", Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, Vol. I, Part 2, P. 574.

In recent years, certain persons have been spreading the argument that a single spark from a war of national liberation or from a revolutionary people's war will lead to a world conflagration destroying the whole of mankind. What are the facts? Contrary to what these persons say, the wars of national liberation and the revolutionary people's wars that have occurred since World War II have not led to world war. The victory of these revolutionary wars has directly weakened the forces of imperialism and greatly strengthened the forces which prevent the imperialists from launching a world war and which defend world peace. Do not the facts demonstrate the absurdity of this argument?

(15) The complete banning and destruction of nuclear weapons is an important task in the struggle to defend world peace. We must do our utmost to this end.

Nuclear weapons are unprecedentedly destructive, which is why for more than a decade now the U.S. imperialists have been pursuing their policy of nuclear blackmail in order to realize their ambition of enslaving the people of all countries and dominating the world.

But when the imperialists threaten other countries with nuclear weapons, they subject the people in their own country to the same threat, thus arousing them against nuclear weapons and against the imperialist policies of aggression and war. At the same time, in their vain hope of destroying their opponents with nuclear weapons, the imperialists are in fact subjecting themselves to the danger of being destroyed.

The possibility of banning nuclear weapons does indeed exist. However, if the imperialists are forced to accept an agreement to ban nuclear weapons, it decidedly will not be because of their "love for humanity" but because of the pressure of the people of all countries and for the sake of their own vital interests.

In contrast to the imperialists, socialist countries rely upon the righteous strength of the people and on their own correct policies, and have no need whatever to gamble with nuclear weapons in the world arena. Socialist countries have nuclear weapons solely in order to defend themselves and to prevent imperialism from launching a nuclear war.

In the view of Marxist-Leninists, the people are the makers of history. In the present, as in the past, man is the decisive factor. Marxist-Leninists attach importance to the role of technological change, but it is wrong to belittle the role of man and exaggerate the role of technology.

The emergence of nuclear weapons can neither arrest the progress of human history nor save the imperialist system from its doom, any more than the emergence of new techniques could save the old systems from their doom in the past.

The emergence of nuclear weapons does not and cannot resolve the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world, does not and cannot alter the law of class struggle, and does not and cannot change the nature of imperialism and reaction.

It cannot, therefore, be said that with the emergence of nuclear weapons the possibility and the necessity of social and national revolutions have disappeared, or the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, and especially the theories of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and of war and peace, have become outmoded and changed into stale "dogmas".

(16) It was Lenin who advanced the thesis that it is possible for the socialist countries to practice peaceful coexistence with the capitalist countries. It is well known that after the great Soviet people had repulsed foreign armed intervention the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government, led first by Lenin and then by Stalin, consistently pursued the policy of peaceful coexistence and that they were forced to wage a war of self-defense only when attacked by the German imperialists.

Since its founding, the People's Republic of China too has consistently pursued the policy of peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems, and it is China which initiated the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence.

However, a few years ago certain persons suddenly claimed Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence as their own "great discovery". They maintain that they have a monopoly on the interpretation of this policy. They treat "peaceful coexistence" as if it were an all-inclusive, mystical book from heaven and attribute to it every success the people of the world achieve by struggle. What is more, they label all who disagree with their distortions of Lenin's views as opponents of peaceful coexistence, as people completely ignorant of Lenin and Leninism, and as heretics deserving to be burnt at the stake.

How can the Chinese Communists agree with this view and practice? They cannot, it is impossible.

Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence is very clear and readily comprehensible by ordinary people. Peaceful coexistence designates a relationship between countries with different social systems, and must not be interpreted as one pleases. It should never be extended to apply to the relations between oppressed and oppressor nations, between oppressed and oppressor countries or between oppressed and oppressor classes, and never be described as the main content of the transition from capitalism to socialism, still less should it be asserted that peaceful coexistence is mankind's road to socialism. The reason is that it is one thing to practice peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. It is absolutely impermissible and impossible for countries practicing peaceful coexistence to touch even a hair of each other's social system. The class struggle, the struggle for national liberation and the transition from capitalism to socialism in various countries are quite another. thing. They are all bitter, life-and-death revolutionary struggles which aim at changing the social system. Peaceful coexistence cannot replace the revolutionary struggles of the people. The transition from capitalism to socialism in any country can only be brought about through the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in that country.

In the application of the policy of peaceful coexistence, struggles between the socialist and imperialist countries are unavoidable in the political, economic and ideological spheres, and it is absolutely impossible to have "all-round co-operation".

It is necessary for the socialist countries to engage in negotiations of one kind or another with the imperialist countries. It is possible to reach certain agreements through negotiation by relying on the correct policies of the socialist countries and on the pressure of the people of all countries. But necessary compromises between the socialist countries and the imperialist countries do not require the oppressed peoples and nations to follow suit and compromise with imperialism and its lackeys. No one should ever demand in the name of peaceful coexistence that the oppressed peoples and nations should give up their revolutionary struggles.

The application of the policy of peaceful coexistence by the socialist countries is advantageous for achieving a peaceful international environment for socialist construction, for exposing the imperialist policies of aggression and war and for isolating the imperialist forces of aggression and war. But if the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries is confined to peaceful coexistence, then it is impossible to handle correctly either the relations between socialist countries or those between the socialist countries and the oppressed peoples and nations. Therefore, it is wrong to make peaceful coexistence the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries.

In our view, the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries should have the following content: to develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance and co-operation among the countries in the socialist camp in accordance with the principle of proletarian internationalism; to strive for peaceful coexistence on the basis of the Five Principles with countries having different social systems and oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war; and to support and assist the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed peoples and nations. These three aspects are interrelated and indivisible, and not a single one can be omitted.

(17) For a very long historical period after the proletariat takes power, class struggle continues as an objective law independent of man's will, differing only in form from what it was before the taking of power.

After the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out a number of times that:

a) The overthrown exploiters always try in a thousand and one ways to recover the "paradise" they have been deprived of.

b) new elements of capitalism are constantly and spontaneously generated in the petty-bourgeois atmosphere.

c) Political degenerates and new bourgeois elements may emerge in the ranks of the working class and among government functionaries as a result of bourgeois influence and the pervasive, corrupting atmosphere of the petty bourgeoisie.

d) The external conditions for the continuance of class struggle within a socialist country are encirclement by international capitalism, the imperialists' threat of armed intervention and their subversive activities to accomplish peaceful disintegration.

Life has confirmed these conclusions of Lenin's.

For decades or even longer periods after socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization, it will be impossible to say that any socialist country will be free from those elements which Lenin repeatedly denounced, such as bourgeois hangers-on, parasites, speculators, swindlers, idlers, hooligans and embezzlers of state funds; or to say that a socialist country will no longer need to perform or be able to relinquish the task laid down by Lenin of conquering "this contagion, this plague, this ulcer that socialism has inherited from capitalism".

In a socialist country, it takes a very long historical period gradually to settle the question of who will win--socialism or capitalism. The struggle between the road of socialism and the road of capitalism runs through this whole historical period. This struggle rises and falls in a wave-like manner, at times becoming very fierce, and the forms of the struggle are many and varied.

The 1957 Declaration rightly states that "the conquest of power by the working class is only the beginning of the revolution, not its conclusion".

To deny the existence of class struggle in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the necessity of thoroughly completing the socialist revolution on the economic, political and ideological fronts is wrong, does not correspond to objective reality and violates Marxism-Leninism.

(18) Both Marx and Lenin maintained that the entire period before the advent of the higher stage of communist society is the period of transition from capitalism to communism, the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In this transition period, the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is to say, the proletarian state, goes through the dialectical process of establishment, consolidation, strengthening and withering away.

In the *Critique of the Gotha Programme,* Marx posed the question as follows:

> "Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."* [302]

Lenin frequently emphasized Marx's great theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and analyzed the development of this theory, particularly in his outstanding work, *The State and Revolution,* where he wrote:

[302] Marx and Engels, Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1955, Vol. II, pp. 32-33.

"... the transition from capitalist society--which is developing towards communism--to a communist society is impossible without a "political transition period", and the state in this period can only be the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." [303]

He further said:

"The essence of Marx's teaching on the state has been mastered only by those who understand that the dictatorship of a *single* class is necessary not only for every class society in general, not only for the *proletariat* which has overthrown the bourgeoisie, but also for the entire *historical period* which separates capitalism from "classless society", from communism." [304]

As stated above, the fundamental thesis of Marx and Lenin is that the dictatorship of the proletariat will inevitably continue for the entire historical period of the transition from capitalism to communism, that is, for the entire period up to the abolition of all class differences and the entry into a classless society, the higher stage of communist society.

What will happen if it is announced, halfway through, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary?

Does this not fundamentally conflict with the teachings of Marx and Lenin on the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat?

Does this not license the development of "this contagion, this plague, this ulcer that socialism has inherited from capitalism"?

In other words, this would lead to extremely grave consequences and make any transition to communism out of the question.

Can there be a "state of the whole people"? Is it possible to replace the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by a "state of the whole people"?

This is not a question about the internal affairs of any particular country but a fundamental problem involving the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism.

In the view of Marxist-Leninists, there is no such thing as a non-class or supra-class state. So long as the state remains a state, it must bear a class character; so long as the state exists, it cannot be a state of the "whole people". As soon as society becomes classless, there will no longer be a state.

Then what sort of thing would a "state of the whole people" be?

Anyone with an elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism can understand that the so-called "state of the whole people" is nothing new. Representative bourgeois figures have always

[303] Lenin, Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 289.
[304] *Ibid*., p. 234.

called the bourgeois state a "state of all the people", or a "state in which power belongs to all the people".

Certain persons may say that their society is already one without classes. We answer: No, there are classes and class struggles in all socialist countries without exception.

Since remnants of the old exploiting classes who are trying to stage a comeback still exist there, since new capitalist elements are constantly being generated there, and since there are still parasites, speculators, idlers, hooligans, embezzlers of state funds, etc., how can it be said that classes or class struggles no longer exist? How can it be said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary?

Marxism-Leninism tells us that in addition to the suppression of the hostile classes, the historical tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the course of building socialism necessarily include the correct handling of relations between the working class and peasantry, the consolidation of their political and economic alliance and the creation of conditions for the gradual elimination of the class difference between worker and peasant.

When we look at the economic base of any socialist society, we find that the difference between ownership by the whole people and collective ownership exists in all socialist countries without exception, and that there is individual ownership too. Ownership by the whole people and collective ownership are two kinds of ownership and two kinds of relations of production in socialist society. The workers in enterprises owned by the whole people and the peasants on farms owned collectively belong to two different categories of laborers in socialist society. Therefore, the class difference between worker and peasant exists in all socialist countries without exception. This difference will not disappear until the transition to the higher stage of communism is achieved. In their present level of economic development all socialist countries are still far, far removed from the higher stage of communism in which "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" is put into practice. Therefore, it will take a long, long time to eliminate the class difference between worker and peasant. And until this difference is eliminated, it is impossible to say that society is classless or that there is no longer any need for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In calling a socialist state the "state of the whole people", is one trying to replace the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state by the bourgeois theory of the state? Is one trying to replace the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by a state of a different character?

If that is the case, it is nothing but a great historical retrogression. The degeneration of the social system in Yugoslavia is a grave lesson.

(19) Leninism holds that the proletarian party must exist together with the dictatorship of the proletariat in socialist countries. The party of the proletariat is indispensable for the entire historical period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The reason is that the dictatorship of the proletariat has to struggle against the enemies of the proletariat and of the people, remold the peasants and other

small producers, constantly consolidate the proletarian ranks, build socialism and effect the transition to communism; none of these things can be done without the leadership of the party of the proletariat.

Can there be a "party of the entire people"? Is it possible to replace the party which is the vanguard of the proletariat by a "party of the entire people"?

This, too, is not a question about the internal affairs of any particular Party, but a fundamental problem involving the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism.

In the view of Marxist-Leninists, there is no such thing as a non-class or supra-class political party. All political parties have a class character. Party spirit is the concentrated expression of class character.

The party of the proletariat is the only party able to represent the interests of the whole people. It can, do so precisely because it represents the interests of the proletariat, whose ideas and will it concentrate. It can lead the whole people because the proletariat can finally emancipate itself only with the emancipation of all mankind, because the very nature of the proletariat enables its party to approach problems in terms of its present and future interests, because the party is boundlessly loyal to the people and has the spirit of self-sacrifice; hence its democratic centralism and iron discipline. Without such a party, it is impossible to maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat and to represent the interests of the whole people.

What will happen if it is announced halfway before entering the higher stage of communist society that the party of the proletariat has become a "party of the entire people" and if its proletarian class character is repudiated?

Does this not fundamentally conflict with the teachings of Marx and Lenin on the party of the proletariat?

Does this not disarm the proletariat and all the working people, organizationally and ideologically, and is it not tantamount to helping restore capitalism?

Is it not "going south by driving the chariot north" to talk about any transition to communist society in such circumstances?

(20) Over the past few years, certain persons have violated Lenin's integral teachings about the interrelationship of leaders, party, class and masses, and raised the issue of "combating the cult of the individual"; this is erroneous and harmful.

The theory propounded by Lenin is as follows:

a) The masses are divided into classes;
b) Classes are usually led by political parties;

c) Political parties, as a general rule, are directed by more or less stable groups composed of the most authoritative, influential and experienced members, who are elected to the most responsible positions and are called leaders.

Lenin said, "All this is elementary."

The party of the proletariat is the headquarters of the proletariat in revolution and struggle. Every proletarian party must practice centralism based on democracy and establish a strong Marxist-Leninist leadership before it can become an organized and battle-worthy vanguard. To raise the question of "combating the cult of the individual" is actually to counterpose the leaders to the masses, undermine the party's unified leadership which is based on democratic centralism, dissipate its fighting strength and disintegrate its ranks.

Lenin criticized the erroneous views which counterpose the leaders to the masses. He called them "ridiculously absurd and stupid".

The Communist Party of China has always disapproved of exaggerating the role of the individual, has advocated and persistently practiced democratic centralism within the Party and advocated the linking of the leadership with the masses, maintaining that correct leadership must know how to concentrate the views of the masses.

While loudly combating the so-called "cult of the individual", certain persons are in reality doing their best to defame the proletarian party and the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time, they are enormously exaggerating the role of certain individuals, shifting all errors onto others and claiming all credit for themselves.

What is more serious is that, under the pretext of "combating the cult of the individual", certain persons are crudely interfering in the internal affairs of other fraternal Parties and fraternal countries and forcing other fraternal Parties to change their leadership in order to impose their own wrong line on these Parties. What is all this if not great-power chauvinism, sectarianism and splittism? What is all this if not subversion?

It is high time to propagate seriously and comprehensively Lenin's integral teachings on the interrelationship of leaders, party, class and masses.

(21) Relations between socialist countries are international relations of a new type. Relations between socialist countries, whether large or small, and whether more developed or less developed economically, must be based on the principles of complete equality, respect for territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, and must also be based on the principles of mutual support and mutual assistance in accordance with proletarian internationalism.

Every socialist country must rely mainly on itself for its construction.

In accordance with its own concrete conditions, every socialist country must rely first of all on the diligent labor and talents of its own people, utilize all its available resources fully and in a planned way, and bring all its potential into play in socialist construction. Only thus can it build socialism effectively and develop its economy speedily.

This is the only way for each socialist country to strengthen the might of the entire socialist camp and enhance its capacity to assist the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat. Therefore, to observe the principle of mainly relying on oneself in construction is to apply proletarian internationalism concretely.

If, proceeding only from its own partial interests, any socialist country unilaterally demands that other fraternal countries submit to its needs, and uses the pretext of opposing what they call "going it alone" and "nationalism", to prevent other fraternal countries from applying the principle of relying mainly on their own efforts in their construction and from developing their economies on the basis of independence, or even goes to the length of putting economic pressure on other fraternal countries--then these are pure manifestations of national egoism.

It is absolutely necessary for socialist countries to practice mutual economic assistance and co-operation and exchange. Such economic co-operation must be based on the principles of complete equality, mutual benefit and comradely mutual assistance.

It would be great-power chauvinism to deny these basic principles and, in the name of "international division of labor" or "specialization", to impose one's own will on others, infringe on the independence and sovereignty of fraternal countries or harm the interests of their people.

In relations among socialist countries it would be preposterous to follow the practice of gaining profit for oneself at the expense of others, a practice characteristic of relations among capitalist countries, or go so far as to take the "economic integration" and the "common market", which monopoly capitalist groups have instituted for the purpose of seizing markets and grabbing profits, as examples which socialist countries ought to follow in their economic co-operation and mutual assistance.

(22) The 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement lay down the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties. These are the principle of solidarity, the principle of mutual support and mutual assistance, the principle of independence and equality and the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation--all on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

We note that in its letter of March 30 the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. says that there are no "superior" and "subordinate" Parties in the communist movement, that all Communist Parties are independent and equal, and that they should all build their relations on the basis of proletarian internationalism and mutual assistance.

It is a fine quality of Communists that their deeds are consistent with their words. The only correct way to safeguard and strengthen unity among the fraternal Parties is genuinely to adhere to, and not to violate, the principle of proletarian internationalism and genuinely to observe, and not to undermine, the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties--and to do so not only in words but, much more important, in deeds.

If the principle of independence and equality is accepted in relations among fraternal Parties, then it is impermissible for any Party to place itself above others, to interfere in their internal affairs, and to adopt patriarchal ways in relations with them.

If it is accepted that there are no "superiors" and "subordinates" in relations among fraternal Parties, then it is impermissible to impose the programme, resolutions and line of one's own Party on other fraternal Parties as the "common programme" of the international communist movement.

If the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation is accepted in relations among fraternal Parties, then one should not emphasize "who is in the majority" or "who is in the minority" and bank on a so-called majority in order to force through one's own erroneous line and carry out sectarian and splitting policies.

If it is agreed that differences between fraternal Parties should be settled through inter-Party consultation, then other fraternal Parties should not be attacked publicly and by name at one's own congress or at other Party congresses, in speeches by Party leaders, resolutions, statements, etc.; and still less should the ideological differences among fraternal Parties be extended into the sphere of state relations.

We hold that in the present circumstances, when there are differences in the international communist movement, it is particularly important to stress strict adherence to the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties as laid down in the Declaration and the Statement.

In the sphere of relations among fraternal Parties and countries, the question of Soviet-Albanian relations is an outstanding one at present. Here the question is what is the correct way to treat a fraternal Party and country and whether the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries stipulated in the Declaration and the Statement are to be adhered to. The correct solution of this question is an important matter of principle in safeguarding the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

How to treat the Marxist-Leninist fraternal Albanian Party of Labor is one question. How to treat the Yugoslav revisionist clique of traitors to Marxism-Leninism is quite another question. These two essentially different questions must on no account be placed on a par.

Your letter says that you "do not relinquish the hope that the relations between the C.P.S.U. and the Albanian Party of Labor may be improved", but at the same time you continue to attack the

Albanian comrades for what you call "splitting activities". Clearly this is self-contradictory and in no way contributes to resolving the problem of Soviet-Albanian relations.

Who is it that has taken splitting actions in Soviet-Albanian relations?

Who is it that has extended the ideological differences between the Soviet and Albanian Parties to state relations?

Who is it that has brought the divergences between the Soviet and Albanian Parties and between the two countries into the open before the enemy?

Who is it that has openly called for a change in the Albanian Party and state leadership?

All this is plain and clear to the whole world.

Is it possible that the leading comrades of the C.P.S.U. do not really feel their responsibility for the fact that Soviet-Albanian relations have so seriously deteriorated?

We once again express our sincere hope that the leading comrades of the C.P.S.U. will observe the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries and take the initiative in seeking an effective way to improve Soviet-Albanian relations.

In short, the question of how to handle relations with fraternal Parties and countries must be taken seriously. Strict adherence to the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries is the only way forcefully to rebuff slanders such as those spread by the imperialists and reactionaries about the "hand of Moscow".

Proletarian internationalism is demanded of all Parties without exception, whether large or small, and whether in power or not. However, the larger Parties and the Parties in power bear a particularly heavy responsibility in this respect. The series of distressing developments which have occurred in the socialist camp in the past period have harmed the interests not only of the fraternal Parties concerned but also of the masses of the people in their countries. This convincingly demonstrates that the larger countries and Parties need to keep in mind Lenin's behest never to commit the error of great-power chauvinism.

The comrades of the C.P.S.U. state in their letter that "the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has never taken and will never take a single step that could sow hostility among the peoples of our country towards the fraternal Chinese people or other peoples". Here we do not desire to go back and enumerate the many unpleasant events that have occurred in the past, and we only wish that the comrades of the C.P.S.U. will strictly abide by this statement in their future actions.

During the past few years, our Party members and our people have exercised the greatest restraint in the face of a series of grave incidents which were in violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries and despite the many difficulties and losses which

have been imposed on us. The spirit of proletarian internationalism of the Chinese Communists and the Chinese people has stood a severe test.

The Communist Party of China is unswervingly loyal to proletarian internationalism, upholds and defends the principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries, and safeguards and strengthens the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

(23) In order to carry out the common programme of the international communist movement unanimously agreed upon by the fraternal Parties, an uncompromising struggle must be waged against all forms of opportunism, which is a deviation from Marxism-Leninism.

The Declaration and the Statement point out that revisionism, or, in other words, Right opportunism, is the main danger in the international communist movement. Yugoslav revisionism typifies modern revisionism.

The Statement points out particularly:

The Communist Parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist "theories" in concentrated form.

It goes on to say:

> After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist programme to the Declaration of 1957; they set the League of Communists of Yugoslavia against the international communist movement as a whole, severed their country from the socialist camp, made it dependent on so-called "aid" from U.S. and other imperialists.

The Statement says further:

The Yugoslav revisionists carry on subversive work against the socialist camp and the world communist movement. Under the pretext of an extra-bloc policy, they engage in activities which prejudice the unity of all the peace-loving forces and countries.

Therefore, it draws the following conclusion:

Further exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists and active struggle to safeguard the communist movement and the working-class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists, remains an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist Parties.

The question raised here is an important one of principle for the international communist movement.

Only recently the Tito clique have publicly stated that they are persisting in their revisionist programme and anti-Marxist-Leninist stand in opposition to the Declaration and the Statement.

U.S. imperialism and its NATO partners have spent several thousand millions of U.S. dollars nursing the Tito clique for a long time. Cloaked as "Marxist-Leninists" and flaunting the banner of a "socialist country", the Tito clique has been undermining the international communist movement and the revolutionary cause of the people of the world, serving as a special detachment of U.S. imperialism.

It is-completely groundless and out of keeping with the facts to assert that Yugoslavia is showing "definite positive tendencies", that it is a "socialist country", and that the Tito clique is an "anti-imperialist force".

Certain persons are now attempting to introduce the Yugoslav revisionist clique into the socialist community and the international communist ranks. This is openly to tear up the agreement unanimously reached at the 1960 meeting of the fraternal Parties and is absolutely impermissible.

Over the past few years, the revisionist trend flooding the international working-class movement and the many experiences and lessons of the international communist movement have fully confirmed the correctness of the conclusion in the Declaration and the Statement that revisionism is the main danger in the international communist movement at present.

However, certain persons are openly saying that dogmatism and not revisionism is the main danger, or that dogmatism is no less dangerous than revisionism, etc. What sort of principle underlies all this?

Firm Marxist-Leninists and genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties must put principles first. They must not barter away principles, approving one thing today and another tomorrow, advocating one thing today and another tomorrow.

Together with all Marxist-Leninists, the Chinese Communists will continue to wage an uncompromising struggle against modern revisionism in order to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the principled stand of the Declaration and the Statement.

While combating revisionism, which is the main danger in the international communist movement, Communists must also combat dogmatism.

As stated in the 1957 Declaration, proletarian parties, "should firmly adhere to the principle of combining. . . universal Marxist-Leninist truth with the specific practice of revolution and construction in their countries".

That is to say:

On the one hand, it is necessary at all times to adhere to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism. Failure to do so will lead to Right opportunist or revisionist errors.

On the other hand, it is always necessary to proceed from reality, maintain close contact with the masses, constantly sum up the experience of mass struggles, and independently work out and

apply policies and tactics suited to the conditions of one's own country. Errors of dogmatism will be committed if one fails to do so, if one mechanically copies the policies and tactics of another Communist Party, submits blindly to the will of others or accepts without analysis the programme and resolutions of another Communist Party as one's own line.

Some people are now violating this basic principle, which was long ago affirmed in the Declaration. On the pretext of "creatively developing Marxism-Leninism", they cast aside the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism. Moreover, they describe as "universal Marxist-Leninist truths" their own prescriptions which are based on nothing but subjective conjecture and are divorced from reality and from the masses, and they force others to accept these prescriptions unconditionally.

That is why many grave phenomena have come to pass in the international communist movement.

(24) A most important lesson from the experience of the international communist movement is that the development and victory of a revolution depend on the existence of a revolutionary proletarian party.

There must be a revolutionary party.

There must be a revolutionary party built according to the revolutionary theory and revolutionary style of Marxism-Leninism.

There must be a revolutionary party able to integrate the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution in its own country.

There must be a revolutionary party able to link the leadership closely with the broad masses of the people.

There must be a revolutionary party that perseveres in the truth, corrects its errors and knows how to conduct criticism and self-criticism.

Only such a revolutionary party can lead the proletariat and the broad masses of the people in defeating imperialism and its lackeys, winning a thorough victory in the national democratic revolution and winning the socialist revolution.

If a party is not a proletarian revolutionary party but a bourgeois reformist party;

If it is not a Marxist-Leninist party but a revisionist party;

If it is not a vanguard party of the proletariat but a party tailing after the bourgeoisie;

If it is not a party representing the interests of the proletariat and all the working people but a party representing the interests of the labor aristocracy;

If it is not an internationalist party but a nationalist party;

If it is not a party that can use its brains to think for itself and acquire an accurate knowledge of the trends of the different classes in its own country through serious investigation and study, and knows how to apply the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and integrate it with the concrete practice of its own country, but instead is a party that parrots the words of others, copies foreign experience without analysis, runs hither and thither in response to the baton of certain persons abroad, and has become a hodgepodge of revisionism, dogmatism and everything but Marxist-Leninist principle;

Then such a party is absolutely incapable of leading the proletariat and the masses in revolutionary struggle, absolutely incapable of winning the revolution and absolutely incapable of fulfilling the great historical mission of the proletariat.

This is a question all Marxist-Leninists, all class-conscious workers and all progressive people everywhere need to ponder deeply.

(25) It is the duty of Marxist-Leninists to distinguish between truth and falsehood with respect to the differences that have arisen in the international communist movement. In the common interest of the unity for struggle against the enemy, we have always advocated solving problems through inter-Party consultations and opposed bringing differences into the open before the enemy.

As the comrades of the C.P.S.U. know, the public polemics in the international communist movement have been provoked by certain fraternal Party leaders and forced on us.

Since a public debate has been provoked, it ought to be conducted on the basis of equality among fraternal Parties and of democracy, and by presenting the facts and reasoning things out.

Since certain Party leaders have publicly attacked other fraternal Parties and provoked a public debate, it is our opinion that they have no reason or right to forbid the fraternal Parties attacked to make public replies.

Since certain Party leaders have published innumerable articles attacking other fraternal Parties, why do they not publish in their own press the articles those Parties have written in reply?

Latterly, the Communist Party of China has been subjected to preposterous attacks. The attackers have raised a great hue and cry and, disregarding the facts, have fabricated many charges against us. We have published these articles and speeches attacking us in our own press.

We have also published in full in our press the Soviet leader's report at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet on December 12, 1962, the *Pravda* Editorial Board's article of January 7, 1963, the speech of the head of the C.P.S.U. delegation at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany on January 16, 1963 and the *Pravda* Editorial Board's article of February 10, 1963.

We have also published the full text of the two letters from the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. dated February 21 and March 30, 1963.

We have replied to some of the articles and speeches in which fraternal Parties have attacked us, but have not yet replied to others. For example, we have not directly replied to the many articles and speeches of the comrades of the C.P.S.U.

Between December 15, 1962 and March 8, 1963, we wrote seven articles in reply to our attackers. These articles are entitled:

"Workers of All Countries, Unite, Oppose Our Common Enemy!",

"The Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us",

"Leninism and Modern Revisionism",

"Let Us Unite on the Basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement",

"Whence the Differences?--A Reply to Thorez and Other Comrades",

"More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us--Some Important Problems of Leninism in the Contemporary World",

"A Comment on the Statement of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.".

Presumably, you are referring to these articles when towards the end of your letter of March 30 you accuse the Chinese press of making "groundless attacks" on the C.P.S.U. It is turning things upside down to describe articles replying to our attackers as "attacks".

Since you describe our articles as "groundless" and as so very bad, why do you not publish all seven of these "groundless attacks", in the same way as we have published your articles, and let all the Soviet comrades and Soviet people think for themselves and judge who is right and who wrong? You are of course entitled to make a point-by-point refutation of these articles you consider "groundless attacks".

Although you call our articles "groundless" and our arguments wrong, you do not tell the Soviet people what our arguments actually are. This practice can hardly be described as showing a serious attitude towards the discussion of problems by fraternal Parties, towards the truth or towards the masses.

We hope that the public debate among fraternal Parties can be stopped. This is a problem that has to be dealt with in accordance with the principles of independence, of equality and of reaching unanimity through consultation among fraternal Parties. In the international communist movement, no one has the right to launch attacks whenever he wants, or to order the "ending of open polemics" whenever he wants to prevent the other side from replying.

It is known to the comrades of the C.P.S.U. that, in order to create a favorable atmosphere for convening the meeting of the fraternal Parties, we have decided temporarily to suspend, as from

March 9, 1963, public replies to the public attacks directed by name against us by comrades of fraternal Parties. We reserve the right of public reply.

In our letter of March 9, we said that on the question of suspending public debate "it is necessary that our two Parties and the fraternal Parties concerned should have some discussion and reach an agreement that is fair and acceptable to all".

****

The foregoing are our views regarding the general line of the international communist movement and some related questions of principle. We hope, as we indicated at the beginning of this letter, that the frank presentation of our views will be conducive to mutual understanding. Of course, comrades may agree or disagree with these views. But in our opinion, the questions we discuss here are the crucial questions calling for attention and solution by the international communist movement. We hope that all these questions and also those raised in your letter will be fully discussed in the talks between our two Parties and at the meeting of representatives of all the fraternal Parties.

In addition, there are other questions of common concern, such as the criticism of Stalin and some important matters of principle regarding the international communist movement which were raised at the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the C.P.S.U., and we hope that on these questions, too, there will be a frank exchange of opinion in the talks.

With regard to the talks between our two Parties, in our letter of March 9 we proposed that Comrade Khrushchev come to Peking; if this was not convenient, we proposed that another responsible comrade of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. lead a delegation to Peking or that we send a delegation to Moscow.

Since you have stated in your letter of March 30 that Comrade Khrushchev cannot come to China, and since you have not expressed a desire to send a delegation to China, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has decided to send a delegation to Moscow.

In your letter of March 30, you invited Comrade Mao Zedong to visit the Soviet Union. As early as February 23, Comrade Mao Zedong in his conversation with the Soviet Ambassador to China clearly stated the reason why he was not prepared to visit the Soviet Union at the present time. You were well aware of this.

When a responsible comrade of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China received the Soviet Ambassador to China on May 9, he informed you that we would send a delegation to Moscow in the middle of June. Later, in compliance with the request of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., we agreed to postpone the talks between our two Parties to July 5.

We sincerely hope that the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties will yield positive results and contribute to the preparations for convening the meeting of all Communist and Workers' Parties.

It is now more than ever necessary for all Communists to unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and of the Declaration and the Statement unanimously agreed upon by the fraternal Parties.

Together with Marxist-Leninist Parties and revolutionary people the world over, the Communist Party of China will continue its unremitting efforts to uphold the interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, the cause of the emancipation of the oppressed peoples and nations, and the struggle against imperialism and for world peace.

We hope that events which grieve those near and dear to us and only gladden the enemy will not recur in the international communist movement in the future.

The Chinese Communists firmly believe that the Marxist-Leninists, the proletariat and the revolutionary people everywhere will unite more closely, overcome all difficulties and obstacles and win still greater victories in the struggle against imperialism and for world peace, and in the fight for the revolutionary cause of the people of the world and the cause of international communism.

Workers of all countries, unite! Workers and oppressed peoples and nations of the world, unite! Oppose our common enemy!

With communist greetings,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

CPCh: The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of The CPSU And Ourselves

It is more than a month since the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union published its Open Letter of July 14 to Party organizations and all Communists in the Soviet Union. This Open Letter, and the steps taken by the leadership of the CPSU since its publication, have pushed Sino-Soviet relations to the brink of a split and have carried the differences in the international communist movement to a new stage of unprecedented gravity.

Now Moscow, Washington, New Delhi and Belgrade are joined in a love feast and the Soviet press is running an endless assortment of fantastic stories and theories attacking China. The leadership of the CPSU has allied itself with U.S. imperialism, the Indian reactionaries and the renegade Tito clique against socialist China and against all Marxist-Leninist parties, in open betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, in brazen repudiation of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement and in flagrant violation of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance.

The present differences within the international communist movement and between the Chinese and Soviet Parties involve a whole series of important questions of principle. In its letter of June 14 to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Central Committee of the CPC systematically and comprehensively discussed the essence of these differences. It pointed out that, in the last analysis, the present differences within the international communist movement and between the Chinese and

Soviet Parties involve the questions of whether or not to accept the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, whether or not to accept Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, whether or not there is need for revolution, whether or not imperialism is to be opposed, and whether or not the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement is desired.

How have the differences in the international communist movement and between the leadership of the CPSU and ourselves arisen? And how have they grown to their present serious dimensions? Everybody is concerned about these questions.

In our article "Whence the Differences?", [305] we dealt with the origin and growth of the differences in the international communist movement in general outline. We deliberately refrained from giving certain facts concerning this question, and particularly certain important facts involving the leadership of the CPSU, and left the leadership of the CPSU some leeway, though we were ready to provide a fuller picture and to thrash out the rights and wrongs when necessary. Now that the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU has told many lies about the origin and development of the differences and completely distorted the facts, it has become necessary for us to set forth certain facts in order to explain the matter in greater detail.

In its Open Letter, the Central Committee of the CPSU dares not state the truth to its Party members and the masses of the people. Instead of being open and above-board and respecting the facts as Marxist-Leninists should, the leadership of the CPSU resorts to the customary practice of bourgeois politicians, distorting the facts and confusing truth and falsehood in its determined attempt to shift the blame for the emergence and growth of the differences on to the Chinese Communist Party.

Lenin once said, "Honesty in politics is the result of strength. and hypocrisy — the result of weakness." Honesty and respect for the facts mark the attitude of Marxist-Leninists. Only those who have degenerated politically depend on telling lies for a living.

The facts are most eloquent. Facts are the best witness. Let us look at the facts.

The Differences Began with the 20th Congress of the CPSU

There is a saying, "It takes more than one cold day for the river to freeze three feet deep." The present differences in the international communist movement did not, of course, begin just today.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU spreads the notion that the differences in the international communist movement were started by the three articles which we published in April 1960 under the title of "Long Live Leninism!" This is a big lie.

What is the truth ?

[305] Renmin Ribao editorial, February 27, 1963

The truth is that the whole series of differences of principle in the international communist movement began more than seven years ago.

To be specific, it began with the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU was the first step along the road of revisionism taken by the leadership of the CPSU. From the 20th Congress to the present, the revisionist line of the leadership of the CPSU has gone through the process of emergence, formation, growth and systematization. And by a gradual process, too, people have come to understand more and more deeply the revisionist line of the CPSU leadership.

From the very outset we held that a number of views advanced at the 20th Congress concerning the contemporary international struggle and the international communist movement were wrong, were violations of Marxism-Leninism. In particular, the complete negation of Stalin on the pretext of "combating the personality cult" and the thesis of peaceful transition to socialism by "the parliamentary road" are gross errors of principle.

The criticism of Stalin at the 20th Congress of the CPSU was wrong both in principle and in method.

Stalin's life was that of a great Marxist-Leninist, a great proletarian revolutionary. For thirty years after Lenin's death, Stalin was the foremost leader of the CPSU and the Soviet Government, as well as the recognized leader of the international communist movement and the standard-bearer of the world revolution. During his lifetime, Stalin made some serious mistakes, but compared to his great and meritorious deeds his mistakes are only secondary.

Stalin rendered great services to the development of the Soviet Union and the international communist movement. In the article "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" published in April 1956, we said:

> After Lenin's death Stalin creatively applied and developed Marxism-Leninism as the chief leader of the Party and the state. Stalin expressed the will and aspirations of the people, and proved himself an outstanding Marxist-Leninist fighter, in the struggle in Defense of the legacy of Leninism against its enemies — the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and other bourgeois agents. Stalin won the support of the Soviet people and played an important role in history primarily because, together with the other leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he defended Lenin's line on the industrialization of the Soviet Union and the collectivization of agriculture. By pursuing this line, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union brought about the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union and created the conditions for the victory of the Soviet Union in the war against Hitler; these victories of the Soviet people accorded with the interests of the working class of the world and all progressive mankind. It was therefore natural that the name of Stalin was greatly *honor*ed throughout the world.

It was necessary to criticize Stalin's mistakes. But in his secret report to the 20th Congress, Comrade Khrushchev completely negated Stalin, and in doing so defamed the dictatorship of the proletariat, defamed the socialist system, the great CPSU, the great Soviet Union and the international communist movement. Far from using a revolutionary proletarian party's method of criticism and self-criticism for the purpose of making an earnest and serious analysis and summation of the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he treated Stalin as an enemy and shifted the blame for all mistakes on to Stalin alone.

Khrushchev viciously and demagogically told a host of lies in his secret report, and threw around charges that Stalin had a "persecution mania", indulged in "brutal arbitrariness", took the path of "mass repressions and terror", "knew the country and agriculture only from films" and "planned operations on a globe", that Stalin's leadership "became a serious obstacle in the path of Soviet social development", and so on and so forth. He completely obliterated the meritorious deeds of Stalin who led the Soviet people in waging resolute struggle against all internal and external foes and achieving great results in socialist transformation and socialist construction, who led the Soviet people in defending and consolidating the first socialist country in the world and winning the glorious victory in the anti-fascist war, and who defended and developed Marxism-Leninism.

In completely negating Stalin at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, Khrushchev in effect negated the dictatorship of the proletariat and the fundamental. theories of Marxism-Leninism which Stalin defended and developed. It was at that Congress that Khrushchev, in his summary report, began the repudiation of Marxism-Leninism on a number of questions of principle.

In his report to the 20th Congress, under the pretext that "radical changes" had taken place in the world situation, Khrushchev put forward the thesis of "peaceful transition". He said that the road of the October Revolution was "the only correct road in those historical conditions", but that as the situation had changed, it had become possible to affect the transition from capitalism to socialism "through the parliamentary road". In essence, this erroneous thesis is a clear revision of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state and revolution and a clear denial of the universal significance of the road of the October Revolution.

In his report, under the same pretext that "radical changes" had taken place in the world situation, Khrushchev also questioned the continued validity of Lenin's teachings on imperialism and on war and peace, and in fact tampered with Lenin's teachings.

Khrushchev pictured the U.S. Government and its head as people resisting the forces of war, and not as representatives of the imperialist forces of war. He said, "... the advocates of settling outstanding issues by means of war still hold strong positions there [in the United States], and ... they continue to exert big pressure on the President and the Administration." He went on to say that the imperialists were beginning to admit that the positions-of-strength policy had failed and that "symptoms of a certain sobering up are appearing" among them. It was as much as saying that it was

possible for the U.S. Government and its head not to represent the interests of the U.S. monopoly capital and for them to abandon their policies of war and aggression and that they had become forces defending peace.

Khrushchev declared: "We want to be friends with the United States and to cooperate with it for peace and international security and also in the economic and cultural spheres." This wrong view later developed into the line of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for the settlement of world problems".

Distorting Lenin's correct principle of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, Khrushchev declared that peaceful coexistence was the "general line of the foreign policy" of the U.S.S.R. This amounted to excluding from the general line of foreign policy of the socialist countries their mutual assistance and co-operation as well as assistance by them to the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, or to subordinating all this to the policy of so-called "peaceful coexistence".

The questions raised by the leadership of the CPSU at the 20th Congress, and especially the question of Stalin and of "peaceful transition", are by no means simply internal affairs of the CPSU; they are vital issues of common interest for all fraternal Parties. Without any prior consultation with the fraternal Parties, the leadership of the CPSU drew arbitrary conclusions; it forced the fraternal Parties to accept a *fait accompli* and, on the pretext of "combating the personality cult", crudely interfered in the internal affairs of fraternal Parties and countries and subverted their readerships, thus pushing its policy of sectarianism and splittism in the international communist movement.

Subsequent developments show with increasing clarity that the revision and betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism by the leaders of the CPSU have grown out of the above errors.

The CPC has always differed in principle in its view of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, and the leading comrades of the CPSU are well aware of this. Yet the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU asserts that the Communist Party of China previously gave the 20th Congress full support, that we "have made a 180-degree turn" in our evaluation of the 20th Congress, and that our position is full of "vacillations and waverings" and is "false".

It is impossible for the leadership of the CPSU to shut out the heavens with one palm. Let the facts speak for themselves. On many occasions in internal discussions after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, leading comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC solemnly criticized the errors of the CPSU leadership.

> In April 1956, less than two months after the 20th Congress, in conversations both with Comrade Mikoyan, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and with the Soviet Ambassador to China, Comrade Mao Zedong expressed our views on the question of Stalin. He emphasized that Stalin's "merits outweighed his faults" and that it was necessary to "make a concrete analysis" and "an all-round evaluation" of Stalin.

On October 23, 1956, on receiving the Soviet Ambassador to China, Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out, "Stalin deserves to be criticized, but we do not agree with the method of criticism, and there are some other matters we do not agree with."

On November 30, 1956, on receiving the Soviet Ambassador to China, Comrade Mao Zedong again pointed out that the basic policy and line during the period when Stalin was in power were correct and that methods that are used against enemies must not be used against one's comrades.

Both Comrade Liu Shao-chi in his conversation with leaders of the CPSU in October 1956, and Comrade Chou En-lai in his conversations on October 1, 1956 with the delegation of the CPSU to the Eighth Congress of the CPC and on January 18, 1957 with leaders of the CPSU, also expressed our views on the question of Stalin, and both criticized the errors of the leaders of the CPSU as consisting chiefly of "total lack of an overall analysis" of Stalin, "lack of self-criticism" and "failure to consult with the fraternal Parties in advance".

In internal discussions with comrades of the CPSU, leading comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC also stated where we differed on the question of peaceful transition. Furthermore, in November 1957 the Central Committee of the CPC presented the Central Committee of the CPSU with a written "Outline of Views on the Question of Peaceful Transition", comprehensively and clearly explaining the viewpoint of the CPC.

In their many internal discussions with comrades of the CPSU, leading comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC also systematically set forth our views on the international situation and the strategy of the international communist movement, with direct reference to the errors of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

These are plain facts. How can the leadership of the CPSU obliterate them by bare-faced lying?

Attempting to conceal these important facts, the Central Committee of the CPSU in its Open Letter quotes out of context public statements by Comrades Mao Zedong, Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping to show that at one time the Chinese Communist Party completely affirmed the 20th Congress of the CPSU. This is futile.

The fact is that at no time and in no place did the Chinese Communist Party completely affirm the 20th Congress of the CPSU, agree with the complete negation of Stalin or endorse the view of peaceful transition to socialism through the "parliamentary road".

Not long after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, on April 5, 1956, we published "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat"; then, on December 29, 1956, we published "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat". While refuting the anti-Communist slanders of the imperialists and reactionaries, these two articles made an all-round analysis of the life of Stalin, affirmed the universal significance of the road of the October

Revolution, summed up the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and tactfully but unequivocally criticized the erroneous propositions of the 20th Congress. Is this not a widely known fact?

Since the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the Chinese Communist Party has continued to display the portrait of Stalin along with those of the other great revolutionary leaders, Marx, Engels and Lenin. Is not this, too, a widely known fact?

It needs to be said, of course, that for the sake of unity against the enemy and out of consideration for the difficult position the leaders of the CPSU were in, we refrained in those days from open criticism of the errors of the 20th Congress, because the imperialists and the reactionaries of all countries were exploiting these errors and carrying on frenzied activities against the Soviet Union, against communism and against the people, and also because the leaders of the CPSU had not yet departed so far from Marxism-Leninism as they did later. We fervently hoped at the time that the leaders of the CPSU would put their errors right. Consequently, we always endeavored to seek out positive aspects and on public occasions gave them whatever support was appropriate and necessary.

Even so, by stressing positive lessons and principles in their public speeches, leading comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC explained our position with regard to the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU asserts that in his political report to the Eighth Congress of the CPC, Comrade Liu Shao-chi completely affirmed the 20th Congress of the CPSU. But it was in this very report that Comrade Liu Shao-chi spoke on the lessons of the Chinese revolution and explained that the road of "peaceful transition" was wrong and impracticable.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU asserts that in his report to the Eighth Congress of the CPC on the revision of the Party Constitution, Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping completely affirmed the "combat against the personality cult" conducted at the 20th Congress. But it was in this very report that Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping discussed at some length democratic centralism in the Party and the interrelationship between leaders and masses, explained the consistent and correct style of work of our Party, and thus in effect criticized the error of the 20th Congress concerning "combating the personality cult".

Is there anything wrong in the way we acted? Have we not done exactly what a Marxist-Leninist party ought to do by persevering in principle and upholding unity?

How can this consistently correct attitude of the Chinese Communist Party towards the 20th Congress be described as full of "vacillations and waverings", as "false" and as representing "a 180-degree turn"?

In making these charges against us in the Open Letter, perhaps the Central Committee of the CPSU thought it could deny the criticisms we made because they were known only to a few leaders of the CPSU, and that it could use falsehoods to deceive the broad masses of the CPSU membership and the Soviet people. But does this not prove its own falseness?

The Serious Consequences of the 20th Congress of the CPSU

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU loudly proclaims the "wonderful" and "majestic results" of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

But history cannot be altered. People not suffering from too short a memory will recall that by its errors the 20th Congress produced not "wonderful" or "majestic results" but a discrediting of the Soviet Union, of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of socialism and communism, and gave an opportunity to the imperialists, the reactionaries and all the other enemies of communism, with extremely serious consequences for the international communist movement.

After the Congress, swollen with arrogance the imperialists and reactionaries everywhere stirred up a world-wide tidal wave against the Soviet Union against communism and against the people. The U.S. imperialists saw the all-out attack on Stalin by the leadership of the CPSU as something that was "never so suited to our purposes", they talked openly about using Khrushchev's secret report as a "weapon with which to destroy the prestige and influence of the communist movement" and they took the opportunity to advocate "peaceful transformation" in the Soviet Union.

The Titoites became most aggressive. Flaunting their reactionary slogan of "anti-Stalinism", they wildly attacked the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system. They declared that the 20th Congress of the CPSU "created sufficient elements" for the "new course" which Yugoslavia had started and that "the question now is whether this course will win or the course of Stalinism will win again".

The Trotskyites, enemies of communism, who had been in desperate straits, feverishly resumed activity. In its *Manifesto to the Workers and Peoples of the Entire World* the so-called Fourth International said, "Today, when the Kremlin leaders are themselves admitting the crimes of Stalin, they implicitly recognize that the indefatigable struggle carried on ... by the world Trotskyist movement against the degeneration of the workers' state, was fully justified."

The errors of the 20th Congress brought great ideological confusion in the international communist movement and caused it to be deluged with revisionist ideas. Along with the imperialists, the reactionaries and the Tito clique, renegades from communism in many countries attacked Marxism-Leninism and the international communist movement.

Most striking among the events which took place during this period were the incident in Soviet-Polish relations and the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary. The two events were

different in character. But the leadership of the CPSU made grave errors in both. By moving up troops in an attempt to subdue the Polish comrades by armed force it committed the error of great-power chauvinism. And at the critical moment when the Hungarian counter-revolutionaries had occupied Budapest, for a time it intended to adopt a policy of capitulation and abandon socialist Hungary to counter-revolution.

These errors of the leadership of the CPSU inflated the arrogance of all the enemies of communism, created serious difficulties for many fraternal Parties and caused the international communist movement great damage.

In the face of this situation, the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Parties persevering in Marxism-Leninism firmly demanded repulsing the assaults of imperialism and reaction and safeguarding the socialist camp and the international communist movement. We insisted on the taking of all necessary measures to smash the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary and firmly opposed the abandonment of socialist Hungary. We insisted that in the handling of problems between fraternal Parties and countries correct principles should be followed so as to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp, and we firmly opposed the erroneous methods of great-power chauvinism. At the same time, we made very great efforts to safeguard the prestige of the CPSU.

At that time the leaders of the CPSU accepted our suggestion and on October 30, 1956 issued the Soviet Government's "Declaration on the Foundations of the Development and Further Strengthening of Friendship and Co-operation Between the Soviet Union and Other Socialist Countries", in which they examined some of their own past mistakes in handling their relations with fraternal countries. On November 1, the Chinese Government issued a statement expressing support for the Soviet Government's declaration.

All this we did in the interests of the international communist movement, and also in order to persuade the leaders of the CPSU to draw the proper lessons and correct their errors in good time and not slide farther away from Marxism-Leninism. But subsequent event showed that the leaders of the CPSU nursed rancor against us and regarded the CPC which perseveres in proletarian internationalism as the biggest obstacle to their wrong line.

The 1957 Moscow Meeting of Fraternal Parties

The 1957 Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties took place in Moscow after the repulse of the heavy attacks of the imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries on the international communist movement.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU says that the 20th Congress of the CPSU played a "tremendous role" in defining the general line of the international communist movement. The facts show the very reverse. The erroneous views of the 20th Congress on many important questions of principle were rejected and corrected by the 1957 meeting of fraternal Parties.

The well-known Declaration of 1957, adopted by the Moscow Meeting, summed up the experience of the international communist movement, set forth the common fighting tasks of all the Communist Parties, affirmed the universal significance of the road of the October Revolution, outlined the common laws governing socialist revolution and socialist construction and laid down the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries. The common line of the international communist movement which was thus worked out at the meeting embodies the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism and is opposed to the erroneous views deviating from Marxism-Leninism which were advanced by the 20th Congress. The principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries laid down in the Declaration are concrete expressions of the principle of proletarian internationalism and stand opposed to the great-power chauvinism and sectarianism of the leadership of the CPSU.

The delegation of the CPC, which was headed by Comrade Mao Zedong, did a great deal of work during the Meeting. On the one hand, it had full consultations with the leaders of the CPSU, and where necessary and appropriate waged struggle against them, in order to help them correct their errors; on the other hand, it held repeated exchanges of views with the leaders of other fraternal Parties in order that a common document acceptable to all might be worked out.

At this meeting, the chief subject of controversy between us and the delegation of the CPSU was the transition from capitalism to socialism. In their original draft of the Declaration the leadership of the CPSU insisted on the inclusion of the erroneous views of the 20th Congress on peaceful transition. The original draft said not a word about non-peaceful transition, mentioning only peaceful transition; moreover, it described peaceful transition as "securing a majority in parliament and transforming parliament from an instrument of the bourgeois dictatorship into an instrument of a genuine people's state power". In fact, it substituted the "parliamentary road" advocated by the opportunists of the Second International for the road of the October Revolution and tampered with the basic Marxist-Leninist theory on the state and revolution.

The Chinese Communist Party resolutely opposed the wrong views contained in the draft declaration submitted by the leadership of the CPSU. We expressed our views on the two successive drafts put forward by the Central Committee of the CPSU and made a considerable number of major changes of principle which we presented as our own revised draft. Repeated discussions were then held between the delegations of the Chinese and Soviet Parties on the basis of our revised draft before the "Joint Draft Declaration by the CPSU and the CPC" was submitted to the delegations of the other fraternal Parties for their opinions.

As a result of the common efforts of the delegations of the CPC and the other fraternal Parties, the Meeting finally adopted the present version of the Declaration, which contains two major changes on the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism compared with the first draft put forward by the leadership of the CPSU. First, while indicating the possibility of peaceful transition, the Declaration also points to the road of non-peaceful transition and stresses that "Leninism teaches,

and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily". Secondly, while speaking of securing "a firm majority in parliament", the Declaration emphasizes the need to "launch an extra-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realization of the socialist revolution".

Despite these changes, the formulation in the Declaration on the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism was still unsatisfactory. We finally conceded the point only out of consideration for the repeatedly expressed wish of the leaders of the CPSU that the formulation should show some connection with that of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

However, we presented the Central Committee of the CPSU with an outline of our views on the question of peaceful transition in which the views of the CPC were explained comprehensively and clearly. The outline emphasizes the following:

> "In the present situation of the international communist movement, it is advantageous from the point of view of tactics to refer to the desire for peaceful transition. But it would be inappropriate to over-emphasize the possibility of peaceful transition."
>
> "They [the proletariat and the Communist Party] must be prepared at all times to repulse counter-revolutionary attacks and, at the critical juncture of the revolution when the working class is seizing state power, to overthrow the bourgeoisie by armed force if it uses armed force to suppress the people's revolution (generally speaking, it is inevitable that the bourgeoisie will do so)."
>
> "To obtain a majority in parliament is not the same as smashing the old state machinery (chiefly the armed forces) and establishing new state machinery (chiefly the armed forces). Unless the military-bureaucratic state machinery of the bourgeoisie is smashed, a parliamentary majority for the proletariat and their reliable allies will either be impossible . . . or undependable. . . ." (See Appendix I.)

As a result of the common efforts of the delegations of the CPC and the other fraternal Parties, the 1957 Declaration also corrected the erroneous views which the CPSU leadership had put forward at the 20th Congress on such questions as imperialism and war and peace, and it added many important points on a number of questions of principle. The main additions were the thesis that U.S. imperialism is the *center* of world reaction and the sworn enemy of the people, the thesis that if imperialism should unleash a world war it would doom itself to destruction, the common laws governing the socialist revolution and the building of socialism; the principle of combining the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution and construction in different countries, the formulation on the importance of applying dialectical materialism in practical work, the thesis that the seizure of political power by the working class is the beginning of the revolution and not its end; the thesis that it will take a fairly long time to solve the question of who

will win — capitalism or socialism, the thesis that the existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source; and so on.

At the same time, the delegation of the CPC made some necessary compromises. In addition to the formulation on the question of peaceful transition, we did not agree with the reference to the 20th Congress of the CPSU and suggested changes. But out of consideration for the difficult position of the leadership of the CPSU at the time, we did not insist on the changes.

Who could have imagined that these concessions which we made out of consideration for the larger interest would later be used by the leadership of the CPSU as an excuse for aggravating differences and creating a split in the international communist movement ?

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU constantly equates the resolution of the 20th Congress of the CPSU with the Declaration of 1957 in its attempt to substitute the wrong line of the 20th Congress for the common line of the international communist movement. We have pointed out long ago and now deem it necessary to reiterate, that in accordance with the principle that all fraternal Parties are independent and equal, no one is entitled to demand of fraternal Parties that they accept the resolutions of the Congress of one Party or for that matter anything else; and the resolutions of a Party Congress, whatever the Party, cannot be regarded as the common line of the international communist movement and have no binding force on other fraternal Parties. Only Marxism-Leninism and the documents unanimously agreed upon constitute the common code binding us and all fraternal Parties.

The Growth of The Revisionism of The CPSU Leadership

After the Moscow Meeting of 1957 with its unanimously agreed Declaration, we hoped that the leadership of the CPSU would follow the line laid down in the Declaration and correct its errors. We regret to say that contrary to the expectations we and all other Marxist-Leninist fraternal Parties entertained, the leadership of the CPSU perpetrated increasingly serious violations of the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries, and departed farther and farther from the path of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The revisionism of the leadership of the CPSU grew. This development aggravated the differences in the international communist movement and carried them to a new stage.

In complete disregard of the common conclusion of the 1957 Declaration that U.S. imperialism is the enemy of all the people of the world, the leadership of the CPSU passionately sought collaboration with U.S. imperialism and the settlement of world problems by the heads of the Soviet Union and the United States. Particularly around the time of the Camp David Talks in September 1959, Khrushchev lauded Eisenhower to the skies, hailing him as a man who “enjoys the absolute confidence of his people” and who “also worries about ensuring peace just as we do”. Moreover, comrades of the CPSU energetically advertised the so-called “spirit of Camp David”, whose existence

Eisenhower himself denied, alleging that it marked "a new era in international relations" and "a turning point in history".

Completely disregarding the revolutionary line of the 1957 Declaration, in statements by Khrushchev and in the Soviet press the leaders of the CPSU vigorously advocated their revisionist line of "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition", praised the "wisdom" and "goodwill" of the imperialists, preached that "a world without weapons without armed forces and without wars" could be brought into being while the greater part of the globe was still ruled and controlled by imperialism, that universal and complete disarmament could "open up literally a new epoch in the economic development of Asia, Africa and Latin America", etc., etc.

The CPSU published many books and articles in which it tampered with the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism, emasculated their revolutionary spirit and propagated its revisionist views on a whole series of important problems of principle in the fields of philosophy, political economy, socialist and communist theory, history, literature and art.

The leadership of the CPSU actively endeavored to impose its erroneous views on the international democratic organizations and to change their correct lines. An outstanding case in point was the behavior of the Soviet comrades at the Peking session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions in June 1960.

Completely disregarding the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries which were laid down in the 1957 Declaration, the leaders of the CPSU, eager to curry *favor* with U.S. imperialism, engaged in unbridled activities against China. They regarded the Chinese Communist Party, which adheres to Marxism-Leninism, as an obstacle to their revisionist line. They thought they had solved their internal problems and had "stabilized" their own position and could therefore step up their policy of "being friendly to enemies and tough with friends".

In 1958 the leadership of the CPSU put forward unreasonable demands designed to bring China under Soviet military control. These unreasonable demands were rightly and firmly rejected by the Chinese Government. Not long afterwards, in June 1959, the Soviet Government unilaterally tore up the agreement on new technology for national Defense concluded between China and the Soviet Union in October 1957, and refused to provide China with a sample of an atomic bomb and technical data concerning its manufacture.

Then, on the eve of Khrushchev's visit to the United States, ignoring China's repeated objections the leadership of the CPSU rushed out the TASS statement of September 9 on the Sino-Indian border incident, siding with the Indian reactionaries. In this way, the leadership of the CPSU brought the differences between China and the Soviet Union right into the open before the whole world.

The tearing up of the agreement on new technology for national Defense by the leadership of the CPSU and its issuance of the statement on the Sino-Indian border clash on the eve of

Khrushchev's visit to the United States were presentation gifts to Eisenhower so as to curry *favor* with the U.S. imperialists and create the so-called "spirit of Camp David".

The leaders of the CPSU and Soviet publications also levelled many virulent attacks on the domestic and foreign policies of the Chinese Communist Party. These attacks were almost invariably led by Khrushchev himself. He insinuated that China's socialist construction was "skipping over a stage" and was "equalitarian communism" and that China's People's Communes were "in essence reactionary". By innuendo he maligned China as warlike, guilty of "adventurism", and so on and so forth. Back from the Camp David Talks, he went so far as to try to sell China the U.S. plot of "two Chinas" and, at the state banquet celebrating the Tenth Anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, he read China a lecture against "testing by force the stability of the capitalist system".

The line of revisionism and splittism pursued by the leadership of the CPSU created serious confusion in the ranks of the international communist movement. It seemed as though U.S. imperialism had ceased to be the most ferocious enemy of the people of the world. Eisenhower was welcomed by certain Communists as a "peace envoy". Marxism-Leninism and the Declaration of 1957 seemed to be outmoded.

In the circumstances, in order to defend Marxism-Leninism and the 1957 Declaration and clear up the ideological confusion in the international communist movement, the Communist Party of China published "Long Live Leninism!" and two other articles in April 1960. Keeping to our consistent stand of persevering in principle and upholding unity, we concentrated on explaining the revolutionary theses of the 1957 Declaration and the fundamental Marxist-Leninist theories on imperialism, war and peace, proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The views in these three articles were totally different from the series of erroneous views that were being propagated by the leaders of the CPSU. However, for the sake of the larger interest, we refrained from publicly criticizing the comrades of the CPSU and directed the spearhead of struggle against the imperialists and the Yugoslav revisionists.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU spends much energy distorting and attacking "Long Live Leninism!" and the two other articles, but is unable to support its attacks with any convincing arguments. We should like to put this question: In those circumstances, should we have kept silent on the wrong views and absurd arguments which had become current? Did we not have the right, and indeed the duty, to come forward in Defense of Marxism-Leninism and the Declaration of 1957?

The Surprise Assault on the CPC by the Leadership of the CPSU

A week after the publication of "Long Live Leninism!" and our two other articles, an American U-2 plane intruded into Soviet air space and the United States aborted the four-power summit

conference. The "spirit of Camp David" completely vanished. Thus, events entirely confirmed our views.

In face of the arch enemy, it was imperative for the Communist Parties of China and the Soviet Union and the fraternal Parties of the whole world to eliminate their differences, strengthen their unity and wage a common struggle against the enemy. But that was not what happened. In the summer of 1960, there was a widening of the differences in the international communist movement, a large-scale campaign was launched against the Chinese Communist Party, and the leadership of the CPSU extended the ideological differences between the Chinese and Soviet Parties to the sphere of state relations.

In early June 1960 the Central Committee of the CPSU made the proposal that the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party to be held in Bucharest later in June, should be taken as an opportunity for representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of all the socialist countries to meet and exchange views on the international situation following the miscarriage of the four-power summit conference caused by the United States. The Chinese Communist Party did not approve of this idea of a hasty meeting nor of the idea of a representative meeting of the Parties of the socialist countries alone. We made the positive proposal that there should be a meeting of representatives of all the Communist and Workers' Parties of the world and maintained that adequate preparations were necessary to make that meeting a success. Our proposal was agreed to by the CPSU. The two Parties thereupon agreed that, in preparation for the international meeting, the representatives of the fraternal Parties attending the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party could provisionally exchange views on the date and place for the meeting, but not take any decision.

At Bucharest, to our amazement, the leaders of the CPSU went back on their word and unleashed a surprise assault on the Chinese Communist Party, turning the spearhead of struggle against us and not against U.S. imperialism.

The Bucharest meeting of representatives of fraternal Parties took place from June 24 to June 26. It is a plain lie for the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to describe that meeting as "comradely assistance" to the Chinese Communist Party.

Indeed, on the eve of the meeting, the Delegation of the CPSU headed by Khrushchev distributed among the representatives of some fraternal Parties, and read out to those of others, a Letter of Information dated June 21 from the Central Committee of the CPSU to the Central Committee of the CPC. This Letter of Information groundlessly slandered and attacked the CPC all along the line; it constituted a programme for the anti-China campaign which was launched by the leadership of the CPSU.

In the meeting, Khrushchev took the lead in organizing a great converging onslaught on the Chinese Communist Party. In his speech, he wantonly vilified the Chinese Communist Party as "madmen", "wanting to unleash war", "picking up the banner of the imperialist monopoly

capitalists", being "pure nationalist" on the Sino-Indian boundary question and employing "Trotskyite ways" against the CPSU. Some of the fraternal Party representatives who obeyed Khrushchev and followed his lead also wantonly charged the CPC with being "dogmatic", "Left adventurist", "pseudo-revolutionary", "sectarian", "worse than Yugoslavia", and so on and so forth.

The anti-China campaign launched by Khrushchev at this meeting was also a surprise to many fraternal Parties. The representatives of a number of Marxist-Leninist fraternal Parties took exception to the wrong action of the leadership of the CPSU.

At this meeting, the delegation of the Albanian Party of Labor refused to obey the baton of the leaders of the CPSU and firmly opposed their sectarian activities. Consequently, the leaders of the CPSU regarded the Albanian Party of Labor as a thorn in their side. Whereupon they took increasingly drastic steps against the Albanian Party.

Can this dastardly attack on the CPC launched by the leadership of the CPSU be called "comradely assistance" ? Of course not. It was a pre-arranged anti-China performance staged by the leadership of the CPSU; it was a serious and crude violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties as laid down in the 1957 Declaration: it was a large-scale attack on a Marxist-Leninist party by the revisionists, represented by the leaders of the CPSU.

In the circumstances, the Communist Party of China waged a tit-for-tat struggle against the leadership of the CPSU in Defense of the positions of Marxism-Leninism and the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties as laid down in the Declaration. For the sake of the larger interest, the CPC Delegation in Bucharest signed the Communique on the meeting, and at the same time, on June 26, 1960 distributed a written statement upon the instructions of the Central Committee of the CPC. In this statement, the CPC Delegation pointed out that Khrushchev's behavior at the Bucharest meeting created an extremely bad precedent in the international communist movement. It solemnly declared:

> "There are differences between us and Comrade Khrushchev on a series of fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism." "The future of the international communist movement depends on the needs and the struggles of the people of all countries and on the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, and will never be decided by the baton of any individual." ". . . our Party believes in and obeys the truth of Marxism-Leninism and Marxism-Leninism alone, and will never submit to erroneous news which run counter to Marxism-Leninism." (See Appendix II.)

The leaders of the CPSU did not reconcile themselves to their failure to subdue the Chinese Communist Party in Bucharest. Immediately after the Bucharest meeting, they brought more pressure to bear on China by taking a series of steps to extend the ideological differences between the Chinese and Soviet Parties to the sphere of state relations.

In July the Soviet Government suddenly took a unilateral decision recalling all the Soviet experts in China within one month, thereby tearing up hundreds of agreements and contracts. The

Soviet side unilaterally scrapped the agreement on the publication of the magazine *Druzhba* (Friendship) by China in the Soviet Union and of *Su Chung You Hao* (Soviet-Chinese Friendship) by the Soviet Union in China and their distribution on reciprocal terms; it took the unwarranted step of demanding the recall by the Chinese Government of a staff member of the Chinese Embassy in the Soviet Union; and it provoked *troubles* on the Sino-Soviet border.

Apparently, the leaders of the CPSU imagined that once they waved their baton, gathered a group of hatchet-men to make a converging assault, and applied immense political and economic pressures, they could force the Chinese Communist Party to abandon its Marxist-Leninist and proletarian internationalist stand and submit to their revisionist and great-power chauvinist behests. But the tempered and long-tested Chinese Communist Party and Chinese people could neither be vanquished nor subdued. Those who tried to subjugate us by engineering a converging assault and applying pressures completely miscalculated.

We shall leave the details of the way the leadership of the CPSU sabotaged Sino-Soviet relations for other articles. Here we shall simply point out that on the subject of Sino-Soviet relations, the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU falsely charges China with extending the ideological differences to the sphere of state relations and with reducing trade between the two countries, while deliberately concealing the fact that the Soviet Government withdrew all its experts from China and unilaterally tore up hundreds of agreements and contracts, and that it was these unilateral Soviet actions which made Sino-Soviet trade shrink. For the leadership of the CPSU to deceive its members and the Soviet people in such a bare-faced way is truly sad.

The Struggle Between the Two Lines at the 1960 Meeting Fraternal Parties

In the latter half of 1960, a sharp struggle developed in the international communist movement around the meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties. It was a struggle between the line of Marxism-Leninism and the line of revisionism and between the policy of persevering in principle and upholding unity and the policy of abandoning principle and creating splits.

It had become evident before the meeting that the leadership of the CPSU was stubbornly persisting in its wrong stand and was endeavoring to impose its wrong line on the international communist movement.

The Chinese Communist Party was keenly aware of the gravity of the differences. In the interests of the international communist movement we made many efforts, hoping that the leadership of the CPSU would not proceed too far down the wrong path.

On September 10, 1960 the Central Committee of the CPC replied to the June 21 Letter of Information of the Central Committee of the CPSU. In its reply which set forth the facts and reasoned things out, the Central Committee of the CPC systematically explained its views on a series of important questions of principle concerning the world situation and the international communist movement, refuted the attacks of the leadership of the CPSU on us, criticized its wrong views and put

forward to the Central Committee of the CPSU five positive proposals for settling the differences and attaining unity. (For the five proposals, see Appendix III.)

The Central Committee of the CPC subsequently sent a delegation to Moscow in September for talks with the delegation of the CPSU. During these talks, the delegation of the CPC pointed out that, while prettifying U.S. imperialism, the leadership of the CPSU was actively vilifying China and extending the ideological differences between the two Parties to state relations, and was thus treating enemies as brothers and brothers as enemies. Again, and again the delegation of the CPC urged the leaders of the CPSU to change their wrong stand, return to the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries, and strengthen the unity between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and between the two countries in order to fight the common enemy. However, the leaders of the CPSU showed not the slightest intention of correcting their errors.

Thus, a sharp struggle became inevitable. This struggle first unfolded in the Drafting Committee, attended by the representatives of 26 fraternal Parties, which prepared the documents for the meeting of fraternal Parties, and later grew to unprecedented acuteness at the meeting of the representatives of 81 fraternal Parties.

In the meetings of the Drafting Committee in Moscow during October, the leaders of the CPSU attempted to force through their own draft statement, which contained a whole string of erroneous views. As a result of principled struggle by the delegations of the CPC and some other fraternal Parties, the Drafting Committee after heated debates made many important changes of principle in the draft statement put forward by the CPSU. The committee reached agreement on most of the draft. However, in their determination to continue the debate, the leadership of the CPSU refused to arrive at agreement on several important points at issue in the draft and, moreover, on Khrushchev's return from New York, even scrapped the agreements which had already been reached on some questions.

The meeting of the representatives of the 81 fraternal Parties was held in Moscow in November 1960. Ignoring the desire of the Chinese and many other delegations to eliminate the differences and strengthen unity, on the eve of the meeting the leadership of the CPSU distributed among the representatives of the fraternal Parties gathered in Moscow a letter of more than sixty thousand words, which attacked the Chinese Communist Party more savagely than ever, thus provoking still sharper controversy.

Such was the most unnatural atmosphere in which the meeting of the representatives of the 81 fraternal Parties was held. By their base conduct, the leaders of the CPSU brought the meeting to the brink of rupture. But the meeting finally reached agreement and achieved positive results, because the delegations of the Chinese Communist Party and some other fraternal Parties kept to principle, persevered in struggle and upheld unity, and because the majority of the delegations of the fraternal Parties demanded unity and were against a split.

In its Open Letter, the Central Committee of the CPSU declares that at this meeting the delegation of the CPC "signed the Statement only when the danger arose of its full isolation". This is another lie.

What was the actual state of affairs?

It is true that, both before and during the meeting, the leadership of the CPSU engineered converging assaults on the Chinese Communist Party by a number of representatives of fraternal Parties, and relying on a so-called majority endeavored to bring the delegations of the Chinese and other Marxist-Leninist Parties to their knees and compel them to accept its revisionist line and views. However, the attempts by the leaders of the CPSU to impose things on others met with failure, both in the Drafting Committee of the 26 fraternal Parties and in the meeting of the representatives of the 81 fraternal Parties.

The fact remains that many of the wrong theses they put forward in their draft statement were rejected. Here are some examples:

The wrong thesis of the leadership of the CPSU that peaceful coexistence and economic competition form the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries was rejected.

Its wrong thesis that the emergence of a new stage in the general crisis of capitalism is the result of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition was rejected.

Its wrong thesis that there is a growing possibility of peaceful transition was rejected.

Its wrong thesis about opposing the policy of "going it alone" on the part of the socialist countries, which in effect meant opposing the policy of their relying mainly on themselves in construction, was rejected.

Its wrong thesis concerning opposition to so-called "cliquish activities" and "factional activities" in the international communist movement was rejected. In effect this thesis meant demanding that fraternal Parties should obey its baton, liquidating the principles of independence and equality in relations among fraternal Parties, and replacing the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation by the practice of subduing the minority by the majority.

Its wrong thesis of under-estimating the serious danger of modern revisionism was rejected.

The fact remains that many correct views on important principles set forth by the delegations of the Chinese and other fraternal Parties were written into the Statement. The theses on the unaltered nature of imperialism; on U.S. imperialism as the enemy of the people of the whole world; on the formation of the most extensive united front against U.S. imperialism; on the national liberation movement as an important force in preventing world war; on the thoroughgoing completion by the newly-independent countries of their national democratic revolutions; on support by the socialist countries and the international working-class movement for the national liberation

struggle; on the need for the working class and the masses in certain advanced capitalist countries under U.S. imperialist political, economic and military domination to direct their chief blows at U.S. imperialist domination and also at the monopoly capital and other reactionary forces at home which betray their national interests; on the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation among fraternal Parties; against the revisionist emasculation of the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism; on the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia; and so on — all these theses are in the Statement as a result of the acceptance of the views of the Chinese and some other delegations.

It is, of course, necessary to add that after the leaders of the CPSU agreed to drop their erroneous propositions and accepted the correct propositions of other Parties, the delegations of the CPC and some other fraternal Parties also made certain concessions. For instance, we differed on the questions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and of the forms of transition from capitalism to socialism, but out of consideration for the needs of the CPSU and certain other fraternal Parties we agreed to the inclusion of the same wording on these two questions as that used in the 1957 Declaration. But we made it plain at the time to the leaders of the CPSU that this would be the last time we accommodated ourselves to such a formulation about the 20th Congress; we would never do so again.

From all the above it can be seen that the struggle between the two lines in the international communist movement dominated the 1960 Moscow Meeting from beginning to end. The errors of the leadership of the CPSU as revealed at this meeting had developed further. From the draft statement of the leaders of the CPSU and their speeches during the meeting, it could be clearly seen that the main political content of the wrong line they were attempting to impose on the fraternal Parties consisted of the erroneous theories of "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition", while its organizational content consisted of erroneous sectarian and splitting policies. It was a revisionist line in fundamental conflict with Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The delegations of the Chinese and other Marxist-Leninist parties resolutely opposed it and firmly upheld the line of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The outcome of the struggle at this meeting was that the revisionist line and views of the leadership of the CPSU were in the main repudiated and that the Marxist-Leninist line gained a great victory. The revolutionary principles embodied in the Statement adopted at the meeting are powerful weapons in the hands of all fraternal Parties in the struggles against imperialism and for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism; they are also powerful weapons in the hands of Marxist-Leninists throughout the world in combating modern revisionism.

At the meeting the fraternal Parties which upheld Marxism-Leninism earnestly criticized the erroneous views of the leadership of the CPSU and compelled it to accept many of their correct views; in doing so they changed the previous highly abnormal situation, in which not even the

slightest criticism of the errors of the leadership of the CPSU was tolerated and its word was final. This was an event of great historical significance in the international communist movement.

The Central Committee of the CPSU asserts in its Open Letter that the delegation of the CPC was "completely isolated" at the meeting. This is merely an impudent attempt on the part of the leadership of the CPSU to represent its defeat as a victory.

The principles of mutual solidarity as well as independence and equality among fraternal Parties and of reaching unanimity through consultation were observed at the meeting and the mistaken attempt of the leaders of the CPSU to use a majority to overrule the minority and to impose their views on other fraternal Parties was frustrated. The meeting demonstrated once again that in resolving differences among fraternal Parties it is highly necessary for Marxist-Leninist parties to stick to principle, persevere in struggle and uphold unity.

The Revisionism of The CPSU Leadership Becomes Systematized

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU asserts that "the CPC leaders were only maneuvering when they affixed their signatures to the Statement of 1960".

Is that really a fact? No. On the contrary, it was the leaders of the CPSU and not we who were maneuvering.

The facts have shown that at the 1960 meeting the leaders of the CPSU agreed to delete or change the erroneous propositions in their draft statement against their will and they were insincere in their acceptance of the correct propositions of fraternal Parties. They did not care two hoots about the document which was jointly agreed upon by the fraternal Parties. The ink was scarcely dry on their signature to the 1960 Statement before they began wrecking it. On December 1 Khrushchev signed the Statement on behalf of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and twenty-four hours later, violating what the fraternal Parties had agreed on, the same Khrushchev brazenly described Yugoslavia as a socialist country at the banquet for the delegations of the fraternal Parties.

After the meeting of the 81 fraternal Parties, the leaders of the CPSU became more and more blatant in wrecking the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. On the one hand, they took as their friend U.S. imperialism which the Statement declares to be the enemy of the people of the world, advocating "U.S.-Soviet co-operation" and expressing the desire to work together with Kennedy to "set about building durable bridges of confidence, mutual understanding and friendship". On the other hand, they took some fraternal Parties and countries as their enemies and drastically worsened the Soviet Union's relations with Albania.

The 22nd Congress of the CPSU in October 1961 marked a new low in the CPSU leadership's efforts to oppose Marxism-Leninism and split the socialist camp and the international communist movement. It marked the systematization of the revisionism which the leadership of the CPSU had developed step by step from the 20th Congress onward.

The leadership of the CPSU unleashed a great public attack on the Albanian Party of Labor at the 22nd Congress. In his speech Khrushchev went so far as openly to call for the overthrow of the Albanian leadership under Comrades Enver Hoxha and Mehmet Shehu. Thus, the leadership of the CPSU established the vicious precedent of a Party congress being used for public attacks on other fraternal Parties.

Another great thing the leadership of the CPSU did at the Congress was the renewed concentrated onslaught on Stalin five years after the complete negation of him at the 20th Congress and eight years after his death.

In the final analysis, this was done in order that the leaders of the CPSU should be able to throw the Declaration and the Statement overboard, oppose Marxism-Leninism and pursue a systematically revisionist line.

Their revisionism was expressed in concentrated form in the new Programme of the CPSU which that Congress adopted.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU says that the line of the 22nd Congress was "approved at the meetings of representatives of the Communist Parties and reflected in the Declaration and Statement". Is it not very careless of the leaders of the CPSU to make such a statement? How can they describe what happened in 1961 as having been "approved" or "reflected" at the meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties in 1960, or as far back as that in 1957 ?

But leaving aside such silly self-commendation for the moment, let us first see the kind of stuff the Programme adopted at the 22nd Congress is made of.

Even a cursory study of the Programme and the report on it made by Khrushchev shows that it is an out-and-out revisionist programme which totally violates the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement.

It runs counter to the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement on many important questions of principle. Many of the erroneous views of the leadership of the CPSU which were rejected at the 1960 meeting of fraternal Parties reappear. For instance, it describes peaceful coexistence as the general principle of foreign policy, one-sidedly stresses the possibility of peaceful transition and slanders the policy of a socialist country's relying mainly on its own efforts in construction as "going it alone".

The Programme goes a step further in systematizing the wrong line pursued by the leadership of the CPSU since its 20th Congress the main content of which is "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition".

The Programme crudely revises the essence of Marxism-Leninism, namely, the teachings on proletarian revolution, on the dictatorship of the proletariat and on the party of the proletariat, declaring that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer needed in the Soviet Union and that the

nature of the CPSU as the vanguard of the proletariat has changed, and advancing preposterous theories of a "state of the whole people" and a "party of the entire people".

It substitutes humanism for the Marxist-Leninist theory of class struggle and substitutes the bourgeois slogans of "freedom", "equality" and "fraternity" for the ideals of communism.

It is a programme which opposes revolution on the part of the people still living under the imperialist and capitalist system, who comprise two-thirds of the world's population, and opposes the carrying of revolution through to completion on the part of the people already on the socialist road, who comprise one-third of the world's population. It is a revisionist programme for the preservation or restoration of capitalism.

The Communist Party of China resolutely opposed the errors of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. Comrade Chou En-lai, who headed the CPC delegation to the Congress, stated our Party's position in his speech there, and he also frankly criticized the errors of the leadership of the CPSU in subsequent conversations with Khrushchev and other leaders of the CPSU.

In his conversation with the delegation of the CPC, Khrushchev flatly turned down our criticisms and advice and even expressed undisguised support for anti-Party elements in the Chinese Communist Party. He openly stated that after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, when the leaders of the CPSU were beginning to take a "road different from that of Stalin" (that is, when they were beginning to take the road of revisionism), they still needed the support of the fraternal Parties. He said, "The voice of the Chinese Communist Party was then of great significance to us", but "things are different now", and "we are doing well" and "we shall go our own way".

Khrushchev's remarks showed that the leaders of the CPSU had made up their minds to go all the way down the road of revisionism and splitting. Although the Chinese Communist Party has frequently given them comradely advice, they have simply ignored it and shown not the slightest intention of mending their ways.

An Adverse Current That Is Opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Is Splitting the International Communist Movement

In the Open Letter the leaders of the CPSU try hard to make people believe that after the 22nd Congress they "undertook new attempts" to improve relations between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and to strengthen unity among the fraternal Parties and countries.

This is another lie.

What are the facts?

They show that since the 22nd Congress the leadership of the CPSU has become more unbridled in violating the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries and in pursuing policies of great-power chauvinism, sectarianism and splittism in order to promote its own

line of systematic revisionism, which is in complete violation of Marxism-Leninism. This has brought about a continuous deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations and grave damage to the unity of the fraternal Parties and countries.

The following are the main facts about how the leaders of the CPSU have sabotaged Sino-Soviet unity and the unity of fraternal Parties and countries since the 22nd Congress:

1. The leaders of the CPSU have tried hard to impose their erroneous line upon the international communist movement and to replace the Declaration and the Statement with their own revisionist programme. They describe their erroneous line as the "whole set of Leninist policies of the international communist movement of recent years", and they call their revisionist programme the "real Communist Manifesto of our time" and the "common programme" of the "Communist and Workers' Parties and of the people of countries of the socialist community".

Any fraternal Party which rejects the erroneous line and programme of the CPSU and perseveres in the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement is looked upon as an enemy by the leaders of the CPSU, who oppose, attack and injure it and try to subvert its leadership by every possible means.

2. Disregarding everything, the leadership of the CPSU broke off diplomatic relations with socialist Albania, an unprecedented step in the history of relations between fraternal Parties and countries.

3. The leadership of the CPSU has continued to exert pressure on China and to make outrageous attacks on the Chinese Communist Party. In its letter of February 22, 1962 to the Central Committee of the CPC, the Central Committee of the CPSU accused the CPC of taking a "special stand of their own" and pursuing a line at variance with the common course of the fraternal Parties, and even made a crime out of our support for the Marxist-Leninist Albanian Party of Labor. As pre-conditions for improving Sino-Soviet relations, the leaders of the CPSU attempted to compel the CPC to abandon its Marxist-Leninist and proletarian internationalist stand, abandon its consistent line, which is in full conformity with the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement, accept their erroneous line, and also accept as a *fait accompli* their violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries. In its Open Letter, the Central Committee of the CPSU boasted of its letters to the Central Committee of the CPC during this period, of Khrushchev's remarks about his desire for unity in October 1962 to our Ambassador to the Soviet Union and so on, but in fact these were all acts for realizing their base attempt.

4. The Central Committee of the CPSU rejected the proposal made by the fraternal Parties of Indonesia, Vietnam, New Zealand, etc., that a meeting of representatives of the fraternal Parties should be convened, as well as the five positive proposals made by the Central Committee of the CPC in its letter of April 7, 1962 to the Central Committee of the CPSU for the preparation for the meeting of fraternal Parties. In its reply of May 30, 1962 to the Central Committee of the CPC, the Central

Committee of the CPSU went so far as to make the demand that the Albanian comrades abandon their own stand as a pre-condition for improving Soviet-Albanian relations and also for convening a meeting of the fraternal Parties.

5. In April and May 1962, the leaders of the CPSU used their organs and personnel in Sinkiang, China, to carry out large-scale subversive activities in the Ili region and enticed and coerced several tens of thousands of Chinese citizens into going to the Soviet Union. The Chinese Government lodged repeated protests and made repeated representations, but the Soviet Government refused to repatriate these Chinese citizens on the pretext of "the sense of Soviet legality" and "humanitarianism". To this day this incident remains unsettled. This is indeed an astounding event, unheard of in the relations between socialist countries.

6. In August 1962 the Soviet Government formally notified China that the Soviet Union would conclude an agreement with the United States on the prevention of nuclear proliferation. This was a joint Soviet-U.S. plot to monopolize nuclear weapons and an attempt to deprive China of the right to possess nuclear weapons to resist the U.S. nuclear threat. The Chinese Government lodged repeated protests against this.

7. The leadership of the CPSU has become increasingly anxious to strike political bargains with U.S. imperialism and has been bent on forming a reactionary alliance with Kennedy, even at the expense of the interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. An outstanding example was the fact that, during the Caribbean crisis, the leadership of the CPSU committed the error of capitulationism by submitting to the nuclear blackmail of the U.S. imperialists and accepting the U.S. government's demand for "international inspection" in violation of Cuban sovereignty.

8. The leadership of the CPSU has become increasingly anxious to collude with the Indian reactionaries and has been bent on forming a reactionary alliance with Nehru against socialist China. The leadership of the CPSU and its press openly sided with Indian reaction, condemned China for its just stand on the Sino-Indian border conflict and defended the Nehru government. Two-thirds of Soviet economic aid to India have been given since the Indian reactionaries provoked the Sino-Indian border conflict. Even after large-scale armed conflict on the Sino-Indian border began in the autumn of 1962, the leadership of the CPSU has continued to extend military aid to the Indian reactionaries.

9. The leadership of the CPSU has become increasingly anxious to collude with the Tito clique of Yugoslavia and has been bent on forming a reactionary alliance with the renegade Tito to oppose all Marxist-Leninist parties. After the 22nd Congress, it took a series of steps which to reverse the verdict on the Tito clique and thus openly tore up the 1960 Statement.

10. Since November 1962 the leadership of the CPSU has launched still fiercer attacks, on an international scale, against the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist Parties and whipped up a new adverse current in order to split the socialist camp and the international

communist movement. Khrushchev made one statement after another and the Soviet press carried hundreds of articles attacking the Chinese Communist Party on a whole set of issues. Directed by the leaders of the CPSU, the Congresses of the fraternal Parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Italy and the Democratic Republic of Germany became stages for anti-China performances. and more than forty fraternal Parties published resolutions, statements or articles attacking the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist Parties.

The facts cited above cannot possibly be denied by the leaders of the CPSU. These iron-clad facts prove that the "new attempts" they made after the 22nd Congress of the CPSU were aimed, not at improving Sino-Soviet relations and strengthening unity between the fraternal Parties and countries, but on the contrary, at further ganging up with the U.S. imperialists, the Indian reactionaries and the renegade Tito clique in order to create a wider split in the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

In these grave circumstances, the Chinese Communist Party had no alternative but to make open replies to the attacks of some fraternal Parties. Between December 15, 1962 and March 8, 1963, we published seven such replies. In these articles we continued to leave some leeway and did not criticize the leadership of the CPSU by name.

Despite the serious deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations resulting from the errors of the leadership of the CPSU, the Chinese Communist Party agreed to send its delegation to Moscow for the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties, and, in order that there might be a systematic exchange of views in the talks, put forward its proposal concerning the general line of the international communist movement in its letter of reply to the Central Committee of the CPSU dated June 14.

As subsequent facts have shown, the leaders of the CPSU were not only insincere about eliminating differences and strengthening unity, but used the talks as a smokescreen for covering up their activities to further worsen Sino-Soviet relations.

On the eve of the talks, the leaders of the CPSU publicly attacked the Chinese Communist Party by name, through statements and resolutions. At the same time, they unjustifiably expelled a number of Chinese Embassy personnel and research students from the Soviet Union.

On July 14, that is, on the eve of the U.S.-British-Soviet talks, while the Sino-Soviet talks were still in progress, the leadership of the CPSU hastily published the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to Party Organizations and All Communists in the Soviet Union and launched unbridled attacks on the Chinese Communist Party.

This was another precious presentation gift made by the leaders of the CPSU to the U.S. imperialists in order to curry *favor* with them.

Immediately afterwards in Moscow, the leadership of the CPSU signed the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests with the United States and Britain in open betrayal of the interests of the Soviet people, the people in the socialist camp including the Chinese people, and the peace-loving people of the world; there was a flurry of contacts between the Soviet Union and India; Khrushchev went to Yugoslavia for a "vacation"; the Soviet press launched a frenzied anti-China campaign; and so on and so forth. This whole train of events strikingly demonstrates that, disregarding everything, the leadership of the CPSU is allying with the imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the renegade Tito clique in order to oppose fraternal socialist countries and fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties. All this completely exposes the revisionist and splitting line which the leadership of the CPSU is following.

At present, the "anti-China chorus" of the imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the revisionists is making a lot of noise. And the campaign led by Khrushchev to oppose Marxism-Leninism and split the socialist camp and the international communist ranks is being carried on with growing intensity.

What Have the Facts of The Past Seven Years Demonstrated?

In the foregoing we have reviewed at some length the origin and development of the differences. Our aim is to clarify the facts which were distorted in the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU and to help our Party members and our people and also the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people of the world to see the truth.

The facts of the past seven years have amply proved that the differences between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and within the international communist movement have arisen solely because the leadership of the CPSU has departed from Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement and pursued a revisionist and splitting line in leadership of the CPSU that has harmed the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

It is not just today that the Chinese Communists have begun to discover the errors of the CPSU leadership. Ever since the 20th Congress of the CPSU, we have watched with concern as the CPSU leadership took the road of revisionism.

Confronted with this grave situation, our Party has scores of times and for a long period considered: what should we do?

We asked ourselves, should we follow the CPSU leadership and suit all our actions to its wishes? In that case, the leadership of the CPSU would of course rejoice, but would not we ourselves then turn into revisionists?

We also asked ourselves, should we keep silent about the errors of the CPSU leadership? We believed that the errors of the CPSU leadership were not just accidental, individual and minor errors, but rather a whole series of errors of principle, which endanger the interests of the entire socialist

camp and international communist movement. As a member in the ranks of the international communist movement, how could we be indifferent and keep silent about these errors? If we should do that, would not we be abandoning our duty to defend Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism?

We foresaw that if we criticized the errors of the leaders of the CPSU, they would certainly strike at us vindictively and thus inevitably cause serious damage to China's socialist construction. But should Communists take a stand of national egoism and not dare to uphold truth for fear of vindictive blows? Should Communists barter away principles?

We took into consideration the fact that the CPSU was built by Lenin, that it is the Party of the first socialist state, and that it enjoyed high prestige in the international communist movement and among the people of the whole world. Therefore, over a considerable period of time, we were particularly careful and patient in criticizing the leaders of the CPSU, trying our best to confine such criticism to inter-Party talks between the leaders of the Chinese and Soviet Parties and to solve the differences through internal discussions without resorting to open polemics.

But all the comradely criticism and advice given to the leaders of the CPSU by responsible comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC in scores of inter-Party talks did not succeed in enabling them to return to the correct path. The CPSU leaders went farther and farther down the road of revisionism and splittism. In return for the advice we gave in goodwill, they applied a succession of political, economic and military pressures against us and launched attacks which became increasingly violent.

The CPSU leaders have a bad habit: they indiscriminately stick labels on anyone who criticizes them.

They say, "You are anti-Soviet!" No, friends! The label "anti-Soviet" cannot be stuck on us. Our criticism of your errors is precisely for the sake of defending the great CPSU and the great Soviet Union and preventing the prestige of the CPSU and the Soviet Union from being badly damaged by you. To put it plainly, it is you, and not we, who are really anti-Soviet and who are defaming and discrediting the CPSU and the Soviet Union. Ever since the complete negation of Stalin at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, you have committed innumerable foul deeds. Not all the water in the Volga can wash away the great shame you have brought upon the CPSU and upon the Soviet Union.

They say, "You are trying to seize the leadership!" No, friends! It is not at all clever of you to make this slander. The way you put it, it would seem that some people are contending with you for some such thing as "the leadership". Is this not tantamount to shamelessly claiming that some sort of "leadership" exists in the international communist movement and that you have this "leadership" ? It is a very, very bad habit of yours thus to put on the airs of a patriarchal party. It is entirely illegitimate. The 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement clearly state that all Communist Parties are independent and equal. According to this principle, the relations among fraternal Parties should

under no circumstances be like the relations between a leading Party and the led, and much less like the relations between a patriarchal father and his son. We have always opposed any one Party commanding other fraternal Parties, and it has never occurred to us that we ourselves should command other fraternal Parties, and so the question of contending for leadership simply does not arise. What confronts the international communist movement now is not whether this or that Party should assume leadership, but whether to respond to the baton of revisionism or to uphold the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement and persevere in the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism. Our criticism of the leadership of the CPSU concerns its attempt to lord it over fraternal Parties and to impose its line of revisionism and splittism on them. What we desire is merely the independent and equal status of the fraternal Parties stipulated in the Declaration and the Statement and their unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

It is the leaders of the CPSU who have provoked and extended the present great debate in the international communist movement and forced it on us. Since they have levelled large-scale attacks and all kinds of unscrupulous slanders against us, and since they have openly betrayed Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and torn up the Declaration and the Statement, they cannot expect us to abstain from replying, from refuting their slanders, from safeguarding the Declaration and the Statement and from defending Marxism-Leninism. The debate is on, and right and wrong must be thoroughly clarified.

We Chinese Communists persevere in principle and uphold unity; we did so in the past, we do so now and we shall continue to do so in the future. While engaging in polemics with the leaders of the CPSU, we still hope they will realize that they have taken a most dangerous road by abandoning revolution, abandoning the revolutionary people of the world, abandoning the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement and eagerly collaborating with the U.S. imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the renegade Tito clique.

The interests of the Chinese and Soviet peoples, of the socialist camp, of the international communist movement, and of the people throughout the world demand that all Communist and Workers' Parties should become united and oppose the common enemy.

We hereby appeal once again to the leadership of the CPSU to correct its errors and return to the path of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the path of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 statement.

The international communist movement is going through an important period. The present debate has a vital bearing on the future of the proletarian world revolution and the destiny of mankind. As history will prove, after this great debate Marxism-Leninism will shine forth more brilliantly and the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat and the people of the world will win still greater victories.

Appendix I: Outline Of Views on The Question of Peaceful Transition

November 10, 1957

I. On the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism, it would be more flexible to refer to the two possibilities, peaceful transition and non-peaceful transition, than to just one, and this would place us in a position where we can have the initiative politically at any time.

1. Referring to the possibility of peaceful transition indicates that for us the use of violence is primarily a matter of self-Defense. It enables the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries to sidestep attacks on them on this issue, and it is politically advantageous — advantageous for winning the masses and also for depriving the bourgeoisie of its pretexts for such attacks and isolating it.

2. If practical possibilities for peaceful transition were to arise in individual countries in the future when the international or domestic situation changes drastically, we could then make timely use of the opportunity to win the support of the masses and solve the problem of state power by peaceful means.

3. Nevertheless, we should not tie our own hands because of this desire. The bourgeoisie will not step down from the stage of history voluntarily. This is a universal law of class struggle. In no country should the proletariat and the Communist Party slacken their preparations for the revolution in any way. They must be prepared at all times to repulse counter-revolutionary attacks and, at the critical juncture of the revolution when the working class is seizing state power, to overthrow the bourgeoisie by armed force if it uses armed force to suppress the people's revolution (generally speaking, it is inevitable that the bourgeoisie will do so).

II. In the present situation of the international communist movement, it is advantageous from the point of view of tactics to refer to the desire for peaceful transition. But it would be inappropriate to over-emphasize the possibility of peaceful transition. The reasons are:

1. Possibility and reality, the desire and whether or not it can be fulfilled, are two different matters. We should refer to the desire for peaceful transition, but we should not place our hopes mainly on it and therefore should not over-emphasize this aspect.

2. If too much stress is laid on the possibility of peaceful transition, and especially on the possibility of seizing state power by winning a majority in parliament it is liable to weaken the revolutionary will of the proletariat, the working people and the Communist Party and disarm them ideologically.

3. To the best of our knowledge, there is still not a single country where this possibility is of any practical significance. Even if it is slightly more apparent in a particular country, over-emphasizing this possibility is inappropriate because it does not conform with the realities in the overwhelming majority of countries. Should such a possibility actually occur in some country, the

Communist Party there must on the one hand strive to realize it, and on the other hand always be prepared to repulse the armed attacks of the bourgeoisie.

4. The result of emphasizing this possibility will neither weaken the reactionary nature of the bourgeoisie nor lull them.

5. Nor will such emphasis make the social democratic parties any more revolutionary.

6. Nor will such emphasis make Communist Parties grow any stronger. On the contrary, if some Communist Parties should as a result obscure their revolutionary features and thus become confused with the social democratic parties in the eyes of the people, they would only be weakened.

7. It is very hard to gather forces and prepare for the revolution, and after all parliamentary struggle is easy in comparison. We must fully utilize the parliamentary form of struggle, but its role is limited. What is most important is to proceed with the hard work of gathering the revolutionary forces.

III. To obtain a majority in parliament is not the same as smashing the old state machinery (chiefly the armed forces) and establishing new state machinery (chiefly the armed forces). Unless the military-bureaucratic state machinery of the bourgeoisie is smashed, a parliamentary majority for the proletariat and their reliable allies will either be impossible (because the bourgeoisie will amend the constitution whenever necessary in order to facilitate the consolidation of their dictatorship) or undependable (for instance, elections may be declared null and void, the Communist Party may be outlawed, parliament may be dissolved, etc.).

IV. Peaceful transition to socialism should not be interpreted in such a way as solely to mean transition through a parliamentary majority. The main question is that of the state machinery. In the 1870's, Marx was of the opinion that there was a possibility of achieving socialism in Britain by peaceful means, because "at that time England was a country in which militarism and bureaucracy were less pronounced than in any other". For a period after the February Revolution, Lenin hoped that through "all power to the Soviets" the revolution would develop peacefully and triumph, because at that time "the arms were in the hands of the people". Neither Marx nor Lenin meant that peaceful transition could be realized by using the old state machinery. Lenin repeatedly elaborated on the famous saying of Marx and Engels, "The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes."

V. The social democratic parties are not parties of socialism. With the exception of certain Left wings, they are parties serving the bourgeoisie and capitalism. They are a variant of bourgeois political parties. On the question of socialist revolution, our position is fundamentally different from that of the social democratic parties. This distinction must not be obscured. To obscure this distinction only helps the leaders of the social democratic parties to deceive the masses and hinders us from winning the masses away from the influence of the social democratic parties. However, it is

unquestionably very important to strengthen our work with respect to the social democratic parties and strive to establish a united front with their left and middle groups.

VI. Such is our understanding of this question. We do hold differing views on this question, but out of various considerations we did not state our views after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Since a joint Declaration is to be issued, we must now explain our views. However, this need not prevent us from attaining common language in the draft Declaration. In order to show a connection between the formulation of this question in the draft Declaration and the formulation of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we agree to take the draft put forward today by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a basis, while proposing amendments in certain places.

Appendix II Statement of The Delegation of The Communist Party of China at The Bucharest Meeting of Fraternal Parties

June 26, 1960

(1) The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China maintains that at this meeting Comrade Khrushchev of the Delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has completely violated the long-standing principle in the international communist movement that questions of common concern should be settled by consultation among fraternal Parties, and has completely broken the agreement made prior to the meeting to confine it to an exchange of views and not to make any decision; this he has done by his surprise attack of putting forward a draft communique of the meeting without having consulted the fraternal Parties on its contents beforehand and without permitting full and normal discussion in the meeting. This is an abuse of the prestige enjoyed by the CPSU in the international communist movement, a prestige which has been built up over the long years since Lenin's time, and it is, moreover, an extremely crude act of imposing one's own will on other people. This attitude has nothing in common with Lenin's style of work and this way of doing things creates an extremely bad precedent in the international communist movement. The Central Committee of the CPC considers that this attitude and this way of doing things on the part of Comrade Khrushchev will have extraordinarily grave consequences for the international communist movement.

(2) The Communist Party of China has always been faithful to Marxism-Leninism and has always steadfastly adhered to the theoretical positions of Marxism-Leninism. In the past two years and more, it has been completely faithful to the Moscow Declaration of 1957, and has firmly upheld all the Marxist-Leninist theses of the Declaration. There are differences between us and Comrade Khrushchev on a series of fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. These differences have a vital bearing on the interests of the entire socialist camp, on the interests of the proletariat and the working people of the whole world, on the question of whether the people of all countries will be able to preserve world peace and prevent the imperialists from launching a world war, and on the question of whether socialism will continue to score victories in the capitalist world, which comprises

two-thirds of the world's population and three-fourths of its land space. All Marxist-Leninists should adopt a serious attitude towards these differences, give them serious thought and hold comradely discussions, so as to achieve unanimous conclusions. However, the attitude Comrade Khrushchev has adopted is patriarchal, arbitrary and tyrannical. He has in fact treated the relationship between the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union and our Party not as one between brothers, but as one between patriarchal father and son. At this meeting he has exerted pressure in an attempt to make our Party submit to his non-Marxist-Leninist views. We hereby solemnly declare that our Party believes in and obeys the truth of Marxism-Leninism and Marxism-Leninism alone, and will never submit to erroneous views which run counter to Marxism-Leninism. We consider that certain views expressed by Comrade Khrushchev in his speech at the Third Congress of the Rumanian Party are erroneous and in contravention of the Moscow Declaration. His speech will be welcomed by the imperialists and the Tito clique and has indeed already been welcomed by them. When the occasion arises, we shall be ready to carry on serious discussions with the CPSU and other fraternal Parties on our differences with Comrade Khrushchev. As for the Letter of Information of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Communist Party of China, which Comrade Khrushchev has distributed in Bucharest, the Central Committee of the CPC will reply to it in detail after carefully studying it; the reply will explain the differences of principle between the two Parties, setting forth the relevant facts, and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China will hold serious, earnest and comradely discussions with fraternal Parties. We are convinced that in any case the truth of Marxism-Leninism will triumph in the end. Truth does not fear contention. Ultimately, it is impossible to portray truth as error or error as truth. The future of the international communist movement depends on the needs and the struggles of the people of all countries and on the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, and will never be decided by the baton of any individual.

(3) We, the Communist Party of China, have always striven to safeguard the unity of all Communist Parties and the unity of all socialist countries. For the sake of genuine unity in the international communist ranks and for the sake of the common struggle against imperialism and reaction, we hold that it is necessary to unfold normal discussions on the differences and that serious questions of principle should not be settled in a hurry by abnormal methods or simply by vote. Nor should one impose on others arbitrary views which have not been tested in practice or which have already proved to be wrong in such tests. Comrade Khrushchev's way of doing things at this meeting is entirely detrimental to the unity of international communism. But however Comrade Khrushchev may act, the unity of the Chinese and Soviet Parties and the unity of all the Communist and Workers' Parties is bound to be further strengthened and developed. We are deeply convinced that, as the international communist movement and Marxism-Leninism develop, the unity of our ranks will constantly grow stronger.

(4) If the relations between our two Parties are viewed as a whole, the above-mentioned differences between Comrade Khrushchev and ourselves are only of a partial character. We hold that the main thing in the relations between our two Parties is their unity in the struggle for the common

cause; this is so because both our countries are socialist countries and both our Parties are built on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and are fighting to advance the cause of the whole socialist camp, to oppose imperialist aggression and to win world peace. We believe that Comrade Khrushchev and the Central Committee of the CPSU and we ourselves will be able to find opportunities to hold calm and comradely discussions and resolve our differences, so that the Chinese and Soviet Parties may become more united and their relations further strengthened. This will be highly beneficial to the socialist camp and to the struggle of the people of the world against imperialist aggression and for world peace.

(5) We are glad to see that the Draft Communique of the Meeting put forward here affirms the correctness of the Moscow Declaration. But the presentation of the Marxist-Leninist theses of the Moscow Declaration in this draft is inaccurate and one-sided. And it is wrong that the draft avoids taking a clear stand on the major problems in the current international situation and makes no mention at all of modern revisionism, the main danger in the international working-class movement. Therefore, this draft is unacceptable to us. For the sake of unity in the common struggle against the enemy, we have submitted a revised draft and propose that it be discussed. If it is not possible to reach agreement this time, we propose that a special drafting committee be set up to work out, after full discussions a document which is acceptable to all.

Appendix Iii the Five Proposals for Settlement of the Differences and Attainment of Unity Contained in the Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in Reply to the Letter of Information of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

September 10, 1960

Striving to settle the differences successfully and to attain unity, we put forward the following proposals in all sincerity:

(1) The fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the Declaration and the Manifesto of the 1957 Moscow Meeting are the ideological foundation for the unity between our two Parties and among all fraternal Parties. All our statements and actions must be absolutely loyal to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the Moscow Declaration, which we should use as the criteria for judging between truth and falsehood.

(2) The relations among the socialist countries and among the fraternal Parties must strictly conform to the principles of equality, comradeship and internationalism as stipulated by the Moscow Declaration.

(3) All disputes among the socialist countries and among the fraternal Parties must be settled in accordance with the stipulations of the Moscow Declaration, through comradely and unhurried discussion. Both the Soviet Union and China, and both the Soviet and Chinese Parties, bear great responsibilities regarding the international situation and towards the international communist movement. They should have full consultations and unhurried discussions on all important questions

of common concern in order to have unity of action. If the disputes between the Chinese and Soviet Parties cannot be settled for the time being in consultations between the two Parties, then unhurried discussions should be continued. When necessary, the views of both sides should be presented completely objectively to the Communist and Workers' Parties of all countries so that these Parties may make correct judgements after serious deliberation and in accordance with Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the Moscow Declaration.

(4) It is of the utmost importance for Communists to draw a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves, between truth and falsehood. Our two Parties should treasure and value our friendship and join hands to oppose the enemy, and should not make statements or take actions liable to undermine the unity between the two Parties and the two countries and thus give the enemy the opportunity of driving a wedge between us.

(5) On the basis of the above principles, our two Parties, together with other Communist and Workers' Parties, should strive through full preparation and consultation to make a success of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of all countries to be held in Moscow in November this year, and, at this meeting, should work out a document conforming to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the 1957 Moscow Declaration to serve as a programme to which we should all adhere, a programme for our united struggle against the enemy.

CPCh: Apologists of Neo-Colonialism

A great revolutionary storm has spread through Asia, Africa and Latin America since World War II. Independence has been proclaimed in more than fifty Asian and African countries. China, Viet Nam, Korea and Cuba have taken the road of socialism. The face of Asia, Africa and Latin America has undergone a tremendous change.

While revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies suffered serious setbacks after World War I owing to suppression by the imperialists and their lackeys, the situation after World War II is fundamentally different. The imperialists are no longer able to extinguish the prairie fire of national liberation. Their old colonial system is fast disintegrating. Their rear has become a front of raging anti-imperialist struggles. Imperialist rule has been overthrown in some colonial and dependent countries, and in others it has suffered heavy blows and is tottering. This inevitably weakens and shakes the rule of imperialism in the metropolitan countries.

The victories of the people's revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America, together with the rise of the socialist camp, sound a triumphant paean to our day and age.

The storm of the people's revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America requires every political force in the world to take a stand. This mighty revolutionary storm makes the imperialists and colonialists tremble and the revolutionary people of the world rejoice. The imperialists and colonialists say, "Terrible, terrible!" The revolutionary people say, "Fine, fine!" The imperialists and

colonialists say, “It is rebellion, which is forbidden.” The revolutionary people say, “It is revolution, which is the people’s right and an inexorable current of history.”

An important line of demarcation between the Marxist-Leninists and the modern revisionists is the attitude taken towards this extremely sharp issue of contemporary world politics. The Marxist-Leninists firmly side with the oppressed nations and actively support the national liberation movement. The modern revisionists in fact side with the imperialists and colonialists and repudiate and oppose the national liberation movement in every possible way.

In their words, the leaders of the CPSU dare not completely discard the slogans of support for the national liberation movement, and at times, for the sake of their own interests, they even take certain measures which create the appearance of support. But if we probe to the essence and consider their views and policies over a number of years, we see clearly that their attitude towards the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America are a passive or scornful or negative one, and that they serve as apologists for neo-colonialism.

In the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU of July 14, 1963 and in a number of articles and statements, the comrades of the CPSU have worked hard at defending their wrong views and attacking the Chinese Communist Party on the question of the national liberation movement. But the sole outcome is to confirm the anti-Marxist-Leninist and anti-revolutionary stand of the leaders of the CPSU on the subject.

Let us now look at the theory and practice of the leaders of the CPSU on the question of the national liberation movement.

Abolition of the Task of Combating Imperialism and Colonialism

Victories of great historic significance have already been won by the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America. This no one can deny. But can anyone assert that the task of combating imperialism and colonialism and their agents has been completed by the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America?

Our answer is, no. This fighting task is far from completed.

However, the leaders of the CPSU frequently spread the view that colonialism has disappeared or is disappearing from the present-day world. They emphasize that “there are fifty million people on earth still groaning under colonial rule”, that the remnants of colonialism are to be found only in such places as Portuguese Angola and Mozambique in Africa, and that the abolition of colonial rule has already entered the “final phase”.

What are the facts?

Consider, first, the situation in Asia and Africa. There a whole group of countries have declared their independence. But many of these countries have not completely shaken off imperialist

and colonial control and enslavement and remain objects of imperialist plunder and aggression as well as arenas of contention between the old and new colonialists. In some, the old colonialists have changed into neo-colonialists and retain their colonial rule through their trained agents. In others, the wolf has left by the front door, but the tiger has entered through the back door, the old colonialism being replaced by the new, more powerful and more dangerous U. S. colonialism. The peoples of Asia and Africa are seriously menaced by the tentacles of neo-colonialism, represented by U. S. imperialism.

Next, listen to the voice of the people of Latin America. The Second Havana Declaration says, "Latin America today is under a more ferocious imperialism, more powerful and ruthless than the Spanish colonial empire."

It adds:

Since the end of the Second World War, . . . North American investments exceed 10 billion dollars. Latin America moreover supplies cheap raw materials and pays high prices for manufactured articles.

It says further:

. . . there flows from Latin America to the United States a constant torrent of money: some $4,000 per minute, $5 million per day, $2 billion per year, $10 billion each five years. For each thousand dollars which leaves us, one dead body remains. $1,000 per death, that is the price of what is called imperialism.

The facts are clear. After World War II the imperialists have certainly not given up colonialism, but have merely adopted a new form, neo-colonialism. An important characteristic of such neo-colonialism is that the imperialists have been forced to change their old style of direct colonial rule in some areas and to adopt a new style of colonial rule and exploitation by relying on the agents they have selected and trained. The imperialists headed by the United States enslave or control the colonial countries and countries which have already declared their independence by organizing military blocs, setting up military bases, establishing "federations" or "communities", and fostering puppet regimes. By means of economic "aid" or other forms, they retain these countries as markets for their goods, sources of raw material and outlets for their export of capital, plunder the riches and suck the blood of the people of these countries. Moreover, they use the United Nations as an important tool for interfering in the internal affairs of such countries and for subjecting them to military, economic and cultural aggression. When they are unable to continue their rule over these countries by "peaceful" means, they engineer military coups d'etat, carry out subversion or even resort to direct armed intervention and aggression.

The United States is most energetic and cunning in promoting neo-colonialism. With this weapon, the U.S. imperialists are trying hard to grab the colonies and spheres of influence of other imperialists and to establish world domination.

This neo-colonialism is a more pernicious and sinister form of colonialism.

We would like to ask the leaders of the CPSU, under such circumstances how can it be said that the abolition of colonial rule has already entered the "final phase"?

In trying to bolster up such falsehoods, the leaders of the CPSU have the temerity to seek help from the 1960 Statement. They say, does not the 1960 Statement mention the vigorous process of disintegration of the colonial system? But this thesis about the rapid disintegration of old colonialism cannot possibly help their argument about the disappearance of colonialism. The Statement clearly points out that "the United States is the mainstay of colonialism today", that "the imperialists, headed by the U.S.A., make desperate efforts to preserve colonial exploitation of the peoples of the former colonies by new methods and in new forms" and that they "try to retain their hold on the levers of economic control and political influence in Asian, African and Latin American countries". In these phrases the Statement exposes just what the leadership of the CPSU is trying so hard to cover up.

The leaders of the CPSU have also created the theory that the national liberation movement has entered upon a "new stage" having economic tasks as its core. Their argument is that, whereas "formerly, the struggle was carried on mainly in the political sphere", today the economic question has become the "central task" and "the basic link in the further development of the revolution".

The national liberation movement has entered a new stage. But this is by no means the kind of "new stage" described by the leadership of the CPSU. In the new stage, the level of political consciousness of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples has risen higher than ever and the revolutionary movement is surging forward with unprecedented intensity. They urgently demand the thorough elimination of the forces of imperialism and its lackeys in their own countries and strive for complete political and economic independence. The primary and most urgent task facing these countries is still the further development of the struggle against imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys. This struggle is still being waged fiercely in the political, economic, military, cultural, ideological and other spheres. And the struggles in all these spheres still find their most concentrated expression in political struggle, which often unavoidably develops into armed struggle when the imperialists resort to direct or indirect armed suppression. It is important for the newly independent countries to develop their independent economy. But this task must never be separated from the struggle against imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys.

Like "the disappearance of colonialism", this theory of a "new stage" advocated by the leaders of the CPSU is clearly intended to whitewash the aggression against and plunder of Asia, Africa and Latin America by neo-colonialism, as represented by the United States, to cover up the sharp contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations and to paralyze the revolutionary struggle of the people of these continents.

According to this theory of theirs, the fight against imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys is, of course, no longer necessary, for colonialism is disappearing and economic development has become the central task of the national liberation movement. Does it not follow that the national liberation movement can be done away with altogether? Therefore, the kind of "new stage" described by the leaders of the CPSU, in which economic tasks are in the *center* of the picture, is clearly nothing but one of no opposition to imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys, a stage in which the national liberation movement is no longer desired.

Prescriptions For Abolishing the Revolution of the Oppressed Nations

In line with their erroneous theories the leaders of the CPSU have sedulously worked out a number of nostrums for all the ills of the oppressed nations. Let us examine them.

The first prescription is labelled peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition.

The leaders of the CPSU constantly attribute the great post-war victories of the national liberation movement won by the Asian, African and Latin American peoples to what they call "peaceful coexistence" and "peaceful competition". The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU says:

In conditions of peaceful coexistence, new important victories have been scored in recent years in the class struggle of the proletariat and in the struggle of the peoples for national freedom. The world revolutionary process is developing successfully.

They also say that the national liberation movement is developing under conditions of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems and of economic competition between the two opposing social systems and that peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition "assist the unfolding of a process of liberation on the part of peoples fighting to free themselves from the economic domination of foreign monopolies", and can deliver "a crushing blow" to "the entire system of capitalist relationship".

All socialist countries should practice the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. But peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition cannot replace the revolutionary struggles of the people. The victory of the national revolution of all colonies and dependent countries must be won primarily through the revolutionary struggle of their own masses, which can never be replaced by that of any other countries.

The leaders of the CPSU hold that the victories of the national liberation revolution are not due primarily to the revolutionary struggles of the masses, and that the people cannot emancipate themselves, but must wait for the natural collapse of imperialism through peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition. In fact, this is equivalent to telling the oppressed nations to put up with imperialist plunder and enslavement forever, and not to rise up in resistance and revolution.

The second prescription is labelled aid to backward countries.

The leaders of the CPSU boast of the role played by their economic aid to the newly independent countries. Comrade Khrushchev has said that such aid can enable these countries "to avoid the danger of a new enslavement", and that "it stimulates their progress and contributes to the normal development and even acceleration of those internal processes which may take these countries onto the highway leading to socialism".

It is necessary and important for the socialist countries to give the newly independent countries economic aid on the basis of internationalism. But in no case can it be said that their national independence and social progress are due solely to the economic aid they receive from the socialist countries and not mainly to the revolutionary struggles of their own people.

To speak plainly, the policy and the purpose of the leaders of the CPSU in their aid to newly independent countries in recent years are open to suspicion. They often take an attitude of great-power chauvinism and national egoism in matters concerning aid to newly independent countries, harm the economic and political interests of the receiving countries, and as a result discredit the socialist countries. As for their aid to India, here their ulterior motives are especially clear. India tops the list of newly independent countries to which the Soviet Union gives economic aid. This aid is obviously intended to encourage the Nehru government in its policies directed against communism, against the people and against socialist countries. Even the U.S. imperialists have stated that such Soviet aid "is very much to our [U.S] interest".

In addition, the leaders of the CPSU openly propose co-operation with U.S. imperialism in "giving aid to the backward countries". Khrushchev said in a speech in the United States in September 1959:

Your and our economic successes will be hailed by the whole world, which expects our two Great Powers to help the peoples who are centuries behind in their economic development to get on their feet more quickly.

Look! The mainstay of modern colonialism [namely, U.S. imperialism] will help the oppressed nations "to get on their feet more quickly"! It is indeed astonishing that the leaders of the CPSU are not only willing but even proud to be the partners of the neo-colonialists.

The third prescription is labelled disarmament. Khrushchev has said:

Disarmament means disarming the war forces, abolishing militarism, ruling out armed interference in the internal affairs of any country, and doing away completely and finally with all forms of colonialism.

He has also said:

Disarmament would create proper conditions for a tremendous increase in the scale of assistance to the newly established national states. If a mere 8-10 per cent of the 120,000 million

dollars spent for military purposes throughout the world were turned to the purpose, it would be possible to end hunger, disease and illiteracy in the distressed areas of the globe within twenty years.

We have always maintained that the struggle for general disarmament should be carried on in order to expose and oppose imperialist arms expansion and war preparations. But one cannot possibly say that colonialism will be eliminated through disarmament.

Khrushchev here sounds like a preacher. Downtrodden people of the world, you are blessed! If only you are patient, if only you wait until the imperialists lay down their arms, freedom will descend upon you. Wait until the imperialists show mercy, and the poverty-stricken areas of the world will become an earthly paradise flowing with milk and honey! . . .

This is not just the fostering of illusions; it is opium for the people.

The fourth prescription is labelled elimination of colonialism through the United Nations.

Khrushchev maintains that if the United Nations takes measures to uproot the colonial system, "the peoples who are now suffering the humiliation arising out of foreign domination, would acquire a clear and immediate prospect of peaceful liberation from foreign oppression".

In a speech at the United Nations General Assembly in September 1960, Khrushchev asked, "Who, if not the United Nations Organization, should champion the abolition of the colonial system of government?"

This is a strange question to ask. According to Khrushchev, the revolutionary people of Asia, Africa and Latin America should not and cannot themselves eliminate colonialism, but must look to the United Nations for help.

At the United Nations General Assembly, Khrushchev also said:

This is why we appeal to the reason and far-sightedness of the peoples of the Western countries, to their governments and their representatives at this high assembly of the United Nations. Let us agree on measures for the abolition of the colonial system of government and thereby accelerate that natural historical process.

It is apparent that what he really means by looking to the United Nations for help is looking to the imperialists for help. The facts show that the United Nations, which is still under the control of the imperialists, can only defend and strengthen the rule of colonialism but can never abolish it.

In a word, the nostrums of the leaders of the CPSU for the national liberation movement have been concocted to make people believe that the imperialists will give up colonialism and bestow freedom and liberation upon the oppressed nations and peoples and that therefore all revolutionary theories, demands and struggles are outmoded and unnecessary and should and must be abandoned.

Opposition To Wars of National Liberation

Although they talk about supporting the movements and wars of national liberation, the leaders of the CPSU have been trying by every means to make the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America abandon their revolutionary struggle, because they themselves are sorely afraid of the revolutionary storm.

The leaders of the CPSU have the famous "theory" that "even a tiny spark can cause a world conflagration" and that a world war must necessarily be a thermonuclear war, which means the annihilation of mankind. Therefore, Khrushchev roars that "'local wars' in our time are very dangerous", and that "we will work hard . . . to put out the sparks that may set off the flames of war". Here Khrushchev makes no distinction between just and unjust wars and betrays the Communist stand of supporting just wars.

The history of the eighteen years since World War II has shown that wars of national liberation are unavoidable so long as the imperialists and their lackeys try to maintain their brutal rule by bayonets and use force to suppress the revolution of oppressed nations. These large-scale and small-scale revolutionary wars against the imperialists and their lackeys, which have never ceased, have hit hard at the imperialist forces of war, strengthened the forces defending world peace and effectively prevented the imperialists from realizing their plan of launching a world war. Frankly speaking, Khrushchev's clamor about the need to "put out" the sparks of revolution for the sake of peace is an attempt to oppose revolution in the name of safeguarding peace.

Proceeding from these wrong views and policies, the leaders of the CPSU not only demand that the oppressed nations should abandon their revolutionary struggle for liberation and "peacefully coexist" with the imperialists and colonialists, but even side with imperialism and use a variety of methods to extinguish the sparks of revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Take the example of the Algerian people's war of national liberation. The leadership of the CPSU not only withheld support for a long period but actually took the side of French imperialism. Khrushchev used to treat Algeria's national independence as an "internal affair" of France. Speaking on the Algerian question on — October 3, 1955, he said, "I had and have in view, first of all, that the USSR does not interfere in the internal affairs of other states." Receiving a correspondent of *Le Figaro* on March 27, 1958, he said, "We do not want France to grow weaker, we want her to become still greater."

To curry *favor* with the French imperialists, the leaders of the CPSU did not dare to recognize the provisional government of the Republic of Algeria for a long time; not until the victory of the Algerian people's war of resistance against French aggression was a foregone conclusion and France was compelled to agree to Algerian independence did, they hurriedly recognize Algeria. This unseemly attitude brought shame on the socialist countries. Yet the leaders of the CPSU glory in their

shame and assert that the victory the Algerian people paid for with their blood should also be credited to the policy of "peaceful coexistence".

Again, let us examine the part played by the leaders of the CPSU in the Congo question. Not only did they refuse to give active support to the Congolese people's armed struggle against colonialism, but they were anxious to "co-operate" with U.S. imperialism in putting out the spark in the Congo.

On July 13, 1960 the Soviet Union joined with the United States in voting for the Security Council resolution on the dispatch of U.N. forces to the Congo; thus, it helped the U.S. imperialists use the flag of the United Nations in their armed intervention in the Congo. The Soviet Union also provided the U.N. forces with means of transportation. In a cable to Kasavubu and Lumumba on July 15, Khrushchev said that "the United Nations Security Council has done a useful thing". Thereafter, the Soviet press kept up a stream of praise for the United Nations for "helping the government of the Congolese Republic to defend the independence and sovereignty of the country", and expressed the hope that the United Nations would adopt "resolute measures". In its statements of August 21 and September 10, the Soviet Government continued to praise the United Nations, which was suppressing the Congolese people.

In 1961 the leaders of the CPSU persuaded Gizenga to attend the Congolese parliament, which had been convened under the "protection" of U.N. troops, and to join the puppet government. The leadership of the CPSU falsely alleged that the convocation of the Congolese parliament was "an important event in the life of the young republic" and "a success of the national forces".

Clearly these wrong policies of the leadership of the CPSU rendered U. S. imperialism a great service in its aggression against the Congo. Lumumba was murdered, Gizenga was imprisoned, many other patriots were persecuted, and the Congolese struggle for national independence suffered a setback. Does the leadership of the CPSU feel no responsibility for all this?

The Areas in Which Contemporary World Contradictions Are Concentrated

It is only natural that the revolutionary people of Asia, Africa and Latin America have rejected the words and deeds of the leaders of the CPSU against the movements and wars of national liberation. But the leaders of the CPSU have failed to draw the appropriate lesson and change their wrong line and policies. Instead, angry at their humiliation, they have launched a series of slanderous attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and the other Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU accuses the Chinese Communist Party of putting forward a "new theory". It says:

. . . according to the new theory the main contradiction of our time is, you see, contradiction not between socialism and imperialism, but between the national-liberation movement and imperialism. The decisive force in the struggle against imperialism, the Chinese comrades hold, is not

the world system of socialism, not struggle of the international working class, but again the national-liberation movement.

In the first place, this is a fabrication. In our letter of June 14, we pointed out that the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world are the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism, and the contradictions among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

We also pointed out:

The contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp is a contradiction between two fundamentally different social systems, socialism and capitalism. It is undoubtedly very sharp. But Marxist-Leninists must not regard the contradictions in the world as consisting solely and simply of the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp.

Our view is crystal clear.

In our letter of June 14, we explained the revolutionary situation in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the significance and role of the national liberation movement. This is what we said:

1. "The various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America; these are the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm *center*s of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism."
2. "The national democratic revolutionary movement in these areas and the international socialist revolutionary movement are the two great historical currents of our time."
3. "The national democratic revolution in these areas is an important component of the contemporary proletarian world revolution."
4. "The anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America are pounding and undermining the foundations of the rule of imperialism and colonialism, old and new, and are now a mighty force in Defense of world peace."
6. "In a sense, therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population."
7. "Therefore, the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America is definitely not merely a matter of regional significance but is one of overall importance for the whole cause of proletarian world revolution.'"

These are Marxist-Leninist theses, conclusions drawn by scientific analysis from the realities of our time.

No one can deny that an extremely *favorable* revolutionary situation now exists in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Today the national liberation revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America are the most important forces dealing imperialism direct blows. The contradictions of the world are concentrated in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The *center* of world contradictions, of world political struggles, is not fixed but shifts with changes in the international struggles and the revolutionary situation. We believe that, with the development of the contradiction and struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in Western Europe and North America, the momentous day of battle will arrive in these homes of capitalism and heartlands of imperialism. When that day comes, Western Europe and North America will undoubtedly become the *center* of world political struggles, of world contradictions.

Lenin said in 1913,

> ". . . a new source of great world storms opened up in Asia ... It is in this era of storms and their 'repercussion' on Europe that we are now living." [306]

Stalin said in 1925:

> "The colonial countries constitute the principal rear of imperialism. The revolutionization of this rear is bound to undermine imperialism not only in the sense that imperialism will be deprived of its rear, but also in the sense that the revolutionization of the East is bound to give a powerful impulse to the intensification of the revolutionary crisis in the West." [307]

Is it possible that these statements of Lenin and Stalin are wrong? The theses they enunciated have long been elementary Marxist-Leninist knowledge. Obviously, now that the leaders of the CPSU are bent on belittling the national liberation movement, they are completely ignoring elementary Marxism-Leninism and the plain facts under their noses.

Distortion Of the Leninist View of Leadership in the Revolution

In its Open Letter of July 14, the Central Committee of the CPSU also attacks the standpoint of the Chinese Communist Party on the question of proletarian leadership in the national liberation movement. It says:

> . . . the Chinese comrades want to "correct" Lenin and prove that hegemony in the world struggle against imperialism should go not to the working class, but to the petty bourgeoisie or the national bourgeoisie, even to "certain patriotically-minded kings, princes and aristocrats."

This is a deliberate distortion of the views of the Chinese Communist Party.

[306] Lenin, Selected Works, International Publishers, New York, 1943, Vol. XI, p. 51.
[307] Stalin, Works , FLPH, Moscow, 1954, Vol. VII, pp. 235-36.

In discussing the need for the proletariat to insist on leading the national liberation movement, the letter of the Central Committee of the CPC of June 14 says:

History has entrusted to the proletarian parties in these areas [Asia, Africa and Latin America] the glorious mission of holding high the banner of struggle against imperialism, against old and new colonialism and for national independence and people's democracy, of standing in the forefront of the national democratic revolutionary movement and striving for a socialist future.

.....

On the basis of the worker-peasant alliance the proletariat and its party must unite all the strata that can be united and organize a broad united front against imperialism and its lackeys. In order to consolidate and expand this united front it is necessary that the proletarian party should maintain its ideological, political and organizational independence and insist on the leadership of the revolution.

In discussing the need for establishing a broad anti-imperialist united front in the national liberation movement, the letter of the Central Committee of the CPC says:

The oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are faced with the urgent task of fighting imperialism and its lackeys.

.....

In these areas, extremely broad sections of the population refuse to be slaves of imperialism. They include not only the workers, peasants, intellectuals and petty bourgeoisie, but also the patriotic national bourgeoisie and even certain kings, princes and aristocrats, who are patriotic.

Our views are perfectly clear. In the national liberation movement, it is necessary both to insist on leadership by the proletariat and to establish a broad anti-imperialist united front. What is wrong with these views? Why should the leadership of the CPSU distort and attack these correct views?

It is not we, but the leaders of the CPSU, who have abandoned Lenin's views on proletarian leadership in the revolution.

The wrong line of the leaders of the CPSU completely abandons the task of fighting imperialism and colonialism and opposes wars of national liberation; this means it wants the proletariat and the Communist Parties of the oppressed nations and countries to roll up their patriotic banner of opposing imperialism and struggling for national independence and surrender it to others. In that case, how could one even talk about an anti-imperialist united front or of proletarian leadership?

Another idea often propagated by the leaders of the CPSU is that a country can build socialism under no matter what leadership, including even that of a reactionary nationalist like Nehru. This is still farther removed from the idea of proletarian leadership.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU misinterprets the proper relationship of mutual support which should exist between the socialist camp and the working-class movement in the capitalist countries on the one hand and the national liberation movement on the other, asserting that the national liberation movement should be "led" by the socialist countries and the working-class movement in the metropolitan countries. It has the audacity to claim that this is "based" on Lenin's views on proletarian leadership. Obviously, this is a gross distortion and revision of Lenin's thinking. It shows that the leaders of the CPSU want to impose their line of abolishing revolution on the revolutionary movement of the oppressed nations.

The Path of Nationalism and Degeneration

In their Open Letter of July 14, the leaders of the CPSU attempt to pin on the Chinese Communist Party the charge of "isolating the national liberation movement from the international working class and its creation, the socialist world system". They also accuse us of "separating" the national liberation movement from the socialist system and the working-class movement in the Western capitalist countries and "counterposing" the former to the latter. There are other Communists, like the leaders of the French Communist Party, who loudly echo the leaders of the CPSU.

But what are the facts? Those who counterpose the national liberation movement to the socialist camp and the working-class movement in the Western capitalist countries are none other than the leaders of the CPSU and their followers, who do not support, and even oppose, the national liberation movement.

The Chinese Communist Party has consistently maintained that the revolutionary struggles of all peoples support each other. We always consider the national liberation movement from the viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, from the viewpoint of the proletarian world revolution as a whole. We believe the victorious development of the national liberation revolution is of tremendous significance for the socialist camp, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the cause of defending world peace.

But the leaders of the CPSU and their followers refuse to acknowledge this significance. They talk only about the support which the socialist camp gives the national liberation movement and ignore the support which the latter gives the former. They talk only about the role of the working-class movement in the Western capitalist countries in dealing blows at imperialism and belittle or ignore the role of the national liberation movement in the same connection. Their stand contradicts Marxism-Leninism and disregards the facts, and is therefore wrong.

The question of what attitude to take towards the relationship between the socialist countries and the revolution of the oppressed nations, and towards the relationship between the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the revolution of the oppressed nations, involves the

important principle of whether Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism are to be upheld or abandoned.

According to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, every socialist country which has achieved victory in its revolution must actively support and assist the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations. The socialist countries must become base areas for supporting and developing the revolution of the oppressed nations and peoples throughout the world, form the closest alliance with them and carry the proletarian world revolution through to completion.

But the leaders of the CPSU virtually regard the victory of socialism in one country or several countries as the end of the proletarian world revolution. They want to subordinate the national liberation revolution to their general line of peaceful coexistence and to the national interests of their own country.

When in 1925 Stalin fought the liquidationists, represented by the Trotskyites and Zinovievites, he pointed out that one of the dangerous characteristics of liquidationism was:

> ". . . lack of confidence in the international proletarian revolution, lack of confidence in its victory; a skeptical attitude towards the national-liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries . . . failure to understand the elementary demand of internationalism, by virtue of which the victory of socialism in one country is not an end in itself, but a means of developing and supporting the revolution in other countries." [308]

He added:

> "That is the path of nationalism and degeneration, the path of the complete liquidation of the proletariat's international policy, for people afflicted with this disease regard our country not as a part of the whole that is called the world revolutionary movement, but as the beginning and the end of that movement, believing that the interests of all other countries should be sacrificed to the interests of our country." [309]

Stalin depicted the line of thinking of the liquidationists as follows:

> "Support the liberation movement in China? But why? Wouldn't that be dangerous? Wouldn't it bring us into conflict with other countries? Wouldn't it be better if we established "spheres of influence" in China in conjunction with other "advanced" powers and snatched something from China for our own benefit? That would be both useful and safe.... And so on and so forth." [310]

He concluded:

[308] Stalin, op. cit ., p. 169.
[309] *Ibid*., pp. 169-70.
[310] *Ibid*., p. 170.

"Such is the new type of nationalist "frame of mind," which is trying to liquidate the foreign policy of the October Revolution and is cultivating the elements of degeneration." [311]

The present leaders of the CPSU have gone farther than the old liquidationists. Priding themselves on their cleverness, they only take up what is "both useful and safe". Mortally afraid of being involved in conflict with the imperialist countries, they have set their minds on opposing the national liberation movement. They are intoxicated with the idea of the two "super-powers" establishing spheres of influence throughout the world. Stalin's criticism of the liquidationists is a fair description of the present leaders of the CPSU. Following in the footsteps of the liquidationists, they have liquidated the foreign policy of the October Revolution and taken the path of nationalism and degeneration.

Stalin warned:

". . . it is obvious that the first country to be victorious can retain the role of standard-bearer of the world revolutionary movement only on the basis of consistent internationalism, only on the basis of the foreign policy of the October Revolution, and that the path of least resistance and of nationalism in foreign policy is the path of the isolation and decay of the first country to be victorious." [312]

This warning by Stalin is of serious, practical significance for the present leaders of the CPSU.

An Example of Social-Chauvinism

Similarly, according to Proletarian internationalism, the proletariat and the Communists of the oppressor nations must actively support both the right of the oppressed nations to national independence and their struggles for liberation. With the support of the oppressed nations, the proletariat of the oppressor nations will be better able to win its revolution.

Lenin hit the nail on the head when he said:

"The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would actually be a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and America were not closely and completely united with the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of "colonial" slaves who are oppressed by capital." [313]

However, some self-styled Marxist-Leninists have abandoned Marxism-Leninism on this very question of fundamental principle. The leaders of the French Communist Party are typical in this respect.

---

[311] *Ibid.*, p. 170.
[312] *Ibid., p.* 171.
[313] Lenin, Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1951, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 472-73.

Over a long period of time, the leaders of the CPF have abandoned the struggle against U.S. imperialism, refusing to put up a firm fight against U.S. imperialist control over and restrictions on France in the political, economic and military fields and surrendering the banner of French national struggle against the United States to people like de Gaulle; on the other hand, they have been using various devices and excuses to defend the colonial interests of the French imperialists, have refused to support, and indeed opposed, the national liberation movements in the French colonies, and particularly opposed national revolutionary wars; they have sunk into the quagmire of chauvinism.

Lenin said,

> "Europeans often forget that colonial peoples are *also* nations, but to tolerate such 'forgetfulness' is to tolerate chauvinism." [314]

Yet the leadership of the French Communist Party, represented by Comrade Thorez, has not only tolerated this "forgetfulness", but has openly regarded the peoples of the French colonies as "naturalized Frenchmen", refused to acknowledge their right to national independence in dissociation from France and publicly supported the policy of "national assimilation" pursued by the French imperialists.

For the past ten years and more, the leaders of the French Communist Party have followed the colonial policy of the French imperialists and served as an appendage of French monopoly capital. In 1946, when the French monopoly capitalist rulers played a neo-colonialist trick by proposing to form a French Union, they followed suit and proclaimed that "we have always envisaged the French Union as a 'free union of free peoples"' and that "the French Union will permit the regulation, on a new basis, of the relations between the people of France and the overseas peoples who have in the past been attached to France". In 1958, when the French Union collapsed and the French government proposed the establishment of a French Community to preserve its colonial system, the leaders of the CPF again followed suit and proclaimed "we believe that the creation of a genuine community will be a positive event".

Moreover, in opposing the demand of the people in the French colonies for national independence, the leaders of the CPF have even tried to intimidate them, saying that "any attempt to break away from the Union of France will only lead to the strengthening of imperialism; although independence may be won, it will be temporary, nominal and false". They further openly declared: "The question is whether this already unavoidable independence will be with France, or without France and against France. The interest of our country requires that this independence should be with France."

[314] Lenin, *Collected Works,* International Publishers, New York, 1942, Vol. XIX, p.250.

On the question of Algeria, the chauvinist stand of the leaders of the CPF is all the more evident. They have recently tried to justify themselves by asserting that they had long "recognized the correct demand of the people of Algeria for freedom". But what are the facts?

For a long time, the leaders of the CPF refused to recognize Algeria's right to national independence; they followed the French monopoly capitalists, crying that "Algeria is an inalienable part of France" and that France "should be a great African power, now and in the future". Thorez and others were most concerned about the fact that Algeria could provide France with "a million head of sheep" and large quantities of wheat yearly to solve her problem of "the shortage of meat" and "make up our deficit in grain".

Just see! What feverish chauvinism on the part of the leaders of the CPF! Do they show an iota of proletarian internationalism? Is there anything of the proletarian revolutionary in them? By taking this chauvinistic stand, they have betrayed the fundamental interests of the international proletariat, the fundamental interests of the French proletariat and the true interests of the French nation.

Against The "Theory of Racism" And The "Theory of The Yellow Peril"

Having used up all their wonder-working weapons for opposing the national liberation movement, the leaders of the CPSU are now reduced to seeking help from racism, the most reactionary of all imperialist theories. They describe the correct stand of the CPC in resolutely supporting the national liberation movement as "creating racial and geographical barriers", "replacing the class approach with the racial approach", and "playing upon the national and even racial prejudices of the Asian and African peoples".

If Marxism-Leninism did not exist, perhaps such lies could deceive people. Unfortunately for the manufacturers of these lies, they live in the wrong age, for Marxism-Leninism has already found its way deep into people's hearts. As Stalin rightly pointed out, Leninism "broke down the wall between whites and blacks, between Europeans and Asiatics, between the 'civilized' and 'uncivilized' slaves of imperialism". [315] It is futile for the leaders of the CPSU to try and rebuild this wall of racism.

In the last analysis, the national question in the contemporary world is one of class struggle and anti-imperialist struggle. Today the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals, anti-imperialist and patriotic bourgeois elements and other patriotic and anti-imperialist enlightened people of all races — white, black, yellow or brown — have formed a broad united front against the imperialists, headed by the United States, and their lackeys. This united front is expanding and growing stronger. The question here is not whether to side with the white people or the colored people, but whether to side with the oppressed peoples and nations or with the handful of imperialists and reactionaries.

[315] Stalin, op. cit. , Vol. VI, p. 144.

According to the Marxist-Leninist class stand, oppressed nations must draw a clear line of demarcation between themselves and the imperialists and colonialists. To blur this line represents a chauvinist-view serving imperialism and colonialism.

Lenin said:

> "This is precisely why the central point in the Social-Democratic programme must be the distinction between oppressing and oppressed nations, which is the *essence* of imperialism, which is *falsely* evaded by the social-chauvinists, and by Kautsky." [316]

By slandering the unity of the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the anti-imperialist struggle as being "based on the geographical and racial principles", the leaders of the CPSU have obviously placed themselves in the position of the social-chauvinists and of Kautsky.

When they peddle the "theory of racism", describing the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America as one of the coloreds against the white race, the leaders of the CPSU are clearly aiming at inciting racial hatred among the white people in Europe and North America, at diverting the people of the world from the struggle against imperialism and at turning the international working-class movement away from the struggle against modern revisionism.

The leaders of the CPSU have raised a hue and cry about the "Yellow Peril" and the "imminent menace of Genghis Khan". This is really not worth refuting. We do not intend in this article to comment on the historical role of Genghis Khan or on the development of the Mongolian, Russian and Chinese nations and the process of their formation into states. We would only remind the leaders of the CPSU of their need to review their history lessons before manufacturing such tales. Genghis Khan was a Khan of Mongolia, and in his day both China and Russia were subjected to Mongolian aggression. He invaded part of northwestern and northern China in 1215 and Russia in 1223. After his death, his successors subjugated Russia in 1240 and thirty-nine years later, in 1279, conquered the whole of China.

Lu Hsun, the well-known Chinese writer, has a paragraph about Genghis Khan in an article he wrote in 1934. We include it here for your reference as it may be useful to you.

He wrote that, as a young man of twenty,

I had been told that "our" Genghis Khan had conquered Europe and ushered in the most splendid period in "our" history. Not until I was twenty-five did, I discover that this so-called most splendid period of "our" history was actually the time when the Mongolians conquered China and we became slaves. And not until last August, when browsing through three books on Mongolian history, looking for history stories, did I find out that the conquest of "Russia" by the Mongolians and their invasion of Hungary and Austria actually preceded their conquest of China, and that the

[316] Lenin, Selected Works, New York, Vol. V, p. 284.

Genghis Khan of that time was not yet our Khan. The Russians were enslaved before we were, and presumably it is they who ought to be able to say "When our Genghis Khan conquered China, he ushered in the most splendid period of our history." [317]

Anyone with a little knowledge of modern world history knows that the "theory of the Yellow Peril" about which the CPSU leadership has been making such a noise is a legacy of the German emperor William II. Half a century ago, William II stated, "I am a believer in the Yellow Peril."

The German Emperor's purpose in propagating the "theory of the Yellow Peril" was to carry the partition of China further, to invade Asia, to suppress revolution in Asia, to divert the attention of the European people from revolution and to use it as a smokescreen for his active preparations for the imperialist world war and for his attempt to gain world hegemony.

When William II spread this "theory of the Yellow Peril", the European bourgeoisie was in deep decline and extremely reactionary, and democratic revolutions were sweeping through China, Turkey and Persia and affecting India, around the time of the 1905 Russian Revolution. That was the period, too, when Lenin made his famous remark about "backward Europe and advanced Asia".

William II was a bigwig in his day. But in reality, he proved to be only a snow man in the sun. In a very short time this reactionary chieftain vanished from the scene, together with the reactionary theory he invented. The great Lenin and his brilliant teachings live on forever.

Fifty years have gone by; imperialism in Western Europe and North America has become still more moribund and reactionary, and its days are numbered. Meanwhile, the revolutionary storm raging over Asia, Africa and Latin America has grown many times stronger than in Lenin's time. It is hardly credible that today there are still people who wish to step into the shoes of William II. This is indeed a mockery of history.

Resurrecting The Old Revisionism in A New Guise

The policy of the leadership of the CPSU on the national-colonial question is identical with the bankrupt policy of the revisionists of the Second International. The only difference is that the latter served the imperialists' old colonialism, while the modern revisionists serve the imperialists' neo-colonialism.

The old revisionists sang to the tune of the old colonialists, and Khrushchev sings to the tune of the neocolonialists.

The heroes of the Second International, represented by Bernstein and Kautsky, were apologists for the old colonial rule of imperialism. They openly declared that colonial rule was progressive, that it "brought a high civilization" to the colonies and "developed the productive forces" there. They even asserted that the "abolition of the colonies would mean barbarism".

[317] Lu Hsun, Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. VI, p. 109.

In this respect Khrushchev is somewhat different from the old revisionists. He is bold enough to denounce the old colonial system.

How is it that Khrushchev is so bold? Because the imperialists have changed their tune.

After World War II, under the twin blows of the socialist revolution and the national liberation revolution, the imperialists were forced to recognize that "if the West had attempted to perpetuate the status quo of colonialism, it would have made violent revolution inevitable and defeat inevitable". The old colonialist forms of rule "on the contrary, ... are likely to prove 'running sores' which destroy both the economic and the moral vigor of a nation's life". Thus, it became necessary to change the form and practice neo-colonialism.

Thus, too, Khrushchev singing to the tune of the neo-colonialist flaunts the "theory of the disappearance of colonialism" in order to cover up the new colonialism. What is more, he tries to induce the oppressed nations to embrace this new colonialism. He actively propagates the view that "peaceful coexistence" between the oppressed nations and civilized imperialism will make "the national economy grow rapidly" and bring about an "uplift of their productive forces", enable the home market in the oppressed countries to "become incomparably greater" and "furnish more raw materials, and various products and goods required by the economy of the industrially developed countries" and, at the same time will "considerably raise the living standard of the inhabitants in the highly developed capitalist countries".

Nor has Khrushchev forgotten to collect certain worn-out weapons from the arsenal of the revisionists of the Second International.

Here are some examples.

The old revisionists opposed wars of national liberation and held that the national question "can be settled only through international agreements" and "advance in all the arts of peace". On this question, Khrushchev has taken over the line of the revisionists of the Second International; he advocates a "quiet burial of the colonial system".

The old revisionists attacked the revolutionary Marxists, hurling at them the slander that "Bolshevism is in essence a warlike type of socialism" and that "the Communist International harbors the illusion that the liberation of the workers can be achieved by means of the bayonets of the victorious Red Army and that a new world war is necessary for the world revolution". They also spread the story that this position had "created the greatest danger of a new world war". The language Khrushchev uses today to slander the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties is exactly the language used by the old revisionists in slandering the Bolsheviks. It is hard to find any difference.

It must be said that in serving the imperialists' neo-colonialism, Khrushchev is not a whit inferior to the old revisionists in their service of the imperialists' old colonialism.

Lenin showed how the policy of imperialism caused the international workers' movement to split into two sections, the revolutionary and the opportunist. The revolutionary section sided with the oppressed nations and opposed the imperialists and colonialists. On the other hand, the opportunist section fed on crumbs from the spoils which the imperialists and colonialists squeezed out of the people of the colonies and semi-colonies. It sided with the imperialists and colonialists and opposed the revolution of the oppressed nations for liberation.

The same kind of division between revolutionaries and opportunists in the international working-class movement as that described by Lenin is now taking shape not only in the working-class movement in capitalist countries but also in socialist countries where the proletariat wields state power.

The experience of history shows that if the national liberation movement is to achieve complete victory it must form a solid alliance with the revolutionary working-class movement, draw a clear line of demarcation between itself and the revisionists who serve the imperialists and colonialists, and firmly eradicate their influence.

The experience of history shows that if the working-class movement of the capitalist countries in Western Europe and North America is to achieve complete victory, it must form a close alliance with the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America, draw a clear line of demarcation between itself and the revisionists, and firmly eradicate their influence.

The revisionists are agents of imperialism who have hidden themselves among the ranks of the international working-class movement. Lenin said, "... the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism." [318] Thus, it is clear that the present fight against imperialism and old and new colonialism must be linked closely with the fight against the apologists of neo-colonialism.

However hard the imperialists disguise their intentions and bestir themselves, however hard their apologists whitewash and help neo-colonialism, imperialism and colonialism cannot escape their doom. The victory of the national liberation revolution is irresistible. Sooner or later the apologists of neo-colonialism will go bankrupt.

Workers of the world and the oppressed nations, unite!

CPCh: Two Different Lines on the Question of War and Peace

November 19, 1963

The whole world is discussing the question of war and peace.

[318] Lenin, Selected Works, Moscow, Vol. I, Part 2, p. 566.

The criminal system of imperialism has brought upon the people of the world numerous wars, including two disastrous world wars. Wars launched by imperialism have caused the people heavy suffering, but have also educated them.

Since World War II, people everywhere have been vigorously demanding world peace. More and more people have come to understand that to defend world peace it imperative to wage struggles against the imperialist policies of aggression and war.

Marxist-Leninists throughout the world are duty bound to treasure the peace sentiments of the people and to stand in the forefront of the struggle for world peace. They are duty bound to struggle against the imperialists' policies of aggression and war, to expose their deceptions and defeat their plans for war. They are duty bound to educate the people, raise their political consciousness and guide the struggle for world peace in the proper direction.

In contrast to the Marxist-Leninists, the modern revisionists help the imperialists to deceive the people, divert the people's attention, weaken and undermine their struggle against imperialism and cover up the imperialists' plans for a new world war, thus meeting the needs of imperialist policy.

The Marxist-Leninist line on the question of war and peace is diametrically opposed to the revisionist line.

The Marxist-Leninist line is the correct line conducive to the winning of world peace. It is the line consistently upheld by all Marxist-Leninist parties, including the Communist Party of China, and by all Marxist-Leninists.

The revisionist line is a wrong line which serves to increase the danger of a new war. It is the line gradually developed by the leaders of the CPSU since its 20th Congress.

On the question of war and peace many lies slandering the Chinese Communists have been fabricated in the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU and in numerous statements by the leaders of the CPSU, but these cannot conceal the essence of the differences.

In what follows we shall analyze the main differences between the Marxist-Leninist and the modern revisionist lines on the question of war and peace.

The Lessons of History

Ever since capitalism evolved into imperialism, the question of war and peace has been a vital one in the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism.

Imperialism is the source of wars in modern times. The imperialists alternately use a deceptive policy of peace and a policy of war. They often cover their crimes of aggression and their preparations for a new war with lies about peace.

Lenin and Stalin tirelessly called upon the people of all countries to combat the peace frauds of the imperialists.

> Lenin said that the imperialist governments "pay lip service to peace and justice, but in fact wage annexationist and predatory wars". [319]

Stalin said that the imperialists "have only one aim in resorting to pacifism: to dupe the masses with high sounding phrases about peace in order to prepare for a new war". [320]

He also said:

> "Many think that imperialist pacifism is an instrument of peace. That is absolutely wrong. Imperialist pacifism is an instrument for the preparation of war and for disguising this preparation by hypocritical talk of peace. Without this pacifism and its instrument, the League of Nations, preparation for war in the conditions of today would be impossible." [321]

In contrast to Lenin and Stalin, the revisionists of the Second International, who were renegades from the working class, helped the imperialists to deceive the people and became their accomplices in unleashing the two World Wars.

Before World War I, the revisionists represented by Bernstein and Kautsky endeavored by hypocritical talk about peace to paralyze the revolutionary fighting will of people and cover up the imperialist plans for a world war.

As World War I was breaking out, the old revisionists speedily shed their peace masks, sided with their respective imperialist governments, supported the imperialist war for the redivision of the world, voted for military appropriations in parliament, and incited the working class of their own countries to plunge into the war and slaughter their class brothers in other countries the hypocritical slogan of "defending the motherland".

When the imperialists needed an armistice in their own interests, the revisionists typified by Kautsky tried to poison people's minds and to oppose revolution by such glib talk as "nothing would make me happier than a conciliatory peace based on the principle, 'Live and let live'". [322]

After World War I, the renegade Kautsky and his successors became still more brazen trumpeters of the imperialists' peace frauds.

The revisionists of the Second International spread a pack of lies on the question of war and peace.

---

[319] Lenin, Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 332.
[320] Stalin, Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1953, Vol. VI, p. 297.
[321] *Ibid*., Vol. XI, p. 209
[322] Kautsky, *National Problems*, Russian ed.

1. They prettified imperialism and turned the minds of the people away from their struggles. Kautsky said, "... the danger to world peace from imperialism is only slight. The greater danger appears to come from the national strivings in the East and from the various dictatorships." [323] Thus, people were asked to believe that the source of war was not imperialism but the oppressed nations of the East and the Soviet state, the great bulwark of peace.

2. They helped the imperialists cover up the danger of a new war and blunted the fighting will of the people. Kautsky said in 1928, "If today you keep on talking loudly about the dangers of imperialist war, you are relying on a traditional formula and not on present-day considerations." [324] Old revisionists of his brand described those believing in the inevitability of imperialist wars as "committed to a fatalistic conception of history". [325]

3. They intimidated the people with the notion that war would destroy mankind. Kautsky said, "... the next war will not only bring want and misery, but will basically put an end to civilization and, at least in Europe, will leave behind nothing but smoking ruins and putrefying corpses." [326] These old revisionists said, "The last war brought the entire world to the brink of the precipice; the next one would destroy it completely. The mere preparation for a new war would ruin the world." [327] 4. They made no distinction between just and unjust wars and forbade revolution. Kautsky said in 1914:

... in present-day conditions, there is no such thing as a war which is not a misfortune for nations in general and for the proletariat in particular. What we discussed was the means by which we could prevent a threatening war, and not which wars are useful and which harmful. [328]

He also said:

The yearning for perpetual peace increasingly inspires the majority of cultured nations. It temporarily pushes the essentially great problem of our times into the background.... [329]

5. They propagated the theory that weapons decide everything and they opposed revolutionary armed struggle. Kautsky said:

As has been often stated, one of the reasons why the coming revolutionary struggles will more rarely be fought out by military means lies in the colossal superiority in armaments of the armies of

[323] Kautsky, *The Question of Defense and Social-Democracy,* in German.
[324] *Ibid*.
[325] Haase's speech on the question of imperialism at the Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party in Chemnitz, 1912, published in the Handbook of the Congress of the Social-Democratic Party in 1910-1913, Vol. II, in German.
[326] Kautsky, "Preface to War and Democracy", in German.
[327] Resolution on the League of Nations, adopted by the Berne Conference of the Socialist International in 1919, Russian ed.
[328] Kautsky, Social-Democracy in War, in German.
[329] Kautsky "Preface to War and Democracy" in German.

modern states over the arms which are at the disposal of "civilians" and which usually render any resistance on the part of the latter hopeless from the very outset. [330]

6. They spread the absurd theory that world peace can be safeguarded and equality of nations achieved through disarmament. Bernstein said:

Peace on earth and good will to all men! We should not pause or rest and must attend to the unhindered advance of society towards prosperity in the interests of all, towards equality of rights among nations through international agreement and disarmament. [331]

7. They spread the fallacy that the money saved from disarmament can be used to assist backward countries. Kautsky said:

... the lighter the burden of military expenditures in Western Europe, the greater the means available for building railways in China, Persia, Turkey, South America etc., and these public works are a far more effective means of promoting industrial development than the building of dreadnoughts. [332]

8. They submitted schemes for the "peace strategy" of the imperialists. Kautsky said:

"The nations of civilized Europe (and likewise the Americans) can maintain peace in the Near and Far East more effectively through their economic and intellectual resources than through ironclads and planes. "[333]

They extolled the League of Nations which was controlled by the imperialists. Kautsky said:

"The mere existence of the League of Nations is itself already a great achievement for the cause of peace. It represents a lever for the preservation of peace such as no other institution can offer. "

10. They spread the illusion that reliance could be placed on U.S. imperialism to defend world peace.

Kautsky said:

"Today the United States is the strongest power in the world and will make the League of Nations irresistible as soon as it works inside it or with it to prevent war." [334]

---

[330] Kautsky, "A Catechism of Social-Democracy", in German.
[331] Bernstein's speech on the question of disarmament at the Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party in Chemnitz, 1912, published in the Handbook of the Congress of the Social Democratic Party in 1910-1913,Vol.II, in German.
[332] Kautsky, "Once More on Disarmament", in German.
[333] Kautsky, The Question of Defense and Social-Democracy, in German.
[334] Kautsky, Socialists and War, in German.

Lenin ruthlessly exposed the ugly features of Kautsky and his ilk. He pointed out that the pacifist phrases of the revisionists of the Second International were only "a *solace* to the people, a means which makes it easier for the governments to bring about the docility of the people in further imperialist slaughter!"

Stalin pointed out:

> "And the most important thing in all this is that Social-Democracy is the main channel of imperialist pacifism within the working class -- consequently, it is capitalism's main support among the working class in preparing for new wars and intervention." [335]

Even a cursory comparison of Comrade Khrushchev's statements on the question of war and peace with those of Bernstein, Kautsky and others shows that there is nothing new in his views, which are a mere reproduction of the revisionism of the Second International. On the question of war and peace, which has a bearing on the destiny of mankind, Khrushchev is following in the footsteps of Bernstein and Kautsky. As history shows, this is a road extremely dangerous to world peace. In order effectively to defend world peace and prevent a new world war, Marxist-Leninists and peace-loving people all over the world must reject and oppose Khrushchev's erroneous line.

The Greatest Fraud

There is no bigger lie than the designation of the arch enemy of world peace as a peace-loving angel.

Since World War II, U.S. imperialism, stepping into the shoes of the German, Italian and Japanese fascists, has been endeavoring to set up a vast world empire such as has never been known before. The "global strategy" of U.S. imperialism has been to grab and dominate the intermediate zone lying between the United States and the socialist camp, put down the revolutions of the oppressed peoples and nations, proceed to destroy the socialist countries, and thus to dominate the whole world.

In the eighteen years since the end of World War II, in order to realize its ambition of world domination, U.S. imperialism has been carrying on aggressive wars or counter-revolutionary armed interventions in various parts of the world and has been actively preparing for a new world war.

It is obvious that imperialism remains the source of modern wars and that U.S. imperialism is the main force of aggression and war in the contemporary world. This has been clearly affirmed in both the 1957 Declaration the 1960 Statement.

[335] Stalin op. cit., Vol. XI, p. 210.

Yet the leaders of the CPSU hold that the chief representatives of U.S. imperialism love peace. They say that a "reasonable" group has emerged capable of soberly assessing the situation. And Eisenhower and Kennedy are representatives of this "reasonable" group.

Khrushchev praised Eisenhower as one who "enjoys the absolute confidence of his people", who "has a sincere desire for peace" and who "also worries about ensuring peace just as we do".

Now Khrushchev praises Kennedy as even better qualified to shoulder the responsibility of preserving world peace than was Eisenhower. He showed "solicitude for the preservation of peace", and it is reasonable to expect him to "create reliable conditions for a peaceful life and creative labor on earth".

Khrushchev works as hard as the revisionists of the Second International at telling lies about imperialism and prettifying it.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU asks those who do not believe in these lies: "Do they really think that all bourgeois governments lack reason in everything they do?" Obviously, the leaders of the CPSU ignore the ABC of Marxism-Leninism. In a class society there is no reason that can transcend class. The proletariat has proletarian reason and the bourgeoisie bourgeois reason. Reason connotes that one must be good at formulating policies in the fundamental interests of one's own class and at taking actions according to one's basic class stand. The reason of Kennedy and his like lies in acting according to the fundamental interests of U.S. monopoly capital, and it is imperialist reason.

At a time when the international balance of class forces is becoming increasingly unfavorable to imperialism and the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war are meeting with constant setbacks, the U.S. imperialists have to disguise themselves more frequently under the cloak of peace.

It is true that Kennedy is rather clever at spinning words about peace and employing peace tactics. But as with his war policy, Kennedy's deceptive peace policy serves the "global strategy" of U.S. imperialism.

Kennedy's "strategy of peace" aims at unifying the whole world into the "world community of free nations" rooted in U.S. S. imperialist "law and justice".

The main points of Kennedy's "strategy of peace" are:

To promote U.S. neo-colonialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America by peaceful means;

To penetrate and dominate other imperialist and capitalist countries by peaceful means;

To encourage by peaceful means the socialist countries to take the Yugoslav Road of "peaceful evolution";

To weaken and undermine by peaceful means the struggle of the people of the world against imperialism.

In his recent speech at the United Nations General Assembly, Kennedy arrogantly announced the following conditions for peace between the United States and the Soviet Union:

(2) The German Democratic Republic must be incorporated into West Germany.
(3) Socialist Cuba must not be allowed to exist.
(4) The socialist countries in Eastern Europe must be given "free choice", by which he means that capitalism must be restored in these countries.
(5) The socialist countries must not support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations. To attain their aims by "peaceful means" wherever possible has been a customary tactic of imperialists and colonialists.

Reactionary classes always rely on two tactics to maintain their rule and to carry out foreign aggrandizement. One is the tactic of priest-like deception, the other that of butcher-like suppression. Imperialism always employs its deceptive policy of peace and its policy of war to reinforce each other, and they are complementary. The reason of Kennedy, who is the representative of U.S. monopoly capital, can express itself only in a more cunning use of these two tactics.

Violence is always the main tactic of reactionary ruling classes. Priest-like deception plays only a supplementary role. Imperialists always rely on positions of strength to carve out their spheres of influence. Kennedy has made this point very clear. He said, "In the end, the only way to maintain the peace is to be prepared in the final extreme to fight for our country--and to mean it." Since Kennedy took office, he has followed the "strategy of flexible response", which requires the speedy building of "versatile military forces" and the strengthening of "all-round power" so that the United States will be able to fight any kind of war it pleases, whether a general war or a limited war, whether a nuclear war or a conventional war, and whether a large war or a small war. This mad plan of Kennedy's has pushed U.S. arms expansion and war preparations to an unprecedented peak. Let us look at the following facts published by official U.S. sources:

1. The military expenditures of the U.S. Government have increased from 46,700 million dollars in the fiscal year 1960 to an estimated 60,000 million dollars in the fiscal year 1964, the highest total ever in peace time and greater than during the Korean war.

2. Kennedy recently declared that in the past two years and more there has been a 100 per cent increase in the number of nuclear weapons of the U.S. strategic alert forces and a 45 per cent increase in the number of Yugoslav Road combat-ready army divisions, the procurement of airlift aircraft has been increased by 175 per cent and there has been an increase by nearly five times in the "special guerrilla and counter-insurgency forces".

3. The U.S. Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff has mapped out plans for nuclear war against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Robert S. McNamara, the U.S. Secretary of Defense, declared at the beginning of this year:

... we have provided, throughout the period under consideration, a capability to destroy virtually all of the "soft" [above-ground] and '"semi-hard" [semi-protected] military targets in the Soviet Union and a large number of their fully hardened missile sites, with an additional capability in the form of a protected force to be employed or held in reserve for use against urban and industrial areas.

The United States has strengthened its network of nuclear missile bases directed against the socialist camp and has greatly strengthened the disposition of its missile-equipped nuclear submarines abroad.

At the same time, the troops of the NATO bloc under U.S. command have pushed eastward this year and approached the borders of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia.

4. The Kennedy Administration has reinforced its Military dispositions in Asia, Latin America and Africa and made great efforts to expand the "special forces" of its land, sea and air services in order to cope with the people's revolutionary movement in those areas. The United States has turned southern Viet Nam into a proving ground for "special warfare" and increased its troops there to more than 16,000.

5. It has strengthened its war commands. It has set up a "U.S. Strike Command" which controls a combined land and air force maintaining high combat readiness in peace time, so that it can be readily sent to any place in the world to provoke wars. It has also set up national military command centers both above and below ground, and organized an Emergency Airborne Command Post operating from aircraft and an Emergency Sea Command Post operating from warships.

These facts demonstrate that the U.S. imperialists are the wildest militarists of modern times, the wildest plotters of a new world war, and the most ferocious enemy of world peace.

It is thus clear that the U. S. imperialists have not become beautiful angels in spite of Khrushchev's bible reading and psalm-singing; they have not turned into compassionate Buddhas in spite of Khrushchev's prayers and incense-burning. However hard Khrushchev tries to serve the U.S. imperialists, they show not the slightest appreciation. They continue to expose their own peace camouflage by fresh and numerous activities of aggression and war, and thus they continue to slap Khrushchev in the face and reveal the bankruptcy of his ridiculous theories prettifying imperialism. The lot of the willing apologists of U.S. imperialism is indeed a sorry one.

The Question of the Possibility of Preventing a New World War

It is a fact that the imperialists headed by the United States are actively preparing a new world war and that the danger of such a war does exist. We should make this fact clear to the people.

But can a new world war be prevented?

The views of the Chinese Communists on this question have always been quite explicit.

After the conclusion of World War II, Comrade Mao Zedong scientifically analyzed the post-war international situation and advanced the view that a new world war can be prevented.

Back in 1946, in his well-known talk with the American correspondent Anna Louise Strong, he said:

> "But the fact that the U.S. reactionaries are now trumpeting so loudly about a U.S.-Soviet war and creating a foul atmosphere, so soon after the end of World War II, compels us to take a look at their real aims. It turns out that under the cover of anti-Soviet slogans they are frantically attacking the workers and democratic circles in the United States and turning all the countries which are the targets of U.S. external expansion into U.S. dependencies. I think the American people and the peoples of all countries menaced by U.S. aggression should unite and struggle against the attacks of the U.S. reactionaries and their running dogs in these countries. Only by victory in this struggle can a third world war be avoided; otherwise, it is unavoidable." [336]

Comrade Mao Zedong's remarks were directed against a pessimistic appraisal of the international situation at the time. The imperialists headed by the United States, together with the reactionaries in various countries, were daily intensifying their anti-Soviet, anti-Communist and anti-popular activities and trumpeting that "war between the United States and the Soviet Union is inevitable" and that "the outbreak of a third world war is inevitable". The Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries gave this great publicity in order to intimidate the Chinese people. Frightened by such blackmail, some comrades became faint-hearted in the face of the armed attack launched by the Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries with U.S. imperialist support and dared not firmly oppose the counter-revolutionary war with a revolutionary war. Comrade Mao Zedong held different views. He pointed out that a new world war could be prevented provided resolute and effective struggles were waged against world reaction. His scientific proposition was confirmed by the great victory of the Chinese Revolution. The victory of the Chinese Revolution brought about a tremendous change in the international balance of class forces.

Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out in June 1950:

> "The menace of war by the imperialist camp still exists, the possibility of a third world war still exists. But the forces thwarting the danger of war and preventing a third world war are rapidly developing, and the political consciousness of the broad masses of the people of the world is rising. A new world war can be prevented provided the Communist Parties of the

[336] Mao Zedong, Selected Works, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1961, p. 100.

world keep on uniting and strengthening all the forces of peace and democracy that can be united." [337]

In November 1957, at the meeting of fraternal Parties, Comrade Mao Zedong made a detailed analysis of the changes in international relations since the end of World War II and showed that the international situation had reached a new turning point. He vividly depicted the situation with a metaphor from a classical Chinese novel -- "The east wind prevails over the west wind". He said, "It is characteristic of the situation today, I believe, that the East wind is prevailing over the West wind. That is to say, the forces of socialism are overwhelmingly superior to the forces of imperialism." [338]

He arrived at this conclusion by an analysis of international class relations. He explicitly placed on the side of "the East wind" the socialist camp, the international working class, the Communist Parties, the oppressed people and nations and the peace-loving people and countries, while confining "the West wind" to the war forces of imperialism and reaction. The political meaning of this metaphor is very lucid and definite. The fact that the leaders of the CPSU and their followers are twisting is metaphor into a geographical or ethnical or meteorological concept only shows that they want to squeeze themselves into the ranks of the "West" in order to please the imperialists and to stir up chauvinism in Europe and North America.

Comrade Mao Zedong's main aim in stating that "the East wind prevails over the West wind" was to point to the growing possibility that a new world war could be prevented and that the socialist countries would be able to carry on their construction in a peaceful environment. These propositions of Comrade Mao Zedong have been and are the consistent views of the Communist Party of China.

It is thus clear that the leaders of the CPSU are deliberately concocting a lie in alleging that the Chinese Communist Party does "not believe in the possibility of preventing a new world war".

Again, it is clear that the thesis on the possibility of preventing a third world war was advanced by Marxist-Leninists long ago; it was not first put forward at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, nor is it Khrushchev's "creation".

Is it then true that Khrushchev has created nothing at all? No. He has created something. Unfortunately, these "creations" are by no means Marxist-Leninist, but revisionist.

First, Khrushchev has willfully interpreted the possibility of preventing a new world war as the only possibility, holding that there is no danger of a new world war.

Marxist-Leninists hold that while pointing to the possibility of preventing a new world war, we must also call attention to the possibility that imperialism may unleash a world war. Only by

[337] Renmin Ribao, June 13, 1950.
[338] On Imperialism and all Reactionaries Are Paper Tigers.

pointing to both possibilities, pursuing correct policies and preparing for both eventualities can we effectively mobilize the masses to wage struggles in Defense of world peace. Only thus will the socialist countries and people and other peace-loving countries and people not be caught unawares and utterly unprepared should imperialism force a world war on the people of the world.

However, Khrushchev and others are against exposing the danger of a new war which the imperialists are plotting. According to them, imperialism has actually become peace-loving. This is helping the imperialists to lull the masses and sap their fighting will so that they will lose their vigilance against the danger of the new war the imperialists are plotting.

Second, Khrushchev has willfully interpreted the possibility of preventing a new world war as the possibility of preventing all wars, holding that the Leninist axiom that war is inevitable so long as imperialism exists is outmoded.

The possibility of preventing a new world war is one thing; the possibility of preventing all wars, including revolutionary wars, is another. And it is completely wrong to confuse the two.

There is soil for wars so long as imperialism and the system of exploitation of man by man exist. This is an objective law discovered by Lenin after abundant scientific study.

> Stalin said in 1952 after indicating the possibility of preventing a new world war, "To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism." [339]

Lenin and Stalin are right and Khrushchev is wrong. History shows that while the imperialists have succeeded in launching two world wars, they have waged numerous wars of other kinds. Since World War II, by their policies of aggression and war the imperialists headed by the United States have brought about ceaseless local wars and armed conflicts of every description in many places, and especially in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is clear that national liberation wars are inevitable when the imperialists, and the U.S. imperialists in particular, send their troops or use their lackeys to carry out sanguinary suppression of the oppressed nations and countries fighting for or upholding national independence.

Lenin said:

> "To deny all possibility of national wars under imperialism is wrong in theory, obviously mistaken historically, and in practice is tantamount to European chauvinism." [340]

It is equally clear that revolutionary civil wars are inevitable when the bourgeois reactionaries suppress the people in their own countries by force of arms.

Lenin said:

---

[339] Stalin, Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., FLPH, Moscow, 1952, p. 41.
[340] Lenin, Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1950, Vol. I, Part 2, p. 571.

"... civil wars are also wars. Whoever recognizes the class struggle cannot fail to recognize civil wars, which in every class society are the natural, and under certain conditions, inevitable continuation, development and intensification of the class struggle. All the great revolutions prove this. To repudiate civil war, or to forget about it, would mean sinking into extreme opportunism and renouncing the socialist revolution." [341]

Nearly all the great revolutions in history were made through revolutionary wars. The American War of Independence and Civil War are cases in point. The French Revolution is another example. The Russian Revolution and the Chinese Revolution are of course examples too. The revolutions in Viet Nam, Cuba, Algeria, etc. are also well-known examples.

In summing up the lessons of the Paris Commune in his speech commemorating the seventh anniversary of the founding of the First International in 1871, Marx mentioned the conditions for the elimination of class domination and class oppression. He said, "... before such a change can be consummated, a dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary, and its first premise is an army of the proletariat. The working class must win the right to its emancipation on the battlefield." [342]

In accordance with Marxist-Leninist theory, Comrade Mao Zedong advanced in 1938 the famous thesis that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun", when discussing the lessons of the Russian and Chinese Revolutions. This thesis, too, has now become a target of attack by the leaders of the CPSU. They say it is evidence of China's being "warlike".

Respected friends, slanders like yours were refuted by Comrade Mao Zedong as far back as twenty-five years ago:

According to the Marxist theory of the state, the army is the chief component of state power. Whoever wants to seize and retain state power must have a strong army. Some people ridicule us as advocates of the "omnipotence of war". Yes, we are advocates of the omnipotence of revolutionary war; that is good, not bad, it is Marxist. [343]

What is wrong with Comrade Mao Zedong's remark? Only those who reject all the historical experience gained in the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions over the last few hundred years would reject this view of his.

With their guns, the Chinese people have created a socialist political power. All except imperialists and their lackeys can readily understand that this is a fine thing and that it is an important factor in safeguarding world peace and preventing a third world war.

[341] Lenin, Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. I, Part 2, p. 571.
[342] Marx and Engels, Works, German ed., Verlag Dietz, Berlin, 1962, Vol. 17, p. 433.
[343] Mao Zedong, Selected Military Writings, FLP, Peking, 1963, p. 273.

Marxist-Leninists never conceal their views. We whole-heartedly support every people's revolutionary war. As Lenin said of such revolutionary war, "Of all the wars known in history it is the only lawful, rightful, just, and truly great war." [344] If we are accused of being warlike simply because of this, it only goes to prove that we genuinely side with the oppressed peoples and nations and are true Marxist-Leninists.

The imperialists and revisionists always denounced the Bolsheviks and revolutionary leaders like Lenin and Stalin as being "warlike". The very fact that today we are likewise abused by imperialists and revisionists shows that we have been holding aloft the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism.

Khrushchev and others vigorously propagate the view that all wars can be prevented and "a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars" can be brought into being while imperialism still exists. This is nothing but Kautsky's theory of "ultra-imperialism" which has long been bankrupt. Their purpose is all too clear, it is to make the people believe that permanent peace can be realized under imperialism and thereby to abolish revolution and national liberation wars and revolutionary civil wars against imperialism and its lackies, and in fact to help the imperialists in their preparations for a new war.

Nuclear Fetishism and Nuclear Blackmail Are the Theoretical Basis and Guiding Policy of Modern Revisionism

The heart of the theory of the leaders of the CPSU on war and peace is their thesis that the emergence of nuclear weapons has changed everything and has changed the laws of class struggle.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU says, "The nuclear rocket weapons that were created in the middle of our century changed the old notions about war." In what way were they changed?

The leaders of the CPSU hold that with the appearance of nuclear weapons there is no longer any difference between just and unjust wars. They say, "the atomic bomb does not adhere to the class principle" and that "the atomic bomb does not distinguish between the imperialists and working people, it hits big areas and therefore millions of workers would be destroyed per one monopolist".

They hold that with the appearance of nuclear weapons the oppressed peoples and nations must abandon revolution and refrain from waging just popular revolutionary wars and wars of national liberation, or else such wars would lead to the destruction of mankind. They say, "... any small 'local war' might spark off the conflagration of a world war" and "Today, any sort of war, though it may break out as an ordinary non-nuclear war, is likely to develop into a destructive nuclear-missile conflagration." Thus, "We will destroy our Noah's Ark --the globe".

[344] Lenin, Collected Works, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. VIII, p. 107.

The leaders of the CPSU hold that the socialist countries must not resist but must yield to imperialist nuclear blackmail and war threats. Khrushchev said:

There can be no doubt that a world nuclear war, if started by the imperialist maniacs, would inevitably result in the downfall of the capitalist system, a system breeding war. But would the socialist countries and the cause of socialism all over the world benefit from a world nuclear disaster? Only people who deliberately shut their eyes to the facts can think so. As regards Marxist-Leninists, they cannot propose to establish a Communist civilization on the ruins of centers of world culture, on land laid waste and contaminated by nuclear fall-out. We need hardly add that in the case of many peoples, the question of socialism would be eliminated altogether because they would have disappeared bodily from our planet.

In short, according to the leaders of the CPSU, with the emergence of nuclear weapons, the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, and the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism have all disappeared. The world no longer has any class contradictions. They regard the contradictions in the contemporary world as boiling down to a single contradiction, that is, their fictitious contradiction between the so-called common survival of imperialism and the oppressed classes and nations on the one hand and their total destruction on the other.

As far as they are concerned, Marxism-Leninism, the Declaration and the Statement, and socialism and communism have all been cast to the winds.

How frankly *Pravda* puts it! "What is the use of principles if one's head is chopped off?"

This is tantamount to saying that the revolutionaries who died under the sabers of the reactionaries for the victory of the Russian revolutions, the October Revolution, the warriors who bravely gave up their lives in the Anti-Fascist War, the heroes who shed their blood in the struggle against imperialism and for national independence and the martyrs to the revolutionary cause through the ages were all fools. Why should they have given up their heads for adherence to principle?

This is the philosophy of out-and-out renegades. It is a shameless statement, to be found only in the confessions of renegades.

Guided by this theory of nuclear fetishism and nuclear blackmail, the leaders of the CPSU maintain that the way to defend world peace is not for all existing peace forces to unite and form the broadest united front against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys but for the two nuclear powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, to co-operate in settling the world's problems.

Khrushchev has said:

We [the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.] are the strongest countries in the world and if we unite for peace there can be no war. Then if any madman wanted war, we would but have to shake our fingers to warn him off.

It is thus apparent to everybody how far the leaders of the CPSU have gone in regarding the enemy as their friend.

In order to cover up their error, the leaders of the CPSU have not hesitated to attack the correct line of the CPC by lies and slanders. They assert that by advocating support for the peoples' wars of national liberation and revolutionary civil wars the Communist Party of China wants to provoke a nuclear world war.

This is a curious lie.

The Communist Party of China has always held that the socialist countries should actively support the peoples' revolutionary struggles, including wars of national liberation and revolutionary civil wars. To fail to do so would be to renounce their proletarian internationalist duty. At the same time, we hold that the oppressed peoples and nations can achieve liberation only by their own resolute revolutionary struggle and that no one else can do it for them.

We have always maintained that socialist countries must not use nuclear weapons to support the peoples' wars of national liberation and revolutionary civil wars and have no need to do so.

We have always maintained that the socialist countries must achieve and maintain nuclear superiority. Only this can prevent the imperialists from launching a nuclear war and help bring about the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

We consistently hold that in the hands of a socialist country; nuclear weapons must always be defensive weapons for resisting imperialist nuclear threats. A socialist country absolutely must not be the first to use nuclear weapons, nor should it in any circumstances play with them or engage in nuclear blackmail and nuclear gambling.

We are opposed both to the wrong practice on the part of the leaders of the CPSU of withholding support from the revolutionary struggles of the peoples and to their wrong approach to nuclear weapons. Instead of examining their own errors, they accuse us of hoping for a "head-on clash" between the Soviet Union and the United States and trying to push them into a nuclear war.

Our answer is: No, friends. You had better cut out your sensation-mongering calumny. The Chinese Communist Party is firmly opposed to a "head-on clash" between the Soviet Union and the United States, and not in words only. In deeds too it has worked hard to avert direct armed conflict between them. Examples of this are the Korean war against U.S. aggression in which we fought side by side with the Korean comrades and our struggle against the United States in the Taiwan Straits. We ourselves preferred to shoulder the heavy sacrifices necessary and stood in the first line of

Defense of the socialist camp so that the Soviet Union might stay in the second line. Have the leaders of the CPSU any sense of proletarian morality when they concoct such lies?

In fact, it is not we but the leaders of the CPSU who have frequently boasted that they would use nuclear weapons to help the anti-imperialist struggle of one country or another.

As everyone knows, the oppressed peoples and nations have no nuclear weapons and they cannot use them to make revolutions, nor is there any need for them to do so. The leaders of the CPSU admit that there is often no clear battle line between the two sides in national liberation wars and civil wars, and therefore the use of nuclear weapons is out of the question. We should then like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: What need is there for a socialist country to support the peoples' revolutionary struggles by nuclear weapons?

We should also like to ask them: How would a socialist country use nuclear weapons to support the revolutionary struggle of an oppressed people or nation? Would it use nuclear weapons on an area where a war of national liberation or a revolutionary civil war was in progress, thereby subjecting both the revolutionary people and the imperialists to a nuclear strike? Or would it be the first to use nuclear weapons against an imperialist country which was waging a conventional war of aggression elsewhere? Obviously, in either case it is absolutely impermissible for a socialist country to use nuclear weapons.

The fact is that when the leaders of the CPSU brandish their nuclear weapons, it is not really to support the people's anti-imperialist struggles.

Sometimes, in order to gain cheap prestige, they just publish empty statements which they never intend to honor.

At other times, during the Caribbean crisis for instance, they engage in speculative, opportunistic and irresponsible nuclear gambling for ulterior motives.

As soon as their nuclear blackmail is seen through and is countered in kind, they retreat one step after another, switch from adventurism to capitulationism and lose all by their nuclear gambling.

We wish to point out that the great Soviet people and Red Army have been and remain a great force safeguarding world peace. But Khrushchev's military ideas based on nuclear fetishism and nuclear blackmail are entirely wrong.

Khrushchev sees only nuclear weapons. According to him, "The present level of military technique being what it is, the Air Force and the Navy have lost their former importance. These arms are being replaced and not reduced."

Of course, those units and men having combat duties on the ground are even less significant. According to him, "In our time, a country's defensive capacity is not determined by the number of

men under arms, of men in uniform. ... a country's Defense potential depends in decisive measure on the fire-power and the means of delivery that country commands."

As for the militia and the people, they are still more inconsequential. Khrushchev has made the well-known remark that for those now having modern weapons at their disposal, the militia is not an army but just human flesh.

Khrushchev's whole set of military theories runs completely counter to Marxist-Leninist teachings on war and the army. To follow his wrong theories will necessarily involve disintegrating the army and disarming oneself morally.

Obviously, if any socialist country should accept Khrushchev's erroneous military strategy, it would inevitably place itself in a most dangerous position.

Khrushchev may confer on himself such titles as "a great peace champion", award himself a peace prize and pin heroes' medals on himself, but no matter how much he may praise himself, he will not be able to cover up his dangerous practice of recklessly playing with nuclear weapons or his fawning before imperialist nuclear blackmail.

Fight or Capitulate?

World peace can be won only through struggle by the people of all countries and not by begging the imperialists for it. Peace can be effectively safeguarded only by relying on the masses of the people and waging a tit-for-tat struggle against the imperialist policies of aggression and war. This is the correct policy.

Tit-for-tat struggle is an important conclusion drawn by the Chinese people from their prolonged struggle against imperialism and its lackeys.

Comrade Mao Zedong said:

> "Chiang Kai-shek always tries to wrest every ounce of power and every ounce of gain from the people, And we? Our policy is to give him tit for tat and to fight for every inch of land. We act after his fashion," [345]

He added:

> "He always tries to impose war on the people, one sword in his left hand and another in his right. We take up swords, too, following his example." [346]

Analyzing the domestic political situation in 1945, Comrade Mao Zedong said:

[345] Mao Zedong, Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 14.
[346] *Ibid*.

"How to give "tit for tat" depends on the situation. Sometimes, not going to negotiations is tit-for-tat; and sometimes, going to negotiations is also tit-for-tat... If they start fighting, we fight back, fight to win peace. Peace will not come unless we strike hard blows at the reactionaries who dare to attack the Liberated Areas." [347]

He drew the following historical lesson from the failure of China's Revolution of 1924-27:

"Confronted by counter-revolutionary attacks against the people, Chen Tu-hsiu did not adopt the policy of giving tit for tat and fighting for every inch of land; as a result, in 1927, within the space of a few months, the people lost all the rights they had won." [348]

The Chinese Communists understand and adhere to the policy of giving tit for tat. We oppose both capitulationism and adventurism. This correct policy ensured the victory of the Chinese revolution and the Chinese people's subsequent great successes in their struggle against imperialism.

All revolutionary people approve and welcome this correct fighting policy put forward by the Chinese Communists. All imperialists and reactionaries fear and hate it.

The policy of giving tit for tat as put forward by the CPC is virulently attacked by the leaders of the CPSU. This only goes to show that they do not in the least want to oppose imperialism. Their sole purpose in attacking and smearing the policy of tit for tat is to cover up their wrong line of catering to the needs of imperialism and surrendering to it.

The leaders of the CPSU assert that a tit-for-tat struggle against imperialism will lead to international tension. How terrible!

According to their logic, the imperialists are allowed to commit aggression and make threats against others but the victims of imperialist aggression are not allowed to fight, the imperialists are allowed to oppress others but the oppressed are not allowed to resist. This is a naked attempt to absolve the imperialists of their crimes of aggression. This is a philosophy of the jungle, pure and simple.

International tension is the product of the imperialist policies of aggression and war. The peoples should of course wage a firm struggle against imperialist aggression and threats. Facts have shown that only through struggle can imperialism be compelled to retreat and a genuine relaxation of international tension be achieved. Constant retreat before the imperialists cannot lead to genuine relaxation but will only encourage their aggression.

We have always opposed the creation of international tension by imperialism and stood for the relaxation of such tension. But the imperialists are bent on committing aggression and creating tension everywhere, and that can only lead to the opposite of what they desire.

---

[347] *Ibid.*, p. 56.
[348] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

Comrade Mao Zedong said:

> "The U.S. imperialists believe that they will always benefit from tense situations, but the fact is that tension created by the United States has led to the opposite of what they desire. It serves to mobilize the people of the whole world against the U.S. aggressors." [349]

Further, "If the U.S. monopoly groups persist in *their* policies of aggression and war, the day is bound to come when the people of the world will hang them by the neck." [350]

The Declaration of 1957 rightly says, "By this policy these anti-popular, aggressive imperialist forces are courting their own ruin, creating their own gravediggers."

> This is the dialectic of history. Those who revere the imperialists can hardly understand this truth.

The leaders of the CPSU assert that by advocating a tit-for-tat struggle the Chinese Communist Party has rejected negotiations. This again is nonsense.

We consistently maintain that those who refuse negotiations under all circumstances are definitely not Marxist-Leninists.

The Chinese Communists conducted negotiations with the Kuomintang many times during the revolutionary wars. They did not refuse to negotiate even on the eve of nation-wide liberation. Comrade Mao Zedong said in March 1949:

> "Whether the peace negotiations are over-all or local, we should be prepared for such an eventuality. We should not refuse to enter into negotiations because we are afraid of trouble and want to avoid complications, nor should we enter into negotiations with our minds in a haze. We should be firm in principle; we should also have all the flexibility permissible and necessary for carrying out our principles." [351]

Internationally, in struggling against imperialism and reaction, the Chinese Communists take the same correct attitude towards negotiations.

In October 1951, Comrade Mao Zedong had this to say about the Korean armistice negotiations:

> "We have long said that the Korean question should be settled by peaceful means. This still holds good now. So long as the U.S. government is willing to settle the question on a just and reasonable basis, and will stop using every shameless means possible to wreck and obstruct

[349] Renmin Ribao, Sept. 9, 1958.
[350] *Ibid*.
[351] Mao Zedong, Selected Works, FLP, Peking, Vol. IV, p. 372.

the progress of the negotiations, as it has done in the past, success in the Korean armistice negotiation is possible; otherwise, it is impossible." [352]

Resolute struggle against the U.S. imperialists has compelled them to accept the Korean armistice agreement in the course of negotiations. We took an active part in the 1954 Geneva Conference and contributed to the restoration of peace in Indo-China.

We are in favor of negotiations even with the United States, which has occupied our territory of Taiwan. The Sino-U.S. ambassadorial talks have been going on for more than eight years now.

We took an active part in the 1961 Geneva Conference on the Laotian question and promoted the signing of the Geneva agreements respecting the independence and neutrality of Laos.

Do the Chinese Communists allow themselves alone to negotiate with imperialist countries while opposing negotiations by the leaders of the CPSU with the leaders of Analyzing the imperialist countries?

No, of course not.

In fact, we have always actively supported all such negotiations by the Soviet Government with imperialist countries as are beneficial and not detrimental to the Defense of world peace.

Comrade Mao Zedong said on May 14, 1960:

"We support the holding of the summit conference whether or not this sort of conference yields achievements, or whether the achievements are big or small. But the winning of world peace should depend primarily on resolute struggle by the people of all countries." [353]

We favor negotiations with imperialist countries. But it is absolutely impermissible to pin hopes for world peace on negotiations, spread illusions about them and thereby paralyze the fighting will of the peoples, as Khrushchev has done. Actually, Khrushchev's wrong approach to negotiations is itself harmful to negotiations. The more Khrushchev retreats before the imperialists and the more he begs, the more the appetite of the imperialists will grow. Khrushchev, who poses as the greatest devotee of negotiations in history, is always an unrequited lover and too often a laughing-stock. Countless historical facts have shown that the imperialists and reactionaries never care to save the face of the capitulationists.

The Road in Defense of Peace and the Road Leading to War

To sum up, our difference with the leaders of the CPSU on the question of war and peace is one between two different lines--whether or not to oppose imperialism, whether or not to support

[352] Renmin Ribao, Oct. 24, 1951.
[353] Renmin Ribao, May 15, 1960.)

revolutionary struggles, whether or not to mobilize the people of the world against the imperialist war plots and whether or not to adhere to Marxism-Leninism.

Like all other genuine revolutionary parties, the Communist Party of China has always been in the forefront of the struggle against imperialism and for world peace.

We hold that to defend world peace it is necessary constantly to expose imperialism and to arouse and organize the people into struggle against the imperialists headed by the United States, and it is necessary to place reliance on the growth of the strength of the socialist camp, on the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and working people of all countries, on the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations, on the struggles of all peace-loving peoples and countries and on the broad united front against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

This line of ours is in keeping with the common line for all Communist Parties laid down in the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

With this line, it is possible ceaselessly to raise political consciousness of the people and to expand the struggle for world peace in the right direction.

With this line, it is possible constantly to strengthen the forces for world peace with the socialist camp as their core and strike at and weaken the imperialist forces for war.

With this line, it is possible constantly to expand the peoples' revolutions and manacle imperialism.

With this line, it is possible to turn to account all available factors, including the contradictions between U.S. imperialism and the other imperialist powers, and to isolate U.S. imperialism to the fullest extent.

With this line, it is possible to smash the nuclear blackmail practiced by U.S. imperialism and defeat its plan for launching a new world war.

This is the line for the people of all countries to win both victory in revolution and world peace. It is the sure and effective road in Defense of world peace.

But the line pursued by the leaders of the CPSU is diametrically opposed to our line, to the common line of all Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people.

The leaders of the CPSU direct the edge of their struggle not at the enemy of world peace but at the socialist camp, thus weakening and undermining the core of strength which defends world peace.

They use nuclear blackmail to intimidate the people of the socialist countries and forbid them to support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, thus helping U.S. imperialism to isolate the socialist camp and suppress peoples' revolutions.

They use nuclear blackmail to intimidate the oppressed peoples and nations and to prohibit them from making revolution, and they collaborate with U.S. imperialism in stamping out the "sparks" of revolution, thus enabling it freely to carry on its policies of aggression and war in the intermediate zone lying between the United States and the socialist camp.

They also intimidate the allies of the United States and forbid them to struggle against the control it has imposed on them, thus helping U.S. imperialism to enslave these countries and consolidate its position.

By this line of action, the leaders of the CPSU have altogether relinquished the struggle against the imperialist policies of aggression and war.

This line of action denies the united front against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys and in Defense of world peace.

It tries to impose the greatest isolation not on the arch-enemy of world peace but on the peace forces.

It means the liquidation of the fighting task of defending world peace.

This is a line that serves the "global strategy" of U.S. imperialism.

It is not the road to world peace but the road leading to greater danger of war and to war itself.

Today the world is no longer what it was on the eve of World War II. There is the powerful socialist camp. The national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America is surging forward. The political consciousness of the people of the world has been very much raised. The strength of the revolutionary peoples has been very much enhanced. The people of the Soviet Union, of the socialist countries and of the whole world will never allow their own destiny to be manipulated by the imperialist forces for war and their trumpeters.

The aggression and war activities of the imperialists and reactionaries are teaching the people of the world gradually to raise their political consciousness. Social practice is the sole criterion of truth. We are confident that as a result of such teaching by the imperialists add reactionaries, many people now holding wrong views on the question of war and peace will change their minds: We have high hopes on this score.

We firmly believe that the Communists and the people of the world will surely smash the imperialist plan for launching a new world war and safeguard world peace provided they expose the imperialist frauds, see through the revisionist lies and shoulder the task of defending world peace.

CPCh: Peaceful Coexistence — Two Diametrically Opposed Policies

Since the 20th Congress of the CPSU Khrushchev and other comrades have talked more about the question of peaceful coexistence than about anything else.

Again, and again the leaders of the CPSU claim that they have been faithful to Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence and have creatively developed it. They ascribe to their policy of "peaceful coexistence" all the credit for the victories won by the peoples of the world in prolonged revolutionary struggles.

They advertise the notion that imperialism, and U.S. imperialism in particular, supports peaceful coexistence, and they wantonly malign the Chinese Communist Party and all Marxist-Leninist parties as being opponents of peaceful coexistence. The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU even slanders China as favoring "competition in unleashing war" with the imperialists.

They describe the words and deeds by which they have betrayed Marxism-Leninism, the proletarian world revolution and the revolutionary cause of the oppressed peoples and nations as being in conformity with Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence.

But can the words "peaceful coexistence" really serve as a talisman for the leaders of the CPSU in their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism? No, absolutely not.

We are now confronted with two diametrically opposed policies of peaceful coexistence.

One is Lenin and Stalin's policy of peaceful coexistence, which all Marxist-Leninists, including the Chinese Communists, stand for.

The other is the anti-Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence, the so-called general line of peaceful coexistence advocated by Khrushchev and others.

Let us now examine Lenin and Stalin's policy of peaceful coexistence and the stuff Khrushchev and others call the general line of peaceful coexistence.

Lenin And Stalin's Policy of Peaceful Coexistence

It was Lenin who advanced the idea that the socialist state should pursue a policy of peaceful coexistence towards countries with different social systems. This correct policy was long followed by the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin.

The question of peaceful coexistence between socialist and capitalist countries could not possibly have arisen prior to the October Revolution, since there was no socialist country in existence. Nevertheless, on the basis of his scientific analysis of imperialism, Lenin foresaw in 1915-16 that

"Socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously *in all* countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois for some time". [354]

In other words, within a certain period of time, socialist countries would exist side by side with capitalist or pre-capitalist countries. The very nature of the socialist system determines that socialist countries must pursue a foreign policy of peace. Lenin said, "Only the working class, when it wins power, can pursue a policy of peace not in words . . . but in deeds." [355] These views of Lenin's can be said to constitute the theoretical basis of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

After the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin proclaimed to the world on many occasions that the foreign policy of the Soviet state was one of peace. But the imperialists were bent on strangling the new-born socialist republic in its cradle. They launched armed intervention against the Soviet state. Lenin rightly pointed out that confronted with this situation "unless we defended the socialist republic by force of arms, we could not exist". [356]

By 1920 the great Soviet people had defeated the imperialist armed intervention. A relative equilibrium of forces had come into being between the Soviet state and the imperialist countries. After trials of strength over several years, the Soviet state had stood its ground. It began to turn from war to peaceful construction. It was in these circumstances that Lenin advanced the idea of a policy of peaceful coexistence. In fact, from that time onwards the imperialists had no choice but to "coexist" with the Soviet state.

During Lenin's lifetime, this equilibrium was always highly unstable and the socialist Soviet Republic was subject to stringent capitalist encirclement. Time and again Lenin pointed out that owing to the aggressive nature of imperialism there was no guarantee that socialism and capitalism would live in peace for long.

In the prevailing conditions, it was not yet possible for him to define at length the content of the policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. But the great Lenin laid down the correct foreign policy for the first state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and advanced the basic ideas of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

What were Lenin's basic ideas on this policy?

First, Lenin pointed out that the socialist state existed in defiance of the imperialists' will. Although it adhered to the foreign policy of peace, the imperialists had no desire to live in peace with

---

[354] ("The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution", Selected Works, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1950, Vol. 1, Part 2, p. 571.

[355] "Draft Resolution on the Current Moment in Politics", Collected Works, fourth Russian ed., Gospolitizdat, Moscow, Vol. 25, pp. 291-92.

[356] ("Report of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) at the Eighth Party Congress", *Selected Works,* International Publishers, New York, 1943, Vol. 8, p. 33.

it and would do everything possible and seize every opportunity to oppose or even destroy the socialist state.

Lenin said:

> "International imperialism . . . could not . . . live side by side with the Soviet Republic, both because of its objective position and because of the economic interests of the capitalist class which are embodied in it. . ." [357]

Further,

> ". . . the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable." [358]

He therefore stressed time and again that the socialist state should maintain constant vigilance against imperialism.

> ". . . the lesson all workers and peasants must master is that we must be on our guard and remember that we are surrounded by men, classes and governments openly expressing their extreme hatred for us. We must remember that we are always at a hair's breadth from all kinds of invasions." [359]

Secondly, Lenin pointed out that it was only through struggle that the Soviet state was able to live in peace with the imperialist countries. This was the result of repeated trials of strength between the imperialist countries and the Soviet state, which adopted a correct policy, relied on the support of the proletariat and oppressed nations of the world and utilized the contradictions among the imperialists.

Lenin said in November 1919:

> "That is the way it always is — when the enemy is beaten, he begins talking peace. We have told these gentlemen, the imperialists of Europe, time and again that we agree to make peace, but they continued to dream of enslaving Russia. Now they have realized that their dreams are not fated to come true. [360]

---

[357] "Report on War and Peace, delivered to the Seventh Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), *Selected Works,* FLPH, Moscow, 1952. Vol. 2 Part 1, p. 422

[358] ("Report of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) at the Eighth Party Congress", Selected Works, New York, Vol. 8, p. 33.

[359] ("On the Domestic and Foreign Policies of the Republic, Report Delivered at the Ninth All-Russian Congress of Soviets", Collected Works, fourth Russian ed., Moscow, Vol. 33, p. 122.

[360] "Speech Delivered at the First All-Russian Conference on Party Work in the Countryside". Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry, FLPH, Moscow 1959, p. 326.

He pointed out in 1921:

> "... the imperialist powers, with all their hatred of Soviet Russia and desire to throw themselves upon her, have had to reject this thought, because the decay of the capitalist world is increasingly advancing, its unity is becoming less and less, and the pressure of the forces of the oppressed colonial peoples, with a population of over 1000 million, is becoming stronger with each year, each month and even each week." [361]

Thirdly, in carrying out the policy of peaceful coexistence, Lenin adopted different principles with regard to the different types of countries in the capitalist world. He attached particular importance to establishing friendly relations with countries which the imperialists were bullying and oppressing. He pointed out that "the fundamental interests of all peoples suffering from the yoke of imperialism coincide', and that the "world policy of imperialism is leading to the establishment of closer relations, alliance and friendship among all the oppressed nations". He said that the peace policy of the Soviet state "will increasingly compel the establishment of closer ties between the R.S.F.S.R. [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and a growing number of neighboring states". [362]

Lenin also said:

> "We now set as the main task for ourselves: to defeat the exploiters and win the waverers to our side — this task is a world-wide one. The waverers include a whole series of bourgeois states, which as bourgeois states hate us, but on the other hand, as oppressed states, prefer peace with us." [363]

As for the basis for peace with the imperialist countries, such as the United States, he said: "Let the U.S. capitalists refrain from touching us." "'The obstacle to such a peace?' From our side, there is none. From the side of the American (and all the other) capitalists, it is imperialism." [364]

Fourthly, Lenin advanced the policy of peaceful coexistence as a policy to be pursued by the proletariat in power towards countries with different social systems. He never made it the sum total of a socialist country's foreign policy. Time and again Lenin made it clear that the fundamental principle of this foreign policy was proletarian internationalism.

He said:

---

[361] ("Speech at the Conclusion of the Tenth National Conference of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)", Collected Works, fourth Russian ed., Vol. 32, pp. 412-13.
[362] "The Work of the Council of People's Commissars, Report Delivered at the Eighth All-Russian Congress of Soviets", Selected Works, New York, Vol. 8, pp. 251 and 252.
[363] "Report on the Work of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars", Collected Works, fourth Russian ed., Vol. 30, p. 299.
[364] ("Reply to Questions by the Correspondent of the American Newspaper, New York Evening Journal", Collected Works, fourth Russian ed., Vol. 30, p. 340.

"Soviet Russia considers it her greatest pride to help the workers of the whole world in their difficult struggle for the overthrow of capitalism." [365]

In the Decree on Peace issued after the October Revolution, while proposing an immediate peace without annexation or indemnities to all the belligerent countries, Lenin called upon the class-conscious workers in the capitalist countries to help, by comprehensive, determined, and supremely vigorous action, "to bring to a successful conclusion the cause of peace, and at the same time the cause of the emancipation of the toiling and exploited masses of the population from all forms of slavery and all forms of exploitation". [366]

The Draft Programme of the Party which Lenin drew up for the Seventh Congress of the Russian Communist Party laid down explicitly that "support of the revolutionary movement of the socialist proletariat in the advanced countries" and "support of the democratic and revolutionary movement in all countries in general, and particularly in the colonies and dependent countries" constituted the important aspects of the Party's international policy. [367]

Fifthly, Lenin consistently held that it was impossible for the oppressed classes and nations to coexist peacefully with the oppressor classes and nations.

In the Theses on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International, he pointed out:

". . . the bourgeoisie, even the most educated and democratic, now no longer hesitates to resort to any fraud or crime, to massacre millions of workers and peasants in order to save the private ownership of the means of production." [368]

Lenin's conclusions were:

". . . the very thought of peacefully subordinating the capitalists to the will of the majority of the exploited, of the peaceful, reformist transition to Socialism is not only extreme philistine stupidity, but also downright deception of the workers, the embellishment of capitalist wage slavery, concealment of the truth." [369]

He repeatedly pointed to the hypocrisy of what the imperialists called the equality of nations. He said:

The League of Nations and the whole postwar policy of the Entente reveal this truth more clearly and distinctly than ever, they are everywhere intensifying the revolutionary struggle

---

[365] ("To the Fourth World Congress of the Comintern and the Petrograd Soviet of Workers and Red Army Deputies", Collected Works, fourth Russian ed., Vol. 33, p 379.
[366] ("Report on Peace", delivered at the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2, Part 1, p. 331.
[367] Selected Works, New York, Vol. 8, p 334.
[368] Selected Works, New York, Vol. 10, p. 164.)
[369] *Ibid*.

both of the proletariat in the advanced countries and of the masses of the working people in the colonial and dependent countries, and are hastening the collapse of the petty-bourgeois national illusion that nations can live together in peace and equality under capitalism. [370]

The above constitute Lenin s basic ideas on the policy of peaceful coexistence.

Stalin upheld Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence. In the thirty years during which he was the leader of the Soviet Union, he consistently pursued this policy.

It was only when the imperialists and reactionaries made armed provocations or launched aggressive wars against the Soviet Union that she had to wage the Great Patriotic War and to fight back in self-Defense.

Stalin pointed out that "our relations with the capitalist countries are based on the assumption that the coexistence of two opposite systems is possible" and that "the maintenance of peaceful relations with the capitalist countries is an obligatory task for us". [371]

He also pointed out:

The peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism is quite possible provided there is a mutual desire to co-operate, readiness to carry out undertaken commitments, and observance of the principle of equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states. [372]

While upholding Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence, Stalin firmly opposed withholding support from other people's revolutions in order to curry favor with imperialism. He forcefully pointed out two opposite lines in foreign policy, "either one or the other" of which must be followed.

One line was that "we continue to pursue a revolutionary policy, rallying the proletarians and the oppressed of all countries around the working class of the U.S.S R. — in which case international capital will do everything it can to hinder our advance".

The other was that "we renounce our revolutionary policy and agree to make a number of fundamental concessions to international capital — in which case international capital no doubt, will not be averse to 'assisting' us in converting our socialist country into a 'good' bourgeois republic".

Stalin cited an example. "America demands that we renounce in principle the policy of supporting the emancipation movement of the working class in other countries, and says that if we made this concession everything would go smoothly. ... perhaps we should make this concession?"

---

[370] "Preliminary Draft of Theses on the National and Colonial Questions", Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2, Part 2, p. 464.
[371] "Political Report of the Central Committee" delivered at the Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.), Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1954, Vol. 10, p. 296.
[372] Stalin, "Replies to Questions of American Editors", Pravda, April 2, 1952.

And he answered in the negative, ". . . we cannot agree to these or similar concessions without being false to ourselves. . ." [373]

These remarks of Stalin's are still of great practical significance. There are indeed two diametrically opposed foreign policies, two diametrically opposed policies of peaceful coexistence. It is an important task for all Marxist-Leninists to distinguish between them, uphold Lenin and Stalin's policy and firmly oppose the policy of betrayal, capitulation and withholding support from revolution as well as the policy which converts a socialist country into a "good" bourgeois republic — policies which Stalin denounced.

The Communist Party of China Upholds Lenin's Policy of Peaceful Coexistence

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU alleges that the Chinese Communist Party "lacks faith in the possibility of peaceful coexistence" and slanderously accuses it of opposing Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence.

Is this true? No. Of course not.

Anyone who respects facts can see clearly that the Chinese Communist Party and the Government of the People's Republic of China have unswervingly pursued Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence with great success.

Since World War II, a fundamental change has taken place in the international balance of class forces. Socialism has triumphed in a number of countries and the socialist camp has come into being. The national liberation movement is growing apace and there have emerged many nationalist states which have newly acquired political independence. The imperialist camp has been greatly weakened and the contradictions among the imperialist countries are becoming increasingly acute. This situation provides more *favorable* conditions for the socialist countries to carry out the policy of peaceful coexistence towards countries with different social systems.

In these new historical conditions, the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government have enriched Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence in the course of applying it.

On the eve of the birth of the People's Republic of China, Comrade Mao Zedong said:

> ". . . we proclaim to the whole world that what we oppose is exclusively the imperialist system and its plots against the Chinese people. We are willing to discuss with any foreign government the establishment of diplomatic relations on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual benefit and mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, provided it is willing to sever relations with the Chinese reactionaries, stops conspiring with them or helping them and adopts an attitude of genuine, and not hypocritical, friendship towards People's China. The Chinese people wish to have friendly co-operation with the people of all countries

[373] "The Work of the April Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission", Works, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 11, pp. 58-60.

and to resume and expand international trade in order to develop production and promote economic prosperity." [374]

In accordance with these principles set forth by Comrade Mao Zedong, we laid down our foreign policy of peace in explicit terms first in the Common Programme adopted by the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference m September 1949 and subsequently in the Constitution of the People's Republic of China adopted by the National People's Congress in September 1954.

In 1954 the Chinese Government initiated the celebrated Five Principles of peaceful coexistence. They are mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. Together with other Asian and African countries, we formulated the Ten Principles on the basis of the Five Principles at the Bandung Conference of 1955.

In 1956 Comrade Mao Zedong summed up our country's practical experience in international affairs and further explained the general principles of our foreign policy.

To achieve a lasting world peace, we must further develop our friendship and co-operation with the fraternal countries in the camp of socialism and strengthen our solidarity with all peace-loving countries. We must endeavor to establish normal diplomatic relations on the basis of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty and of equality and mutual benefit with all countries willing to live together with us in peace. We must give active support to the national independence and liberation movement in countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America as well as to the peace movement and to just struggles in all countries throughout the world. [375]

In 1957 he said:

"To strengthen our unity with the Soviet Union, to strengthen our unity with all socialist countries — this is our fundamental policy, herein lies our basic interest.

Then, there are the Asian and African countries, and all the peace-loving countries and peoples — we must strengthen and develop our unity with them.

As for the imperialist countries, we should also unite with their peoples and strive to coexist in peace with these countries, do business with them and prevent any possible war, but under no circumstances should we harbor any unrealistic notions about them." [376]

[374] "Address to the Preparatory Committee of the New Political Consultative Conference", Selected Works, Foreign Languages Press, Peking 1961, Vol. IV, p. 408.
[375] "Opening Address to the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China."
[376] On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People.)

In our foreign affairs over the past fourteen years, we have adopted different policies towards different types of countries and varied our policies according to the different conditions in countries of the same type.

1. We differentiate between socialist and capitalist countries. We persevere in the proletarian internationalist principle of mutual assistance with regard to socialist countries. We take the upholding and strengthening of the unity of all the countries in the socialist camp as the fundamental policy in our foreign relations.

2. We differentiate between the nationalist countries which have newly attained political independence and the imperialist countries.

Although fundamentally different from the socialist countries in their social and political systems, the nationalist countries stand in profound contradiction to imperialism. They have common interests with the socialist countries — opposition to imperialism, the safeguarding of national independence and the Defense of world peace. Therefore, it is quite possible and feasible for the socialist countries to establish relations of peaceful coexistence and friendly co-operation with these countries. The establishment of such relations is of great significance for the strengthening of the unity of the anti-imperialist forces and for the advancement of the common struggle of the peoples against imperialism.

We have consistently adhered to the policy of consolidating and further developing peaceful coexistence and friendly co-operation with countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. At the same time, we have waged appropriate and necessary struggles against countries such as India which have violated or wrecked the Five Principles.

3. We differentiate between the ordinary capitalist countries and the imperialist countries and also between different imperialist countries.

As the international balance of class forces grows increasingly *favorable* to socialism and as the imperialist forces become daily weaker and the contradictions among them daily sharper, it is possible for the socialist countries to compel one imperialist country or another to establish some sort of peaceful coexistence with them by relying on their own growing strength, the expansion of the revolutionary forces of the peoples, the unity with the nationalist countries and the struggle of all the peace-loving people, and by utilizing the internal contradictions of imperialism.

While persevering in peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems, we unswervingly perform our proletarian internationalist duty. We actively support the national liberation movements of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the working-class movements of Western Europe, North America and Australasia, the people's revolutionary struggles, and the people's struggles against the imperialist policies of aggression and war and for world peace.

In all this we have but one objective in view, that is, with the socialist camp and the international proletariat as the nucleus, to unite all the forces that can be united in order to form a broad united front against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

On the basis of the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence, the Chinese Government over the past ten years and more has established friendly relations with many countries having different social systems and promoted economic and cultural exchanges with them. China has concluded treaties of friendship, of peace and friendship or of friendship, mutual assistance and mutual non-aggression with the Yemen, Burma, Nepal, Afghanistan, Guinea, Cambodia, Indonesia and Ghana. She has successfully settled her boundary questions with Burma, Nepal, Pakistan, Afghanistan, etc., questions which were left over by history.

No one can obliterate the great achievements of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government in upholding Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence.

In manufacturing the lie that China opposes peaceful coexistence, the leaders of the CPSU are prompted by ulterior motives. To put it bluntly, their aim is to draw a veil over their own ugliness in betraying proletarian internationalism and colluding with imperialism.

The General Line Of "Peaceful Coexistence" Of the CPSU Leaders

It is not we, but the leaders of the CPSU, who in fact violate Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence.

The leaders of the CPSU have lauded their concept of peaceful coexistence in superlative terms. What are their main views on the question of peaceful coexistence?

(1) The leaders of the CPSU maintain that peaceful coexistence is the overriding and supreme principle for solving contemporary social problems. They assert that it is "the categorical imperative of modern times" and "the imperious demand of the epoch". [377] They say that "peaceful coexistence alone is the best and the sole acceptable way to solve the vitally important problems confronting society" [378] and that the principle of peaceful coexistence should be made the "basic law of life of the whole of modern society ". [379]

(2) They hold that imperialism has become willing to accept peaceful coexistence and is no longer the obstacle to it. They say that "not a few government and state leaders of Western countries are now also coming out for peace and peaceful coexistence", [380] and that they "understand more and more clearly the necessity of peaceful coexistence". [381] In particular

[377] B. N. Ponomaryov, "Victorious Banner of the Communists of the World", Pravda, Nov. 18, 1962.
[378] A. Rumyantsev, "Our Common Ideological Weapon", Problems of Peace and Socialism, No. 1, 1962.
[379] N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the U. N. General Assembly, Sept 23, 1960.
[380] N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Gadjah Mada University, Djokjakarta, Indonesia, Feb. 21, 1960.
[381] N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., Jan. 14, 1960.

they have loudly announced a U.S. President's "admission of the reasonableness and practicability of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems". [382]

(3) They advocate "all-round co-operation" with imperialist countries, and especially with the United States. They say that the Soviet Union and the United States "will be able to find a basis for concerted actions and efforts for the good of all humanity" [383] and can "march hand in hand for the sake of consolidating peace and establishing real international co-operation between all states". [384]

(4) They assert that peaceful coexistence is "the general line of foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp". [385]

(5) They also assert that "the principle of peaceful coexistence determines the general line of foreign policy of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties", [386] that it is "the basis of the strategy of communism" in the world today, and that all Communists "have made the struggle for peaceful coexistence the general principle of their policy". [387]

(6) They regard peaceful coexistence as the prerequisite for victory in the peoples' revolutionary struggles. They hold that the victories won by the people of different countries have been achieved under "conditions of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems". [388] They assert that "it was precisely in conditions of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems that the socialist revolution triumphed in Cuba, that the Algerian people gained national independence, that more than forty countries won national independence, that the fraternal Parties grew in number and strength. and that the influence of the world communist movement increased". [389]

(7) They hold that peaceful coexistence is "the best way of helping the international revolutionary labor movement achieve its basic class aims". [390] They declare that under peaceful coexistence the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism in capitalist countries has grown They believe, moreover, that the victory of socialism in economic competition "will mean delivering a crushing blow to the entire system of capitalist relationships". [391] They state that "when the Soviet people will enjoy the blessings of

---

[382] Editorial article in Izvestia, Dec. 4, 1961.
[383] Telegram of greetings from N. S. Khrushchev and L. Brezhnev to John F. Kennedy, Dec. 30, 1961.
[384] See p. 18, note 2.
[385] N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Reception given by the Embassy of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the Soviet Union, July 5, 1961.
[386] B. N. Ponomaryov, "Some Problems of the Revolutionary Movement", Problems of Peace and Socialism, No. 12, 1962.
[387] Kommunist (Moscow), No. 2, 1962, p. 89.
[388] B. N. Ponomaryov, "A New Stage in the General Crisis of Capitalism", Pravda, Feb. 8, 1981.
[389] Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Mar. 30, 1963.
[390] Open Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to Party Organizations and All Communists in the Soviet Union, July 14, 1963.
[391] See p. 19. note 3.

communism, new hundreds of millions of people on earth will say: 'We are for communism!'" [392] and that by then even capitalists may "go over to the Communist Party".

Just consider. What do these views have in common with Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence?

Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence is one followed by a socialist country in its relations with countries having different social systems, whereas Khrushchev describes peaceful coexistence as the supreme principle governing the life of modern society.

Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence constitutes one aspect of the international policy of the proletariat in power, whereas Khrushchev stretches peaceful coexistence into the general line of foreign policy for the socialist countries and even further into the general line for all Communist Parties.

Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence was directed against the imperialist policies of aggression and war, whereas Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence caters to imperialism and abets the imperialist policies of aggression and war.

Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence is based on the standpoint of international class struggle, whereas Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence strives to replace international class struggle with international class collaboration.

Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence proceeds from the historical mission of the international proletariat and therefore requires the socialist countries to give firm support to the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed peoples and nations while pursuing this policy, whereas Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence seeks to replace the proletarian world revolution with pacifism and thus renounces proletarian internationalism.

Khrushchev has changed the policy of peaceful coexistence into one of class capitulation. In the name of peaceful coexistence, he has renounced the revolutionary principles of the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960, robbed Marxism-Leninism of its revolutionary soul, and distorted and mutilated it beyond recognition.

This is a brazen betrayal of Marxism-Leninism!

Three Differences of Principle

On the question of peaceful coexistence, the difference between the leaders of the CPSU, on the one hand, and ourselves and all Marxist-Leninist parties and indeed all Marxist-Leninists, on the other, is not whether socialist countries should pursue the policy of peaceful coexistence. It is an issue

[392] Programme of the CPSU, adopted by the 22nd Congress of the CPSU.

of principle concerning the correct attitude towards Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence. It manifests itself mainly in three questions.

The first question is: In order to attain peaceful coexistence, is it necessary to wage struggles against imperialism and bourgeois reaction? Is it possible through peaceful coexistence to abolish the antagonism and struggle between socialism and imperialism?

Marxist-Leninists consistently maintain that as far as the socialist countries are concerned, there is no obstacle to the practice of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. The obstacles always come from the imperialists and the bourgeois reactionaries.

The Five Principles of peaceful coexistence were advanced to combat the imperialist policies of aggression and war. Under these principles, it is impermissible in international relations to encroach upon the territory and sovereignty of other countries, interfere in their internal affairs, impair their interests and equal status or wage aggressive wars against them. But it is in the very nature of imperialism to commit aggression against other countries and nations and to desire to enslave them. As long as imperialism exists, its nature will never change. That is why intrinsically the imperialists are unwilling to accept the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence. Whenever possible, they try to disrupt and destroy the socialist countries and they commit aggression against other countries and nations and try to enslave them.

History shows that it is only owing to unfavorable objective causes that the imperialists dare not risk starting a war against the socialist countries, or are forced to agree to an armistice and to accept some sort of peaceful coexistence.

History also shows that there have always been sharp and complex struggles between the imperialist and socialist countries, which have sometimes culminated in direct military conflicts or wars. When hot wars are not in progress, the imperialists wage cold wars, which they have been ceaselessly waging ever since the end of World War II. In fact, the imperialist and the socialist countries have been in a state of cold-war coexistence. At the same time as they actively expand their armaments and prepare for war, the imperialist countries use every means to oppose the socialist countries politically, economically and ideologically, and even make military provocations and war threats against them. The imperialists' cold war against the socialist countries and the latter's resistance to it are manifestations of the international class struggle.

The imperialists push on with their plans of aggression and war not only against the socialist countries but throughout the world. They try to suppress the revolutionary movements of the oppressed peoples and nations.

In these circumstances, the socialist countries, together with the people of all other countries, must resolutely combat the imperialist policies of aggression and war and wage a tit-for-tat struggle against imperialism. This class struggle inevitably goes on, now in an acute and now in a relaxed form.

But Khrushchev is impervious to these inexorable facts. He proclaims far and wide that imperialism has already admitted the necessity of peaceful coexistence, and he regards the anti-imperialist struggles of the socialist countries and of the people of the world as incompatible with the policy of peaceful coexistence.

In Khrushchev's opinion, a socialist country has to make one concession after another and keep on yielding to the imperialists and the bourgeois reactionaries even when they subject it to military threats and armed attack or make humiliating demands which violate its sovereignty and dignity.

By this logic, Khrushchev describes his incessant retreats, his bartering away of principles and docile acceptance of the U.S. imperialists' humiliating demands during the Caribbean crisis as "a victory of peaceful coexistence".

By the same logic, Khrushchev describes China's adherence to correct principles on the Sino-Indian boundary question and her counter-attack against the military onslaught of the Indian reactionaries, an act of self-Defense by China when the situation became intolerable, as "a violation of peaceful coexistence".

At times, Khrushchev also talks about struggle between the two different social systems. But how does he see this struggle?

He has said, "The inevitable struggle between the two systems must be made to take the form exclusively of a struggle of ideas...." [393]

Here the political struggle has disappeared!

He has also said:

The Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of states with differing socio-economic and political systems does not mean just an absence of war, a temporary state of unstable ceasefire. It presupposes the maintenance between these states of friendly economic and political relations; it envisages the establishment and development of various forms of peaceful international co-operation. [394]

Here, struggle has disappeared altogether!

Like a conjurer, Khrushchev plays one trick after another, first reducing major issues to minor ones, and then minor issues to naught. He denies the basic antagonism between the socialist and capitalist systems, he denies the fundamental contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist

[393] See p. 18, note 4.
[394] N. S. Khrushchev, "Answers to the Questions of the Austrian Professor Hans Thirring", Pravda, Jan. 3, 1962.

camps, and he denies the existence of international class struggle. And so, he transforms peaceful coexistence between the two systems and the two camps into "all-round co-operation".

The second question is: Can peaceful coexistence be made the general line of foreign policy for socialist countries?

We hold that the general line of foreign policy for socialist countries must embody the fundamental principle of their foreign policy and comprise the fundamental content of this policy.

What is this fundamental principle? It is proletarian internationalism.

Lenin said, "Alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all the oppressed peoples against any and all the imperialists — such is the external policy of the proletariat." ("The External Policy of the Russian Revolution", *Collected Works,* fourth Russian ed., Vol. 25, p. 69.) This principle of proletarian internationalism advanced by Lenin should be the guide for the foreign policy of socialist countries.

Since the formation of the socialist camp, every socialist country has had to deal with three kinds of relations in its foreign policy, namely, its relations with other socialist countries, with countries having different social systems, and with the oppressed peoples and nations.

In our view, the following should therefore be the content of the general line of foreign policy for socialist countries: to develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance and co-operation among the countries of the socialist camp in accordance with the principle of proletarian internationalism; to strive for peaceful coexistence on the basis of the Five Principles with countries having different social systems and oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war; and to support and assist the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed peoples and nations. These three aspects are interrelated and not a single one can be omitted.

The leaders of the CPSU have one-sidedly reduced the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries to peaceful coexistence. We would like to ask: How should a socialist country handle its relations with other socialist countries? Should it merely maintain relations of peaceful coexistence with them?

Of course, socialist countries, too, must abide by the Five Principles in their mutual relations. It is absolutely impermissible for any one of them to undermine the territorial integrity of another fraternal country, to impair its independence and sovereignty, interfere in its internal affairs, carry on subversive activities inside it, or violate the principle of equality and mutual benefit in its relations with another fraternal country. But merely to carry out these principles is far from enough. The 1957 Declaration states:

These are vital principles... However, they do not exhaust the essence of relations between them. Fraternal mutual aid is part and parcel of these relations. This aid is a striking expression of socialist internationalism.

In making peaceful coexistence the general line of foreign policy, the leaders of the CPSU have in fact liquidated the proletarian internationalist relations of mutual assistance and co-operation among socialist countries and put the fraternal socialist countries on a par with the capitalist countries. This amounts to liquidating the socialist camp.

The leaders of the CPSU have one-sidedly reduced the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries to peaceful coexistence. We would like to ask: How should a socialist country handle its relations with the oppressed peoples and nations? Should the relationship between the proletariat in power and its class brothers who have not yet emancipated themselves or between it and all oppressed peoples and nations be one of peaceful coexistence alone and not of mutual help?

After the October Revolution, Lenin repeatedly stressed that the land of socialism, which had established the dictatorship of the proletariat, was a base for promoting the proletarian world revolution. Stalin, too, said, "The revolution which has been victorious in one country must regard itself not as a self-sufficient entity, but as an aid, as a means *for* hastening the victory of the proletariat in all countries." [395] He added that "it constitutes . . . a mighty base for its further development [i.e. of the world revolution]". [396]

In their foreign policy, therefore, socialist countries can in no circumstances confine themselves to handling relations with countries having different social systems, but must also correctly handle the relations among themselves and their relations with the oppressed peoples and nations. They must make support of the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations their internationalist duty and an important component of their foreign policy.

In contrast with Lenin and Stalin, Khrushchev makes peaceful coexistence the general line of foreign policy for socialist countries and, in so doing, excludes from this policy the proletarian internationalist task of helping the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations. So far from being a "creative development" of the policy of peaceful coexistence, this is a betrayal of proletarian internationalism on the pretext of peaceful coexistence.

The third question is: Can the policy of peaceful coexistence of the socialist countries be the general line for all Communist Parties and for the international communist movement? Can it be substituted for the people's revolution?

We maintain that peaceful coexistence connotes a relationship between countries with different social systems, between independent sovereign states. Only after victory in the revolution is it possible and necessary for the proletariat to pursue the policy of peaceful coexistence. As for oppressed peoples and nations, their task is to strive for their own liberation and overthrow the rule

[395] "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists", Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1953, Vol. 6, p. 415.
[396] *Ibid*, p. 419.

of imperialism and its lackeys. They should not practice peaceful coexistence with the imperialists and their lackeys, nor is it possible for them to do so.

It is therefore wrong to apply peaceful coexistence to the relations between oppressed and oppressor classes and between oppressed and oppressor nations, or to stretch the socialist countries' policy of peaceful coexistence so as to make it the policy of the Communist Parties and the revolutionary people in the capitalist world, or to subordinate the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations to it.

We have always held that the correct application of Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence by the socialist countries helps to develop their power, to expose the imperialist policies of aggression and war and to unite all the anti-imperialist peoples and countries, and it therefore helps the people's struggles against imperialism and its lackeys. At the same time, by directly hitting and weakening the forces of aggression, war and reaction, the people's revolutionary struggles against imperialism and its lackeys help the cause of world peace and human progress, and therefore help the socialist countries' struggle for peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems. Thus, the correct application of Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence by the socialist countries is in harmony with the interests of the people's revolutionary struggles in all countries.

However, the socialist countries' struggle for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems and the people's revolution in various countries are two totally different things.

In its letter of June 14 replying to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Central Committee of the CPC states:

. . . it is one thing to practice peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. It is absolutely impermissible and impossible for countries practicing peaceful coexistence to touch even a hair of each other's social system. The class struggle, the struggle for national liberation and the transition from capitalism to socialism in various countries are quite another thing. They are all bitter, life-and-death revolutionary struggles which aim at changing the social system. Peaceful coexistence cannot replace the revolutionary struggles of the people. The transition from capitalism to socialism in any country can only be brought about through the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in that country.

In a class society it is completely wrong to regard peaceful coexistence as "the best and the sole acceptable way to solve the vitally important problems confronting society" and as the "basic law of life for the whole of modern society". This is social pacifism which repudiates class struggle. It is an outrageous betrayal of Marxism-Leninism.

Back in 1946, Comrade Mao Zedong differentiated between the two problems and explicitly stated that compromise between the Soviet Union and the United States, Britain and France on certain issues "does not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and

make compromises at home. The people in those countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions." ("Some Points in Appraisal of the Present International Situation", *Selected Works,* Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 87.)

This is a correct Marxist-Leninist policy. Guided by this correct policy of Comrade Mao Zedong's, the Chinese people firmly and determinedly carried the revolution through to the end and won the great victory of their revolution.

Acting against this Marxist-Leninist policy, the leaders of the CPSU equate one aspect of the policy to be pursued by the proletariat in power in its state relations with countries having different social systems with the general line of all the Communist Parties, and they try to substitute the former for the latter, demanding that Communist Parties and revolutionary peoples should all follow what they call the general line of peaceful coexistence. Not desiring revolution themselves, they forbid others to make it. Not opposing imperialism themselves, they forbid others to oppose it.

This the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU and Khrushchev's recent remarks have strenuously denied. It has been asserted that it is "a monstrous slander to accuse the leaders of the CPSU of extending peaceful coexistence to relations between the oppressed and oppressor classes and between the oppressed and oppressor nations. They have even hypocritically stated that peaceful coexistence "cannot be extended to the class struggle against capital within the capitalist countries and to national liberation movement".

But such prevarication is futile.

We should like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Since the policy of peaceful coexistence constitutes only one aspect of the foreign policy of socialist countries, why have you asserted until recently that it represents "the strategic line for the whole period of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale"? [397] In requiring the Communist Parties of all the capitalist countries and of the oppressed nations to make peaceful coexistence their general line, are you not aiming at replacing the revolutionary line of the Communist Parties with your policy of "peaceful coexistence" and willfully applying that policy to the relations between oppressed and oppressor classes and between oppressed and oppressor nations?

We should also like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Since the peoples win victory in their revolutions by relying primarily on their own struggles, how can such victory be attributed to peaceful coexistence or described as its outcome? Do not such allegations of yours mean the subordination of the revolutionary struggles of the peoples to your policy of peaceful coexistence?

We should further like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Economic successes in socialist countries and the victories they score in economic competition with capitalist countries undoubtedly play an exemplary role and are an inspiration to oppressed peoples and nations. But how can it be

[397] "For the Unity and Solidarity of the International Communist Movement", editorial article in Pravda, Dec. 6, 1963.

said that socialism will triumph on a worldwide scale through peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition instead of through the revolutionary struggles of the peoples?

The leaders of the CPSU advertise reliance on peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition as being enough to "deliver a crushing blow to the entire system of capitalist relationships" and bring about world-wide peaceful transition to socialism. This is equivalent to saying that the oppressed peoples and nations have no need to wage struggles, make revolution and overthrow the reactionary rule of imperialism and colonialism and their lackeys, and that they should just wait quietly — until the production levels and living standards of the Soviet Union outstrip those of the most developed capitalist countries, when the oppressed and exploited slaves throughout the world would be able to enter communism together with their oppressors and exploiters. Is this not an attempt on the part of the leaders of the CPSU to substitute what they call peaceful coexistence for the revolutionary struggles of the peoples and to liquidate such struggles?

An analysis of these three questions makes it clear that our difference with the leaders of the CPSU is a major difference of principle. In essence it boils down to this. Our policy of peaceful coexistence is Leninist and is based on the principle of proletarian internationalism. It contributes to the cause or opposing imperialism and defending world peace and accords with the interests of the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations the world over: whereas the so-called general line of peaceful coexistence pursued by the leaders of the CPSU is anti-Leninist, it abandons the principle of proletarian internationalism, damages the cause of opposing imperialism and defending world peace, and runs counter to the interests of the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations.

The CPSU Leaders' General Line of Peaceful Coexistence Caters to U.S. Imperialism

The general line of peaceful coexistence pursued by the leaders of the CPSU is firmly rejected by all Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary people but is warmly praised by the imperialists.

The spokesmen of Western monopoly capital make no secret of their appreciation of this general line of the leaders of the CPSU. They see in Khrushchev "the West's best friend in Moscow" [398] and say that "Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev acts like an American politician". [399] They say, "Comrade Khrushchev is considered, as far as the free world is concerned, the best Prime Minister the Russians have. He genuinely believes in peaceful coexistence." [400] They declare that "this possibility of better Soviet-American relations has led to the feeling in U.S. State Department circles that, within certain limits, the U.S. should facilitate Khrushchev's task". [401]

[398] "How Nice Must We Be to Nikita?" in the U.S. magazine Time, Mar. 9, 1962.
[399] U.S. Under-Secretary of State Harriman's television interview, Aug. 18, 1963.
[400] "Kennedy Helps Khrushchev", in the British magazine Time and Tide, Apr. 18-24, 1963.
[401] Agence France Presse dispatch from Washington, July 14 1963, on U.S. government officials' comment on the Open Letter of the CPSU.

The imperialists have always been hostile to the socialist countries' policy of peaceful coexistence, exclaiming "the very phrase 'coexistence' is both weird and pre-sumptuous" and "let us relegate to the scrap heap the concept of a transitory and uneasy coexistence". [402] Why do they now show so much interest in Khrushchev's general line of peaceful coexistence? Because the imperialists are clear on its usefulness to them.

The U.S. imperialists have invariably adopted the dual tactics of war and peace in order to attain their strategic objectives of liquidating the people's revolutions, eliminating the socialist camp and dominating the world. When they find the international situation growing unfavorable to them, they need to resort increasingly to peace tricks while continuing their arms expansion and war preparations.

In 1958 John Foster Dulles proposed that the United States should dedicate itself to "a noble strategy" of "peaceful triumph". [403]

After assuming office, Kennedy continued and developed Dulles' "strategy of peace" and talked a great deal about "peaceful coexistence". He said, ". . . we need a much better weapon than the H-bomb . . . and that better weapon is peaceful co-operation." [404]

Does this mean that the U.S. imperialists genuinely accept peaceful coexistence, or, in the words of the leaders of the CPSU, admit "the reasonableness and practicability of peaceful coexistence"? Of course not.

A little serious study makes it easy to see the real meaning and purpose of "peaceful coexistence" as advocated by the U.S. imperialists.

What is its real meaning and purpose?

1. In the name of peaceful coexistence, the U.S. imperialists try to tie the hands of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and forbid them to support the revolutionary struggles of the people in the capitalist world.

Dulles said:

The Soviet Government could end the "cold war", so far as it is concerned if it would free itself from the guiding direction of international communism and seek primarily the welfare of the Russian nation and people. Also, the "cold war" would come to an end if international communism abandoned its global goals. . . [405]

[402] Formerly U.S. Under-Secretary of State Douglas Dillon's address on U.S. foreign policy, Apr. 20, 1960.
[403] Dulles' speech before the California State Chamber of Commerce, Dec. 4, 1958.
[404] Kennedy's speech at the U.N. General Assembly, Sept. 20, 1963.
[405] Dulles' speech before the U.S. House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, Jan. 28, 1959.

Kennedy stated that if U.S.-Soviet relations were to be improved, the Soviet Union would have to abandon the plan of "communizing the entire world" and "look only to its national interest and to providing a better life for its people under conditions of peace". [406]

Dean Rusk has put the point even more bluntly. "There can be no assured and lasting peace until the communist leaders abandon their goal of a world revolution." He has also said that there are "signs of restiveness among the Soviet leaders "about the burdens and risks of their commitments to the world communist movement". And he has even asked the Soviet leaders to "go on from there, by putting aside the illusion of a world communist triumph". [407]

The meaning of these words is only too clear. The U.S. imperialists describe the revolutionary struggles by the oppressed peoples and nations in the capitalist world for their own emancipation as being the outcome of attempts by the socialist countries to "communize the entire world". They say to the Soviet leaders: Do you wish to live in peace with the United States? Very well! But on condition that you must not support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations in the capitalist world and must see to it that they will not rise in revolution. According to the wishful thinking of the U.S. imperialists, this will leave them free to stamp out the revolutionary movements in the capitalist world and to dominate and enslave its inhabitants, who comprise two-thirds of the world's population.

2. In the name of peaceful coexistence, the U.S. imperialists try to push ahead with their policy of "peaceful evolution" vis-à-vis the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and to restore capitalism there.

Dulles said, "The renunciation of force . . . implies, not the maintenance of the *status quo,* but peaceful change." [408] "It is not sufficient to be defensive. Freedom must be a positive force that will penetrate." [409] "We hope to encourage an evolution within the Soviet world." [410]

Eisenhower asserted that whatever the United States could do by peaceful means would be done, "in order that those people who are held in bondage by a tyrannical dictatorship might finally have the right to determine their own fates by their own free votes". [411]

Kennedy said that the "task is to do all in our power to see that the changes taking place . . . in the Soviet empire on all continents . . . lead to more freedom for more men and to world peace". [412] He declared that he would "pursue a policy of patiently encouraging freedom and carefully

---

[406] Kennedy's interview with Adzhubei, Editor-in-Chief of Izvestia, Nov. 25, 1961.
[407] Rusk's address at the National Convention of the American Legion, Sept. 10, 1963.
[408] Dulles' address to the Award Dinner of the New York State Bar Association, Jan. 31, 1959.
[409] See p. 35, note 2.
[410] Dulles' testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, Feb. 8, 1959.
[411] Eisenhower's speech at the Polish-American Congress at Chicago, Sept. 30, 1960.
[412] Kennedy, The Strategy of Peace, p. 199.

pressuring tyranny" towards the socialist countries in Eastern Europe, so as to provide "free choice" for the people of those countries.

The meaning of these words, too, is very clear. The U.S. imperialists malign the socialist system as "dictatorial" and "tyrannical" and describe the restoration of capitalism as "free choice". They say to the Soviet leaders: Do you wish to live in peace with the United States? Very well! But this does not mean we recognize the *status quo* in the socialist countries; on the contrary, capitalism must be restored there. In other words, the U.S. imperialists will never reconcile themselves to the fact that one-third of the world's population has taken the socialist road, and they will always attempt to destroy all the socialist countries.

Briefly, what the U.S. imperialists call peaceful coexistence amounts to this: no people living under imperialist domination and enslavement may strive for liberation, all who have already emancipated themselves must again come under imperialist domination and enslavement, and the whole world must be incorporated into the American "world community of free nations".

It is easy to see why the general line of peaceful coexistence of the leaders of the CPSU is exactly to the taste of U.S. imperialism.

On the pretext of peaceful coexistence, the leaders of the CPSU do their best to curry favor with U.S. imperialism and serve its fraudulent peace policy by constantly proclaiming that the representatives of U.S. imperialism "are concerned about peace".

On the pretext of peaceful coexistence, the leaders of the CPSU apply the policy of peaceful coexistence to the relations between oppressed and oppressor classes and between oppressed and oppressor nations, and they oppose revolution and try to liquidate it; this exactly suits the U.S. imperialists' requirement that the socialist countries should not support people's revolutions in the capitalist world.

On the pretext of peaceful coexistence, the leaders of the CPSU try to substitute international class collaboration for international class struggle and advocate "all-round co-operation" between socialism and imperialism, thus opening the door to imperialist penetration of the socialist countries; this exactly suits the needs of the U.S. imperialist policy of "peaceful evolution".

The imperialists have always been our best teachers by negative example. Let us here cite extracts from two speeches by Dulles after the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

He stated:

. . . I had said . . . that there was evidence within the Soviet Union of forces toward greater liberalism. . . .

. . . if these forces go on and continue to gather momentum within the Soviet Union, then we can think, and reasonably hope, I said within a decade or perhaps a generation, that we would have

what is the great goal of our policy, that is, a Russia which is governed by people who are responsive to the wishes of the Russian people, who had given up their predatory world-wide ambitions to rule and who conform to the principles of civilized nations and such principles as are embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. [413]

He also stated:

. . . the long-range prospect — indeed, I would say the long-range certainty — is that there will be an evolution of' the present policies of the Soviet rulers so that they will become more nationalist and less internationalist. [414]

Apparently, Dulles' ghost has been haunting the betrayers of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and they have become so obsessed with the so-called general line of peaceful coexistence that they do not pause to consider how well their actions accord will, the desires of U.S. imperialism.

Soviet-U.S. Collaboration is the Heart and Soul of the CPSU Leaders' General Line of Peaceful Coexistence

While harping on peaceful coexistence in recent years, the leaders of the CPSU have in fact not only violated the principle of proletarian internationalism but even failed to conform to the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence in their attitude towards China and a number of other socialist countries. To put it plainly, their ceaseless advocacy of peaceful coexistence as the general line of their foreign policy amounts to a demand that all the socialist countries and the Communist Parties must submit to their long-cherished dream of Soviet-U.S. collaboration.

The heart and soul of the general line of peaceful coexistence pursued by the leaders of the CPSU is Soviet-U.S. collaboration for the domination of the world.

Just look at the extraordinary statements they have made:

"The two greatest modern powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, have left far behind any other country in the world." [415]

"Each of these two powers is leading a large group of nations — the Soviet Union leading the world socialist system and the United States the capitalist camp." [416]

[413] Dulles' press conference of May 15, 1956.
[414] Dulles' press conference of Oct. 28, 1958.
[415] N. N. Yakovlev, "After 30 Years . . .", a pamphlet written for the 30th anniversary of Soviet-American diplomatic relations.
[416] *Ibid*.

"We [the Soviet Union and the United States] are the strongest countries in the world and if we unite for peace there can be no war. Then if any madman wanted war, we would but have to shake our fingers to warn him off." [417]

". . . if there is agreement between N. S. Khrushchev, the head of the Soviet Government, and John Kennedy, the President of the United States, there will be a solution of international problems on which mankind's destinies depend." [418]

We would like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Since the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement say clearly that U.S. imperialism is the sworn enemy of the people of the world and the main force making for aggression and war, how can you "unite" with the main enemy of world peace to "safeguard peace"?

We would like to ask them: Can it be that more than a hundred countries and over three thousand million people have no right to decide their own destiny? Must they submit to the manipulations of the two "giants", the two "greatest powers", the Soviet Union and the United States? Isn't this arrogant nonsense of yours an expression of great-power chauvinism and power politics pure and simple?

We would also like to ask them: Do you really imagine that if only the Soviet Union and the United States reached agreement, if only the two "great men" reached agreement, the destiny of mankind would be decided and all international issues settled? You are wrong, hopelessly wrong. From time immemorial, things have never happened in this way. and they are much less likely to do so in the nineteen sixties. The world today is full of complex contradictions, the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism, and the contradictions among the imperialist countries and among the monopoly capitalist groups in the imperialist countries. Would these contradictions disappear once the Soviet Union and the United States reached agreement?

The only country the leaders of the CPSU look up to is the United States. In their pursuit of Soviet-U.S. collaboration, they do not scruple to betray the Soviet people's true allies, including their class brothers and all the oppressed peoples and nations still living under the imperialist-capitalist system.

The leaders of the CPSU are trying hard to wreck the socialist camp. They use every kind of lie and slander against the Chinese Communist Party and exert political and economic pressure on China. As for socialist Albania, nothing short of its destruction would satisfy them. Hand in hand

[417] Khrushchev's interview with the U.S. correspondent C. L Sulzberger. Sept. 5, 1961.
[418] A. A. Gromyko, Speech at the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., Dec. 13, 1962.

with U.S. imperialism, they brought pressure to bear upon revolutionary Cuba, making demands on it at the expense of its sovereignty and dignity.

The leaders of the CPSU are trying hard to sabotage the revolutionary struggles of the peoples against imperialism and its lackeys. They are acting as preachers of social reformism and are sapping the revolutionary fighting will of the proletariat and its political party in various countries. To cater to the needs of imperialism, they are undermining the national liberation movement and becoming more and more shameless apologists of U.S. neo-colonialism.

What do the leaders of the CPSU get from U.S. imperialism in return for all their strenuous efforts and for the high price they pay in pursuit of Soviet-U.S. collaboration?

Since 1959, Khrushchev has become obsessed with summit meetings between the Soviet Union and the United States. He has had many fond dreams and spread many illusions about them. He has extolled Eisenhower as "a big man" who "understands big politics". [419] He has enthusiastically praised Kennedy as one who "understands the great responsibility that lies with the governments of two such powerful states". [420] The leaders of the CPSU made a big fuss about the so-called spirit of Camp David and proclaimed the Vienna meeting to be "an event of historic significance". The Soviet press claimed that once the heads of the Soviet Union and the United States sat at the same table, history would arrive at a "new turning point" and that a handshake between the two "greats men"' would usher in a "new era" in international relations.

But how does U.S. imperialism treat the leaders of the CPSU? A little over a month after the Camp David talk, Eisenhower declared, "I wasn't aware of any spirit of Camp David." And seven months after the talks he sent a U-2 spy plane to intrude into the Soviet Union, thus wrecking the four-power summit conference. Not long after the Vienna meeting, Kennedy put forward the following insolent conditions for twenty years of peace between the Soviet Union and the United States: no support by the Soviet Union for any people's revolutionary struggles, and the restoration of capitalism in the socialist countries of Eastern Europe. A year or more after the Vienna meeting Kennedy ordered the piratical military blockade of Cuba and created the Caribbean crisis.

Searching high and low among the quick and the dead, where can one find the much vaunted "spirit of Camp David", "turning point in the history of mankind and "new era in international relations"?

After the signing of the tripartite treaty on the partial nuclear test ban, the leaders of the CPSU gave great publicity to the so-called spirit of Moscow. They spoke of the need to "strike while the iron is hot", asserted that "all the favorable conditions are there" for the Soviet Union and the United

[419] Speech by N. S. Khrushchev at the luncheon in his honor given by the Mayor of New York on Sept. 17, 1959.
[420] N. S. Khrushchev, Radio and Television Speech, June 15, 1981.

States to reach further agreements, and declared that it was bad to take the attitude that "time can wait" or "there is no hurry". [421]

What is the "spirit of Moscow"? Let us look at recent events.

To create more of an atmosphere of Soviet-U.S. co-operation, the leaders of the CPSU held a rally in Moscow in celebration of the thirtieth anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. At the same time, they sent a cultural delegation to the United States for celebrations there. But what came of the enthusiasm of the leader of the CPSU? The entire staff of the U.S. Embassy in the Soviet Union refused to attend the Moscow rally, and the U.S. State Department issued a special memorandum asking the American public to boycott the Soviet cultural delegation, whom they denounced as "extremely dangerous and suspicious people ".

While the leaders of the CPSU were advocating "Soviet-U.S. co-operation", the United States sent the agent Barghoorn to carry on activities in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government very properly arrested this agent. But, after Kennedy made the threat that the success of the wheat deal between the United States and the Soviet Union "depends upon a reasonable atmosphere in both countries", which he said had been "badly damaged by the Barghoorn arrest", the Soviet Government hurriedly released this U.S. agent without any trial, on the grounds of "the concern of the U.S. high officials over F. C. Barghoorn's fate", over the fate of an agent who "the investigation confirmed . . . had been engaged in intelligence activities against the U.S.S.R.".

Are all these manifestations of the "spirit of Moscow"? If so, it is indeed very sad.

Moscow! Bright capital of the first socialist country and glorious name cherished by so many millions of people throughout the world since the Great October Revolution! Now this name is being used by the leaders of the CPSU to cover up their foul practice of collaboration with the U.S. imperialists. What an unprecedented shame!

All too often have the leaders of the CPSU said fine things about the U.S. imperialists and begged favors from them; all too often have they lost their temper with fraternal countries and Parties and put pressure on them; all too many are the tricks and deceptions they have practiced on the revolutionary people in various countries — solely in order to beg for "friendship" and "trust" from U.S. imperialism. But "while the drooping flowers pine for love, the heartless brook babbles on". All that the leaders of the CPSU have received from the U.S. Imperialists is humiliation, again humiliation, always humiliation!

A Few Words of Advice to the Leaders of the CPSU

During the bitter days of resistance to armed imperialist intervention and amidst the raging fires of the Patriotic War, was there ever an occasion when the great Soviet people under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin bowed to difficulties? Did they ever kneel before the enemy? Today,

[421] Article by observer in Izvestia, Aug. 21, 1963.

the world situation is most *favorable* to revolution and socialism is stronger than ever, while imperialism has never been in such difficulties; yet how ignominiously has the first socialist country, the state founded by Lenin, been bullied by U.S. imperialism and how grossly has the socialist camp been disgraced by the leaders of the CPSU! How is it possible for us, for any Marxist-Leninists or revolutionary people, not to feel distress?

Here we should like to offer sincere advice to the leaders of the CPSU.

The United States, the most ferocious imperialist country, has the mad strategic aim of conquering the world. It is frantically suppressing the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations and has openly declared its intention of bringing Eastern Europe back into the so-called world community of free nations. How can you imagine that the heaviest blows of the U.S. imperialists in pursuit of their aggressive plans for conquering the whole world will fall on others and not on the Soviet Union?

The United States is an imperialist country and the Soviet Union a socialist country. How can you expect "all-round co-operation" between two countries with entirely different social systems?

There are mutual deception and rivalry even between the United States and the other imperialist powers, and the United States will not be satisfied until it has trampled them underfoot. How then can you imagine that the imperialist United States will live in harmony with the socialist Soviet Union?

Leading comrades of the CPSU! Just think the matter over soberly. Can U.S. imperialism be depended upon when a storm breaks in the world? No! The U.S. imperialists are undependable, as are all imperialists and reactionaries. The only dependable allies of the Soviet Union are the fraternal countries of the socialist camp, the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties and all oppressed peoples and nations.

The laws of historical development operate independently of any individual's will. No one can possibly prevent the growth of the socialist camp and the revolutionary movement of the oppressed peoples and nations, let alone destroy them. He who betrays the people of the socialist camp and the world and dreams of dominating the globe by colluding with U.S. imperialism is bound to end up badly. It is very mistaken and dangerous for the leaders of the CPSU to do so.

It is not yet too late for the leaders of the CPSU to rein in at the brink. It is high time for them to discard their general line of peaceful coexistence and return to Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence, to the road of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

CPCh: The Leaders of the CPSU Are the Greatest Splitters of Our Times

Never before has the unity of the international communist movement been so gravely threatened as it is today when we are witnessing a deluge of modern revisionist ideology. Both internationally and inside individual Parties, fierce struggles are going on between Marxism-

Leninism and revisionism. The international communist movement is confronted with an unprecedentedly serious danger of a split.

It is the urgent task of the Communists, the proletariat and the revolutionary people of the world to defend the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement.

The Communist Party of China has made consistent and unremitting efforts to defend and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement in accordance with Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. It has been and remains the unswerving position of the Chinese Communist Party to uphold principle, uphold unity, eliminate differences and strengthen the struggle against our common enemy.

Ever since they embarked on the path of revisionism, the leaders of the CPSU have tirelessly professed their devotion to the unity of the international communist movement. Of late, they have been particularly active in crying for "unity". This calls to mind what Engels said ninety years ago. "One must not allow oneself to be misled by the cry for 'unity'. Those who have this word most often on their lips are the ones who sow the most dissension...." "... the biggest sectarians and the biggest brawlers and rogues at times shout loudest for unity." ("Engels to A. Bebel, June 20, 1873", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels,* Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, p. 345.)

While presenting themselves as champions of unity, the leaders of the CPSU are trying to pin the label of splittism on the Chinese Communist Party. In its Open Letter the Central Committee of the CPSU says:

The Chinese leaders are undermining the unity not only of the socialist camp but of the entire world communist movement, trampling on the principles of proletarian internationalism and grossly violating accepted standards of relations between fraternal parties.

And the subsequent articles published in the Soviet press have been condemning the Chinese Communists as "sectarians" and "splitters".

But what are the facts? Who is undermining the unity of the socialist camp? Who is undermining the unity of the international communist movement? Who is trampling on the principles of proletarian internationalism? And who is grossly violating the accepted standards of relations between fraternal Parties? In other words, who are the real, out-and-out splitters?

Only when these questions are properly answered can we find the way to defend and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement and overcome the danger of a split.

A Review of History

In order to gain a clear understanding of the nature of splittism in the present international communist movement and to struggle against it in the correct way, let us look back on the history of the international communist movement over the past century or so.

The struggle between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism and between the forces defending unity and those creating splits runs through the history of the development of the communist movement. This is the case both in individual countries and on the international plane. In this prolonged struggle, Marx, Engels and Lenin expounded the true essence of proletarian unity on a theoretical level and, by their deeds, set brilliant examples in combating opportunism, revisionism and splittism.

In 1847 Marx and Engels founded the earliest international working-class organization — the Communist League. In the *Communist Manifesto,* which they wrote as the programme of the League, Marx and Engels advanced the militant call, "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" and gave a systematic and profound exposition of scientific communism, thus laying the ideological basis for the unity of the international proletariat.

Throughout their lives Marx and Engels worked unremittingly for this principled unity of the international proletariat.

In 1864 they established the First International, the International Working Men's Association, to unite the workers' movements of all countries. Throughout the period of the First International they waged principled struggles against the Bakuninists, Proudhonists, Blanquists, Lasallians, etc., the fiercest struggle being that against the Bakuninist splitters.

The Bakuninists attacked Marx's theory from the very beginning. They charged Marx with wanting to make his "particular programme and personal doctrine dominant in the International". In fact, however, it was they who tried to impose the dogmas of their sect on the International and to replace the programme of the International with Bakunin's opportunist programme. They resorted to one intrigue after another, lined up a "majority" by hook or by crook and engaged in sectarian and divisive activities.

To defend the genuine unity of the international proletariat, Marx and Engels took an uncompromising and principled stand against the open challenge of the Bakuninist splitters to the First International. In 1872 the Bakuninists who persisted in their splitting activities were expelled from the International at its Hague Congress, in which Marx personally participated.

Engels said that if the Marxists had adopted an unprincipled and conciliatory attitude towards the divisive activities of the Bakuninists at the Hague, it would have had grave consequences for the international working-class movement. He stated, "Then the International would indeed have gone

to pieces — gone to pieces through 'unity'!". ("Engels to A. Bebel, June 20, 1873", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels,* FLPH, Moscow, p. 346.)

Led by Marx and Engels, the First International fought against opportunism and splittism and laid the basis for the supremacy of Marxism in the international working-class movement.

With the announcement of the end of the First International in 1876 there began the successive establishment of mass socialist workers' parties in many countries. Marx and Engels followed the establishment and development of these parties with close attention in the hope that they would be established and developed on the basis of scientific communism.

Marx and Engels devoted particular attention and concern to the German Social-Democratic Party which then occupied an important position in the working-class movement in Europe. On many occasions, they sharply criticized the German Party for its rotten spirit of compromise with opportunism in the pursuit of "unity".

In 1875 they criticized the German Social-Democratic Party for its union with the Lasallians at the expense of principle and for the resultant Gotha Programme. Marx pointed out that this union was "bought too dearly" and that the Gotha Programme was "a thoroughly objectionable programme that demoralizes the Party". ("Marx to W. Bracke, May 5, 1875", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels,* FLPH, Moscow, pp. 360, 361.) Engels pointed out that it was a "bending of the knee to Lasallians on the part of the whole German socialist proletariat", adding, "I am convinced that a union on *this* basis will not last a year." ("Engels to A. Bebel, March 18-28. 1875", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels,* FLPH, Moscow, p. 358.)

In criticizing the Gotha Programme. Marx put forward the well-known principle that for Marxists "there would be no haggling about principles'" ("Marx to W. Bracke, May 5. 1875", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels,* FLPH, Moscow, p. 361.)

Later Marx and Engels again sharply criticized the leaders of the German Party for tolerating the activities of the opportunists inside the Party. Marx said that these opportunists tried "to replace its materialistic basis... by modern mythology with its goddesses of Justice, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" ("Marx to F. A. Sorge, October 19, 1877". *Selected Correspondence* of *Marx and Engels,* FLPH, Moscow, p. 376) and that this was a "vulgarization of Party and theory". ('Marx to F. A. Sorge, September 19, 1879'. *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels,* FLPH. Moscow, p. 396.) In their "Circular Letter" to the leaders of the German Party, Marx and Engels wrote:

For almost forty years we have stressed the class struggle as the immediate driving power of history, and in particular the class struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat as the great lever of the modern social revolution; it is, therefore, impossible for us to co-operate with people who wish to expunge this class struggle from the movement. ("Marx and Engels to A. Bebel, W. Liebknecht, W. Bracke and Others ('Circular Letter'), September 17-18, 1879". *Selected Correspondence,* FLPH, Moscow. p. 395.)

Founded under Engels' influence in 1889, the Second International existed in a period when capitalism was developing "peacefully". While Marxism became widespread and the *Communist Manifesto* became the common programme of tens of millions of workers everywhere during this period, the socialist parties in many countries blindly worshipped bourgeois legality instead of utilizing it and became legalists, thus opening the floodgates for opportunism.

Hence, throughout the period of the Second International., the international working-class movement was divided into two main groups, the revolutionary Marxists and the pseudo-Marxian opportunists.

Engels waged irreconcilable struggles against the opportunists. He refuted with particular sharpness their fallacies on the peaceful evolution of capitalism into socialism. He said of those opportunists who posed as Marxists that Marx "would repeat to these gentlemen what Heine had said of his imitators: I sowed dragons but I reaped fleas". ("Engels' Letter to Paul Lafargue, October 27, 1890", quoted in *Marx and Engels on Literature and Art*, French ed., Edition Sociales, Paris, 1954, p. 258.)

After the death of Engels in 1895, these fleas came out for the open and systematic revision of Marxism and gradually took over the leadership of the Second International.

As the outstanding revolutionary in the international working-class movement after Engels, the great Lenin shouldered the heavy responsibility of defending Marxism and opposing the revisionism of the Second International.

When the revisionists of the Second International howled that Marxism was "incomplete" and "outmoded", Lenin solemnly declared. "We take our stand entirely on the Marxist theoretical position", because revolutionary theory "unites all socialists". ("Our Programme", *Collected Works,* FLPH, Moscow, 1960, Vol. 4. pp. 210, 211.)

Above all, Lenin fought to create a Marxist party in Russia. In order to build a party of the new type, differing fundamentally from the opportunist parties of the Second International, he waged uncompromising struggles against the various anti-Marxist factions inside the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party.

Like other parties of the Second International, the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party had a revolutionary as well as an opportunist group. The Bolsheviks led by Lenin constituted the former and the Mensheviks the latter.

The Bolsheviks led by Lenin conducted prolonged theoretical and political struggles against the Mensheviks in order to safeguard the unity of the proletarian party and the purity of its ranks, and finally in 1912 expelled the Mensheviks for their persistence in opportunism and splitting activities.

All the opportunist factions abused Lenin in the most vicious language. They tried by every means to label him a splitter. Lining up with all the anti-Leninist factions and raising the banner of "non-factionalism", Trotsky wantonly attacked the Bolshevik Party and Lenin, whom he called a "usurper" and "splitter". Lenin replied that Trotsky, who paraded as "non-factional", was "a representative of the 'worst remnants of factionalism"' ("Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Outcries for Unity", Lenin, *Selected* Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1950 Vol. 1. Part 2, p. 251) and "the worst of splitters'" ("The Collapse of the 'August' Bloc", *Collected Works*, 4th Russian ed., Moscow, Vol. 20, p. 142.)

Lenin put it clearly: 'Unity — a great cause and a great slogan! But the workers' cause requires the *unity of the Marxists* and not the unity of the Marxists with the opponents and distorters of Marxism." ("Unity", *Collected Works,* 4th Russian ed., Moscow, Vol. 20, p. 211.)

Lenin's struggle against the Mensheviks was of great international significance, for Menshevism was a Russian form and variant of the revisionism of the Second International and was supported by the revisionist leaders of the Second International.

While combating the Mensheviks, Lenin also waged a series of struggles against the revisionism of the Second International.

Before World War I, Lenin criticized the revisionists of the Second International on the theoretical and political plane and fought them face to face at the Stuttgart and Copenhagen Congresses.

When World War I broke out, the leaders of the Second International openly betrayed the proletariat. Serving the imperialists' interests, they urged the proletarians of different countries to slaughter each other and thus brought about a most serious split in the international proletariat. As Rosa Luxemburg said, the revisionists turned the previous proud slogan of "Workers of all countries, unite!" into the command on the battlefield, "Workers of all countries, slay one another!" ("Either — Or", *Selected Speeches and Writings of Rosa Luxemburg,* German ed., Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1951, Vol. 2, p. 534.)

The Social-Democratic Party of Germany, Marx's native land, was then the most powerful and influential party in the Second International. It was the first to side with the imperialists of its own country, and thus became the arch-criminal splitting the international working-class movement.

At this critical juncture, Lenin stepped forward to fight resolutely in Defense of the unity of the international proletariat.

In his article 'The Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War" circulated in August 1914, Lenin proclaimed the collapse of the Second International and sternly condemned most of its leaders, and in particular those of the German Social-Democratic Party, for their overt betrayal of socialism.

In view of the fact that the revisionists of the Second International had turned their secret alliance with the bourgeoisie into an open alliance and that they had made the split in the international working-class movement irrevocable, Lenin stated,

It is impossible to carry out the tasks of Socialism at the present time, it is impossible to achieve real international unity of the workers, without a determined rupture with opportunism and explaining to the masses the inevitability of its bankruptcy. ("The War and Russian Social-Democracy", *Selected Works,* FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 1, Part 2, p. 403.)

For this reason, Lenin staunchly supported the Marxists in breaking with the opportunists in many European countries and boldly called for the establishment of a third International to replace the bankrupt Second International so as to rebuild the revolutionary unity of the international proletariat. The Third International was founded in March 1919. It inherited the positive achievements of the Second International and discarded its opportunist, social chauvinist, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois rubbish. Thus, it enabled the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat to grow both in breadth and depth.

Lenin's theory and practice carried Marxism to a new stage in its development — the stage of Leninism. On the basis of Marxism-Leninism, the unity of the international proletariat and the international communist movement was further strengthened and expanded.

Experience And Lessons

What does the history of the development of the international communist movement demonstrate ?

First, it demonstrates that like everything else, the international working-class movement tends to divide itself in two. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is inevitably reflected in the communist ranks. It is inevitable that opportunism of one kind or another should arise in the course of the development of the communist movement, that opportunists should engage in anti-Marxist-Leninist splitting activities and that Marxist-Leninists should wage struggles against opportunism and splittism. It is precisely through this struggle of opposites that Marxism-Leninism and the international working-class movement have developed. And it is also through this struggle that the international working-class movement has strengthened and consolidated its unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

Engels said:

The movement of the proletariat necessarily passes through different stages of development; at every stage part of the people get stuck and do not join in the further advance; and this alone explains why it is that actually the "solidarity of the proletariat" is everywhere being realized in different party groupings, which carry on life-and-death feuds with one another.... ("Engels to A. Bebel, June 20, 1873". *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels,* FLPH, Moscow, p 347.)

This is exactly what happened. The Communist League, the First International and the Second International, all of which were originally unified, divided in two in the course of their development and became two conflicting parts. Each time the international struggle against opportunism and splittism carried the international working-class movement forward to a new stage and enabled it to forge a firmer and broader unity on a new basis. The victory of the October Revolution and the founding of the Third International were the greatest achievements in the struggle against the Second International's revisionism and splittism. Unity, struggle or even splits, and a new unity on a new basis — such is the dialectics of the development of the international working-class movement.

Secondly, the history of the international communist movement demonstrates that in every period the struggle between the defenders of unity and the creators of splits is in essence one between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism-revisionism, between the upholders of Marxism and the traitors to Marxism.

Both internationally and in individual countries, genuine proletarian unity is possible only on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

Both internationally and in individual countries, wherever opportunism and revisionism are rampant, a split becomes inevitable in the proletarian ranks. Every split in the communist movement is invariably caused by the opportunist-revisionist opposition to and betrayal of Marxism-Leninism.

What is splittism?

It means a split with Marxism-Leninism. Anyone who opposes and betrays Marxism-Leninism and undermines the basis of proletarian unity is a splitter.

It means a split with the revolutionary proletarian party. Anyone who persists in a revisionist line and turns a revolutionary proletarian party into a reformist bourgeois party is a splitter.

It means a split with the revolutionary proletariat and the broad masses of the working people. Anyone who follows a programme and line running counter to the revolutionary will and fundamental interests of the proletariat and the working people is a splitter.

Lenin said, "Where the *majority* of the class-conscious workers have rallied around precise and definite decisions there is *unity* of opinion and action," while opportunism "is, in fact, schism, in that it most unblushingly thwarts the will of the majority of the workers." ("Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Outcries for Unity", *Selected Works* FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 1, Part 2, pp. 255 and 258.)

By disrupting proletarian unity, splittism serves the bourgeoisie and meets its needs. It is the consistent policy of the bourgeoisie to create splits within the ranks of the proletariat. Its most sinister method of doing so is to buy over or cultivate agents within the proletarian ranks. And agents of the bourgeoisie are exactly what the opportunists and revisionists are. So far from seeking to unite the proletariat in the fight against the bourgeoisie, they want the proletariat to co-operate with it. This was what the revisionists of the Second International, such as Bernstein and Kautsky, did. At a time

when the imperialists were most afraid that the proletariat of all countries would unite to turn the imperialist war into civil wars, they came forward to create a split in the international working-class movement and advocate co-operation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

The splitters in the communist ranks are those who, to meet the needs of the bourgeoisie, split with Marxism-Leninism, with the revolutionary proletarian party and with the revolutionary proletariat and the broad masses of the laboring people; and they remain splitters even when for a time they are in the majority or hold the leading posts.

In the days of the Second International, the revisionists represented by Bernstein and Kautsky were in the majority, and the Marxists represented by Lenin were in the minority. Yet obviously it was Bernstein, Kautsky and other opportunists who were the splitters, and not revolutionaries like Lenin.

In 1904 the Mensheviks were the splitters although they held leading positions which they had usurped in the central organs of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party. Lenin pointed out at the time, "The leading *center*s (the Central Organ, the Central Committee, and the Council) *have broken* with the Party," and "the *center*s *have put themselves outside* the Party. There is no middle ground; one is either with the *center*s or with the Party." [422]

In brief, opportunism and revisionism are the political and ideological roots of splittism. And splittism is the organizational manifestation of opportunism and revisionism. It can also be said that opportunism and revisionism are splittism as well as sectarianism. The revisionists are the greatest and vilest splitters and sectarians in the communist movement.

Thirdly, the history of the international communist movement demonstrates that proletarian unity has been consolidated and has developed through struggle against opportunism, revisionism and splittism. The struggle for unity is inseparably connected with the struggle for principle.

The unity the proletariat requires is class unity, revolutionary unity, unity against the common enemy and for or the great goal of communism. The unity of the international proletariat has its theoretical and political basis in Marxism-Leninism. Only when it has theoretical and political unity can the international proletariat have organizational cohesion and unity of action.

The genuine revolutionary unity of the proletariat can be attained only by upholding principle and upholding Marxism-Leninism. Unity bought by forsaking principles and by wallowing in the mire with opportunists ceases to be proletarian unity; instead, as Lenin said, it "means in practice unity of the proletariat with the national bourgeoisie and a *split* in the international proletariat, unity of lackeys and a split among the revolutionists". [423]

[422] "A Letter to the Zurich Group of Bolsheviks", Collected Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1962, Vol. 8. pp. 63 and 64.
[423] "The Honest Voice of a French Socialist", Collected Works, International Publishers, New York. 1930, Vol. 18, p. 329.

He also pointed out that "as the bourgeoisie will not die until it is overthrown", so the opportunist current bribed and supported by the bourgeoisie "will not die if it is not 'killed', *i.e.*, overthrown, deprived of every influence among the Socialist proletariat". Hence, it is necessary to wage "a merciless struggle against the current of opportunism". [424]

Faced with the challenge of the opportunist-revisionists who are openly splitting the international communist movement, the Marxist-Leninists must make no compromise in matters of principle, but must resolutely combat this splittism. This is an invaluable behest of Marx, Engels and Lenin, as well as the only correct way to safeguard the unity of the international communist movement.

The Greatest Splitters of Our Times

The events of recent years show that the leaders of the CPSU headed by Khrushchev have become the chief representatives of modern revisionism as well as the greatest splitters in the international communist movement.

Between the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, the leaders of the CPSU developed a rounded system of revisionism. They put forward a revisionist line which contravenes the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, a line which consists of "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition", "peaceful transition", "a state of the whole people" and "a party of the entire people". They have tried to impose this revisionist line on all fraternal Parties as a substitute for the common line of the international communist movement which was laid down at the meetings of fraternal Parties in 1957 and 1960. And they have attacked anyone who perseveres in the Marxist-Leninist line and resists their revisionist line.

The leaders of the CPSU have themselves undermined the basis of the unity of the international communist movement and created the present grave danger of a split by betraying Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and pushing their revisionist and divisive line.

Far from working to consolidate and expand the socialist camp, the leaders of the CPSU have endeavored to split and disintegrate it. They have thus made a mess of the splendid socialist camp.

They have violated the principles guiding relations among fraternal countries as laid down in the Declaration and the Statement, pursued a policy of great-power chauvinism and national egoism towards fraternal socialist countries and thus disrupted the unity of the socialist camp.

They have arbitrarily infringed the sovereignty of fraternal countries, interfered in their internal affairs, carried on subversive activities and striven in every way to control fraternal countries.

[424] *Ibid*.

In the name of the "international division of labor", the leaders of the CPSU oppose the adoption by fraternal countries of the policy of building socialism by their own efforts and developing their economies on an independent basis, and attempt to turn them into economic appendages. They have tried to force those fraternal countries which are comparatively backward economically to abandon industrialization and become their sources of raw materials and markets for surplus products.

The leaders of the CPSU are quite unscrupulous in their pursuit of the policy of great-power chauvinism. They have constantly brought political, economic and even military pressure to bear on fraternal countries.

The leaders of the CPSU have openly called for the overthrow of the Party and government leaders of Albania, brashly severed all economic and diplomatic relations with her and tyrannically deprived her of her legitimate rights as a member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the Council of Economic Mutual Assistance.

The leaders of the CPSU have violated the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance, made a unilateral decision to withdraw 1,390 Soviet experts working in China, to tear up 343 contracts and supplementary contracts on the employment of experts and to cancel 257 projects of scientific and technical co-operation, and pursued a restrictive and discriminatory trade policy against China. They have provoked incidents on the Sino-Soviet border and carried on large-scale subversive activities in Sinkiang. On more than one occasion, Khrushchev went so far as to tell leading comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC that certain anti-Party elements in the Chinese Communist Party were his "good friends". He has praised Chinese anti-Party elements for attacking the Chinese Party's general line for socialist construction, the big leap forward and the people's communes, describing their action as a "manly act".

Such measures which gravely worsen state relations are rare even between capitalist countries. But again, and again the leaders of the CPSU have adopted shocking and extreme measures of this kind against fraternal socialist countries. Yet they go on prating about being "faithful to proletarian internationalism". We would like to ask, is there a shred of internationalism in all these deeds of yours?

The great-power chauvinism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU are equally glaring in their conduct vis-a-vis fraternal Parties.

Since the 20th Congress of the CPSU its leaders have tried, on the pretext of "combating the personality cult", to change the leadership of other fraternal Parties to conform to their will. Right up

to the present they have insisted on "combating the personality cult" as a precondition for the restoration of unity and as a "principle" which is "obligatory on every Communist Party". [425]

Contrary to the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties laid down in the Declaration and the Statement, the leaders of the CPSU ignore the independent and equal status of fraternal Parties, insist on establishing a kind of feudal patriarchal domination over the international communist movement and turn the relations between brother Parties into those between a patriarchal father and his sons. Khrushchev has more than once described a fraternal Party as a "silly boy" and called himself its "mother". [426] With his feudal psychology of self-exaltation, he has absolutely no sense of shame.

The leaders of the CPSU have completely ignored the principle of achieving unanimity through consultation among fraternal Parties and habitually make dictatorial decisions and order others about. They have recklessly torn up joint agreements with fraternal Parties, taken arbitrary decisions on important matters of common concern to fraternal Parties and forced *faits accomplis* on them.

The leaders of the CPSU have violated the principle that differences among fraternal Parties should be settled through inter-Party consultation; they first used their own Party congress and then the congresses of other fraternal Parties as rostrums for large-scale public attacks against those fraternal Parties which firmly uphold Marxism-Leninism.

The leaders of the CPSU regard fraternal Parties as pawns on their diplomatic chessboard. Khrushchev plays fast and loose, he blows hot and cold, he talks one way one day and another the next, and yet he insists on the fraternal Parties dancing to his every tune without knowing whence or whither.

The leaders of the CPSU have stirred up trouble and created splits in many Communist Parties by encouraging the followers of their revisionist line in these Parties to attack the leadership, or usurp leading positions, persecute Marxist-Leninists and even expel them from the Party. It is this divisive policy of the leaders of the CPSU that has given rise to organizational splits in the fraternal Parties of many capitalist countries.

The leaders of the CPSU have turned the magazine *Problems of Peace and Socialism,* originally the common journal of fraternal Parties, into an instrument for spreading revisionism, sectarianism and splittism and for making unscrupulous attacks on Marxist-Leninist fraternal Parties in violation of the agreement reached at the meeting at which the magazine was founded.

---

[425] "For the Unity and Solidarity of the International Communist Movement", article by the editorial board, Pravda, Dec. 6, 1963.

[426] Cf. Khrushchev's interview with Gardner Cowles, Editor of the U.S. magazine Look, Apr. 20, 1962, report by Khrushchev to the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Dec. 12, 1962.

In addition, they are imposing the revisionist line on the international democratic organizations, changing the correct line pursued by these organizations and trying to create splits in them.

The leaders of the CPSU have completely reversed enemies and comrades. They have directed the edge of struggle, which should be against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys, against the Marxist-Leninist fraternal Parties and countries.

The leaders of the CPSU are bent on seeking Soviet-U.S. co-operation for the domination of the world, they regard U.S. imperialism, the most ferocious enemy of the people of the world, as their most reliable friend, and they treat the fraternal Parties and countries adhering to Marxism-Leninism as their enemy. They collude with U.S. imperialism, the reactionaries of various countries, the renegade Tito clique and the Right-wing social democrats in a partnership against the socialist fraternal countries, the fraternal Parties, the Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionary people of all countries.

When they snatch at a straw from Eisenhower or Kennedy or others like them, or think that things are going smoothly for them, the leaders of the CPSU are beside themselves with joy, hit out wildly at the fraternal Parties and countries adhering to Marxism-Leninism, and endeavor to sacrifice fraternal Parties and countries on the altar of their political dealings with U.S. imperialism.

When their wrong policies come to grief and they find themselves in difficulties, the leaders of the CPSU become angrier and more red-faced than ever, again hit out wildly at the fraternal Parties and countries adhering to Marxism-Leninism, and try to make others their scapegoats.

These facts show that the leaders of the CPSU have taken the road of complete betrayal of proletarian internationalism, in contravention of the interests of the Soviet people, the socialist camp and the international communist movement and those of all revolutionary people.

These facts clearly demonstrate that the leaders of the CPSU counterpose their revisionism to Marxism-Leninism, their great-power chauvinism and national egoism to proletarian internationalism and their sectarianism and splittism to the international unity of the proletariat. Thus, like all the opportunists and revisionists of the past, the leaders of the CPSU have turned into creators of splits in many fraternal Parties, the socialist camp and the entire international communist movement.

The revisionism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU constitute a greater danger than those of any other opportunists and splitters, whether past or present. As everyone knows, this revisionism is occurring in the CPSU, the Party which was created by Lenin and which has enjoyed the highest prestige among all Communist Parties; it is occurring in the great Soviet Union, the first socialist country. For many years, Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people the world over have held the CPSU in high esteem and regarded the Soviet Union as the base of world revolution and the model of struggle. And the leaders of the CPSU have taken advantage of all this — of the prestige of the Party

created by Lenin and of the first socialist country — to cover up the essence of their revisionism and splittism and deceive those who are still unaware of the truth. At the same time, these past masters in double-dealing are shouting "unity, unity", while actually engaged in splitting. To a certain extent, their tricks do temporarily confuse people. Traditional confidence in the CPSU and ignorance of the facts have prevented quite a few people from recognizing the revisionism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU sooner.

Because the leaders of the CPSU exercise state power in a large socialist country which exerts world-wide influence, their revisionist and divisive line have done far greater harm to the international communist movement and the proletarian cause of world revolution than that of any of the opportunists and splitters of the past.

It can be said that the leaders of the CPSU are the greatest of all revisionists as well as the greatest of all sectarians and splitters known to history.

It is already clear that the revisionism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU have greatly assisted the spread of the revisionist torrent internationally and rendered enormous service to imperialism and the reactionaries of all countries.

The revisionism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU are the product both of the lush growth of the bourgeois elements inside the Soviet Union, and of imperialist policy, and particularly of the U.S. imperialist policies of nuclear blackmail and "peaceful evolution". In turn, their revisionist and divisive theories and policies cater not only to the widespread capitalist forces at home but also to imperialism, and serve to paralyze the revolutionary will and to obstruct the revolutionary struggle of the people of the world.

Indeed, the leaders of the CPSU have already won warm praise and applause from imperialism and its lackeys.

The U.S. imperialists praise Khrushchev especially for his splitting activities in the international communist movement. They say, "It seems clear that Khrushchev is sufficiently in earnest in his desire for a *detente* with the West that he is willing to risk a split in the Communist movement to achieve it." [427] "Nikita Khrushchev has destroyed, irrevocably, the unified bloc of Stalin's day. That is perhaps Khrushchev's greatest service — not to Communism, but to the Western world." [428] "We ought to be grateful for his mishandling of his relationship with the Chinese.... We should be grateful for his introducing disarray into international Communism by a lot of quite bumptious and sudden initiatives." [429]

[427] "Openings for Diplomacy: Cracks in the Blocs", The Nation, Feb. 9, 1963.
[428] "Moscow and Peking: How Wide the Split?", Newsweek, Mar. 26, 1962.
[429] "With Test-Ban Treaty — Has Khrushchev Changed His Ways?", U.S. News and World Report, Sept. 30, 1963.

They firmly believe that Khrushchev is "the best Soviet Prime Minister the west can expect to treat with and... it must try for the time being to avoid any action that might further weaken his position". [430] They say, "The Administration is now convinced that the U.S. should offer Khrushchev maximum support in his dispute with Red China." [431]

The Trotskyites, who have long been politically bankrupt, are among those applauding the leaders of the CPSU. The former actively support the latter on such fundamental issues as the attitude one should take towards Stalin, towards U.S. imperialism and towards the Yugoslav revisionists. They say, "The situation created by the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU and still more by the Twenty-second Congress is eminently *favorable* for the revival of our movement in the workers states themselves." [432] "We have prepared for this for more than 25 years. Now we must move in, and move energetically." [433] "In relation to the Khrushchev tendency, we will give a critical support to its struggle for destalinization against the more conservative tendencies.... [434]

Just consider! All the enemies of revolution support the leaders of the CPSU with alacrity. The reason is that they have found a common language with the leaders of the CPSU in their approach to Marxism-Leninism and world revolution, and that the revisionist and divisive line of the leaders of the CPSU meets the counter-revolutionary needs of U.S. imperialism.

As Lenin said, the bourgeoisie understands that "the active people in the working-class movement who adhere to the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie, than the bourgeoisie itself ". ("The International Situation and the Fundamental Tasks of the Communist International", *Selected Works,* New York, Vol. 10, p. 196.) The imperialist lords and masters are gleefully letting the leaders of the CPSU clear the way for the destruction of the proletarian cause of world revolution.

Having brought on the serious danger of a split in the international communist movement, the leaders of the CPSU are trying to shift the blame, vilifying the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties as guilty of "splittism" and "sectarianism" and fabricating a host of charges against them.

Here we deem it necessary to take up some of their chief slanders and to refute them one by one.

---

[430] "Communist Unity Seen in U.S. as Thing of the Past", the London Times, Jan. 17, 1962.
[431] "The Periscope", Newsweek, July 1, 1963.
[432] "The International Situation and Our Tasks", resolution adopted by the Reunification Congress of the Trotskyites' so-called Fourth International in June 1963, Fourth International, No. 17 October-December 1963, p. 47.
[433] "The New Stage of the Russian Revolution and the Crisis of Stalinism", resolution adopted by a meeting of the National Committee of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers' Party of the U.S.A. Apr. 13-15, 1956, The 20th Congress (C.P.S.U.) and World Trotskyism, New Park Publications Ltd., London, 1957, p. 36.
[434] "The Repercussions of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU", resolution adopted by the International Secretariat of the Trotskyites' so-called Fourth International, Dec. 5, 1961, Fourth International, No. 14, winter issue, 1961-1962, p. 25.

Refutation Of the Charge of Being Anti-Soviet

The leaders of the CPSU accuse all who resist and criticize their revisionism and splittism of being anti-Soviet. This is a terrifying charge. To oppose the first socialist country in the world and the Party founded by the great Lenin — what insolence!

But we advise the leaders of the CPSU not to indulge in histrionics. The anti-Soviet charge can never apply to us.

We also advise the leaders of the CPSU not to become self-intoxicated. The anti-Soviet charge can never silence Marxist-Leninists.

Together with all other Communists and revolutionary people the world over, we Chinese Communists have always cherished sincere respect and love for the great Soviet people, the Soviet state and the Soviet Communist Party. For it was the people of the Soviet Union who, under the leadership of Lenin's Party, lit the triumphant torch of the October Revolution, opened up the new era of world proletarian revolution and marched in the van along the road to communism in the years that followed. It was the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet state which, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, pursued a Marxist-Leninist domestic and foreign policy, scored unprecedented achievements in socialist construction, made the greatest contribution to victory in the war against fascism and gave internationalist support to the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and working people of all other countries.

Not long before his death, Stalin said:

> "... representatives of the fraternal parties, in their admiration for the daring and success of our Party, conferred upon it the title of the "Shock Brigade" of the world revolutionary and labor movement. By this, they were expressing the hope that the successes of the "Shock Brigade" would help to ease the position of the peoples languishing under the yoke of capitalism. I think that our Party has justified these hopes...." [435]

He was right in saying that the Soviet Party built by Lenin had justified the hopes of all Communists. The Soviet Party was worthy of the admiration and support it won from all the fraternal Parties, including the Chinese Communist Party.

But, beginning with the 20th Congress, the leaders of the CPSU headed by Khrushchev have been launching violent attacks on Stalin and taking the road of revisionism.

Is it possible to say that they have justified the hopes of all Communists? No, it is not. In its *Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement,* the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China points out that it is the common demand of the people in the countries

[435] Speech at the Nineteenth Congress of the Party, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, p. 9.

of the socialist camp and of the international proletariat and working people that all Communist Parties in the socialist camp should:

1. adhere to the Marxist-Leninist line and pursue correct Marxist-Leninist domestic and foreign policies;
2. consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and the worker-peasant alliance led by the proletariat and carry the socialist revolution forward to the end on the economic, political and ideological fronts;
3. promote the initiative and creativeness of the broad masses, carry out socialist construction in a planned way, develop production, improve the people's livelihood and strengthen national Defense;
4. strengthen the unity of the socialist camp on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, and support other socialist countries on the basis of proletarian internationalism;
5. oppose the imperialist policies of. aggression and war, and defend world peace;
6. oppose the anti-Communist, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary policies of the reactionaries of all countries; and
7. help the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed classes and nations of the world.

It adds that all Communist Parties in the socialist camp "owe it to their own people and to the international proletariat and working people to fulfil these demands".

But instead, the leaders of the CPSU have abandoned these demands, disappointed the hopes of the fraternal Parties and pursued a revisionist and divisive line. This violates the interests not only of the international proletariat and working people but also of the CPSU, the Soviet state and the Soviet people themselves.

It is none other than the leaders of the CPSU headed by Khrushchev who are anti-Soviet.

The leaders of the CPSU have completely negated Stalin and painted the first dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist system as dark and dreadful. What is this if not anti-Soviet?

The leaders of the CPSU have proclaimed the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat, altered the proletarian character of the CPSU and opened the floodgates for capitalist forces in the Soviet Union. What is this if not anti-Soviet?

The leaders of the CPSU seek U.S.-Soviet co-operation and tirelessly fawn upon U.S. imperialism, and have thus disgraced the great Soviet Union. What is this if not anti-Soviet?

The leaders of the CPSU pursue the policy of great-power chauvinism and treat fraternal socialist countries as dependencies and have thus damaged the prestige of the Soviet state. What is this if not anti-Soviet?

The leaders of the CPSU obstruct and oppose the revolutionary struggles of other peoples and act as apologists for imperialism and neo-colonialism, and have thus tarnished the glorious internationalist tradition of Lenin's Party. What is this if not anti-Soviet?

In short, the actions of the leaders of the CPSU have brought deep shame upon the great Soviet Union and the CPSU and seriously damaged the fundamental interests of the Soviet people. They are anti-Soviet actions through and through.

Naturally, in these circumstances, the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties and Marxist-Leninists are bound to subject the revisionist and divisive line of the leaders of the CPSU to serious criticism for the purpose of defending the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the international communist movement and upholding the principle of proletarian internationalism. We oppose only the revisionist and divisive errors of the leaders of the CPSU. And we do so for the sake of defending the CPSU founded by Lenin and safeguarding the fundamental interests of the Soviet Union, the first socialist country, and of the Soviet people. How can this be described as anti-Soviet?

Whether one defends or opposes the Soviet Union depends on whether or not one truly defends the line of Marxism-Leninism and the principle of proletarian internationalism and whether or not one truly defends the fundamental interests of the Soviet Party, the Soviet state and the Soviet people. To subject the leaders of the CPSU to serious criticism for their revisionism and splittism is to defend the Soviet Union. On the other hand, to pursue a revisionist and divisive line, as the leaders of the CPSU are doing, is actually to oppose the Soviet Union; and to copy this wrong line or submit to it is not genuinely to defend the Soviet Union but to help the leaders of the CPSU damage the fundamental interests of the Soviet people.

Here we may recall Lenin's attitude to the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party in the early years of the 20th century. The German Social-Democratic Party was then the biggest and most influential party in the Second International. But as soon as Lenin discovered opportunism among its leaders, he made it clear to the Russian Social-Democrats that they should not take "the least creditable features of German Social-Democracy as a model worthy of imitation". [436]

He further stated:

> We must criticize the mistakes of the German leaders fearlessly and openly if we wish to be true to the spirit of Marx and help the Russian socialists to be equal to the present-day tasks of the workers' movement. [437]

[436] "The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart", Selected Works, New York, Vol. 4, p. 315.
[437] "Preface to the Pamphlet by Voinov (A. V. Lunacharsky) on the Attitude of the Party Towards the Trade Unions", Collected Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1962, Vol. 13, p. 165.

In the spirit of Lenin's behest, we would advise the leaders of the CPSU: If you do not correct your revisionist errors, we will continue to criticize you "fearlessly and openly" in the interests of the CPSU, the Soviet state and the Soviet people, and in the interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement and for the sake of their unity.

Refutation Of the Charge of Seizing the Leadership

The leaders of the CPSU ascribe our criticisms and our opposition to their revisionist and divisive line to a desire to "seize the leadership".

First, we would like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: You say we want to seize the leadership. From whom? Who now holds the leadership? In the international communist movement, is there such a thing as a leadership which lords it over all fraternal Parties? And is this leadership in your hands?

Apparently, the leaders of the CPSU consider themselves the natural leaders who can lord it over all fraternal Parties. According to their logic, their programme, resolutions and statements are all infallible laws. Every remark and every word of Khrushchev's are imperial edicts, however wrong or absurd they may be. All fraternal Parties must submissively hear and obey and are absolutely forbidden to criticize or oppose them. This is outright tyranny. It is the ideology of feudal autocrats, pure and simple.

However, we must tell the leaders of the CPSU that the international communist movement is not some feudal clique. Whether large or small, whether new or old, and whether in or out of power, all fraternal Parties are independent and equal. No meeting of fraternal Parties and no agreement unanimously adopted by them has ever stipulated that there are superior and subordinate Parties, one Party which leads and other Parties which are led, a Party which is a father and Parties which are sons, or that the leaders of the CPSU are the supreme rulers over other fraternal Parties.

The history of the international proletarian revolutionary movement shows that, owing to the uneven development of revolution, at a particular historical stage the proletariat and its party in one country or another marched in the van of the movement.

Marx and Engels pointed out that the trade union movement in Britain and the political struggle of the French working class were successively in the van of the international proletarian movement. After the defeat of the Paris Commune, Engels said that "the German workers have for the moment been placed in the vanguard of the proletarian struggle". He went on to say:

> "How long events will allow them to occupy this post of *honor* cannot be foretold.... the main point, however, is to safeguard the true international spirit, which allows no patriotic

chauvinism to arise, and which joyfully welcomes each new advance of the proletarian movement, no matter from which nation it comes." [438]

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the Russian working class, standing at the forefront of the international proletarian movement, won victory in the proletarian revolution for the first time in history.

Lenin said in 1919:

"Hegemony in the revolutionary proletarian International has passed for the time being — but not for long, it goes without saying — to the Russians, just as at various periods of the nineteenth century it was in the hands of the English, then of the French, then of the Germans." [439]

The "vanguard" referred to by Engels, or the "hegemony" referred to by Lenin, in no way means that any Party which is in the van of the international working-class movement can order other fraternal Parties about, or that other Parties must obey it. When the Social-Democratic Party of Germany was in the forefront of the movement, Engels said that "it has no right to speak in the name of the European proletariat and especially no right to say something false". [440] When the Russian Bolshevik Party was in the van, Lenin said, "... while foreseeing every stage of development in other countries we must decree nothing from Moscow." [441]

Even the vanguard position referred to by Engels and Lenin does not remain unchanged for a long time but shifts according to changing conditions. This shift is decided not by the subjective wishes of any individual or party, but by the conditions shaped by history. If conditions change, other parties may come to the van of the movement. When a party which formerly held the position of vanguard takes the path of revisionism, it is bound to forfeit this position despite the fact that it has been the largest party and has exerted the greatest influence. The German Social-Democratic Party was a case in point.

At one period in the history of the international communist movement, the Communist International gave centralized leadership to the Communist Parties of the world. It played a great historic role in promoting the establishment and growth of Communist Parties in many countries. But when the Communist Parties matured and the situation of the international communist movement grew more complicated, centralized leadership on the part of the Communist International ceased to

[438] "Prefatory Note to The Peasant War in Germany", Selected Works of Marx and Engels, FLPH. Moscow, Vol. 1, pp. 653-54.
[439] "The Third International and Its Place in History", Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2 Part 2, p. 203.
[440] "Engels to A. Bebel, March 18-28, 1875", Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels, FLPH, Moscow. p. 354.
[441] "Report on the Party Program, Delivered at the Eighth Congress of the RCP (B)", Selected Works, FLPH. Moscow. Vol. 2. Part 2, p. 159.

be either feasible or necessary. In 1943 the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International stated in a resolution proposing to dissolve the Comintern:

... to the extent that the internal as well as the international situation of individual countries became more complicated, the solution of the problems of the labor movement of each country through the medium of some international *center* would meet with insuperable obstacles.

Events have shown that this resolution corresponded to reality and was correct.

In the present international communist movement, the question of who has the right to lead whom simply does not arise. Fraternal Parties should be independent and completely equal, and at the same time they should be united. On questions of common concern, they should reach unanimity of views through consultation, and they should concert their actions in the struggle for the common goal. These principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties are clearly stipulated in the Declaration of 1957, and the Statement of 1960.

It is a flagrant violation of these principles, as laid down in the Declaration and the Statement, for the leaders of the CPSU to consider themselves the leaders of the international communist movement and to treat all fraternal Parties as their subordinates.

Because of their different historical backgrounds, the fraternal Parties naturally find themselves in different situations. Those Parties which have won victory in their revolutions differ from those which have not yet done so, and those which won victory earlier differ from those which did so later.

But these differences only mean that the victorious Parties, and in particular the Parties which won victory earlier, have to bear a greater internationalist responsibility in supporting other fraternal Parties, and they have absolutely no right to dominate other fraternal Parties.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union was built by Lenin and Stalin. It was the first Party to win the victory of the proletarian revolution, realize the dictatorship of the proletariat and engage in socialist construction. It was only logical that the CPSU should carry forward the revolutionary tradition of Lenin and Stalin, shoulder greater responsibility in supporting other fraternal Parties and countries and stand in the van of the international communist movement.

Taking these historical circumstances into account, the Chinese Communist Party expressed the sincere hope that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union would shoulder this glorious historic mission. At the 1957 Moscow Meeting of the fraternal Parties, our delegation emphasized that the socialist camp should have the Soviet Union at its head. The reason was that, although they had committed some mistakes, the leaders of the CPSU did finally accept the Moscow Declaration which was unanimously adopted by the fraternal Parties. Our proposal that the socialist camp should have the Soviet Union at its head was written into the Declaration.

We hold that the existence of the position of head does not contradict the principle of equality among fraternal Parties. It does not mean that the CPSU has any right to control other Parties; what it means is that the CPSU carries greater responsibility and duties on its shoulders.

However, the leaders of the CPSU have not been satisfied with this position of "head". Khrushchev complained of it on many occasions. He said, "What does 'at the head' give us materially? It gives us neither milk nor butter, neither potatoes nor vegetables nor flats. Perhaps it gives us something morally? Nothing at all!" [442] Later he said, 'What is the use of at the head' for us? To hell with it!" [443]

The leaders of the CPSU say they have no desire for the position of "head", but in practice they demand the privilege of lording it over all fraternal Parties. They do not require themselves to stand in the van of the international communist movement in pursuing the Marxist-Leninist line and fulfilling their proletarian internationalist duty, but they do require all fraternal Parties to obey their baton and follow them along the path of revisionism and splittism.

By embarking on the path of revisionism and splittism, the leaders of the CPSU automatically forfeited the position of "head" in the international communist movement. If the word "head" is now to be applied to them. it can only mean that they are at the head of the revisionists and splitters.

The question confronting all Communists and the entire international communist movement today is not who is the leader over whom, but whether one should uphold Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism or submit to the revisionism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU. In spreading the slander that we want to seize the leadership, the leaders of the CPSU are in fact insisting that all fraternal Parties, including our own, must bow to their revisionist and divisive leadership.

Refutation Of the Charge of Frustrating the Will of The Majority and Violating International Discipline

In their attacks on the Chinese Communist Party since 1960, the leaders of the CPSU have most frequently resorted to the charge that we "frustrate the will of the majority" and "violate international discipline". Let us review our debate with them on this question.

At the Bucharest meeting in June 1960 the leaders of the CPSU made a surprise assault on the Chinese Communist Party by distributing their Letter of Information attacking it and tried to coerce it into submission by lining up a majority. Their attempt did not succeed. But after the meeting they advanced the argument that the minority must submit to the majority in relations among fraternal Parties, and demanded that the CPC should respect the "views and will unanimously expressed" at

[442] Khrushchev's speech at the banquet given in honor of the delegations of the fraternal Parties of the socialist countries on Feb. 4, 1960.
[443] Khrushchev's speech at the meeting of the delegates of twelve fraternal Parties at Bucharest, June 24, 1960

the Bucharest meeting on the pretext that the delegates of scores of Parties had opposed the views of the CPC.

This erroneous argument was refuted by the Central Committee of the CPC in its Letter of Reply, dated September 10, 1960, to the Letter of Information of the Central Committee of the CPSU. It pointed out:

... where the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism are concerned, the problem of exactly who is right and who is wrong cannot in every case be judged by who has the majority, after all, truth is truth. Error cannot be turned into truth because of a temporary majority, nor will truth be turned into error because of a temporary minority.

Yet in its letter of November 5, 1960, the Central Committee of the CPSU repeated the fallacy about the minority's submitting to the majority in the international communist movement. Quoting a passage from Lenin's article "The Duma 'Seven'", it accused the CPC, saying that "he who does not wish to respect the opinion of the majority of the fraternal Parties is in essence coming out against the unity and solidarity of the international communist movement".

At the Moscow Meeting of the fraternal Parties in 1960, the delegation of the CPC once more refuted this fallacy of the leaders of the CPSU. It declared that it is totally wrong to apply the principle of the minority's submitting to the majority to the relations among fraternal Parties in actual present-day conditions in which centralized leadership such as that of the Comintern neither exists nor is desirable. Within a Party the principle that the minority should submit to the majority and the lower Party organization to the higher one should be observed. But it cannot be applied to relations among fraternal Parties. In their mutual relations, each fraternal Party maintains its independence and at the same time unites with all the others. Here, the relationship in which the minority should submit to the majority does not exist, and still less so the relationship in which a lower Party organization should submit to a higher one. The only way to deal with problems of common concern to fraternal Parties is to hold discussions and reach unanimous agreement in accordance with the principle of consultation.

The delegation of the CPC pointed out that by advancing the principle that the minority should submit to the majority in its letter, the Central Committee of the CPSU had obviously repudiated the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation. Our delegation asked, "On what supra-Party constitution does the Central Committee of the CPSU base itself in advancing such an organizational principle? When and where did the Communist and Workers' Parties of all countries ever adopt such a supra-Party constitution?'

The delegation of the CPC then proceeded to expose the ruse of the Central Committee of the CPSU in deliberately omitting the word "Russian" from its citation of a passage dealing with the situation within the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party from Lenin's article "The Duma 'Seven' ",

in order to extend the principle of the minority's submitting to the majority, which is valid within a Party, to the relations among fraternal Parties.

The delegation of the CPC further stated:

... even within a Party, where the principle of the minority's submitting to the majority must be observed organizationally, it cannot be said that on questions of ideological understanding truth can always be told from error on the basis of which is the majority and which the minority opinion. It was in this very article, "The Duma 'Seven'", that Lenin severely denounced the despicable action of the seven liquidationists in the Party fraction in the Duma who took advantage of a majority of one to suppress the Marxists who were in the minority. Lenin pointed out that although the seven liquidationists constituted the majority, they could not possibly represent the united will, united resolutions, united tactics of the majority of the advanced and conscious Russian workers who were organized in a Marxist way, and that therefore all shouts about unity were sheer hypocrisy. "The Non-Party seven want to eat up the six Marxists and demand that this be called 'unity'." [444] He continued that it was precisely these six Marxists in the Party fraction in the Duma who were acting in accordance with the will of the majority of the proletariat, and that unity could be preserved only if those seven delegates "renounce their policy of suppression". [445]

The delegation of the CPC continued that Lenin's words show:

... that even within a Party group the majority is not always correct, that on the contrary sometimes the majority have to "renounce the policy of suppression" if unity is to be preserved, and this is particularly the case where relations among fraternal Parties are concerned. The comrades of the Central Committee of the CPSU rashly quoted a passage from Lenin without having fully grasped its meaning. Moreover, they purposely deleted an important word. Even so, they failed in their aim!

We have quoted at length from a speech of the delegation of the CPC at the 1960 Moscow Meeting in order to show that the absurd charge of the leaders of the CPSU that we "frustrate the will of the majority" was completely refuted by us some time ago. It is precisely because the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties persistently opposed this fallacy that the principle of achieving unanimity through consultation among the fraternal Parties was written into the Statement of 1960.

Yet even now the leaders of the CPSU keep on clamoring that "the minority should submit to the majority". This can only mean that they wish to deny the independent and equal status of all fraternal Parties and to abolish the principle of achieving unanimity through consultation. They are trying to force some fraternal Parties to submit to their will on the pretext of a "majority", and to use

[444] Collected Works, 4th Russian ed., Vol. 19, p. 407.
[445] *Ibid*., p. 425.

the sham preponderance thus obtained to attack fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties. Their very actions are sectarian and divisive and violate the Declaration and the Statement.

Today, if one speaks of an international discipline binding on all Communist Parties, it can only mean observance of the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties as laid down in the Declaration and the Statement. We have cited a great many facts to prove that these principles have been violated by the leaders of the CPSU themselves.

If the CPSU leaders insist on marking off the "majority" from the "minority", then we would like to tell them quite frankly that we do not recognize their majority. The majority you bank on is a false one. The genuine majority is not on your side. Is it true that the members of fraternal Parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism are a minority in the international communist movement? You and your followers are profoundly alienated from the masses, so how can the great mass of Party members and people who disapprove of your wrong line be counted as part of your majority?

The fundamental question is: Who stands with the broad masses of the people? Who represents their basic interests? And who reflects their revolutionary will?

In 1916 Lenin said of the situation in the German Social-Democratic Party:

> "Liebknecht and Rühle are only 2 against 108. But these two represent millions of people, the exploited masses, the vast majority of the population, the future of mankind, the revolution which is growing and maturing with each day. The 108 represent only the groveling spirit of a small handful of bourgeois lackeys among the proletariat." [446]

Today, more than ninety per cent of the world's population desire revolution, including those who are not yet but will eventually become politically conscious. The real majority are the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties and Marxist-Leninists who represent the fundamental interests of the people, and not the handful of revisionists who have betrayed these interests.

Refutation Of the Charge of Supporting the Anti-Party Groups of Fraternal Parties

In its Open Letter, the leadership of the CPSU makes the slanderous charge that "the CPC leadership organizes and supports various anti-party groups *of* defectors, which oppose the Communist Parties of the United States, Brazil, Italy, Belgium, Australia and India".

What are the facts?

The fact is, the splits that have occurred in certain Communist Parties in recent years have largely been due to the forcible application by the leaders of the CPSU of their revisionist and divisive line.

[446] Lenin, "An Open Letter to Boris Souvarine", Collected Works, 4th Russian ed., Vol. 23, pp. 190-91.

The leaders of certain Communist Parties have led the revolutionary movement of their own countries astray and brought serious losses to the revolutionary cause either because they accepted the revisionist line imposed on them by the leaders of the CPSU or because their own revisionist line was encouraged by the leaders of the CPSU. By following the leaders of the CPSU and banging the drum for them in the struggle between the two lines in the international communist movement, they adversely affect the unity of the movement. Inevitably this arouses widespread dissatisfaction inside their own Parties and resistance and opposition from the Marxist-Leninists in them.

Aping the leaders of the CPSU, their followers practice a divisive policy inside their own Parties. Violating the principle of democratic centralism, they forbid normal inner-Party discussion of differences concerning the Party line and of major problems confronting the international communist movement. Moreover, they illegitimately ostracize, attack and even expel Communists who adhere to principle. As a result, the struggle between the two lines within the Parties inevitably takes on a particularly acute form.

In essence, the struggle within these Communist Parties turns on whether to follow the Marxist-Leninist line or the revisionist line, and whether to make the Communist Party a genuine vanguard of the proletariat and a genuine revolutionary proletarian party or to convert it into a servant of the bourgeoisie and a variant of the Social-Democratic Party.

In the Open Letter, the leaders of the CPSU present a distorted picture of the struggles within the Communist Parties of the United States of America, Brazil, Italy, Belgium, Australia and India. They vilify in the most malicious language those Marxist-Leninists who have been attacked and ostracized by the revisionist groups in their own Parties.

Is it possible for the leaders of the CPSU to conceal or alter the truth about the struggles within these Communist Parties by calling white black and black white? No. They certainly cannot!

Take for example the inner-Party struggle in the Belgian Communist Party.

Differences have existed inside the Belgian Communist Party for a long time. The struggle within the Party has become increasingly acute as the original leading group has sunk deeper and deeper into the quagmire of revisionism and abandoned Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

During the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary, the revisionist group in the Belgian Communist Party went so far as to issue a statement condemning the Soviet Union for helping the Hungarian working people to put down the rebellion.

This revisionist group opposed the Congolese people's armed resistance to the bloody repression of the Belgian colonialists and supported the U.S. imperialists' utilization of the United Nations to interfere in and suppress the movement for national independence in the Congo. It

shamelessly prided itself on being the first to appeal to the United Nations, "desiring the rapid and integral application of the U.N. decisions". [447]

It praised the Tito clique's revisionist programme, saying that it "contains ideas which enrich Marxism-Leninism". [448]

It denigrated the 1960 Statement, saying that its contents were all mixed up and that "in every twenty lines there is a phrase contradicting the general line of the Statement". [449]

During the great strike of the Belgian workers towards the end of 1960 and at the beginning of 1961, this revisionist group undermined the workers will to fight by denouncing their resistance to suppression by the police and gendarmes as 'rash and irresponsible actions" [450]

In the face of these betrayals of the interests of the Belgian working class and the international proletariat, it is only natural that Belgian Marxist-Leninists headed by Comrade Jacques Grippa earnestly struggled against this revisionist group. They have exposed and repudiated the errors of the revisionist group inside the Party and have firmly resisted and opposed its revisionist line.

Thus, it is clear that the struggle inside the Belgian Communist Party is a struggle between the Marxist-Leninist and the revisionist line.

How has the revisionist group in the Belgian Communist Party handled this inner-Party struggle? They have pursued a sectarian and divisive policy and used illegitimate means to attack and ostracize those Communists who have persevered in a principled Marxist-Leninist stand. At the 14th Congress of the Belgian Communist Party, they refused to allow Jacques Grippa and other comrades to speak and, disregarding the widespread opposition of the membership, illegitimately declared them expelled from the Party.

It is in these circumstances that Belgian Marxist-Leninists headed by Comrade Jacques Grippa, upholding the revolutionary line, have firmly combated the revisionist and divisive line pursued by the original leading group and fought to rebuild the Belgian Communist Party. Are not their actions absolutely correct and above reproach?

In openly supporting the revisionist group in the Belgian Party and encouraging it to attack and ostracize Belgian Marxist-Leninists, the leaders of the CPSU have simply exposed themselves as creators of splits in fraternal Parties.

---

[447] Ernest Burnelle's interview with a correspondent of l'Humanite on the Congolese question, Le Drapeau Rouge (organ of the Belgian Communist Party), July 26, 1960.
[448] "The Belgian Communist Party and the Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia", Le Drapeau Rouge, Apr. 22, 1958.
[449] Speech by Jean Blume at the Federal Congress of Brussels on Dec. 3. 1961. cited by Jacques Grippa in "For the Marxist-Leninist Unity of the Party and for the Marxist-Leninist Unity of the International Communist Movement", Le Drapeau Rouge, Feb. 22, 1962.
[450] Jean Blume. "For a Complete and Quick Victory: Two Communist Proposals", Le Drapeau Rouge, Dec. 29, 1960.

As for the Indian Communist Party, its situation is even graver.

On the basis of a wealth of facts, we pointed out in "A Mirror for Revisionists", published by the Editorial Department of the *People's Daily* on March 9, 1963, that the renegade clique headed by Dange had betrayed Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, betrayed the revolutionary cause of the Indian proletariat and people and embarked on the road of national chauvinism and class capitulationism. This clique has usurped the leadership of the Indian Communist Party and, conforming to the will of the big Indian capitalists and landlords, has been transforming the Party into a lackey of the Nehru government which represents their interests.

What has happened to the Indian Communist Party since then?

Now everybody can see that the Dange clique is still travelling on the road of betrayal. It is still advocating class collaboration and the realization of socialism in India through the Nehru government. It actively supported the Nehru government's huge budget providing for arms expansion and war preparation, and its measures for fleecing the people. In August 1963 it sabotaged the great strike of one million people in Bombay against the Nehru government's ruthless taxation policy. It tried to obstruct the holding of a mass rally in Calcutta demanding the release of the imprisoned Communists, in which one hundred thousand people participated. It is continuing its frenzied anti-China activities and supporting the Nehru government's expansionist policy. It is following the Nehru government's policy of hiring itself out to U.S. imperialism.

As their renegade features are revealed, Dange and company meet increasing opposition and resistance from the broad rank and file of the Indian Communist Party. More and more Indian Communists have come to see clearly that Dange and company are the bane of the Indian Communist Party and the Indian nation. They are now struggling to rehabilitate the Party's glorious and militant revolutionary tradition. They are the genuine representatives and the hope of the Indian proletariat and the Indian people.

The leaders of the CPSU clamor about the Chinese Communist Party's support of "defectors" and "renegades", but it is they themselves who support such out-and-out defectors and renegades as Dange and company.

The leaders of the CPSU denounce Communists in many countries who dare to combat revisionism and splittism as "defectors", "renegades" and "anti-party elements". But what have these Communists done? Nothing except to adhere to Marxism-Leninism and insist on a revolutionary party and a revolutionary line. Do the leaders of the CPSU really think that their abuse can cow these Marxist-Leninists, make them abandon their struggle for the correct and against the wrong line, and prevent them from carrying it through to the end? This wishful thinking can never be transformed into reality.

Everywhere and at all times, true revolutionaries, true proletarian revolutionary fighters, true Marxist-Leninists (militant materialists), are dauntless people; they are not afraid of the abuse of the

reactionaries and revisionists. For they know it is not such seemingly formidable giants as the reactionaries and revisionists, but "nobodies" like themselves who represent the future. All great men were once nobodies. Provided that they possess the truth and enjoy the support of the masses, those who are seemingly insignificant at first are sure to be victorious in the end. This was true of Lenin and of the Third International. On the other hand, the celebrities and the big battalions inevitably dwindle, decline and putrefy when they lose possession of the truth and therefore lose the support of the masses. This was the case with Bernstein, Kautsky and the Second International. Everything tends to change into its opposite in particular conditions.

Communists are makers of revolution. If they refuse to make revolutions, they cease to be Marxist-Leninists and become revisionists and such-like. As Marxist-Leninists, Communists by their very nature should adhere to their revolutionary stand and oppose revisionism. Similarly, a Marxist-Leninist party should as a matter of course give firm support to revolutionaries and to Communists who oppose revisionism.

The Chinese Communist Party has never concealed its position. We support all revolutionary comrades who adhere to Marxism-Leninism. In the international communist movement, we have contacts with revisionists; why then can we not have contacts with Marxist-Leninists? The leaders of the CPSU describe our support for Marxist-Leninists in other countries as a divisive act. In our opinion, it is simply a proletarian internationalist obligation which it is our duty to discharge.

Fearing no difficulty or tyranny, upholding truth and daring to struggle, Marxist-Leninists in all countries have demonstrated the great revolutionary spirit of communist fighters. Among such heroic fighters are the Belgian Communists represented by Jacques Grippa and other comrades, the Brazilian Communists represented by João Amazonas, Mauricio Grabois and other comrades, the Australian Communists represented by E. F. Hill and other comrades, the Ceylonese Communists represented by Premalal Kumarasiri, Nagalingam Sanmugathasan and other comrades, and the many Marxist-Leninists both inside and outside the Indian, Italian, French, U.S. and other Communist Parties. They have made important contributions to the common world proletarian cause by upholding the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, by working persistently to build revolutionary vanguard parties of the proletariat armed with Marxist-Leninist principles, and by persevering in the revolutionary line that conforms with the fundamental interests of the proletariat and other working people of their own countries. They deserve the respect, sympathy and support of all people fighting for the victory of communism throughout the world.

In short, whatever the country or place, where one finds oppression, there one finds resistance; where one finds revisionists, there one finds Marxist-Leninists fighting them, and where one finds expulsion of Marxist-Leninists from the Party and other divisive measures, there outstanding Marxist-Leninists and strong revolutionary Parties inevitably emerge. Changes contrary to the expectations of the modern revisionists are taking place. The revisionists are producing their own opposites and will eventually be buried by them. This is an inexorable law.

In the last analysis, the present great debate in the international communist movement *center*s on whether to adhere to Marxism-Leninism or to revisionism, whether to adhere to proletarian internationalism or to great-power chauvinism and whether to desire unity or a split. This dispute over fundamental principles began long ago, following the 20th Congress of the CPSU. It went on in private talks between fraternal Parties for a considerable time until it came into the open a little more than two years ago.

As everybody knows, the leaders of the CPSU first provoked and insisted on the open polemics in the international communist movement.

At their 22nd Congress in October 1961, they made public attacks on the Albanian Party of Labor. In his address at that Congress, Comrade Chou En-lai, the head of the Chinese Communist Party delegation, took exception to this action by the leaders of the CPSU, pointing out that it could not be regarded as representing a serious Marxist-Leninist attitude. What was the answer of the Soviet Party leaders? They declared that they were "absolutely correct" [451] and were taking "the only correct and genuinely Marxist-Leninist position of principle" [452] in starting the open polemics.

Then, in January 1962, the Viet Nam Workers Party suggested that "mutual attacks on the radio and in the press should be stopped by the Parties". This suggestion was supported by the Chinese Communist Party, the Albanian Party of Labor and other fraternal Parties. But in effect the leaders of the CPSU refused to make a definite commitment to halt public polemics. Far from stopping their open attacks on the Albanian Party of Labor, they proceeded to engineer open attacks on the Chinese Communist Party too at the successive congresses of five fraternal Parties in Europe in late 1962 and early 1963, and so launched another round of open polemics on an even wider scale. This gave us no choice but to make public replies to the attackers.

Although we had not yet answered all the attacks by fraternal Parties, in its reply to the Central Committee of the CPSU in March 1963 the Central Committee of our Party stated that in order to create a *favorable* atmosphere for the scheduled talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties we would temporarily suspend public replies in the press from March 9, without prejudice to our rights. But on the eve of the talks the leaders of the CPSU took the further step of openly attacking the Chinese Communist Party by name in their Party statements and resolutions.

On July 14, in the midst of the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Party delegations in Moscow, the Central Committee of the CPSU published its Open Letter to Party organizations and all Communists in the Soviet Union, in which it distorted the facts, confused right and wrong, and blatantly and demagogically attacked and abused the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao

[451] Khrushchev's concluding speech at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, Oct. 27, 1961, Documents of the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, FLPH, Moscow, p. 334.
[452] "The Banner of Our Epoch", article by the editorial board, Pravda, Feb. 21, 1962.

Zedong. Thus, the leaders of the CPSU took yet a further step and provoked open polemics on a still larger scale.

From July 15, 1963 onward, the leaders of the CPSU slandered and attacked China as their Enemy No. 1, using all the media at their disposal, such as government statements, speeches by leaders, meetings and articles, and setting in motion all their propaganda machinery, from the central and local press to the radio and television stations. Between July 15 and October 31 their twenty-six central newspapers and journals alone published 1,119 articles by editorial boards, editorials, commentaries, signed articles, readers' letters and cartoons, in which the Chinese Communist Party and its leaders, Mao Zedong, Liu Shao-chi, Chou En-lai and other comrades, were assailed by name. Incomplete figures based on the study of the 15 organs of the Union Republics showed that at least 728 similar anti-Chinese articles and items appeared in the Soviet local press in the same period.

We have published the most important anti-Chinese material including the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU, which we printed in full twice and broadcast to the whole world in more than a dozen foreign languages in order to acquaint those interested in this open debate with the views of the leaders of the CPSU. We have not printed every one of the Soviet articles attacking China simply because they are so numerous and, in most cases, repeat each other, and because our press has limited space. Our publishing houses have collected all these articles and will print them in book form.

The Soviet side has already put out nearly two thousand anti-Chinese articles and other items. In accordance with the principle of equality among all fraternal Parties, the Chinese side has the right to publish a commensurate number of replies.

As the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU touches upon many questions involving a series of fundamental theoretical issues in Marxism-Leninism as well as many major events of the past seven or eight years in the international communist movement, the Editorial Departments of our *People's Daily* and *Red Flag,* after careful study, started the series of comments that began on September 6, 1963. Up to now, we have published only seven comments on this Open Letter, including the present one.

We have not yet concluded our comments. As for the vast number of anti-Chinese articles published by the central or local press of the Soviet Union, we have not even begun to reply to them.

In his answers to newspapermen on October 25, 1963, Khrushchev called for a cessation of the public debate. Subsequently, however, the Soviet press continued to publish articles attacking China.

Recently, the leaders of the CPSU again proposed a halt to the public debate which they said had "done enormous harm to the communist movement". Yet in the past they said that public polemics were "in the interests of the whole world communist movement" [453] and "the only correct

[453] "Toward New Victories of Communism", article by the editorial board, Kommunist, No. 16, 1961.

and genuinely Marxist-Leninist position of principle". [454] We would like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: What sort of games are you playing, saying one thing at one time and another thing at another?

We would also like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Is it in accord with the principle of equality among fraternal Parties for you to ask us to be silent after publishing less than ten articles in reply to your two thousand articles and other items attacking China, and when we have not yet even completed our reply to your Open Letter? Is it in accord with the principles of democratic discussion for you to become impatient and intolerant and to refuse to listen when we have said only a little while you have talked so much and for so long?

Again, we would like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Was it not an outright threat and intimidation when you brazenly declared in the Soviet government statement of September 21, 1963 that if the Chinese continued the polemics, "they must clearly realize that the most resolute rebuff from the CPSU and the Soviet people awaits them on this road"? Do you really believe that other people are bound docilely to obey your orders and tremble at your roar? To be frank, ever since September 21 you have been eagerly waiting to see what "the most resolute rebuff" would be.

Comrades and friends! You are mistaken, completely mistaken.

Now that the public debate is on, it must proceed according to rule. If you think you have said enough, you should allow the other side ample chance to reply. If you think you still have a lot to say, please say it all. But when you do so, let the other side have his full say as well. In a word, there should be equal rights. Have not you, too, said that fraternal Parties are equal? Why then do you insist that you may start public polemics whenever you want to attack fraternal Parties and at the same time deprive the Parties so attacked of their right to make public replies whenever you choose to stop the polemics?

The leaders of the CPSU unscrupulously provoked, extended and insisted on the open polemics, but now they have begun to clamor for their cessation. What is behind all this?

Apparently, things have not developed according to the expectations of the launchers of these polemics. The public debate, which the leaders of the CPSU at first thought would be to their advantage, is developing in a way contrary to their wishes. Truth is not on the side of the leaders of the CPSU, and therefore in their attacks on others they can only depend on lies, slanders, distortion of the facts and confusion of right and wrong. When argument develops and it becomes necessary to produce facts and reason things out, they find the ground slipping from under their feet and take fright.

Lenin once said that for revisionists "there is nothing more disagreeable, undesirable unacceptable than the elucidation of the prevailing theoretical, programmatic, tactical and

[454] See p. 77, note 2.

organizational differences". ("Once More About the International Socialist Bureau and the Liquidators", *Collected Works,* 4th Russian ed., Moscow, Vol. 20, p. 37.)

This is precisely the situation in which the leaders of the CPSU now find themselves.

The stand of the Chinese Communist Party on public polemics is known to all. From the very beginning, we have held that differences among fraternal Parties should be resolved through private consultations. The public polemics were neither provoked nor desired by us.

However, since the public debate is already on and since the leaders of the CPSU have said that to conduct it is to "act in Lenin's manner", [455] it must be conducted on the basis of democratic discussion by adducing facts and by reasoning until everything is thrashed out.

More important still, since the leaders of the CPSU have openly betrayed Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and torn up the Declaration and the Statement, they cannot expect us to refrain from defending Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism and the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement. Since the debate concerns major issues of principle in the international communist movement, they must be thoroughly thrashed out. This, too, represents a serious Marxist-Leninist attitude.

The essence of the matter is that the existing differences in the international communist movement are between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism and between proletarian internationalism and great-power chauvinism. These major differences of principle cannot be solved in a fundamental way by a cessation of the public debate. On the contrary, only through public debate, setting forth the facts and reasoning things out will it be possible to clarify matters, distinguish right from wrong and safeguard and strengthen the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Marxism-Leninism is a science, and science fears no debate. Anything which fears debate is no science. The present great debate in the international communist movement is impelling Communists, revolutionists and revolutionary people in all countries to use their brains and ponder over problems concerning the revolution in their own countries and the world revolution in accordance with the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism. Through this great debate, people will be able to distinguish between right and wrong and between real and sham Marxism-Leninism. Through this great debate, all the revolutionary forces in the world will be mobilized, and all Marxist-Leninists will be tempered ideologically and politically and will be able to integrate Marxism-Leninism with concrete practice in their own countries in a more mature way. Thus, Marxism-Leninism will undoubtedly be further enriched, developed and raised to new heights.

[455] "The Historic Congress of the Leninist Party", Pravda editorial, Nov. 4, 1961.

The revisionism and great-power chauvinism of the leaders of the CPSU are an unprecedented menace to the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. By taking a revisionist and great-power chauvinist position, the leaders of the CPSU are standing for a split. So long as they maintain such a position, they are in fact working for sham unity and a real split no matter how volubly they may talk of "unity" and abuse others as "splitters" and "sectarians".

The Chinese Communist Party, other Marxist-Leninist parties and all Marxist-Leninists persevere in Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. This position is the only correct one for defending and strengthening the genuine unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism constitute the basis of that unity. Only on this basis can the unity of fraternal Parties and countries be built. Such unity will be out of the question if one departs from this basis. To fight for Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism is to work for the unity of the international communist movement. Persevering in principle and upholding unity are inextricably bound together.

If the leaders of the CPSU genuinely want unity and are not just pretending, they should loyally abide by the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and by the Marxist-Leninist teachings concerning classes and class struggle, the state and revolution, and especially proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is absolutely impermissible for them to substitute class collaboration or class capitulation for class struggle, and social reformism or social pacifism for proletarian revolution, or abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat no matter under what pretext.

If the leaders of the CPSU genuinely want unity and are not just pretending, they should strictly abide by the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. It is absolutely impermissible for them to substitute their own Party programme for the common programme which was unanimously agreed upon by the fraternal Parties.

If the leaders of the CPSU genuinely want unity and are not just pretending, they should draw a sharp line of demarcation between enemies and comrades and should unite with all socialist countries, all fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties, the proletariat of the whole world, all oppressed people and nations and all peace-loving countries and people in order to oppose U.S. imperialism, the arch-enemy of the people of the world, and its lackeys. It is absolutely impermissible for them to treat enemies as friends and friends as enemies, and to ally themselves with the U.S. imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries and the renegade Tito clique against fraternal countries and Parties and all revolutionary people in the vain pursuit of world domination through U.S.-Soviet collaboration.

If the leaders of the CPSU genuinely want unity and are not just pretending, they should be faithful to proletarian internationalism and strictly abide by the principles guiding relations among

fraternal countries and Parties, as laid down in the Declaration and the Statement. It is absolutely impermissible for them to replace these principles with policies of great-power chauvinism and national egoism. In other words, they should

observe the principle of solidarity and never line up a number of fraternal Parties to attack other fraternal Parties and engage in sectarian and divisive activities;

adhere to the principle of mutual support and mutual assistance and never try to control others in the name of assistance or, on the pretext of the "international division of labor", impair the sovereignty and interests of fraternal countries and oppose their building socialism through self-reliance;

observe the principle of independence and equality and never place themselves above other fraternal Parties or impose their own Party's programme, line and resolutions on others; never interfere in the internal affairs of fraternal Parties and carry out subversive activities under the pretext of "combating the personality cult"; and never treat fraternal Parties as their property and fraternal countries as their dependencies;

follow the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation and never force through their own Party's wrong line in the name of the so-called majority or use the Congresses of their own Party or of other Parties and such forms as resolutions, statements and leaders' speeches for public and explicit attacks on other fraternal Parties, and certainly never extend ideological differences to state relations.

In short, if the leaders of the CPSU genuinely desire the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, they must make a clean break with their line of revisionism, great-power chauvinism and splittism. The unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement can be safeguarded and strengthened only by remaining loyal to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and by opposing modern revisionism and modern dogmatism, great-power chauvinism and other forms of bourgeois nationalism, and sectarianism and splittism, and by doing so not merely in words but in deeds. This is the sole way to defend and strengthen unity.

Taken as a whole, the present world situation is most *favorable*. The international communist movement has already gained brilliant victories, bringing about a fundamental change in the international balance of class forces. At present the international communist movement is being assailed by an adverse current of revisionism and splittism; this phenomenon is not inconsistent with the law of historical development. Even though it creates temporary difficulties for the international communist movement and some fraternal Parties, it is a good thing that the revisionists have revealed their true features and that a struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism has ensued.

Without any doubt, Marxism-Leninism will continue to demonstrate its youthful vitality and will sweep the whole world; the international communist movement will grow stronger and more united on the basis of Marxism-Leninism; and the cause of the international proletariat and the world people's revolution will win still more brilliant victories. Modern revisionism will undoubtedly go bankrupt.

We would like to advise the leaders of the CPSU to think matters over calmly: what will you're clinging to revisionism and splittism lead to? Once again, we would like to make a sincere appeal to the leaders of the CPSU: We hope you will be able to return to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, to the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement and to the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries as laid down in these documents, so that the differences will be eliminated and the unity of the international communist movement and the socialist camp and unity between China and the Soviet Union will be strengthened on these principled bases.

Despite our serious differences with the leaders of the CPSU, we have full confidence in the vast membership of the CPSU and in the Soviet people, who grew up under the guidance of Lenin and Stalin. As always, the Communists and the people of China will unswervingly safeguard the unity between China and the Soviet Union, and consolidate and develop the deep-rooted friendship between our two peoples.

Communists of the world, unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism!

CPCh: On Khrushchev's Phony Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World

Introduction

The theories of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are the quintessence of Marxism-Leninism. The questions of whether revolution should be upheld or opposed and whether the dictatorship of the proletariat should be upheld or opposed have always been the focus of struggle between Marxism- Leninism and all brands of revisionism and are now the focus of struggle between Marxist-Leninists the world over and the revisionist Khrushchev clique.

At the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, the revisionist Khrushchev clique developed their revisionism into a complete system not only by rounding off their anti-revolutionary theories of "peaceful coexistence" and "peaceful transition" but also by declaring that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary in the Soviet Union and advancing the absurd theories of the "state of the whole people" and the "party of the entire people".

The Programme put forward by the revisionist Khrushchev clique at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU is a programme of phony communism, a revisionist programme against proletarian revolution and for the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian party.

The revisionist Khrushchev clique abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat behind the camouflage of the "state of the whole people", change the proletarian character of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union behind the camouflage of the "party of the entire people" and pave the way for the restoration of capitalism behind that of "full-scale communist construction".

In its Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement dated June 14, 1963, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China pointed out that it is most absurd in theory and extremely harmful in practice to substitute the "state of the whole people" for the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the "party of the entire people" for the vanguard party of the proletariat. This substitution is a great historical retrogression which makes any transition to communism impossible and helps only to restore capitalism.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the press of the Soviet Union resort to sophistry in self-justification and charge that our criticisms of the "state of the whole people" and the "party of the entire people" are allegations "far removed from Marxism", betray "isolation from the life of the Soviet people" and are a demand that they "return to the past".

Well, let us ascertain who is actually far removed from Marxism- Leninism, what Soviet life is actually like and who actually wants the Soviet Union to return to the past.

Socialist Society and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

What is the correct conception of socialist society? Do classes and class struggle exist throughout the stage of socialism? Should the dictatorship of the proletariat be maintained and the socialist revolution be carried through to the end? Or should the dictatorship of the proletariat be abolished so as to pave the way for capitalist restoration? These questions must be answered correctly according to the basic theory of Marxism-Leninism and the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The replacement of capitalist society by socialist society is a great leap in the historical development of human society. Socialist society covers the important historical period of transition from class to classless society. It is by going through socialist society that mankind will enter communist society.

The socialist system is incomparably superior to the capitalist system. In socialist society, the dictatorship of the proletariat replaces bourgeois dictatorship and the public ownership of the means of production replaces private ownership. The proletariat, from being an oppressed and exploited class, turns into a ruling class and a fundamental change takes place in the social position of the working people. Exercising dictatorship over a few exploiters only, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat practices the broadest democracy among the masses of the working people, a democracy that is impossible in capitalist society. The nationalization of industry and collectivization of agriculture open wide vistas for the vigorous development of the social productive forces, ensuring a rate of growth incomparably greater than that in any older society.

However, one cannot but see that socialist society is a society born out of capitalist society and is only the first phase of communist society. It is not yet a fully mature communist society in the economic and other fields. It is inevitably stamped with the birth marks of capitalist society. When defining socialist society Marx said:

> What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has **developed** on its own foundations, but, on the contrary, just as it **emerges** from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birth marks of the old society from whose womb it emerges. [456]

Lenin also pointed out that in socialist society, which is the first phase of communism, "Communism **cannot** as yet be fully ripe economically and entirely free from traditions or traces of capitalism". [457]

In socialist society, the differences between workers and peasants, between town and country, and between manual and mental laborers still remain, bourgeois rights are not yet completely abolished, it is not possible "at once to eliminate the other injustice, which consists in the distribution of articles of consumption 'according to the amount of labor performed' (and not according to needs)", and therefore differences in wealth still exist. [458]

The disappearance of these differences, phenomena and bourgeois rights can only be gradual and long drawn-out. As Marx said, only after these differences have vanished and bourgeois rights have completely disappeared will it be possible to realize full communism with its principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs".

Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the Soviet Union, China and other socialist countries all teach us that socialist society covers a very, very long historical stage. Throughout this stage, the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat goes on and the question of "who will win" between the roads of capitalism and socialism remains, as does the danger of restoration of capitalism.

In its Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement dated June 14, 1963, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China states:

> For a very long historical period after the proletariat takes power, class struggle continues as an objective law independent of man's will, differing only in form from what it was before the taking of power.

After the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out a number of times that:

---

[456] See: Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1958, Vol. 2, p. 23.]
[457] Lenin, "The State and Revolution", Selected Works, FLPH, Mos- cow, 1952, Vol. 2, Part 1, p. 302.]
[458] *Ibid*., p. 296.

a) The overthrown exploiters always try in a thousand and one ways to recover the "paradise" they have been deprived of.
b) New elements of capitalism are constantly and spontaneously generated in the petty-bourgeois atmosphere.
c) Political degenerates and new bourgeois elements may emerge in the ranks of the working class and among government functionaries as a result of bourgeois influence and the pervasive, corrupting influence of the petty bourgeoisie.
d) The external conditions for the continuance of class struggle within a socialist society are encirclement by international capitalism, the imperialists' threat of armed intervention and their subversive activities to accomplish peaceful disintegration.

Life has confirmed these conclusions of Lenin's.

In socialist society, the overthrown bourgeoisie and other reactionary classes remain strong for quite a long time, and indeed in certain respects are quite powerful. They have a thousand and one links with the international bourgeoisie. They are not reconciled to their defeat and stubbornly continue to engage in trials of strength with the proletariat. They conduct open and hidden struggles against the proletariat in every field.

Constantly parading such signboards as support for socialism, the Soviet system, the Communist Party and Marxism-Leninism, they work to undermine socialism and restore capitalism. Politically, they persist for a long time as a force antagonistic to the proletariat and constantly attempt to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat. They sneak into the government organs, public organizations, economic departments and cultural and educational institutions so as to resist or usurp the leadership of the proletariat.

Economically, they employ every means to damage socialist ownership by the whole people and socialist collective ownership and to develop the forces of capitalism. In the ideological, cultural and educational fields, they counterpose the bourgeois world outlook to the proletarian world outlook and try to corrupt the proletariat and other working people with bourgeois ideology.

The collectivization of agriculture turns individual into collective farmers and provides *favorable* conditions for the thorough remolding of the peasants. However, until collective ownership advances to ownership by the whole people and until the remnants of private economy disappear completely, the peasants inevitably retain some of the inherent characteristics of small producers. In these circumstances spontaneous capitalist tendencies are inevitable, the soil for the growth of new rich peasants still exists and polarization among the peasants may still occur.

The activities of the bourgeoisie as described above, its corrupting effects in the political, economic, ideological and cultural and educational fields, the existence of spontaneous capitalist tendencies among urban and rural small producers, and the influence of the remaining bourgeois rights and the force of habit of the old society all constantly breed political degenerates in the ranks of

the working class and Party and government organizations, new bourgeois elements and embezzlers and grafters in state enterprises owned by the whole people and new bourgeois intellectuals in the cultural and educational institutions and intellectual circles.

These new bourgeois elements and these political degenerates attack socialism in collusion with the old bourgeois elements and elements of other exploiting classes which have been overthrown but not eradicated. The political degenerates entrenched in the leading organs are particularly dangerous, for they support and shield the bourgeois elements in organs at lower levels.

As long as imperialism exists, the proletariat in the socialist countries will have to struggle both against the bourgeoisie at home and against international imperialism. Imperialism will seize every opportunity and try to undertake armed intervention against the socialist countries or to bring about their peaceful disintegration. It will do its utmost to destroy the socialist countries or to make them degenerate into capitalist countries. The international class struggle will inevitably find its reflection within the socialist countries.

Lenin said:

> The transition from capitalism to Communism represents an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this **hope** is converted into **attempts** at restoration. [459]

He also pointed out:

> The abolition of classes requires a long, difficult and stubborn **class struggle**, which **after** the overthrow of the power of capital, **after** the destruction of the bourgeois state, **after** the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, **does not disappear** (as the vulgar representatives of the old Socialism and the old Social-Democracy imagine), but merely changes its forms and in many respects becomes fiercer. [460]

Throughout the stage of socialism, the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the political, economic, ideological and cultural and educational fields cannot be stopped. It is a protracted, repeated, tortuous and complex struggle. Like the waves of the sea, it sometimes rises high and sometimes subsides, is now fairly calm and now very turbulent. It is a struggle that decides the fate of a socialist society. Whether a socialist society will advance to communism or revert to capitalism depends upon the outcome of this protracted struggle.

The class struggle in socialist society is inevitably reflected in the Communist Party. The bourgeoisie and international imperialism both understand that in order to make a socialist country

[459] See: Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", *Selected Works*, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2, Part 2, p. 61.
[460] Lenin, "Greetings to the Hungarian Workers", Selected Works, FPLH, Moscow, Vol. 2, Part 2, pp. 210-11.

degenerate into a capitalist country, it is first necessary to make the Communist Party degenerate into a revisionist party.

The old and new bourgeois elements, the old and new rich peasants and the degenerate elements of all sorts constitute the social basis of revisionism, and they use every possible means to find agents within the Communist Party. The existence of bourgeois influence is the internal source of revisionism and surrender to imperialist pressure the external source.

Throughout the stage of socialism, there is inevitable struggle between Marxism-Leninism and various kinds of opportunism – mainly revisionism -- in the Communist Parties of socialist countries. The characteristic of this revisionism is that, denying the existence of classes and class struggle, it sides with the bourgeoisie in attacking the proletariat and turns the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

In the light of the experience of the international working-class movement and in accordance with the objective law of class struggle, the founders of Marxism pointed out that the transition from capitalism, from class to classless society, must depend on the dictatorship of the proletariat and that there is no other road.

Marx said that

"The class struggle necessarily leads to the **dictatorship of the proletariat**". [461]

He also said:

"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but **the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat**." [462]

The development of socialist society is a process of uninterrupted revolution. In explaining revolutionary socialism Marx said:

This socialism is the **declaration of the permanence of the revolution**, the **class dictatorship** of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the **abolition of class distinctions generally**, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations. [463]

In his struggle against the opportunism of the Second International, Lenin creatively expounded and developed Marx's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He pointed out:

[461] "Marx to J. Wedemeyer, March 5, 1852", Selected Works of Marx and Engels, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2, p. 452.
[462] Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", Selected Works of Marx and Engels, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2, pp. 32-33.
[463] Marx, "The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850", Selected Works of Marx and Engels, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 1, p. 223.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is not the end of class struggle but its continuation in new forms. The dictatorship of the proletariat is class struggle waged by a proletariat which has been victorious and has taken political power in its hands against a bourgeoisie that has been defeated but not destroyed, a bourgeoisie that has not vanished, not ceased to offer resistance, but that has intensified its resistance. [464]

He also said:

> The dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle – bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative – against the forces and traditions of the old society. [465]

In his celebrated work *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People* and in other works, Comrade Mao Zedong, basing himself on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, gives a comprehensive and systematic analysis of classes and class struggle in socialist society, and creatively develops the Marxist-Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Comrade Mao Zedong examines the objective laws of socialist society from the viewpoint of materialist dialectics. He points out that the universal law of the unity and struggle of opposites operating both in the natural world and in human society is applicable to socialist society, too.

In socialist society, class contradictions still remain and class struggle does not die out after the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production. The struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism runs through the entire stage of socialism. To ensure the success of socialist construction and to prevent the restoration of capitalism, it is necessary to carry the socialist revolution through to the end on the political, economic, ideological and cultural fronts. The complete victory of socialism cannot be brought about in one or two generations; to resolve this question thoroughly requires five to ten generations or even longer.

Comrade Mao Zedong stresses the fact that two types of social contradictions exist in socialist society, namely, contradictions among the people and contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, and that the former are very numerous. Only by distinguishing between the two types of contradictions, which are different in nature, and by adopting different measures to handle them correctly is it possible to unite the people, who constitute more than 90 per cent of the population, defeat their enemies, who constitute only a few per cent, and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat.

---

[464] See: Lenin, "Foreword to the Speech 'On Deception of the People with Slogans of Freedom and Equality'", *Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry*, FLPH, Moscow, 1959, p. 302.
[465] Lenin: "'Left-Wing' Communism, an Infantile Disorder", Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2, Part 2, p. 367.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the basic guarantee for the consolidation and development of socialism, for the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie and of socialism in the struggle between the two roads.

Only by emancipating all mankind can the proletariat ultimately emancipate itself. The historical task of the dictatorship of the proletariat has two aspects, one internal and the other international.

The internal task consists mainly of completely abolishing all the exploiting classes, developing socialist economy to the maximum, enhancing the communist consciousness of the masses, abolishing the differences between ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, between workers and peasants, between town and country and between mental and manual laborers, eliminating any possibility of the re-emergence of classes and the restoration of capitalism and providing conditions for the realization of a communist society with its principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs".

The international task consists mainly of preventing attacks by international imperialism (including armed intervention and disintegration by peaceful means) and of giving support to the world revolution until the peoples of all countries finally abolish imperialism, capitalism and the system of exploitation.

Before the fulfilment of both tasks and before the advent of a full communist society, the dictatorship of the proletariat is absolutely necessary.

Judging from the actual situation today, the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat are still far from accomplished in any of the socialist countries. In all socialist countries without exception, there are classes and class struggle, the struggle between the socialist and the capitalist roads, the question of carrying the socialist revolution through to the end and the question of preventing the restoration of capitalism.

All the socialist countries still have a very long way to go before the differences between ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, between workers and peasants, between town and country and between mental and manual laborers are eliminated, before all classes and class differences are eliminated and a communist society with its principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs", is realized. Therefore, it is necessary for all the socialist countries to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In these circumstances, the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the revisionist Khrushchev clique is nothing but a betrayal of socialism and communism.

Antagonistic Classes and Class Struggle Exist in the Soviet Union

In announcing the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, the revisionist Khrushchev clique base themselves mainly on the argument that antagonistic classes have been eliminated and that class struggle no longer exists.

But what is the actual situation in the Soviet Union? Are there really no antagonistic classes and no class struggle there?

Following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat was established in the Soviet Union, capitalist private ownership was destroyed and socialist ownership by the whole people and socialist collective ownership were established through the nationalization of industry and the collectivization of agriculture, and great achievements in socialist construction were scored during several decades. All this constituted an indelible victory of tremendous historic significance won by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin.

However, the old bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes which had been overthrown in the Soviet Union were not eradicated and survived after industry was nationalized and agriculture collectivized. The political and ideological influence of the bourgeoisie remained. Spontaneous capitalist tendencies continued to exist both in the city and in the countryside. New bourgeois elements and kulaks were still incessantly generated. Throughout the long intervening period, the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads have continued in the political, economic and ideological spheres.

As the Soviet Union was the first, and at the time the only, country to build socialism and had no foreign experience to go by, and as Stalin departed from Marxist-Leninist dialectics in his understanding of the laws of class struggle in socialist society, he prematurely declared after agriculture was basically collectivized that there were "no longer antagonistic classes" [466] in the Soviet Union and that it was "free of class conflicts", [467] one-sidedly stressed the internal homogeneity of socialist society and overlooked its contradictions, failed to rely upon the working class and the masses in the struggle against the forces of capitalism and regarded the possibility of restoration of capitalism as associated only with armed attack by international imperialism. This was wrong both in theory and in practice.

Nevertheless, Stalin remained a great Marxist-Leninist. As long as he led the Soviet Party and state, he held fast to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist course, pursued a Marxist-Leninist line and ensured the Soviet Union's victorious advance along the road of socialism.

---

[466] Stalin, "On the Draft Constitution of the U.S.S.R", Problems of Leninism, FLPH, Moscow, 1954, p. 690.
[467] Stalin, "Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.) on the Work of the Central Committee", Problems of Leninism, FLPH, Moscow, p. 777.

Ever since Khrushchev seized the leadership of the Soviet Party and state, he has pushed through a whole series of revisionist policies which have greatly hastened the growth of the forces of capitalism and again sharpened the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and the struggle between the roads of socialism and capitalism in the Soviet Union.

Scanning the reports in Soviet newspapers over the last few years, one finds numerous examples demonstrating not only the presence of many elements of the old exploiting classes in Soviet society, but also the generation of new bourgeois elements on a large scale and the acceleration of class polarization.

Let us first look at the activities of various bourgeois elements in the Soviet enterprises owned by the whole people.

Leading functionaries in some state-owned factories and their gangs abuse their positions and amass large fortunes by using the equipment and materials of the factories to set up "underground workshops" for private production, selling the products illicitly and dividing the spoils. Here are some examples.

In a Leningrad plant producing military items, the leading functionaries placed their own men in "all key posts" and "turned the state enterprise into a private one". They illicitly engaged in the production of non-military goods and from the sale of fountain pens alone embezzled 1,200,000 old rubles in three years. Among these people was a man who "was a Nepman...in the 1920's" and had been a "lifelong thief". [468]

In a silk-weaving mill in Uzbekistan, the manager ganged up with the chief engineer, the chief accountant, the chief of the supply and marketing section, heads of workshops and others, and they all became "new-born entrepreneurs". They purchased more than ten tons of artificial and pure silk through various illegal channels in order to manufacture goods which "did not pass through the accounts". They employed workers without going through the proper procedures and enforced "a twelve-hour working day". [469]

The manager of a furniture factory in Kharkov set up an "illegal knitwear workshop" and carried on secret operations inside the factory. This man "had several wives, several cars, several houses, 176 neck-ties, about a hundred shirts and dozens of suits". He was also a big gambler at the horse-races. [470]

Such people do not operate all by themselves. They invariably work hand in glove with functionaries in the state departments in charge of supplies and in the commercial and other departments. They have their own men in the police and judicial departments who protect them and

[468] See: Krasnaya Zvezda, May 19, 1962.
[469] See: Pravda Vostoka, Oct. 8, 1963.
[470] See: Pravda Ukrainy, May 18, 1962.

act as their agents. Even high-ranking officials in the state organs support and shield them. Here are a few examples.

The chief of the workshops affiliated to a Moscow psychoneurological dispensary and his gang set up an "underground enterprise", and by bribery "obtained fifty-eight knitting machines" and a large amount of raw material. They entered into business relations with "fifty-two factories, handicraft co-operatives and collective farms" and made three million rubles in a few years. They bribed functionaries of the Department for Combating Theft of Socialist Property and Speculation, controllers, inspectors, instructors and others. [471]

The manager of a machinery plant in the Russian Federation, together with the deputy manager of a second machinery plant and other functionaries, or forty-three persons in all, stole more than nine hundred looms and sold them to factories in Central Asia, Kazakhstan, the Caucasus and other places, whose leading functionaries used them for illicit production. [472]

In the Kirghiz SSR, a gang of over forty embezzlers and grafters, having gained control of two factories, organized underground production and plundered more than thirty million rubles' worth of state property. The gang included the Chairman of the Planning Commission of the Republic, a Vice-Minister of Commerce, seven bureau chiefs and division chiefs of the Republic's Council of Ministers, National Economic Council and State Control Commission, as well as "a big kulak who had fled from exile". [473]

These examples show that the factories which have fallen into the clutches of such degenerates are socialist enterprises only in name, that in fact they have become capitalist enterprises by which these persons enrich themselves. The relationship of such persons to the workers has turned into one between exploiters and exploited, between oppressors and oppressed.

Are not such degenerates who possess and make use of means of production to exploit the labor of others out-and-out bourgeois elements? Are not their accomplices in government organizations, who work hand in glove with them, participate in many types of exploitation, engage in embezzlement, accept bribes, and share the spoils, also out-and-out bourgeois elements?

Obviously, all these people belong to a class that is antagonistic to the proletariat – they belong to the bourgeoisie. Their activities against socialism are definitely class struggle with the bourgeoisie attacking the proletariat.

Now let us look at the activities of various kulak elements on the collective farms.

---

[471] See: Izvestia, Oct. 20, 1963, and Izvestia Sunday Supplement, No. 12, 1964.
[472] See: *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, Aug. 9, 1963.
[473] Sovietskaya Kirghizia, Jan. 9, 1962.]

Some leading collective-farm functionaries and their gangs steal and speculate at will, freely squander public money and fleece the collective farmers. Here are some examples.

The chairman of a collective farm in Uzbekistan "held the whole village in terror". All the important posts on this farm "were occupied by his in-laws and other relatives and friends". He squandered "over 132,000 *rubles* of the collective farm for his personal 'needs'". He had a car, two motor-cycles and three wives, each with "a house of her own". [474]

The chairman of a collective farm in the Kursk Region regarded the farm as his "hereditary estate". He conspired with its accountant, cashier, chief warehouse-keeper, agronomist, general store-manager and others. Shielding each other, they "fleeced the collective farmers" and pocketed more than a hundred thousand *rubles* in a few years. [475]

The chairman of a collective farm in the Ukraine made over 50,000 *rubles* at its expense by forging purchase certificates and cash-account orders in collusion with its woman accountant, who had been praised for keeping "model accounts" and whose deeds had been displayed at the Moscow Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy. [476]

The chairman of a collective farm in the Alma-Ata Region specialized in commercial speculation. He bought "fruit juice in the Ukraine or Uzbekistan, and sugar and alcohol from Jambul", processed them and then sold the wine at very high prices in many localities. In this farm a winery was created with a capacity of over a million liters a year, its speculative commercial network spread throughout the Kazakhstan SSR, and commercial speculation became one of the farm's main sources of income. [477]

The chairman of a collective farm in Byelorussia considered himself "a feudal princeling on the farm" and acted "personally" in all matters. He lived not on the farm but in the city or in his own splendid villa, and was always busy with "various commercial machinations" and "illegal deals". He bought cattle from the outside, represented them as the products of the collective farm and falsified output figures. And yet "not a few commendatory newspaper reports" had been published about him and he had been called a "model leader". [478]

These examples show that collective farms under the control of such functionaries virtually become their private property. Such men turn socialist collective economic enterprises into economic enterprises of new kulaks. There are often people in their superior organizations who protect them. Their relationship to the collective farmers has likewise become that of oppressors to oppressed, of

[474] Selskaya Zhizn, June 26, 1962.
[475] See: *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta*, No. 35, 1963.
[476] See: *Selskaya Zhizn*, Aug. 14, 1963.
[477] See: *Pravda*, Jan. 14, 1962.
[478] See: *Pravda*, Feb. 6, 1961.

exploiters to exploited. Are not such neo-exploiters who ride on the backs of the collective farmers one-hundred-percent neo-kulaks?

Obviously, they all belong to a class that is antagonistic to the proletariat and the laboring farmers, belong to the kulak or rural bourgeois class. Their anti-socialist activities are precisely class struggle with the bourgeoisie attacking the proletariat and the laboring farmers.

Apart from the bourgeois elements in state enterprises and collective farms, there are many others in both town and country in the Soviet Union.

Some of them set up private enterprises for private production and sale; others organize contractor teams and openly undertake construction jobs for state or co-operative enterprises; still others open private hotels.

A "Soviet woman capitalist" in Leningrad hired workers to make nylon blouses for sale, and her "daily income amounted to over 700 new *rubles*". [479]

The owner of a workshop in the Kursk Region made felt boots for sale at speculative prices. He had in his possession 540 pairs of felt boots, eight kilograms of gold coins, 3,000 meters of high-grade textiles, 20 carpets, 1,200 kilograms of wool and many other valuables. [480]

A private entrepreneur in the Gomel Region "hired workers and artisans" and in the course of two years secured contracts for the construction and overhauling of furnaces in twelve factories at a high price. [481]

In the Orenburg Region there are "hundreds of private hotels and trans-shipment points", and "the money of the collective farms and the state is continuously streaming into the pockets of the hostelry owners". [482]

Some engage in commercial speculation, making tremendous profits through buying cheap and selling dear or bringing goods from far away. In Moscow there are a great many speculators engaged in the re-sale of agricultural produce. They "bring to Moscow tons of citrus fruit, apples and vegetables and re-sell them at speculative prices". "These profit-grabbers are provided with every facility, with market inns, store-rooms and other services at their disposal". [483]

In the Krasnodar Territory, a speculator set up her own agency and "employed twelve salesmen and two stevedores". She transported "thousands of hogs, hundreds of quintals of stolen

[479] See: Izvestia, April 9, 1963.
[480] See: *Sovietskaya Rossiya*, Oct. 9, 1963.
[481] See: *Izvestia*, Oct. 18, 1960.
[482] Selskaya Zhizn, July 17, 1963.
[483] Selskaya Zhizn, July 17, 1963.

slag bricks, whole wagons of glass" and other building materials from the city to the villages. She reaped high profits out of each re-sale. [484]

Others specialize as brokers and middlemen. They have wide contacts and through them one can get anything, in return for a bribe. There was a broker in Leningrad who "though he is not the Minister of Trade, controls all the stocks", and "though he holds no post on the railway, disposes of wagons". He could obtain "things the stocks of which are strictly controlled, from outside the stocks". "All the store-houses in Leningrad are at his service." For delivering goods, he received huge "bonuses" – 700,000 *rubles* from one timber combine in 1960 alone. In Leningrad, there is "a whole group" of such brokers. [485]

These private entrepreneurs and speculators are engaged in the most naked capitalist exploitation. Isn't it clear that they belong to the bourgeoisie, the class antagonistic to the proletariat?

Actually, the Soviet press itself calls these people "Soviet capitalists", "new-born entrepreneurs", "private entrepreneurs", "newly-emerged kulaks", "speculators", "exploiters", etc. Isn't the revisionist Khrushchev clique contradicting themselves when they assert that antagonistic classes do not exist in the Soviet Union?

The facts cited above are only a part of those published in the Soviet press. They are enough to shock people, but there are many more which have not been published, many bigger and more serious cases which are covered up and shielded. We have quoted the above data in order to answer the question whether there are antagonistic classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union. These data are readily available and even the revisionist Khrushchev clique is unable to deny them.

These data suffice to show that the unbridled activities of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat are widespread in the Soviet Union, in the city as well as the countryside, in industry as well as agriculture, in the sphere of production as well as the sphere of circulation, all the way from the economic departments to Party and government organizations, and from the grass-roots to the higher leading bodies. These anti-socialist activities are nothing if not the sharp class struggle of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

It is not strange that attacks on socialism should be made in a socialist country by old and new bourgeois elements. There is nothing terrifying about this so long as the leadership of the Party and state remains a Marxist-Leninist one. But in the Soviet Union today, the gravity of the situation lies in the fact that the revisionist Khrushchev clique have usurped the leadership of the Soviet Party and state and that a privileged bourgeois stratum has emerged in Soviet society.

We shall deal with this problem in the following section.

[484] Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta, No. 27, 1963.
[485] Literaturnaya Gazeta, July 27 and Aug. 17, 1963.

The Soviet Privileged Stratum and the Revisionist Khrushchev Clique

The privileged stratum in contemporary Soviet society is composed of degenerate elements from among the leading cadres of Party and government organizations, enterprises and farms as well as bourgeois intellectuals; it stands in opposition to the workers, the peasants and the overwhelming majority of the intellectuals and cadres of the Soviet Union.

Lenin pointed out soon after the October Revolution that bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies and force of habit were encircling and influencing the proletariat from all directions and were corrupting certain of its sections. This circumstance led to the emergence from among the Soviet officials and functionaries both of bureaucrats alienated from the masses and of new bourgeois elements. Lenin also pointed out that although the high salaries paid to the bourgeois technical specialists staying on to work for the Soviet regime were necessary, they were having a corrupting influence on it.

Therefore, Lenin laid great stress on waging persistent struggles against the influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies, on arousing the broad masses to take part in government work, on ceaselessly exposing and purging bureaucrats and new bourgeois elements in the Soviet organs, and on creating conditions that would bar the existence and reproduction of the bourgeoisie. Lenin pointed out sharply that "without a systematic and determined struggle to improve the apparatus, we shall perish before the basis of socialism is created." [486]

At the same time, he laid great stress on adherence to the principle of the Paris Commune in wage policy, that is, all public servants were to be paid wages corresponding to those of the workers and only bourgeois specialists were to be paid high salaries. From the October Revolution to the period of Soviet economic rehabilitation, Lenin's directives were in the main observed; the leading personnel of the Party and government organizations and enterprises and Party members among the specialists received salaries roughly equivalent to the wages of workers.

At that time, the Communist Party and the government of the Soviet Union adopted a number of measures in the sphere of politics and ideology and in the system of distribution to prevent leading cadres in any department from abusing their powers or degenerating morally or politically.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union headed by Stalin adhered to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the road of socialism and waged a staunch struggle against the forces of capitalism. Stalin's struggles against the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and Bukharinites were in essence a reflection within the Party of the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and of the struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism. Victory in these struggles smashed the vain hopes of the bourgeoisie to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union.

[486] Lenin, "Plan of the Pamphlet 'On the Food Tax'", Collected Works, 4th Russian ed., Moscow, Vol. 32, p. 301.

It cannot be denied that before Stalin's death high salaries were already being paid to certain groups and that some cadres had already degenerated and become bourgeois elements. The Central Committee of the CPSU pointed out in its report to the 19th Party Congress in October 1952 that degeneration and corruption had appeared in certain Party organizations.

The leaders of these organizations had turned them into small communities composed entirely of their own people, "setting their group interests higher than the interests of the Party and the state". Some executives of industrial enterprises "forget that the enterprises entrusted to their charge are state enterprises, and try to turn them into their own private domain".

"Instead of safeguarding the common husbandry of the collective farms", some Party and Soviet functionaries and some cadres in agricultural departments "engage in filching collective-farm property". In the cultural, artistic and scientific fields too, works attacking and smearing the socialist system had appeared and a monopolistic "Arakcheyev regime" had emerged among the scientists.

Since Khrushchev usurped the leadership of the Soviet Party and state, there has been a fundamental change in the state of the class struggle in the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev has carried out a series of revisionist policies serving the interests of the bourgeoisie and rapidly swelling the forces of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

On the pretext of "combating the personality cult", Khrushchev has defamed the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system and thus in fact paved the way for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. In completely negating Stalin, he has in fact negated Marxism-Leninism which was upheld by Stalin and opened the floodgates for the revisionist deluge.

Khrushchev has substituted "material incentive" for the socialist principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work". He has widened, and not narrowed, the gap between the incomes of a small minority and those of the workers, peasants and ordinary intellectuals. He has supported the degenerates in leading positions, encouraging them to become even more unscrupulous in abusing their powers and to appropriate the fruits of labor of the Soviet people. Thus, he has accelerated the polarization of classes in Soviet society.

Khrushchev sabotages the socialist planned economy, applies the capitalist principle of profit, develops capitalist free competition and undermines socialist ownership by the whole people.

Khrushchev attacks the system of socialist agricultural planning, describing it as "bureaucratic" and "unnecessary". Eager to learn from the big proprietors of American farms, he is encouraging capitalist management, fostering a kulak economy and undermining the socialist collective economy.

Khrushchev is peddling bourgeois ideology, bourgeois liberty, equality, fraternity and humanity, inculcating bourgeois idealism and metaphysics and the reactionary ideas of bourgeois individualism, humanism and pacifism among the Soviet people, and debasing socialist morality.

The rotten bourgeois culture of the West is now fashionable in the Soviet Union, and socialist culture is ostracized and attacked.

Under the signboard of "peaceful coexistence", Khrushchev has been colluding with U.S. imperialism, wrecking the socialist camp and the international communist movement, opposing the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, practicing great-power chauvinism and national egoism and betraying proletarian internationalism. All this is being done for the protection of the vested interests of a handful of people, which he places above the fundamental interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the socialist camp and the whole world.

The line Khrushchev pursues is a revisionist line through and through. Guided by this line, not only have the old bourgeois elements run wild but new bourgeois elements have appeared in large numbers among the leading cadres of the Soviet Party and government, the chiefs of state enterprises and collective farms, and the higher intellectuals in the fields of culture, art, science and technology.

In the Soviet Union at present, not only have the new bourgeois elements increased in number as never before, but their social status has fundamentally changed. Before Khrushchev came to power, they did not occupy the ruling position in Soviet society. Their activities were restricted in many ways and they were subject to attack. But since Khrushchev took over, usurping the leadership of the Party and the state step by step, the new bourgeois elements have gradually risen to the ruling position in the Party and government and in the economic, cultural and other departments, and formed a privileged stratum in Soviet society.

This privileged stratum is the principal component of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union today and the main social basis of the revisionist Khrushchev clique. The revisionist Khrushchev clique are the political representatives of the Soviet bourgeoisie, and particularly of its privileged stratum.

The revisionist Khrushchev clique have carried out one purge after another and replaced one group of cadres after another throughout the country, from the central to the local bodies, from leading Party and government organizations to economic and cultural and educational departments, dismissing those they do not trust and placing their protégés in leading posts.

Take the Central Committee of the CPSU as an example. The statistics show that seventy per cent of the members of the Central Committee of the CPSU who were elected at its 19th Congress in 1952 were purged in the course of the 20th and 22nd Congresses held respectively in 1956 and 1961. And nearly fifty per cent of the members who were elected at the 20th Congress were purged at the time of the 22nd Congress.

Or take the local organizations. On the eve of the 22nd Congress, on the pretext of "renewing the cadres", the revisionist Khrushchev clique, according to incomplete statistics, removed from office forty-five per cent of the members of the Party Central Committees of the Union Republics and of the

Party Committees of the Territories and Regions, and forty per cent of the Municipal and District Party Committees. In 1963, on the pretext of dividing the Party into "industrial" and "agricultural" Party committees, they further replaced more than half the members of the Central Committees of the Union Republics and of the Regional Party Committees.

Through this series of changes the Soviet privileged stratum has gained control of the Party, the government and other important organizations.

The members of this privileged stratum have converted the function of serving the masses into the privilege of dominating them. They are abusing their powers over the means of production and of livelihood for the private benefit of their small clique.

The members of this privileged stratum appropriate the fruits of the Soviet people's labor and pocket incomes that are dozens or even a hundred times those of the average Soviet worker and peasant. They not only secure high incomes in the form of high salaries, high awards, high royalties and a great variety of personal subsidies, but also use their privileged position to appropriate public property by graft and bribery. Completely divorced from the working people of the Soviet Union, they live the parasitical and decadent life of the bourgeoisie.

The members of this privileged stratum have become utterly degenerate ideologically, have completely departed from the revolutionary traditions of the Bolshevik Party and discarded the lofty ideals of the Soviet working class. They are opposed to Marxism-Leninism and socialism. They betray the revolution and forbid others to make revolution. Their sole concern is to consolidate their economic position and political rule. All their activities revolve around the private interests of their own privileged stratum.

People have seen how in Yugoslavia, although the Tito clique still displays the banner of "socialism", a bureaucratic bourgeoisie opposed to the Yugoslav people has gradually come into being since the Tito clique took the road of revisionism, transforming the Yugoslav state from a dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bureaucrat bourgeoisie and its socialist public economy into state capitalism. Now people see the Khrushchev clique taking the road already travelled by the Tito clique. Khrushchev looks to Belgrade as his Mecca, saying again and again that he will learn from the Tito clique's experience and declaring that he and the Tito clique "belong to one and the same idea and are guided by the same theory". This is not at all surprising.

[N. S. Khrushchev, Interview with Foreign Correspondents at Brioni in Yugoslavia, Aug. 28, 1963.]

As a result of Khrushchev's revisionism, the first socialist country in the world built by the great Soviet people with their blood and sweat is now facing an unprecedented danger of capitalist restoration.

The Khrushchev clique is spreading the tale that "there are no longer antagonistic classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union" in order to cover up the facts about their own ruthless class struggle against the Soviet people.

The Soviet privileged stratum represented by the revisionist Khrushchev clique constitutes only a few per cent of the Soviet population. Among the Soviet cadres its numbers are also small. It stands diametrically opposed to the Soviet people, who constitute more than 90 per cent of the total population, and to the great majority of the Soviet cadres and Communists. The contradiction between the Soviet people and this privileged stratum is now the principal contradiction inside the Soviet Union, and it is an irreconcilable and antagonistic class contradiction.

The glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was built by Lenin, and the great Soviet people displayed epoch-making revolutionary initiative in the October Socialist Revolution, they showed their heroism and stamina in defeating the White Guards and the armed intervention by more than a dozen imperialist countries, they scored unprecedently brilliant achievements in the struggle for industrialization and agricultural collectivization, and they won a tremendous victory in the Patriotic War against the German fascists and saved all mankind. Even under the rule of the Khrushchev clique, the mass of the members of the CPSU and the Soviet people are carrying on the glorious revolutionary traditions nurtured by Lenin and Stalin, and they still uphold socialism and aspire to communism.

The broad masses of the Soviet workers, collective farmers and intellectuals are seething with discontent against the oppression and exploitation practiced by the privileged stratum. They have come to see ever more clearly the revisionist features of the Khrushchev clique which is betraying socialism and restoring capitalism.

Among the ranks of the Soviet cadres, there are many who still persist in the revolutionary stand of the proletariat, adhere to the road of socialism and firmly oppose Khrushchev's revisionism. The broad masses of the Soviet people, of Communists and cadres are using various means to resist and oppose the revisionist line of the Khrushchev clique, so that the revisionist Khrushchev clique cannot so easily bring about the restoration of capitalism. The great Soviet people are fighting to defend the glorious traditions of the Great October Revolution, to preserve the great gains of socialism and to smash the plot for the restoration of capitalism.

Refutation of the So-called State of the Whole People

At the 22nd Congress of the CPSU Khrushchev openly raised the banner of opposition to the dictatorship of the proletariat, announcing the replacement of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the "state of the whole people". It is written in the Programme of the CPSU that the dictatorship of the proletariat "has ceased to be indispensable in the U.S.S.R." and that "the state, which arose as a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, has, in the new, contemporary stage, become a state of the entire people".

Anyone with a little knowledge of Marxism-Leninism knows that the concept of the state is a class concept. Lenin pointed out that "the distinguishing feature of the state is the existence of a separate class of people in whose hands **power** is concentrated". [487]

The state is a weapon of class struggle, a machine by means of which one class represses another. Every state is the dictatorship of a definite class. So long as the state exists, it cannot possibly stand above class or belong to the whole people.

The proletariat and its political party have never concealed their views; they say explicitly that the very aim of the proletarian socialist revolution is to overthrow bourgeois rule and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. After the victory of the socialist revolution, the proletariat and its party must strive unremittingly to fulfil the historical tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat and eliminate classes and class differences, so that the state will wither away. It is only the bourgeoisie and its parties which in their attempt to hoodwink the masses try by every means to cover up the class nature of state power and describe the state machinery under their control as being "of the whole people" and "above class".

The fact that Khrushchev has announced the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and advanced the thesis of the "state of the whole people" demonstrates that he has replaced the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state by bourgeois falsehoods.

When Marxist-Leninists criticized their fallacies, the revisionist Khrushchev clique hastily defended themselves and tried hard to invent a so-called theoretical basis for the "state of the whole people". They now assert that the historical period of the dictatorship of the proletariat mentioned by Marx and Lenin refers only to the transition from capitalism to the first stage of communism and not to its higher stage. They further assert that "the dictatorship of the proletariat will cease to be necessary before the state withers away" and that after the end of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there is yet another stage, the "state of the whole people". [488]

These are out-and-out sophistries.

In his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Marx advanced the well-known axiom that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the state of the period of transition from capitalism to communism. Lenin gave a clear explanation of this Marxist axiom. He said:

In his *Critique of the Gotha Programme* Marx wrote: "Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but **the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat**." Up to now this axiom has never been disputed by Socialists, and yet it implies the

[487] Lenin, "The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book", Collected Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1960, Vol. 1, p. 419.
[488] Pravda editorial board's article, "Programme for the Building of Communism", Aug. 18, 1961.

recognition of the existence of the **state** right up to the time when victorious socialism has grown into complete communism.

Lenin further said:

> "The essence of Marx's teaching on the state has been mastered only by those who understand that the dictatorship of a **single** class is necessary not only for the **proletariat** which has overthrown the bourgeoisie, but also for the entire **historical period** which separates capitalism from "classless society", from Communism." [489]

It is perfectly clear that according to Marx and Lenin, the historical period throughout which the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat exists, is not merely the period of transition to the first stage of communism, as alleged by the revisionist Khrushchev clique, but the entire period of transition from capitalism to "complete communism", to the time when all class differences will have been eliminated and "classless society" realized, that is to say, to the higher stage of communism.

It is equally clear that the state in the transition period referred to by Marx and Lenin is the dictatorship of the proletariat and nothing else. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the form of the state in the entire period of transition from capitalism to the higher stage of communism, and also the last form of the state in human history. The withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat will mean the withering away of the state. Lenin said:

Marx deduced from the whole history of Socialism and of the political struggle that the state was bound to disappear, and that the transitional form of its disappearance (the transition from state to nonstate) would be the "proletariat organized as the ruling class". [490]

Historically the dictatorship of the proletariat may take different forms from one country to another and from one period to another, but in essence it will remain the same. Lenin said:

> "The transition from capitalism to Communism certainly cannot but yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: **the dictatorship of the proletariat**." [491]

It can thus be seen that it is absolutely not the view of Marx and Lenin but an invention of the revisionist Khrushchev that the end of the dictatorship of the proletariat will precede the withering away of the state and will be followed by yet another stage, "the state of the whole people".

In arguing for their anti-Marxist-Leninist views, the revisionist Khrushchev clique has taken great pains to find a sentence from Marx and distorting it by quoting it out of context. They have arbitrarily described the future **nature of the state** (**Staatswesen** in German) of communist society

---

[489] Lenin, "The State and Revolution", Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2, Part 1, p. 234.
[490] *Ibid*., pp. 256-57.
[491] *Ibid*, p. 234.

referred to by Marx in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme* as the 'state of communist society', which is no longer a dictatorship of the proletariat". [492]

They gleefully announced that the Chinese would not dare to quote this from Marx. Apparently, the revisionist Khrushchev clique think this is very helpful to them.

As it happens Lenin seems to have foreseen that revisionists would make use of this phrase to distort Marxism. In his *Marxism on the State*, Lenin gave an excellent explanation of it. He said, "...the dictatorship of the proletariat is a 'political transition period'.... But Marx goes on to speak of 'the future **nature of the state** (**gosudarstvennost** in Russian, **Staatswesen** in German) of communist society'!! Thus, there will be a state even in '**communist** society'!! Is there not a contradiction in this?" Lenin answered, "No." He then tabulated the three stages in the process of development from the bourgeois state to the withering away of the state:

The first stage – in bourgeois society, the state is needed by the bourgeoisie – the bourgeois state.

The second stage – in the period of transition from capitalism to communism, the state is needed by the proletariat – the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The third stage – in communist society, the state is not necessary, it withers away.

He concluded: "Complete consistency and clarity!!"

In Lenin's tabulation, only the bourgeois state, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the withering away of the state are to be found. By precisely this tabulation Lenin made it clear that when communism is reached the state withers away and becomes non-existent.

Ironically enough, the revisionist Khrushchev clique also quoted this very passage from Lenin's *Marxism on the State* in the course of defending their error. And then they proceeded to make the following idiotic statement:

> "In our country the first two periods referred to by Lenin in the opinion quoted already belong to history. In the Soviet Union a state of the whole people **– a communist state system**, the state of the **first phase of communism**, has arisen and is developing." [493]

If the first two periods referred to by Lenin have already become a thing of the past in the Soviet Union, the state should be withering away, and where could a "state of the whole people" come from? If the state is not yet withering away, then it ought to be the dictatorship of the proletariat and under absolutely no circumstances a "state of the whole people".

---

[492] M. A. Suslov, Report at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU, February 1964 (New Times, English ed., No. 15, 1964, p. 62.

[493] "From the Party of the Working Class to the Party of the Whole Soviet People", editorial board's article of Partyinaya Zhizn, Moscow, No. 8, 1964.

In arguing for their "state of the whole people", the revisionist Khrushchev clique exert themselves to vilify the dictatorship of the proletariat as undemocratic. They assert that only by replacing the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the "state of the whole people" can democracy be further developed and turned into "genuine democracy for the whole people". Khrushchev has pretentiously said that the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat exemplifies "a line of energetically developing democracy" and that "proletarian democracy is becoming socialist democracy of the whole people". [494]

These utterances can only show that their authors either are completely ignorant of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state or are maliciously distorting them.

Anyone with a little knowledge of Marxism-Leninism knows that the concept of democracy as a form of the state, like that of dictatorship, is a class one. There can only be class democracy, there cannot be "democracy for the whole people".

Lenin said:

> "Democracy for the vast majority of the people, and suppression by force, i.e. exclusion from democracy, of the exploiters and oppressors of the people – this is the change democracy undergoes during the **transition** from capitalism to Communism." [495]

Dictatorship over the exploiting classes and democracy among the working people – these are the two aspects of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is only under the dictatorship of the proletariat that democracy for the masses of the working people can be developed and expanded to an unprecedented extent. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat there can be no genuine democracy for the working people.

Where there is bourgeois democracy there is no proletarian democracy, and where there is proletarian democracy there is no bourgeois democracy. The one excludes the other. This is inevitable and admits of no compromise. The more thoroughly bourgeois democracy is eliminated, the more will proletarian democracy flourish. In the eyes of the bourgeoisie, any country where this occurs is lacking in democracy. But actually, this is the promotion of proletarian democracy and the elimination of bourgeois democracy. As proletarian democracy develops, bourgeois democracy is eliminated.

This fundamental Marxist-Leninist thesis is opposed by the revisionist Khrushchev clique. In fact, they hold that so long as enemies are subjected to dictatorship there is no democracy and that the only way to develop democracy is to abolish the dictatorship over enemies, stop suppressing them and institute "democracy for the whole people".

---

[494] N. S. Khrushchev, "Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU", and "On the Programme of the CPSU", delivered at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, October 1961.

[495] Lenin, "The State and Revolution", Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2, Part 1, p. 291.

Their view is cast from the same mold as the renegade Kautsky's concept of "pure democracy".

In criticizing Kautsky Lenin said:

"...'pure democracy' is not only an **ignorant** phrase, revealing a lack of understanding both of the class struggle and of the nature of the state, but also a thrice-empty phrase, since in communist society democracy will **wither away** in the process of changing and becoming a habit, but will never be "pure" democracy." [496]

He also pointed out:

"The dialectics (course) of the development is as follows: from absolutism to bourgeois democracy; from bourgeois to proletarian democracy; from proletarian democracy to none." [497]

That is to stay, in the higher stage of communism proletarian democracy will wither away along with the elimination of classes and the withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

To speak plainly, as with the "state of the whole people", the "democracy for the whole people" proclaimed by Khrushchev is a hoax. In thus retrieving the tattered garments of the bourgeoisie and the old-line revisionists, patching them up and adding a label of his own, Khrushchev's sole purpose is to deceive the Soviet people and the revolutionary people of the world and cover up his betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat and his opposition to socialism.

What is the essence of Khrushchev's "state of the whole people"?

Khrushchev has abolished the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and established a dictatorship of the revisionist clique headed by himself, that is, a dictatorship of the privileged stratum of the Soviet bourgeoisie. Actually his "state of the whole people" is not a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat but a state in which his small revisionist clique wield their dictatorship over the masses of the workers, the peasants and the revolutionary intellectuals.

Under the rule of the Khrushchev clique, there is no democracy for the Soviet working people, there is democracy only for the handful of people belonging to the revisionist Khrushchev clique, for the privileged stratum and for the bourgeois elements, old and new. Khrushchev's "democracy for the whole people" is nothing but out-and-out bourgeois democracy, i.e., a despotic dictatorship of the Khrushchev clique over the Soviet people.

In the Soviet Union today, anyone who persists in the proletarian stand, upholds Marxism-Leninism and has the courage to speak out, to resist or to fight is watched, followed, summoned, and even arrested, imprisoned or diagnosed as "mentally ill" and sent to "mental hospitals".

[496] Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", Selected Works, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2, Part 2, p. 48.
[497] Lenin, Marxism on the State, Russian ed., Moscow, 1958, p. 42.

Recently the Soviet press has declared that it is necessary to "fight" against those who show even the slightest dissatisfaction, and called for "relentless battle" against the "rotten jokers" who are so bold as to make sarcastic remarks about Khrushchev's agricultural policy. [498]

It is not particularly astonishing that the revisionist Khrushchev clique should have on more than one occasion bloodily suppressed striking workers and the masses who put up resistance.

The formula of abolishing the dictatorship of the proletariat while keeping a state of the whole people reveals the secret of the revisionist Khrushchev clique; that is, they are firmly opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat but will not give up state power till their doom.

The revisionist Khrushchev clique knows the paramount importance of controlling state power. They need it for clearing the way for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. These are Khrushchev's real aims in raising the banners of the "state of the whole people" and "democracy for the whole people".

Peking Review: No.1 of 1970

[see supplementary PDFs]

Peking Review: No. 21 of 1971

[see supplementary PDFs]

Peking Review: No. 22 of 1971

[see supplementary PDFs]

Peking Review: No. 23 of 1971

[see supplementary PDFs]

Peking Review: No. 26 of 1971

[see supplementary PDFs]

Võ Nguyên Giáp: The South Vietnamese People Will Win[499]

Ten years ago, on July 20, 1954, following the great victory of our army and people on the Dien Bien Phu battlefield, the Geneva agreements were signed, restoring peace in Indochina, on the basis of respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity, and territorial integrity of our country, Vietnam, and of two friendly countries, Cambodia and Laos.

[498] Izvestia, Mar. 10, 1964.

[499] This is an edited condensation of General Giap's article entitled "The Liberation War of the South Vietnam People Against the US. Imperialists and Their Henchmen Will Certainly Win," published originally in Nhan Dan on July 19, 1964 (the tenth anniversary of the signing of the Geneva accords). It was published as a pamphlet by the Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, in 1965.

As laid down in the agreements, free general elections would be held throughout Vietnam two years after the armistice for the peaceful reunification of our country. To create every favorable condition for this work, the belligerent armies were provisionally regrouped respectively north and south of the seventeenth parallel, and the administration of each zone undertook to ensure all democratic liberties for the people, and at the same time determined not to accept weapons and military personnel from any country nor to join any military alliance.

Ten years have elapsed since the Geneva agreements were signed. During these ten years our people have successfully carried out socialist revolution and construction in the completely liberated North. However, throughout these ten years, the United States imperialists and their henchmen have done their utmost to sabotage the Geneva agreements and have unleashed a war to invade and sell out the South of our country. Thus, after fighting valiantly for ten years, making a great contribution to the victory of the first sacred resistance, our fourteen million southern compatriots had again to rise up and wage a second sacred resistance against the United States imperialists and their stooges, for independence, democracy, peace, neutrality, for the implementation of the Geneva agreements, and then for the reunification of the fatherland.

I

The Geneva agreements. a great victory for our people, the fruit of ten years of long and hard resistance, of nearly one hundred years of national liberation struggle. This victory has safeguarded the gains of the August revolution in the North of our country. It has helped the Vietnamese revolution in the North to attain the socialist stage and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to become the first socialist country in Southeast Asia.

For French and American imperialism, the Geneva agreements. were a most pitiful setback. They have put an end to the domination of the French colonialists in Indochina. They have foiled the scheme of the United States imperialists to prolong and extend the war and turn the Indochinese countries into new United States colonies and military bases. They were the bitterest defeat of the United States imperialists in Southeast Asia after their disaster in the Chinese mainland and in Korea.

While the Indochinese countries scored a great victory in their valiant and hard resistance and the French Expeditionary Corps faced grave danger, United States imperialism made strenuous efforts to salvage the situation, but in the end it, together with its defeated ally, was forced to sit for negotiation to end the war. This no surprise to us, and historical facts have given added proof that even when negotiating to reach an agreement, United States imperialism already schemed to sabotage it with a view to impairing the victories of the Indochinese peoples and restricting its defeats to the utmost.

No sooner had the ink of the signatures on the Geneva agreements dried than the United States imperialists set up the aggressive South-Asia military bloc and brazenly put South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos under its protection. They schemed to consolidate further their strategic position in Southeast Asia while using this new aggressive bloc as a tool to carry on their war policy and curb the development of the national liberation movement. At utter variance with the provisions

of the Geneva agreements, they plotted to continue their aggressive policy under the form of neo-colonialism with view to turning South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos into their new-type colonies and military bases. This dark and perfidious. scheme came out clearly in the statements of the United States government that the security of the United States was decided along the seventeenth parallel and the Vietnam-Laos border.

In the new strategic plan of the United States imperialists, South Vietnam holds a position of utmost importance. This is precisely why soon after the armistice the United States stopped all military aid to the French in Indochina, ousted the latter from the South, and rigged up the Ngo Dinh Diem administration so that it would be entirely at its beck and call, hoping to use this subservient clique *to suppress our compatriots patriotic struggle in the South, rapidly turn the South into a new-type United States colony and military base, and permanently partition our country.*

The United States imperialists have trampled upon all the provisions of the Geneva agreements, overtly introduced weapons, munitions, and war matériel into the South at an accelerated tempo, and increased their military personnel from two hundred at the end of the war to thirty-five hundred in 1961. They have frenziedly stepped up their intervention in every field, feverishly built up a regular and modern army for the puppet administration, and strengthened such other antirevolutionary armed forces as the civil guard, People's Militia, police, and public security. They have frantically built up and Giap refers to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), established in the autumn of 1954. extended military bases in the South and have constructed a complete system of strategic roads so big and perfect that they can be used not only to carry out the aggressive war in South Vietnam but also to meet the greater requirements of the U.S. Army in Southeast Asia.

With the help of the United States imperialists and in furtherance of their neo-colonialist policy, the supporters of Ngo Dinh Diem dethroned Bao Dai, a puppet of the French colonialists, illegally founded in the South the so-called Republic of Vietnam, and resorted to oppression and flattery to carry out separatist general elections. Meanwhile, they sealed off the provisional military demarcation line and turned down every proposal to re-establish normal relations and convene a consultative conference with the North.

Despite its signboard of "independence" and "democracy" and its other deceptive policies such as "land reform" and "rehabilitation of the national economy," since its very inception the Ngo Dinh Diem administration revealed itself as a traitorous clique and came up against powerful opposition from all our compatriots in the South. It carried out a fascist dictatorial policy of utmost barbarity, launched hundreds of mopping-up campaigns with its regular army, perpetrated countless crimes, and set up prisons everywhere to jail and torture patriots. It implemented a state policy of "indictment of communists" and "extermination of communists" to repress the former resistance members, the parents of those regrouped in the North, those who stood for independence, freedom, peaceful national reunification, and the implementation of the Geneva agreements. It exterminated

Buddhist, Cao Dai, and Hoa Hao believers, [500] and even terrorized those who had closely cooperated with it once they did not submit unconditionally.

This unilateral war started in 1954 and became most atrocious in 1957-1959 after the United States-Diem clique had provisionally consolidated their administrative and military machine. The Phu Loi massacre [501] and the law 10/1959 [502] were typical of this most savage policy of terror. With their special military courts, prisons, guillotines, and wartime repressive measures, they hoped to drown in blood the patriotic movement of our southern compatriots in a short period, consolidate their selfish privileges and interests, and realize their dream of "pacifying the South, filling up the Ben Hai River and marching to the North."

However, far from yielding the expected results, the United States-Diem policy of war and terrorism roused high indignation among all strata of our compatriots in the South. *Our fellow countrymen held aloft the banner of peace, independence, reunification, democracy, and waged a persistent and valiant political struggle against the enemy, relying on the just cause and legality of the Geneva agreements.*

When the United States-Diem clique treacherously sabotaged the Geneva agreements, everywhere meetings and demonstrations broke out, slogans appeared demanding an end to terror and reprisals, the reestablishment of North-South relations, a consultative conference for general elections, and the peaceful reunification of the country. The political struggle grew all the more powerful when the United States-Diem clique resorted to such machinations to sabotage further independence and national reunification as referendum and separatist general elections. It became fierce and bloody in the waves of struggle against the policy of "indictment of communists," the mopping-up operations, and the massacres of the population. This unyielding political struggle, often waged in front of the muzzles of enemy guns, succeeded in checking and foiling part of their Machiavellian schemes; it highlighted our compatriots' indomitable spirit, and frustrated the enemy's policy of "indictment and extermination of communists" which it has raised to the level of "state policy" in order to divide the southern people, liquidate patriots, and quench the revolutionary movement. With various forms of struggle, relying on arguments, the legality of the Geneva agreements, and the pressure of the masses, our compatriots showed their patriotism and solidarity in struggle, exposed the dictatorial and traitorous Ngo Dinh Diem administration, drove it into ever growing isolation, and pilloried it.

[500] The Cao Dai religion is a synthesis of many faiths, both traditional and modern, while the Hoa Hao is a reformed Buddhist sect. Each has had as many million adherents in South Vietnam. For decades they have had their own military forces and strong political hold over large regions. Diem's attack on the sects in the early years of his rule touched off the first armed resistance to his regime.

[501] In his letter of January 26, 1961, to H. E. Ambassador M. Gopala Menon, Chairman of the International Control Commission set up at Geneva, Giap reported the food poisoning of over six thousand detainees in the Phu Loi camp in early 1999. Philippe Devillers (in Honey, ed., North Vietnam Today, p. 37) records the death of some twenty detainees there in December 1959.

[502] Promulgated on May 6, 1959, this statute reshaped the entire judiciary system of South Vietnam, establishing special military courts under the direct authority of the Defense Ministry throughout the country. Rights of defense counsel and appeal were removed. The tribunals could only pass sentences of death (carried out on the spot) or hard labor for life

Throughout five years of arduous and fierce political struggle with their bare hands against the violence of the enemy, our southern compatriots experienced countless sufferings and losses, but they carried the day.

Thousands of villages were burned by the enemy, and hundreds of thousands of people were jailed, tortured, and killed in prisons. and concentration camps. But sufferings and losses could not dampen our people's combativeness and patriotism. On the contrary, through their fierce political struggle, our compatriots were tempered and became aware of the ferocity of the United States-Diem clique—and of its irremediable fundamental weakness—for it is the enemy of the people and of the fatherland, for it represents violence and injustice.

Through their fierce political struggle, our compatriots clearly realized that *to overthrow the enemy, attain the fundamental aspirations of the broad masses of the people, there was no other way than to wage a revolutionary struggle.* Far from quenching our compatriots' revolutionary spirit, United States-Diem guns, bullets, prisons, reeducation centers, and fascist laws exacerbated it all the more. For five years on end, the United States-Diem clique waged a real war against the people, but the latter's revolutionary spirit held out and in many vast areas the revolutionary forces were still kept intact.

The end of 1959 and beginning of 1960 marked a new development in the southern revolutionary movement. *The persistent political struggle in the past years now bolstered by an armed struggle for self-defense, grew all the more powerful and sweeping.* The revolutionary mettle of the masses in the Mekong Delta as well as in the immense Western Highlands, rose an overflowing tide. The enemy's grip was broken over vast areas. In some places the enemy grass-roots administration was broken up and the cruel devils isolated or punished; in some, the prosperity zones were destroyed and nearly 80 percent of their inhabitants were liberated. The political situation of the United States-Diem administration underwent a serious and endless crisis. In face of the people's new revolutionary high tide, they realized that their scheme to "pacify" the South rapidly and use it as a base to attack the North was obviously a fiasco; they had to devote all their efforts to deal with the new developments of the movement.

The United States imperialists openly stepped up their armed intervention in the South of our country. In May 1961 the bilateral military agreement between United States Vice President Johnson and Ngo Dinh Diem was signed; then came into being the Staley-Taylor plan [503] and the setting-up of the U.S. Military Command in Saigon under Gen. Paul Harkins. [504] *The United States imperialists and their henchmen decided to launch an "undeclared war" in the South, to use this area a testing ground for their so-called "special war" aimed at repressing the national liberation movement.*

In brief, the plan of this "special war," the Staley-Taylor plan, envisaged three stages: first to "pacify" the South and establish a network of spy—commando centers in the North; then to

[503] Economist Eugene Staley and General Maxwell Taylor were influential in establishing the broad contours of policy in the beginning of the Kennedy. administration. Strategy then called for regroupement of the population into "strategic hamlets," pacification, and economic development.

[504] Head of the U.S. Military Mission to South Vietnam during the Kennedy administration.

rehabilitate the economy and increase the puppet military forces in the South while stepping up sabotage work in the North; lastly to develop the southern economy and to attack the North.

To carry out the first stage (regarded as most important), they worked out a series of new measures, including the increase of the army's effectiveness, the improvement of equipment, and the raising of the fighting capacities of the puppet armed forces as well as the enforcement of the "state policy" of "strategic hamlets" aimed at gradually concentrating and controlling the bulk of the population. The United States imperialists stepped up their multiform aid to the Ngo Dinh Diem administration; first of all, the military aid. They reckoned that within eighteen months, namely, by the end of 1962, the super increased reactionary military forces would certainly smash the per people's political and military revolutionary forces: meanwhile, most of the fourteen millions of our compatriots in the South would be herded into "strategic hamlets," kept under close watch, and severed from all connections with the guerrilla groups; the whole of South Vietnam would then be "pacified"; their first stage would be brought to completion.

At the outset, the enemy's perfidious scheme did cause new difficulties for our compatriots in the South. However, inspired with an unshakable determination to struggle and with a dogged will to overthrow the enemy of the nation, our compatriots have carried on their valiant struggle in order to frustrate the United States imperialists' new plan of armed intervention. *To oppose the United States-Diem "special war" the southern people have launched a sweeping and powerful guerrilla war, an all-out and protracted people's resistance.* At the beginning, our compatriots in the South had only their bare hands, while the enemy had a marked superiority in material forces. Our people in the South had to put up an extremely hard and fierce struggle, opposing justice to aggression, weakness to strength, heroism to modern weapons. Capturing enemy weapons to equip themselves, our army and people in the South have overcome all difficulties and trials, developed their forces rap-idly, scored success after success, and will win ever greater victories.

The United States-Diem clique regarded military measures as most efficient to crush our armed forces and political bases. Through-out 1962 and 1963 our army and people inflicted upon them many military setbacks. Unable to bring out the expected results, the "helicopter tactics," modern weapons, chemical poisons, and the like, could not even save their initiators from bitter failures. Most of the raids upon the villages, big and small, were repelled or smashed. The southern army and people annihilated many enemy posts, stormed many enemy garrisons, and attacked reinforcements or convoys on road and on water. Early in 1963 the resounding Ap Bac victory of the Liberation Army and My Tho guerrillas highlighted our fighters' boundless heroism and inspired the patriotic armed forces in the South to win battles and destroy the enemy. According to the figures released by the Liberation News Agency, in three years of guerrilla warfare (1961-1963) our southern army and people destroyed and put out of action more than 250,000 enemy troops, among them nearly 1,500 Americans, shot down and damaged hundreds of enemy planes, captured over 30,000 weapons of all kinds.

The stated policy of strategic hamlets is the backbone of the "special war"; the United States-Diem clique pinned all their hopes on this policy and mustered manpower and wealth to enforce it at any cost. They reckoned that in short time they could build seventeen thousand "strategic hamlets," turning the South into a huge system of prisons. However, at the very start, their plan met

with our compatriots' fierce opposition. The herding of people was not as easy as they expected; the tempo of building "strategic ham-lets" was slowed down as time passed. A number of "strategic ham-lets" were destroyed either immediately after their establishment or so many times that the enemy could not consolidate them. Others, once destroyed, were turned into fighting villages, solid strongholds for guerrilla warfare. No more than six or seven thousand hamlets were set up, according to the statistics of the Ngo Dinh Diem administration.

Together and in coordination with the military struggle and destruction of "strategic hamlets," there developed a sweeping and powerful political struggle involving all strata of the people. Many a time the political force of the masses crushed enemy mopping-up operations and successfully protected our compatriots' lives and property. It is this same force that destroyed the rural administration block by block, liberated many vast areas in the countryside, and called upon tens of thousands of enemy troops and officials to cross over to the people's side. In 1962-1963 alone, more than fifty million. individual participations in political struggles under various forms and sizes were recorded. The seething struggle during the second half of 1963 put up by Buddhist believers, youths, students, intellectuals, and laboring people in the towns, big and small, especially in Hue and Saigon-Cholon, plunged the United States-Diem clique into an ever-deepening crisis.

After two years of large-scale "special war," the United States imperialists and their henchmen faced many difficulties and setbacks. both in the military and political fields. The time limit of eighteen months having elapsed, *their strategy of rapid "pacification" of the South once again floundered. The Staley-Taylor plan turned out to be a fiasco* in the face of the boundless heroism of our army and people in the South.

Owing to the repeated defeats of the "special war," the internal contradictions between the United States imperialists and their henchmen grew so sharp that late in 1963 and early in 1964, the United States imperialists had to stage two coups d'état aimed at swapping horses midstream and salvaging the situation. Ngo Dinh Diem and Ngo Dinh Nhu were overthrown and assassinated; soon after that, the Duong Van Minh clique was also replaced by new henchmen.

Throughout nine years, the Diem-Nhu brothers efficiently served the United States imperialists, sold out their country and their com patriots, and were praised by the Americans as the "number one anti-communist fighters" in Southeast Asia and as "great men" of the "free world." Now, forced to overthrow Diem-Nhu and ready to kill their faithful servants, the United States imperialists admitted the shameful failure of their new-type colony, the fiasco of their so-called "special war." The pitiful collapse of Diem-Nhu led to consternation in the ranks of the puppet administration and army, rousing be wilderment and weariness among them. It could not solve the ever-sharper contradictions between the United States imperialists and their henchmen and instead rendered them more acute and com plicated. It could not bolster the sagging morale of the puppet troops and officials, shattering it instead.

Late in 1963 and particularly early in 1964, our people in the South made the best use of the enemy's weak points and difficulties, stepped up their activities in every field, and scored great victories. According to the preliminary statistics of the Liberation News Agency, in the first six months of this year the southern army and people fought nearly 14,000 battles; razed to the ground

400 enemy posts; smashed and forced the enemy to withdraw from over 550 other posts; annihilated and captured 42,000 enemy troops, among them more than 500 Americans; put out of action nearly 30,000 of them; seized 5,000 weapons of all kinds, as well as millions of bullets and hand grenades; and shot down 170 planes of various types, damaging over Highlands to the Fifth Zone coastal areas rose up an and demolished nearly 2,000 "strategic hamlets," extending the liberated zone in many regions. The above figures *prove the southern resistance is entering a new stage, and the balance of forces is continuously tipping in our favor.*

Of course, in face of this situation, with their extremely reactionary and cruel nature, the United States imperialists did not admit them-selves beaten but frenziedly stepped up their aggressive war. Now they have to envisage a protracted war in the South. They have worked out a new strategic plan, the Johnson-McNamara plan, aimed at "pacifying" the South during 1964-1965. This new plan does not basically differ from the bankrupt Staley-Taylor plan. What is new is that the United States imperialists make greater efforts to increase their war means in the hope of securing better results for their special war. The puppet armed forces are increased to 350,000 regular troops, apart from 200,000 civil guards and reactionary fighting youths; the number of United States advisers and servicemen now reaches 25,000; aircraft of all types amounts to over 700; all other weapons are also increased. The military aid for 1964 goes up from $500 to $625 million. This is a fairly great war effort by the United States imperialists aimed at salvaging the desperate situation of the puppet army, mustering forces to "pacify" the areas controlled by the guerrillas according to plan, first of all again to tighten their grip on the eight provinces in the Mekong Delta and a number of regions in south Central Vietnam.

To carry out this plan, the United States imperialists sent. General Taylor, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, as ambassador to the South. This appointment of Taylor shows that the United States imperialists are most obdurate and cling to their "big-stick foreign policy" which has met with failure these past ten years in the South. Taylor is the very man who advocated the theory of "special war" which has been tested for the first time in the South and which has obviously gone bankrupt. Taylor is also the exponent of the theory of pacification of the South within eighteen months; however, twice eighteen months have elapsed, and this plan has not yet been initially carried out and has been replaced by a new one. The appointment of Taylor to South Vietnam reminds us of that of such top French generals as De Tassigny and Navarre to Indochina every time the French Expeditionary Corps was in serious difficulty. Our compatriots in the South and the heroic southern liberation troops, though having to fight a protracted and hard war, will certainly reserve for Taylor or any United States aggressive general the fate our people reserved for the former defeated French generals.

II

Throughout the French rule, South Vietnamese society, like the rest of our country, was a colonial and semifeudal one. After the successful August revolution, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, made its appearance. With the reconquest by the French colonialists' troops, part of our country *bore the character of a people's democracy while part of it remained a colonial and semifeudal country.* Our entire people's great resistance war ended with the historic Dien Bien Phu victory. On the basis of the Geneva agreements, and owing to the United States imperialists' intervention in

South Vietnam, our country has been temporarily divided into two zones with differing politico-social systems. The North, completely liberated, has been successfully building socialism; the South, becoming a new-type United States colony, has borne the character of a colonial and semi-feudal society. After ten years of revolutionary struggle, new changes. in line with the upward trend of history have taken place. Today, part of South Vietnam remains colonial and semifeudal, while part of it, namely, the ever-enlarged free zone, bears a new character: there, our compatriots enjoy independence, democracy, and freedom.

The very nature of such a society has shown that at present in South Vietnam there exist two fundamental contradictions: one between our southern people and the aggressive imperialists, first of all the United States imperialists and their henchmen; the other is the contradiction between the southern people, first of all the peasants, and feudal landlordism. These contradictions have defined: (1) the character of the revolution in the South which is a *national democratic revolution;* (2) its strategic task which is the overthrow of imperialism, the completion of national independence in combination with the overthrow of feudal landlordism, and the completion of people's democracy.

Owing to the collusion between United States imperialism and the local reactionary forces, South Vietnamese society contains a basic contradiction, between our southern people on the one hand and aggressive imperialism and its lackeys representative of the most reactionary pro-American feudal landlords and comprador bourgeois on the other. This main contradiction defines the *concrete object and immediate task of the revolution* in South Vietnam, as well as the organization of forces for the completion of this revolutionary task.

Soon after the restoration of peace in Indochina, the object of the revolution in South Vietnam began to change. American imperialism had kicked out defeated French colonialism, seized South Vietnam, and established the pro-American Ngo Dinh Diem administration. United States imperialism has neither established a ruling machinery nor utilized occupation troops in the South as French old colonialism did; but through interventionist policies and military and economic aid, it has controlled the South in all fields. Neo-colonialism, which is being practiced by American imperial-ism in South Vietnam, is a product of imperialism in modern times. Owing to the growing influence of the world socialist system and to the national liberation movement which is storming in many countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the imperialists can no longer rule over their colonies with old methods; the native reactionary forces also are frightened and anxious for their privileges. *Neo-colonialism is precisely the collusion and compromise between foreign imperialists and a section of native comprador bourgeois and reactionary feudal landlords to maintain the colonial rule under new forms and methods, while checking and opposing the movement of the broad masses.*

Neo-colonialism is by nature a concentrated expression of the basic tendency of capitalism: the enslavement of weak and small nations, the search for and struggle over markets and raw materials, and the utter oppression and exploitation of the people of these nations. Its main practice is reliance on violence. It differs from old colonialism in the fact that it carries out its policy of enslavement and uses violence not directly, but indirectly through the medium of a puppet administration and an army vested with sham independence and democracy, and in the form of "aid" or "alliance" in all respects. Neo-colonialism masks its aggressive and exploiting nature in many cloaks; therefore, it is all the more cunning and wicked and easily induces the people to relax their vigilance. In the South,

after the defeat of French imperialism, old colonialism was completely doomed and was buried together with the images of its cruel or crafty governors general and high commissioners and its ruthless expeditionary corps against the will of United States imperialism which, unable to revive that decaying corpse, is compelled to act under the cloak of neo-colonialism.

Neo-colonialism relies on its quislings as a tool to carry out its policy. Its strength is drawn partly from the vast economic and military possibilities-which are many of the metropolis, but which, on the other hand, are directly determined by whether or not the native reactionary forces are strong economically and politically. In South Vietnam, the United States-sponsored puppet administration was set up at a time when our people were gaining successes and imperialism meeting with failure. Therefore, right from its inception, it lacked vitality and was fraught with the inherent causes of inner contradictions, crises, and wars. Its social basis is next to nil: feudalism, landlordism, and comprador bourgeoisie, which had not been very strong under the French rule, were weakened and differentiated during years resistance war. After the restoration of peace, they were again divided due to the opposing viewpoints between the United States and France. On the other hand, the revolutionary people have reached a very high degree of political consciousness and are strongly united. \

In these conditions, the United States-backed puppet administration cannot stand firm on its feet without closely clinging to its bosses and making themselves docile lackeys at the beck and call of United States imperialism in all affairs, big or small. In face of the people's revolutionary high tide, it is compelled to embark rapidly dictatorship and fascism, feverishly carrying out the United States policy of military intensification and war preparation. For its own existence, it is forced to declare bluntly its opposition to the Geneva agreements and the cherished aspirations of our people: peace, independence, democracy, and national reunification. That is why, despite the United States-Diem slogans of "overthrowing colonial ism," "boycotting feudalism," and "extermination of communists," and despite their boastful claim of liquidating social evils or carrying out a number of demagogic reforms, the large masses of people have immediately made out behind the mended cloak the real face of the international gendarme, which is the face of United States imperialism and that of the Ngo family, which for many generations have served as running dogs, and the people are all the more resolute in their struggle against them. For many years, the United States-backed puppet administration has had to resort to a policy of violence in order to repress the movement, using privileges and interests as lures to create a new generation of traitors; it has had to strive put under its close control the army, the police, and the administration at various levels in an attempt to enlarge its social bases. But the rising tide of the ever sweeping and powerful struggle of our people, coupled with the coup d'état overthrowing the rule of the Ngo family, has inflicted heavy losses upon United States imperialism; ranks of its quislings cannot be consolidated, let alone enlarged.

The policy of United States imperialism and its henchmen is one of invasion and betrayal of South Vietnam. In consequence, both the unilateral war they started in 1954 and the "special war" they have kindled recently are only aimed at repressing the people's revolutionary movement, dominating and enslaving South Vietnam, and transforming it into a United States neo-colony and military base. This is clearly *an unjust war, an aggressive war*. Therefore, in consideration of its political goal and nature, the war carried out by United States imperialism and its henchmen is by

no means different from the aggressive war kindled by French colonialism in former times to enslave our people.

In the United States imperialists' strategy of "flexible response," "special war" ranks third, coming after world nuclear war and limited war. Considering that the balance of world forces is tipping unfavorably for them, and the immediate difficulties met in the kindling of a large-scale war, the United States imperialists hope to win successes in "limited war" with conventional weapons, especially in the "special wars" aimed at repressing the liberation movement of the weak and small nations. The United States brass have made a thoroughgoing study of the characteristics of this kind of war, the aim of which, in their opinion, is to oppose guerrilla war, that is, the people's war. Therefore, special warfare takes place within the limits. of a country with no fixed frontline and rare mobilization of large units; on the other hand, there must be an all-around combination of military, political, psychological, and economic activities. The fore going features regarding the limit, scale, or real characteristics of special war by no means change its nature: *special war is aggressive war.*

United States imperialism, the sworn enemy of the southern people and of our entire nation, possessed of a capitalist economy with most developed modern industry, is the most barbarous imperialist chieftain, the main force of war and aggression, the bulwark of the world counter-revolutionary forces. Economically and militarily, it is a strong enemy.

Compared with French imperialism in former times, it has greater possibilities in all respects—in money and in modern weapons which are stockpiled in great quantities. But the assessment we make of the enemy forces must be factual. We must view them not only on the basis of the balance of world forces in general but also within the limit of a given area, within the real limit of the southern part of our country. Today in the world, the United States military and eco-nomic forces are still strong, but, compared with the revolutionary forces which are developing throughout the world, they are in a weaker position than before. Moreover, United States imperialism is being attacked on all sides and has to scatter its forces in many places.

It suffered heavy defeats in China, Korea, and Cuba, is being beaten in Laos and South Vietnam, and is meeting with difficulties. in many other places.

Today in South Vietnam the United States imperialists and their lackeys ever more isolated politically. Militarily speaking, their army is superior to ours in effectiveness, modern weapons, and mobility. All their temporarily strong points must be studied carefully, especially when solving questions regarding operations and campaigns. However, it is certain that all these strong points cannot make up for their most basic weak points in morale and politics, which are inherent in an enemy of the people, in a counter-revolutionary army. But in the South of our country, these weak points are all the more serious owing to the weakness of the southern reactionary forces and to the peculiar form of the aggressive war which is taking place there.

1. Whether in the unilateral war in former times or in the "special war" at present, the United States imperialists and their lackeys have been conducting an unjust war, that of aggressors and traitors trampling underfoot the most elementary rights of our people and the dearest

aspirations of our nation. Therefore, they are meeting with the fierce resistance of our fourteen million southern compatriots. They are fighting a whole nation.

2. In this "special war," their military forces are mainly the puppet army. But the absolute majority of their men, being sons of the toiling people, cannot find it in their hearts to go on serving as cannon fodder to defend the interests of the enemy. In the face of the fierce struggle and successes the people and Liberation Army, a hatred for war will certainly develop among the reactionary troops. An ever-growing number of soldiers, stirred by patriotism, will certainly turn their guns against the enemy and side with the people. Moreover, owing to the weakening of the social basis of the reactionary forces as a result of their inner contradictions, which have grown acute and intricate, the enemy has less and less basis for consolidating his army and administration; the morale of the officials in the puppet administration and of the men among the puppet army is flagging markedly with every passing day.
3. To consolidate the reactionary army, the United States imperialists bring in more advisers, military personnel, and even several task forces. The introduction of greater United States military forces into South Vietnam is immediately effective in controlling the reactionary military forces of their henchmen more closely. But we must clearly realize that, for the United States, the introduction of more military forces into South Vietnam is politically a most passive action. The increase of American military forces will diminish the "special" character of the war. The new face of colonialism has become more ineffective. Our people's hatred will increase and the contradiction between the United States advisers and the puppet officers and men will be sharpened, not to mention the weakness of the G.I's in a war against the guerrillas in a tropical battlefield such as South Vietnam. Even the United States brass has to recognize that these weak points have greatly curtailed the effectiveness of their activities.

The South, like the rest of Vietnam, was a colonial and semifeudal country with an extremely backward economy which was, moreover, ruined by war for many years. After the restoration of peace, it had not yet had time to bring its production to normal when it again fell victim to another aggressive war. Our southern people have had to endure privations and misery caused by a war dragging on for decades. With the successful August revolution, the people's power was established. This power was afterward maintained and consolidated in the free zones, guerrilla zones, and guerrilla bases throughout the years of nationwide resistance; however, implementing the Geneva agreements, our power gradually gave place to that of the reactionaries, henchmen of the United States imperialists.

For the same reason our people's armed forces in South Vietnam, which had matured in the Fifth Zone [505] and Mekong Delta battlefields during the years of resistance against the French, regrouped to the North, provisionally leaving behind their beloved native land which they had protected at the cost of their blood, while, for their part, tens of thousands of enemy troops withdrew from the Bac Bo Delta. Not only did our guerrilla bases and guerrilla zones cease to exist, but even our immense free zones were temporarily put under the control of the opponents. Availing themselves of these conditions, the United States imperialists and the Ngo Dinh Diem

[505] The northernmost region of South Vietnam.

administration started a unilateral war to extinguish the patriotic movement with a view to transforming South Vietnam into an American new-type colony and military base. They pinned their hope on our ruined economy and on the very difficult conditions created by the absence of a people's power and army to protect them. And they thought that our southern people had no other way than letting themselves be subjugated by their bayonets and guillotines.

But our southern compatriots are really a heroic people. *They are possessed of an invincible potential power* and a political strength which the United States imperialists and their quislings are incapable of understanding. They have coped with a people having a very high revolutionary spirit and very great political superiority. Revolutionary theory is translated into invincible strength once it has gripped the masses. In a revolutionary war, the people's political superiority will be translated into a material force capable of turning the tables on the enemy, overcoming all difficulties and hardships to defeat in the end an enemy who at first was several times stronger. The southern people are indeed outstanding sons of the Vietnamese people, a people having the tradition of struggling to the bitter end against foreign invasion, "rather to sacrifice their lives than be en-slaved." Our southern people made the Nam Ky and Ba To insurrections; [506] in the historic days of August, they rose up to take the revolution to victory and establish the people's power; they enjoyed the political and economic rights brought to them by the revolution; and they fought heroically, making an important contribution to the victory of the great resistance war of the nation. After a long revolutionary struggle, the southern people reached a high political and organizational level, gaining many experiences from their political and their armed struggles. For this reason, in the face of a most barbarous enemy, the revolutionary movement in the South has been maintained and developed every day.

The southern people, armed with a revolutionary spirit and the experiences gained in their revolutionary struggle, are, moreover, encouraged by the strength of a just cause and closely sealed into very strong and firm bloc by *lofty revolutionary goals:* national independence, land to the tillers, basic freedoms, peace, and national re-unification. After a national democratic revolutionary struggle fraught with sacrifice and hardships, and a great patriotic resistance war, the lofty national democratic ideals broadly disseminated by the Party since 1930 have taken deep root into the heart and mind of the masses of people. We cannot give up fighting so long as we have not wrested back independence, land, and the basic rights to life. The national resistance war ended successfully, the Geneva agreements. recognized Vietnam's sovereignty, independence, unity, and territorial integrity; the battle cannot come an end so long as these clauses of the agreements are not implemented. The southern people are determined to hold firm the national and democratic banner and raise it aloft till victory.

In the former resistance years, President Ho Chi Minh used to say: "Unity, unity, and broad unity; victory, victory, and great victory." The southern people clearly realize that unity is strength, unity is the main factor of victory. Though the enemy is materially strong, he is constantly divided by inner contradictions, while the southern people on the contrary enjoy a tradition of broad unity established throughout the first sacred resistance war. In the first years following the restoration of peace, the struggle was fraught with difficulties and hardships, and the southern patriots, though at

[506] 1940 and 1945.

times severed from one another organizationally, were closely bound to one another morally. The love for one's own fellow countrymen, the national pride and solidarity, and the pursuit of common revolutionary goals are sources of strength encouraging our compatriots firmly to maintain and actively to broaden unity. If the South Vietnam National Liberation Front has grown rapidly and enjoyed such a great prestige among the people, it is mainly due to the experiences gained in the past, to the traditions of national unity, and to the development and application of these experiences to the new historical conditions.

Moreover, the southern people are encouraged to organize themselves *along a correct political line and in adequate forms of struggle*. For this reason, however atrocious the enemy, and however difficult and dangerous the conditions of struggle may be, the political and armed forces of the people are growing stronger and stronger. The process of revolutionary struggle of the southern people is a development from political struggle to armed struggle, with both of them then being combined with each other and enhancing each other. The southern people have developed their political superiority to a high degree, having worked out a correct principle and a great many forms of struggle. Politically and militarily speaking, the revolutionary struggle in the South has been developing to a fairly high degree thanks to the creative spirit of the masses; it has, therefore, been able to thwart many dangerous policies and maneuvers of the enemy, frustrate his modern strategy, and achieve greater and greater successes.

The revolutionary war waged by our compatriots in the South has been carried on when half of our country is liberated and advancing to socialism. *The North is a hope and an encouragement for the southern people*, especially in the years when the enemy carries out most atrocious terrorization and repression. The liberated North is the pride of the entire Vietnamese people, a firm and strong base of the struggle for national reunification. Our southern compatriots feel that their northern fellow countrymen are always close by their side in the struggle against a common enemy, which enhances their confidence and strengthens their determination to overcome all difficulties on their advance to victory.

Over the past years, our southern people have been struggling against a most barbarous enemy. The most reactionary and inhuman nature of the United States imperialists and their puppet administration have wrought havoc with our southern people who become all the more aware of the real face of the enemy of the nation and nurture an ever-deeper hatred for him. In war the fighting spirit and hatred are a huge force. This explains why the United States jet helicopters, amphibious cars, ultrarapid submachine guns, flamethrowers, automatic mines, noxious chemicals, unsinkable landing craft, and other modern weapons cannot save the puppet army from repeated failures.

On the contrary, the southern liberation forces are armed only with rudimentary weapons, but their very high fighting spirit have helped them score success after success.

At present, the revolutionary war in the South is still facing many difficulties and hardships. However, with their heroic fighting spirit, our southern compatriots and Liberation Army have scored great successes and created stable factors of strategic significance. The people's political forces and revolutionary armed forces have grown stronger and stronger, the liberated area wider. Our southern people are turning the table on the enemy, and the successful development of the liberation

war in South Vietnam has eloquently testified that in a revolutionary struggle and in war, the decisive factor is, in the last analysis, man and political lines, and that the decisive strength is that of the masses of people.

III

As has been said above, during the last ten years in South Vietnam, the revolutionary struggle of our people has shifted from the political form to the form of political and armed struggle and has now become a national liberation war waged by the entire people against the "special war" unleased by the United States imperialists and their lackeys.

Basing ourselves on the characteristics stated in Section II, we can draw the conclusion that: *the war for liberation waged by the South Vietnamese people at present is a nationwide, all-sided, self-supporting, long-term, and arduous war which in the end will certainly be victorious.* Besides this fundamental political content, similar to that of the former patriotic war against the French colonialists and American interventionists, the present war for liberation of our people in the South has its own peculiarities in that our enemy is not the old colonialism of the French imperialists but the neo-colonialism of the United States imperialists; our southern compatriots have now made great progress in ideology and organization; the international situation is more favorable; and also the form of warfare used by the enemy is the aggressive war of a special type, not a classical one.

It is clear that this is *a war waged by the entire people*. For the sake of safeguarding the vital interests of the nation, in face of the danger that their country will be subjugated, their homes destroyed, their lives threatened, and their property trampled underfoot, fourteen million of our compatriots in the South, regardless of age, sex, nationality, creed, and political affiliation, are resolved not to be enslaved and have risen together against the United States imperialists and their henchmen.

The war has been waged by the entire people because *the political goals of the war for liberation* are just and very lofty, the South Vietnam National Liberation Front has a correct political line which can mobilize and organize the entire people. The platform of the Front "To struggle for peace, neutrality, independence, and democracy and for the future reunification of the country"-has reflected the primary and urgent requirements and the most profound aspirations of the South Vietnamese people. It has satisfied the immediate revolutionary task created by the social condition of South Vietnam.

The United States imperialists have done their best to practice neo-colonialism, to set up the "Republic of Vietnam" having its "independence" and "sovereignty," because they want to overshadow the fundamental contradictions between our people and the aggressive imperialists and to create conditions for the maintenance of the pup pet administration, which hides behind the false images of nation and sovereignty to deceive the masses and win them over. However, the Ngo Dinh Diem administration, owing to the conditions which originated it and to the policies it was compelled to follow from its inception, did not succeed in its deceit and laid bare its face of traitor to the country.

In face of the perfidious scheme of neo-colonialism and the puppet administration, we must raise all the higher the banner of *national independence*. That is why the slogan "National independence and the urgent clauses for national salvation" put forth by the South Vietnam National Liberation Front has been able to rally broadly all patriotic and democratic forces in a united front against the imperialists and their stooges on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance. Not only the grass-roots worker-peasant masses but all the sections of petty bourgeois intelligentsia, the national bourgeoisie, and patriotic personalities have risen as one man against the common enemy under the banner of national independence. The minority people in the South have set a shining example of indomitable spirit. Most of the religious sects also approve of the Front's platform; even the pro-French elements and the large majority of Catholic refugees from the North have today sympathized with the Front and taken part, to a certain degree, in the struggle for national salvation.

In a revolution to liberate a colonial or semicolonial and semi-feudal country the anti-imperialist question cannot be taken apart from the antifeudal question, nor can the national revolution be separated from the democratic revolution, because the substance and content of the national question is the peasant question; without put-ting forth the democratic question, without rousing the great peasant masses, it is quite impossible to consolidate and strengthen the National United Front and to set up a solid worker-peasant alliance. which can serve as a basis to powerfully develop other patriotic forces.

In the specific condition of South Vietnamese society, the democratic problem plays a particularly important role because, with its false agrarian reform policy, the United States imperialists-sponsored puppet administration has done its utmost to grab the land allotted to the peasants during the war of resistance against the French; what this administration called agrarian reform was actually the distribution of a small acreage of land to its faithful lackeys. It is precisely for this reason that the South Vietnam National Liberation Front has raised the slogan: "To carry out land rent reduction and then to solve the land problem for the peasants. that the tillers will have land to till." During the last ten years, the peasants in the South have received in distribution more than 3.5 million acres of land, or nearly three times over the acreage of land allotted during the former resistance war. Most of these lands belonged to the imperialists and reactionary big landlords who had followed the enemy. This distribution of land to the peasants bears a paramount significance because the people's war is a revolutionary war waged by the masses of which the peasants make up over 90 percent. As the peasants in the South have by tradition an indomitable fighting spirit, the fact that they have now received vital interests from the revolution is for them a stimulus and they can organize themselves into a mighty force to wage a long resistance war.

In South Vietnam, not only has the puppet administration grabbed the land of the peasants, but it has daily violated the lives and property of the people, it has sprayed toxic chemicals to destroy the crop and it has coerced the inhabitants into leaving their homes and villages to be herded into "strategic hamlets." In the town, the economic policy which depends on the United States imperialists has caused the bankruptcy of the native manufacturers and traders and a serious unemployment among the toiling people. That is why the democratic slogan has also another meaning, which is to *improve the people's livelihood* and to demand *the implementation of an independent economic policy.*

Democracy has, furthermore, a political meaning of paramount im-portance, which is to demand the carrying-out of democratic liberties. in opposition to the fascist dictatorial regime. The United States imperialists usually boast that the administrations under their sway have pursued a policy of "freedom," that they have also written down "democratic liberties" in their constitutions. However, in practice, from the very beginning these administrations have become fascist dictatorial powers. That is why the slogans "To institute a broad and progressive democratic regime, to guarantee democratic liberties demanding the implementation of Article 14-C of the Geneva agreements, [507] to oppose discrimination against former resistance members," and so on, have responded to the urgent requirements of all strata of the population and have effectively urged the broad masses of people to rise against the enemy.

At present our country is temporarily partitioned into two zones, each having a different social regime. The revolutionary task ahead of the South Vietnamese people is to overthrow the United States imperialists and their henchmen and to win independence and democracy. The great majority of grass-roots masses have realized not only the necessity of carrying out this task, they have also aspired to take the revolution to new height. Meanwhile, the national bourgeoisie and a section of the middle classes on the one hand oppose United States imperialism out of nationalism and, on the other, want to defend the interests of their own classes. In order to rally the largest majority of people, the Front has laid down appropriate home and foreign policies; internally it advocates the *promotion of national industry and trade and development of the national economy*: externally it advocates a diplomatic policy of peace and neutrality. The word, "neutrality" has a great echo among the upper classes in South Vietnam and a widespread repercussion among the officers, soldiers, and civil servants of the enemy's administration; it has received the greatest approval and support from abroad. It is necessary to stress the *requirement for peace* and the *step taken to reunify the country* because genuine peace is the aspiration of everyone in the South, the more so since it has experienced twenty years of continual warfare, and because reunification is the profound aspiration of every Vietnamese, Vietnam has ever been one and indivisible.

Because the goal of its struggle is just and conforms to the funda-mental aspirations of the people, and is mentioned in its platform, it can be said that at present *the South Vietnam National Liberation Front is able to rally the overwhelming majority of fourteen million people of the South, to mobilize, organize, and lead our compatriots there in the war for national liberation and salvation.* It is obvious. that this war, which bears a national character as well as a class char-acter, is mainly a war for national salvation against the United States aggressive imperialists and their myrmidons. *This is a people's war in a new historic condition in South Vietnam.*

The liberation war waged by the South Vietnamese people *is an all-out war.*

In this "special war" the enemy fights us mainly by military means, but he also lays stress on political activities, the "*cong van du* activities," [508] in order to win over the people and eagerly to

[507] Article 14 of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Vietnam states: "Each Party undertakes to refrain from any reprisals or discrimination against persons or organizations on account of their activities during the hostilities and to guarantee their democratic liberties"

[508] Espionage and intelligence activity carried out by local agents.

penetrate into South Vietnam through economic and cultural media, and the like. The liberation war waged by our people over there covers many fields: military, political, economic, and cultural.

1. Our people cherish peace by tradition. In the early days of the successful August revolution, when the Democratic Republic of Vietnam had just been set up, we did our best to win peace by signing the preliminary agreement with the French government. But historical facts have shown that while we loved peace, the imperialists and colonialists did their utmost to kindle war. In the end, to defend the vital interests of our country, all our people have risen up, using armed violence and revolutionary struggle against counter-revolutionary violence, against the aggressive war of the French colonialists propped up by the United States imperialists. And we have carried the day.

In 1954, after the signing of the Geneva agreements, from North to South, all our people longed for peace; they made every effort to maintain and consolidate it and fought against all acts sabotaging the Geneva agreements in the South. While the United States imperialists and the puppet administration used counter-revolutionary violence to terrorize and massacre them, our people have put up a most valiant political struggle against the enemy for many years. In fact, this struggle has testified once again that *to the counter-revolutionary violence of the enemy, our people must definitely oppose revolutionary violence*.

At the price of their hard-won experiences, our compatriots in the South realized that the fundamental trend of imperialism and its lackeys is violence and war; that is *why the most correct path to be followed by the peoples to liberate themselves is revolutionary violence and revolutionary war*. This path conforms strictly to the ethics and the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism on class struggle, on the state, and on the revolution. Only by revolutionary violence can the masses defeat aggressive imperialism and its lackeys and overthrow the reactionary administration to take power. When the United States imperialists stepped up armed intervention in the South, the revolutionary struggle waged by our people turned into a widespread people's war, which has won greater and greater successes with every passing day.

The experiences gained in the revolutionary struggle put up by all our people during the last decades and by our southern compatriots over the past ten years have proved that revolutionary violence and revolutionary war is the correct path followed by the peoples who want to rise up and smash the domination of the colonialist imperialists and their lackeys; in specific conditions they are the real possibilities for these peoples to liberate themselves.

2. Revolutionary violence takes many forms: political violence, armed violence, and armed violence combined with political violence. Basing ourselves on our absolute superiority in the political field, and on the policy of the enemy who uses military as well as political means to quell the revolution, our southern compatriots are now using political violence combined with armed violence against the enemy. They have known how to take advantage of and to develop the valuable experiences gained by all our people in the revolutionary struggles they have waged up to the present time. These various forms of violence have led our people to brilliant victories. We have also known how to apply creatively the experiences gained in the recent revolutionary struggles in the world such as in Cuba and Algeria, where great successes have been achieved as the result of a skillful coordination between armed struggle and political struggle. It can be said that one of the

striking particularities of the revolutionary war in the South, of the comprehensive character of this war, is that it is *developing simultaneously in two forms-political struggle and armed struggle – in a long period.*

Political struggle plays a very fundamental role because our basic strength and the enemy's basic weakness lie in the political field, because the enemy schemes to deceive the people by political means, because the South Vietnamese people are by tradition indomitable in political struggle and have a very high political and organizational spirit. Once the people have a high revolutionary spirit, they are always a huge force, play a decisive role, and are a deciding factor of the revolutionary struggle. However, particularly in the present era, the toiling worker-peasant masses and progressive people of the world have made big strides on the road of revolutionary struggle; particularly in the South our people have been tempered for decades in political and armed struggles; while the administration and army serving the United States imperialists are very weak in the political field, our people have ample possibilities of developing extensively their political strength and of exploiting the great shortcomings of the enemy in order to secure victory for us.

Armed struggle is a high form of revolutionary struggle; *it is playing a very fundamental and important role.* Only with the support of armed struggle can the masses bring into play their political authority. As the enemy is using counter-revolutionary war against the people, to overthrow his domination it is absolutely necessary for the people to annihilate and destroy the puppet army. In the specific situation of South Vietnam, armed struggle should closely combine with political struggle; at the same time, it should abide by the laws on warfare and play its role of annihilating as many enemy forces as possible.

3. In the South, from the two major currents of struggle mentioned above, the masses have formed and built up a very mighty political force and an ever-powerful revolutionary armed force.

The *political army of the masses* includes all ages and sexes and has established bases everywhere-in the lowlands and highlands, in town and country. This army has risen up and smashed to pieces the enemy's rural administration, destroyed a great number of strategic hamlets, carried out agitation work among the puppet soldiers, and urged tens of thousands of them to go over to the side of the people; it has fought against conscription and corvée, against the spraying of toxic chemicals, repression of religions, arson, and eviction from houses; it has demanded the protection of human lives and property, the improvement of the people's livelihood, the application of democracy, the punishment of Ngo Dinh Diem's henchmen, and the expulsion of the United States imperialists from South Vietnam.

This political army has now used a legal form for its struggle, turned what is illegal into legal; it has never threatened by terror and bloodshed; it has advanced bare-handed and used a patriotic language to convince the enemy troops. Nobody can forget the scene in which tens of thousands of peasants broke through the cordon of bayonets, rushed into town, and stirred the streets with shouts of hatred and indignation. Nobody can forget the picture of a mountain girl who threw herself in front of an enemy bulldozer which was destroying her village to build a strategic road; the image of a South Vietnamese girl who, with her body, prevented an enemy cannon from shelling her village.

While workers, pupils, and students have played a worthwhile role in the political struggle in the towns, the women peasants were constantly on the front rank of the struggle in the countryside. When this political army temporarily stops direct struggle, it will engage in the production of foods and weapons, do afforestation work, dig trenches, make spikes, fence their fighting villages, or perform their duty as transporters, scouts, or messengers to help the army-men.

At first, *the revolutionary armed forces* of South Vietnam were the self-defense units and armed propaganda units which saw the light of day in the fire of the movement of political struggles of the people. Then bigger units appeared with the extensive development of the militia and guerrilla units in the course of the war. At present, the armed forces of the South Vietnamese people have grown very swiftly in strength under three forms which coordinate closely with one another in military operations: *the militia and guerrillas, the local troops, and the regular army*. Though still young and fighting in very hard and difficult conditions, the *South Vietnam Liberation Army* has successively defeated the enemy and has now raised the degree of its political consciousness and has increased its equipment, mobility, and fighting strength. In equipment, it mainly relies on the arms and ammunition taken from the enemy and increases its strength in the course of fighting; it is closely linked with the population. Like the Vietnam People's Army, the brother South Vietnam Liberation Army is not only an army which fights heroically but an army which is remarkable in production and excellent in all its work; it can annihilate great numbers of enemy troops at the front and actively make propaganda among the population; it can successfully carry out agitation work among enemy troops; and it can work painstakingly to fend for itself when supply from outside meets with difficulties.

In the face of an enemy equipped with modern arms, one which has great mobility and equipment for its intelligence service, but a very low morale, the South Vietnam Liberation Army has known how to analyze the strong and weak points of the enemy; it has fought unremittingly and got the upper hand of the enemy; together with the inhabitants, it has destroyed strategic hamlets, victoriously resisted small raids and large-scale raids as well; it has laid ambushes, carried out sudden attacks and annihilated whole companies, even whole regiments, stormed small posts, then bigger posts, and even a whole subsector. The Liberation troops have attacked communication lines (roads and waterways) of the enemy, burned oil depots and ammunition dumps, attacked airfields, sunk warships, and killed American advisers in the very center of Saigon. In the recent past, the armed struggle of our people in the South has *developed into a quite extensive guerrilla war of a fairly high level*. It can be said that at present, guerrilla warfare in the South develops at a quicker tempo than during the resistance against the French and faces more difficult fighting conditions. The Liberation troops have performed a great number of heroic deeds. During the arduous and fierce struggle they have waged, there appeared many examples of immortal sacrifice and great heroism, which continue the glorious tradition of the nation, the revolution, and the former resistance war- Tru Van Tho plugged a loophole with his body; Mai Van The cut one of his arms to continue the fighting; Nguyen Viet Khai had three helicopters shot down to his credit; Ly Van So damaged three amphibious cars; a group at Ap Bac got its fame; the Long Trung guerrillas persistently resisted a twenty-nine-day raid, and so forth.

The Liberation Army is now heroically annihilating the United States-sponsored puppet army commanded by American advisers. It made its appearance only a few years ago, yet it is the terror of

the enemy who has gradually realized that it is not he who in the future will annihilate us, it is the Liberation Army which will defeat him. The heroic South Vietnam Liberation Army deserves the confidence of our southern compatriots and of the fatherland.

4. After the victories of the political struggle and armed struggle, the liberated areas have been broadened, running from the high plateaus of Central Vietnam to the Mekong Delta. The building of these areas in the political, economic, and cultural fields has become an important task and is all the more important for the liberation war in the South. At present, the liberated areas are separated from one another, some are entangled with the enemy-controlled areas, others reach into out-of-the-way places; they cover the provinces of the densely peopled delta and even draw near big and small towns. The liberated areas are not only firm guerrilla bases but are also built to become shining models of a new life, of a new regime in opposition to the gloomy state and stifling atmosphere of the enemy-controlled areas.

Under the direction of the Front, the people of the liberated areas are obviously masters of the land and are doing their best to manage and build their life along progressive lines. Democratic liberties, freedom of belief, freedom of business, and equality among nationalities are respected and widely implemented. Cultural, social, and educational activities as well as the health services are progressing. A healthy patriotic art and literature of a mass character contributes to the mobilization of the people for the struggle.

Here our compatriots are freed from the plunder and exploitation by the enemy; they are enthusiastically tackling production, improving their method of work, raising their livelihood and at the same the economic, agrarian, and religious policies of the Front, and the time actively pooling their efforts to wage the war of resistance. Here policy dealing with the bourgeois and foreign residents, the policy regarding the puppet soldiers and officers who go over to the side of the people are clearly defined and readjusted.

At present, the liberated areas have played their strategic role in the liberation war and have brought great influence to bear on the inhabitants of the enemy-controlled areas, including the towns. The liberated areas are precisely the first pictures of free and independent South Vietnam in the future; they will certainly be expanded and consolidated and will become the regions in which the future regime of the South will be applied after the victory of the liberation war.

IV

Before the danger of a greater failure, the ruling circles in the United States are striving to retrieve their present situation in South Vietnam.

Political circles and influential personalities in the United States have brought forward many opinions and have devised varied military measures not excluding the political ones. This clearly reflects the American embarrassment and deadlock after ten years of intervention and aggression in the South of our country.

After the signing of the Geneva agreements, with the fame and force that the United States had at that time, all American political and military figures were optimistic, thinking that South Vietnam was an easy prey. At the birth of the Staley-Taylor plan, though they were no more optimistic than they had been five or six years before, a great many people from the aggressive circles in the United States were still confident of the "special war" as a means to pacify South Vietnam within eighteen months. But now, after ten years of successive failures, especially the bitter ones over the past three years, their optimism and confidence have vanished; they begin to squabble with one another-and the squabble is growing hotter—about the cause of their defeat and about the measures to restore the situation. During the discussion, they come to agree on one point: their hope of winning swiftly in South Vietnam is lost, but they are still at variance on how to get out of the present tunnel with no end in view.

Owing to its extremely warlike and reactionary nature, the Johnson government is striving to continue the war and is clinging to its aggressive colonial policy in the South. This is easy to understand, if we examine the strategic position of South Vietnam with regard to the whole of the American warlike scheme in Indochina and South-east Asia, and the important significance of the first experiment of their "special warfare" in the South aimed at repressing the movement for independence of various peoples. Johnson has many a time spoken of the determination of the United States to stay in South Vietnam at all costs. Therefore, it is quite certain that the United States government will continue *to intensify the "special war"* it has kindled and will further speed up every military activity, with a view to boosting the morale and bridging the gap between its lackeys who are wavering and who are at variance with one another, and endeavoring to win some victory before finding another solution.

Simultaneously with the pushing forward of the aggressive war in South Vietnam, the United States imperialists will *further intensify the provocation and sabotage in North Vietnam*, hoping to create more difficulties for our entire people's struggle for national reunification. The fact that the Americans are obliged to increase these acts at present, at this time when they are deeply bogged down in the South, shows that they are in a bitterly passive situation. It is precisely because they are defeated by the southern people that they must take such adventurous measures. It is certain that in intensifying these acts the United States imperialists can threaten no one, but bring upon themselves further shameful failures and hatred of the entire people from North to South. How can these acts prevent the northern people from giving their unshakable support to their south-ern compatriots' patriotic struggle? How can they lessen the latter's ironlike confidence in and sincere sympathy with the socialist North, the revolutionary base of the whole country?

Owing to their acute crisis in South Vietnam, the United States imperialists have schemed to intensify their armed intervention in the Kingdom of Laos and threaten the neutrality of the Kingdom of Cambodia, with a view to creating tension in Indochina and Southeast Asia. They want to rely upon these provocative acts and this dis play of force to screen their defeats in South Vietnam, and mislead the world opinion which is severely condemning their aggressive war in the South.

To serve these dark warlike schemes, thousands of United States military personnel, United States weapons, ammunition, and war means have recently been introduced into South Vietnam. At

the same time, the United States has carried out the transfer of its army and warships to Southeast Asia.

In the face of the United States policy of adding fuel to the fire, and of intensifying the sabotage of peace in Indochina and South-east Asia, our people in North Vietnam set themselves extremely heavy responsibilities and tasks*: to strengthen the defense of socialist North Vietnam, to protect our people's peaceful and creative labor; to be determined to support our southern people's patriotic struggle; to push forward the struggle for peaceful reunification of the fatherland; to strengthen the solidarity with and the support to the Laotian and Cambodian peoples in the defense of their independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity, and in their struggle against the United States intervention and aggression.* This responsibility is very heavy, and this task very high. However, with our thorough revolutionary spirit, profound patriotism, and just inter-national spirit, we will certainly discharge our responsibility before the nation and the world's people.

The resolution of the Third-Party National Congress [509]has stressed: " Vietnam is one, the Vietnamese people is one, our entire people's will for national reunification is unshakable, the final victory will certainly be ours." In the light of the resolution, we have clearly realized that North Vietnam is building socialism, that South Vietnam is carrying on the liberation war, and that these two tasks have a close relation with each other and help each other. While carrying on the second sacred resistance war to liberate themselves, our south-ern compatriots also aim at checking and smashing the United States imperialists' scheme of aggression against our whole country. Inversely, to build socialism in North Vietnam peacefully, and to strengthen the force of the North in every respect-political, eco-nomic, and national defense-is precisely the most decisive task with regard to the development of the whole Vietnamese revolution, and the struggle for national reunification. Over the past ten years, this ideological trend has unceasingly mobilized sixteen million northern people eagerly to work and record brilliant achievements in the building-up of their country; without halting before any sacrifice, fourteen million southern people are heroically fighting to win back and firmly defend every inch of land of Vietnam. *North and South Vietnam are under the same roof; the South is the front line; the North is the political and moral support of the fatherland.* North Vietnam has the task of building socialism and making it a firm basis for the southern people's patriotic struggle, and the struggle for national reunification. Today in the North the movement for sworn brotherhood between the northern and southern people, a lively expression of North and South Vietnam kinship, has gained town and country; *the successive emulation drives for our southern kith and kin and national reunification*, have brought in the highest labor productivity. "Everyone redoubles his efforts to show his gratitude to his southern kith and kin"; this warm appeal from President Ho Chi Minh, the beloved leader of the entire people, is urging every one of us to work.

Facing the United States imperialists' and their lackeys' scheme of intensifying provocative and sabotage acts in the North, our people in North Vietnam must *strive to strengthen and consolidate national defense, defend security, and further raise their revolutionary vigilance and their hatred for the enemy.* We must clearly realize that to build the North and defend it are twin tasks. Each of us in North Vietnam must be aware that the economic building and development of production is the central task; at the same time, he must always pay attention to combining economic building with

[509] September 5, 1960.

strengthening national defense, strive to increase the defense work in all respects, be ready to cope with all provocations and sabotages of the enemy, and smash every one of his adventurous acts. All the commandos of the United States imperialists' lackeys in South Vietnam as well as those of Chiang Kai-shek commanded by the United States recently introduced secretly into North Vietnam, were surrounded and completely annihilated by our army men and people. This shows the high vigilance and sharp readiness for fighting of North Vietnam's army men and people. We must develop this good to continue dealing heavier blows at the United States imperialists and their flunkeys if they pursue their aggression against socialist North Vietnam.

The armed forces— the People's Army, the People's Armed Security Forces, the People's Militia, and the People's Self-Defense Units—must clearly realize their heavy responsibility in the present. situation of the country. North Vietnam is building in peace; South Vietnam is carrying on the liberation war. Over the past ten years, though being heavily defeated by the southern people, the United States imperialists do not want to draw useful lessons and are pursuing the aggressive war on half of our country. Before the complete victory tween of our people the extremely hard and complex struggle be our people and the United States imperialists still goes on. *Therefore, we must further raise the tradition of determination to fight and to win, be always vigilant and ready for fighting, heighten the spirit to implement the orders, be united and closely act in unison, boldly wipe out the enemy, and be determined successfully to fulfill every military task entrusted by the Party and government.* We must further develop the spirit of readiness for fighting of a revolutionary army, firmly hold every weapon and instrument of war, and defend the territorial integrity, airspace, and territorial waters of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. We are certain to point defeat every wicked scheme of the United States imperialists.

Recently, simultaneously with the intensification of provocative and sabotage acts in North Vietnam, the strafing and shelling of the Laotian people's liberated zone, and the violation of the Cambodian border, the bellicose Americans have still clamored that they will strafe and shell the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and extend the war to the North. We warn the United States imperialists: "Should the United States militarists be rash enough to attack the North; the entire people of the country would stand up as one man to smash to smithereens their aggression and completely defeat them all over the country." To attack the North is to attack a socialist country; it is certain that the peoples of the brother socialist countries, of Southeast Asia, and the progressive people the world over will wholeheartedly support us.

The July 15, 1964, statement of our government has said that there is only one issue for the United States imperialists in South Vietnam:

1. The United States government must respect the sovereignty, independence, unity, and territorial integrity of Vietnam and refrain from interfering in her internal affairs.
2. The United States government must put an end to its aggressive war there, in South Vietnam, withdraw all its troops and weapons from and leave the South Vietnamese people to settle their own internal affairs by themselves in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Liberation Front.
3. The peaceful reunification of Vietnam is an internal affair of the Vietnamese people; it will be solved in accordance with the spirit of the political program of the Vietnam Fatherland

Front and the program of the South Vietnam National Liberation Front. Except for this, there is no other way out. If the United States. imperialists continue their war of aggression against South Vietnam; they will certainly be defeated by the southern people and will finally be doomed to complete failure. If they rashly extend the war to the North, this would be suicide for them.

The successes recorded during ten years of peaceful construction in North Vietnam are filling each of us with enthusiasm. The social-ist building in Vietnam will certainly succeed. The successes of the revolution in South Vietnam during the past ten years are powerfully mobilizing every one of us. The revolutionary work to liberate South Vietnam and peacefully re-unify the fatherland will certainly succeed brilliantly. Today no reactionary force in the world can prevent thirty million people of our whole country from carrying out their sacred aspiration—*to build a peaceful, unified, independent, democratic, prosperous, and powerful Vietnam.*

Leninism or Social-Imperialism?

— In Commemoration of the Centenary of the Birth of the Great Lenin

by the Editorial Departments of Renmin Ribao (People's Daily), Hongqi (Red Flag) and Jiefangjun Bao (Liberation Army Daily)

Section I: The Banner of Leninism Is Invincible

The centenary of the birth of the great Lenin falls on April 22 this year.

Throughout the world, the Marxist-Leninists, the proletariat and the revolutionary people ate commemorating this date of historic significance with the highest respect for the great Lenin.

After the death of Marx and Engels, Lenin was the great leader of the international communist movement and the great teacher of the proletariat and oppressed people of the world.

In 1871, the year after Lenin was born, the uprising of the Paris Commune occurred; this was the first attempt of the proletariat to overthrow the bourgeoisie. The world was entering the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution late in the nineteenth and early in the twentieth centuries when Lenin began his revolutionary activities. In his struggles against imperialism and opportunism of every kind, and especially against the revisionism of the Second International, Lenin inherited, defended and developed Marxism and brought it to a new and higher stage, the stage of Leninism. As Stalin put it, **"Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution."** [510]

Lenin analyzed the contradictions of imperialism, revealed the law governing it and solved a series of major questions of the proletarian revolution in the era of imperialism and settled the question of socialism "'**achieving victory first in one or several countries."** [511] He expounded the

[510] Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 6, p. 63.
[511] Lenin, "The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 23, p. 75.

thesis that the proletariat must assume leadership in the bourgeois-democratic revolution and led the Russian proletariat in staging a general rehearsal in the revolution of 1905. Under his leadership the Great October Socialist Revolution brought about the fundamental change from the old world of capitalism to the new world of socialism, opening up a new era in the history of mankind.

Lenin's theoretical and practical contributions to the cause of the proletarian revolution were extremely great.

After the death of Lenin, Stalin inherited and defended the cause of Leninism in his struggles against domestic and foreign class enemies and against the Right and "Left" opportunists in the Party. He led the Soviet people in continuing the advance along the socialist toad and in winning great victories. During World War II the Soviet people under the command of Stalin became the main force in defeating fascist aggression and made magnificent contributions which will live forever in the history of mankind.

We Chinese Communists and the Chinese people will never forget that it was precisely in Leninism that we found our road to liberation. Comrade Mao Zedong says: **"The salvoes of the October Revolution brought us Marxism-Leninism."** "**They** (the Chinese — Tr.) **found Marxism-Leninism, the universally applicable truth, and the face of China began to change."** [512] He points out: **"The Chinese people have always considered the Chinese revolution a continuation of the Great October Socialist Revolution."** [513]

Applying the theory of Marxism-Leninism, Comrade Mao Zedong creatively solved the fundamental problems of the Chinese revolution and led the Chinese people in waging the most protracted, fierce, arduous and complicated revolutionary struggles and revolutionary wars ever known in the history of the world proletarian revolution and in winning victory in the people's revolution in China, this large country in the East. This is the greatest victory in the world proletarian revolution since the October Revolution.

We are now living in a great new era of world revolution. The international situation has undergone world-shaking changes since Lenin's time. The development of the entire world history has proved that Lenin's revolutionary teachings are correct and that the banner of Leninism is invincible.

But history has its twists and turns. Just as Bernstein-Kautsky revisionism emerged after the death of Engels, so did Khrushchev-Brezhnev revisionism after the death of Stalin.

Eleven years after Khrushchev came to power, a split occurred within the revisionist clique and he was replaced by Brezhnev. More than five years have elapsed since Brezhnev took office. And

[512] Mao Zedong, "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship," Selected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 4, p. 1476 and p. 1475.
[513] Chairman Mao's speech of April 17, 1957.

now it is this Brezhnev who is conducting the "commemoration" of the centenary of Lenin's birth in the Soviet Union.

Lenin once said:

> **"It has always been the case in history that after the death of revolutionary leaders who were popular among the oppressed classes, their enemies have attempted to appropriate their names so as to deceive the oppressed classes."** [514]

This is exactly what the renegade Brezhnev and his ilk ate doing to the great Lenin. In their so-called Theses on the Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, they have the impudence to distort the great image of Lenin, the revolutionary teacher of the proletariat, and pass off their revisionist rubbish as Leninism. They pretend to "commemorate" Lenin, but in reality, they are appropriating the name of Lenin to press forward with their social imperialism, social-fascism and social-militarism. What an outrageous insult to Lenin!

Today our fighting tasks ate thoroughly to expose the betrayal of Leninism by the Soviet revisionist renegades, to lay bate the class nature of Soviet revisionist social imperialism, point out the historical law that social-imperialism, like capitalist imperialism, will meet its inevitable doom, and further promote the great struggle of the people of the world against U.S. imperialism, Soviet revisionism and all reaction. Here is the tremendous significance of out commemoration of the centenary of the birth of the great Lenin.

Section II: The Fundamental Question of Leninism Is the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

In his struggles against opportunism and revisionism, Lenin repeatedly pointed out that the fundamental question in the proletarian revolution is that of using violence to seize political power, smash the bourgeois state machine and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

He said:

> **"The latter** (the bourgeois state — Tr.**) cannot be superseded by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) in the process of 'withering away'; as a general rule, this can happen only by means of a violent revolution."** [515]

He added that Marx's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat

> **"Is inseparably bound up with all he taught on the revolutionary role of the proletariat in history. The culmination of this role is the proletarian dictatorship."** [516]

---

[514] Lenin, "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 23, p. 117.
[515] Lenin, "The State and Revolution," Selected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 3, p. 179.
[516] *ibid*., p. 184.

The victory of the October Revolution led by Lenin was a victory for the Marxist theory of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The toad of the October Revolution is the toad of the proletariat achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat through violent revolution.

Around the time of the October Revolution, Lenin summed up the new revolutionary practice and further developed the Marxist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He pointed out that the socialist revolution covets "**a whole epoch of intensified class conflicts"** [517] and that **"until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope is converted into attempts at restoration."** [518] Therefore, he maintained that the dictatorship of the proletariat **"is necessity ... not only for the proletariat which has overthrown the bourgeoisie, but for the entire historical period between capitalism and 'classless society,' communism."** [519]

Today, as we commemorate the centenary of Lenin's birth, it is of vital practical significance to study anew these brilliant ideas of Lenin's.

As is well known, it is precisely on the fundamental question of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat that the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has betrayed Leninism and the October Revolution.

Far back, when Khrushchev began to reveal his revisionist features, Comrade Mao Zedong acutely pointed out:

> **"I think there are two 'swords': One is Lenin and the other Stalin. The sword of Stalin has now been abandoned by the Russians." "As for the sword of Lenin, has it too now been abandoned to a certain extent by some leaders of the Soviet Union? In my view, it has been abandoned to a considerable extent. Is the October Revolution still valid? Can it still be the example for all countries ? Khrushchev's report at the 2oth Congress of the C.P.S.U. says it is possible to gain political power by the parliamentary road, that is to say, it is no longer necessary for all countries to learn from the October Revolution. Once this gate is opened, Leninism by and large is thrown out."** [520]

Section III: Counter-Revolutionary Coup d'états by the Khrushchev-Brezhnev Renegade Clique

How was it possible for the restoration of capitalism to take place in the Soviet Union, the first socialist state in the world, and how was it possible for the Soviet Union to become social-imperialist ? If we examine this question from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism, and especially in the light of Comrade Mao 'Zedong's theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, we shall be able to understand that this was mainly a product of the class struggle in the Soviet

[517] Lenin, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 22, p. 138.
[518] Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 28, p. 235.
[519] Lenin, "The State and Revolution," Selected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 3, p. 192.
[520] Chairman Mao's Speech at the Second Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, November 15, 1956.

Union, the result of the usurpation of Patty and government leadership by a handful of Party persons in power taking the capitalist road there, in other words, the result of the usurpation of the political power of the proletariat by the Soviet bourgeoisie.

At the same time, it was the result of the policy of "peaceful evolution" which world imperialism, in trying to save itself from its doom, has pushed in the Soviet Union through the medium of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique.

Comrade Mao Zedong points out:

> **"Socialist society covets a considerably long historical period. In the historical period of socialism, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggle, there is the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist toad, and there is the danger of capitalist restoration."** [521]

In socialist society the class struggle still focuses on the question of political power. Comrade Mao Zedong points out:

> "Those representatives of the bourgeoisie who have sneaked into the Party, the government, the army and various spheres of culture are a bunch of counterrevolutionary revisionists. Once conditions are ripe, they will seize political power and turn the dictatorship of the proletariat into a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie." [522]

Classes and class struggle continued to exist in the Soviet Union long after the October Revolution, although the bourgeoisie had been overthrown. Stalin cleared out quite a gang of counter-revolutionary representatives of the bourgeoisie who had wormed their way into the Party—Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin, Rykov and the like. This showed that sharp class struggle was going on all the time and that there was always the danger of capitalist restoration.

Being the first state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Soviet Union lacked experience in consolidating this dictatorship and preventing the restoration of capitalism. In these circumstances and after Stalin's death, Khrushchev, a capitalist roader in power hiding in the Soviet Communist Party, came out with a surprise attack in his "secret report" viciously slandering Stalin and by every kind of treacherous manoeuvres usurped Party and government power in the Soviet Union. This was a counter-revolutionaty coup d'etat which turned the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and which overthrew socialism and restored capitalism.

---

[521] Chairman Mao's Speeches at the Working Conference of the Central Committee at Pei Taiho in August 1962 and at the Tenth
Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Party in September of the same year.
[522] Circular of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist
Patty, May 16, 1966.

Brezhnev was Khrushchev's accomplice in the counterrevolutionary coup d'etat and later replaced him. Brezhnev's rise to power is, in essence, the continuation of Khrushchev's counter-revolutionaty coup. Brezhnev is Khrushchev the Second.

Comrade Mao Zedong points out:

> **"The rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie."** [523]
>
> **"The Soviet Union today is under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, a dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie, a dictatorship of the German fascist type, a dictatorship of the Hitler type."** [524]

This brilliant thesis of Comrade Mao Zedong's most penetratingly reveals the class essence and social roots of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism and its fascist nature.

Since the Soviet revisionist renegade clique usurped Patty and government power in the Soviet Union, the Soviet bourgeois privileged stratum has greatly expanded its political and economic power and has occupied the ruling position in the Party, the government, and the army as well as in the economic and cultural fields. And from this stratum there has emerged a bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class, namely, a new type of big bourgeoisie which dominates the whole state machine and controls all the social wealth.

Utilizing the state power under its control, this new-type bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class has turned socialist ownership into ownership by capitalist roaders and turned the socialist economy into a capitalist economy and a state monopoly capitalist economy. In the name of the "state," it unscrupulously plunders the state treasury and embezzles at will the fruits of the labor of the Soviet people in every possible way. Indulging in luxury and debauchery, it rides roughshod over the people.

This new-type bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class is a bourgeoisie that has turned the **hope of restoration** into **attempts at restoration.** It has suppressed the heroic sons and daughters of the October Revolution, is lording it over the people of different nationalities in the Soviet Union and has set up its own small counter-revolutionary tsarist court. Therefore, it is reactionary in the extreme and mortally hates and fears the people.

Like all other reactionary and decadent classes, this new-type bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class is riddled with internal contradictions. In their desperate efforts to keep the power they have usurped, the members of this class are both working hand in glove with each other and scheming and struggling against one another. The greater their difficulties, the fiercer their strife, open and secret.

---

[523] A talk of Chairman Mao's in August 1964.
[524] A talk of Chairman Mao's on May 11, 1964.

In order to extort maximum profits and maintain its reactionary tule, this new-type bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class not only exploits and oppresses the people of its own country, but it necessarily engages in rabid expansion and aggression, joins the company of world imperialism in redividing the world and pursues the most vicious social-imperialist policies.

This new-type bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class constitutes the class basis of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. At present the general representative of this class is Brezhnev. He has frantically pushed and developed Khrushchev revisionism and is completing the evolution from capitalist restoration to social-imperialism, which was already begun when Khrushchev was in power.

Since Brezhnev took office, he has pushed the so-called new economic system in an all-round way and established the capitalist principle of profit in a legal form, thus intensifying the exploitation of the working people by the oligarchy of bureaucrat monopolists. He and his like extort exorbitant taxes in total disregard of the lives of the people, follow Hitler's policy of "guns instead of butter" and accelerate the militarization of the national economy to meet the needs of social-imperialism for arms expansion and war preparation.

The perverse acts of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique have caused immense damage to the social productive forces and brought about gave consequences: the decline of industry, the deterioration of agriculture, the reduction in livestock, inflation, shortages of supplies, the unusual scarcity of commodities on state markets and the increasing impoverishment of the working people. The Soviet revisionist renegades have not only squandered a vast amount of the wealth accumulated by the Soviet people through decades of hard work, but have also humbly begged for loans from West Germany, a country defeated in World War II, and are even selling out the country's natural resources and inviting Japanese monopoly capital into Siberia. 'The economy of the Soviet Union is already in the tip of an inextricable crisis. As friends of the Soviet people, we the Chinese people, along with the people of the world, are extremely indignant with the Soviet revisionist renegades who have brought so much damage and disgrace to the homeland of Leninism; we feel deep sympathy for the broad masses of the Soviet people who are suffering enormously from the all-round restoration of the capitalist system.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique once said that the dictatorship of the proletariat "has ceased to be indispensable in the U.S.S.R." and that the Soviet Union "has ... become a state of the entire people."[525] But now they are slapping their own faces and asserting that the "state of the entire people continues the cause of the proletarian dictatorship''[526] and that "the state of the whole people" and "the state of proletarian dictatorship" are "of one and the same type." [527] They ate also making a hullabaloo about "'strengthening party leadership," "strengthening discipline," "strengthening

[525] "Programme of the C.P.S.U." adopted at the Soviet revisionist "22nd Congress."
[526] Soviet revisionist Theses on the Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.
[527] Soviet revisionist Pravda, March 5, 1970.

centralism'' and so on. "A state of the entire people" and at the same time a "proletarian dictatorship" — they lump together these two diametrically opposed concepts for no other purpose than to deceive the masses and camouflage the dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie. By "party leadership" they actually mean political control over the broad masses of the party members and the people by the handful of social-fascist oligarchs. By "discipline" they mean suppression of all who ate dissatisfied with their rule. And by "centralism" they mean further centralizing the political, economic and military power in the hands of their gang. In short, they ate putting all these signboards up for the purpose of strengthening their fascist dictatorship and preparing for wars of aggression.

Beset with difficulties at home and abroad, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique is resorting more and more openly to counter-revolutionary violence to buttress its reactionary rule which betrays Lenin and the October Revolution. In the Soviet Union of today, special agents and spies run amuck and reactionary laws and decrees multiply. Revolution is a crime, and people ate everywhere being jailed on false charges; counter-revolution is a merit, and renegades congratulate each other on their promotion. Large numbers of revolutionaries and innocent people have been thrown into concentration camps and "mental hospitals." The Soviet revisionist clique even sends tanks and armored cats brutally to suppress the people's resistance.

Lenin pointed out:

> **"Nowhere in the world is there such an oppression of the majority of the country's population as there is in Russia,**" and nationalities other than Russians were regarded "as *inorodtsi* (**aliens**)." [528]

National oppression "turned the nationalities without any rights into great reservoirs of fierce hatred for the monarchs." [529] Now the Soviet revisionist new tsars have restored the old tsars' policy of national oppression, adopted such cruel measures as discrimination, forced migration, splitting and imprisonment to oppress and persecute the minority nationalities and turned the Soviet Union back into the **"prison of nations."** [530]

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique exercises comprehensive bourgeois dictatorship throughout the ideological sphere. It wantonly suppresses and destroys the proletariat's socialist ideology and culture while opening the floodgates to the rotten bourgeois ideology and culture. It vociferously preaches militarism, national chauvinism and racism and turns literature and art into tools for pushing social-imperialism.

---

[528] Lenin, "Socialism and War," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol, 21, p. 285.
[529] Lenin, "Speech at the First All-Russia Congress of the Navy," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 26, p. 322.
[530] Lenin, "The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 21, p. 392.

In denouncing the dark rule of the tsarist system, Lenin indicated that police tyranny, savage persecution and demoralization had reached such an extent that **"the very stones cry out"** [531] One can just as well compare the tule of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique with the tsarist system castigated by Lenin.

In staging the counter-revolutionary coup d'etat, the Khrushchev-Brezhnev renegade clique played a role which no imperialist or reactionary was in a position to play. As Stalin said, **"The easiest way to capture a fortress is from within."** [532] The fortress of socialism, which had withstood the 14-nation armed intervention, the White guard rebellion, the attack by several million Hitlerite troops and imperialist sabotage, subversion, blockade and encirclement of every kind, was finally captured from within by this handful of renegades. The Khrushchev-Brezhnev clique are the biggest renegades in the history of the international communist movement. They are criminals indicted by history for their towering crimes.

Section IV: Socialism in Words, Imperialism in Deeds

Lenin denounced the renegades of the Second International as "**socialism in words, imperialism in deeds,** *the growth of opportunism into imperialism.*" [533]

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique, too, has grown from revisionism into social-imperialism. The difference lies in the fact that the social-imperialists of the Second International such as Kautsky did not hold state power; they only served the imperialists of their own countries to earn a few crumbs from the superprofits plundered from the people of other countries. The Soviet revisionist social-imperialists, however, directly plunder and enslave the people of other countries by means of the state power they have usurped.

The historical lesson is: Once its political power is usurped by a revisionist clique, a socialist state will either turn into social-imperialism, as in the case of the Soviet Union, or be reduced to a dependency or a colony, as in the case of Czechoslovakia and the Mongolian People's Republic. Now one can see clearly that the essence of the Khrushchev-Brezhnev renegade clique's rise to power lies in the transformation of the socialist state created by Lenin and Stalin into a hegemonic social-imperialist power.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique talks glibly about Leninism, socialism and proletarian internationalism, but it acts in an out-and-out imperialist way.

It talks glibly about practicing "internationalism" towards its so-called fraternal countries, but in fact it imposes fetter upon fetter, such as the "Warsaw Treaty Organization" and the "Council for Mutual Economic Assistance," on a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's

[531] Lenin, "Review of Home Affairs," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 5, p. 258.
[532] History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course, Chinese ed., People's Publishing House, p. 471.
[533] Lenin, "The Tasks of the Third International," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 29, p. 458.

Republic, thereby confining them within its barbed-wire "socialist community" and freely ransacking them. It uses its overlord position to press its "international division of labor," "specialization in production" and "economic integration," to force these countries to adapt their national economies to the Soviet revisionist needs and turn them into its markets, subsidiary processing workshops, orchards, vegetable gardens and ranches, all so that outrageous super-economic exploitation can be carried on.

It has adopted the most despotic and vicious methods to keep these countries under strict control and stationed massive numbers of troops there, and it has even openly dispatched hundreds of thousands of troops to trample Czechoslovakia underfoot and install a puppet regime at bayonet point. Like the old tsars denounced by Lenin, this gang of renegades bases its relations with its neighbors entirely "on the feudal principle of privilege." [534]

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique talks glibly about its "aid" to countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, but in fact, under the guise of "aid," it is trying hard to bring a number of these countries into its sphere of influence in contending with U.S. imperialism for the intermediate zone. Through the export of war materiel and capital and through unequal trade, Soviet revisionism is plundering their natural resources, interfering in their internal affairs and looking for chances to grab military bases.

Lenin pointed out:

"To the numerous 'old' motives of colonial policy, finance capital has added the struggle for the sources of raw materials, for the export of capital, for 'spheres of influence,' . . . for economic territory in general." [535]

Soviet revisionist social-imperialism is moving along precisely this orbit of capitalist imperialism.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique talks glibly about its "full support" for the revolutionary struggles in other countries, but in fact it is collaborating with all the most reactionary forces in the world to undermine the revolutionary struggles of various peoples. It wildly vilifies the revolutionary masses in the capitalist countries as "extremists" and "mobs" and _ tries to split and disintegrate the people's movements there. It has supplied money and guns to the reactionaries of Indonesia, India and other countries and thus directly helped them massacre revolutionaries, and is scheming night and day to put out the flames of the people's armed struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and suppress the national-liberation movements. Like U.S. imperialism, it is acting as a world gendarme.

[534] Lenin, "On the National Pride of the Great Russians," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 21, p. 85.
[535] Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 22, p. 293.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique talks glibly about its approval of "struggle against imperialism," mouthing a few phrases scolding the United States now and then, but in fact, Soviet revisionism and U.S. imperialism are both the biggest imperialisms vainly attempting to dominate the world. There is absolutely nothing in common between the Soviet revisionists' so-called opposition to the United States and the struggles of the people of the various countries against U.S. imperialism. In order to redivide the world, Soviet revisionism and U.S. imperialism ate contending and colluding with each other at the same time. What Soviet revisionism has done on a series of major issues, such as the questions of Germany, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, Japan and nuclear weapons, is evidence of its crimes in contending and colluding with U.S. imperialism. Both of them are playing imperialist power politics at the expense of the interests of the people of all countries. Whatever compromises may be reached between Soviet revisionism and U.S. imperialism are mere temporary agreements between gangsters.

Lenin pointed out: "Contemporary militarism is the result of capitalism." [536] Contemporary war "arises out of the very nature of imperialism." [537]

Since Brezhnev came to power, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has gone farther and farther down the road of militarism. It has taken over Khrushchev's military strategic principle of nuclear blackmail and energetically developed missile-nuclear weapons, and at the same time redoubled its efforts to expand conventional armaments, comprehensively strengthening its ground, naval and air forces, and carried out the imperialist "gunboat policy" throughout the world.

On the question of war, formerly Khrushchev hypocritically advocated a world "without weapons, without armed forces and without wats" to cover up actual arms expansion and war preparation. Today, Brezhnev and company have somewhat changed their tune. They have gone all out to stir up war fanaticism, clamoring that the present international situation is "fraught with the danger of a new world war,'' [538] brazenly threatening to "forestall the opponent" and bragging about their "strategic missiles" being "capable of destroying any target at any place." [539] They have been increasing military expenditures still more frantically, stepping up their mobilization and preparation for wars of aggression and plotting to unleash a blitzkrieg of the Hitler type.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has occupied Czechoslovakia by surprise attack, encroached upon Chinese territories such as Chenpao Island and the Tiehlickti area and made nuclear threats against our country. All this fully reveals the aggressive and adventurous nature of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism.

---

[536] Lenin, "Bellicose Militarism and the Anti-Militarist Tactics of Social-Democracy," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 15, p. 166.
[537] Lenin, "Eighth Congress of the R.C.P. (B)," Collected Works,
Chinese ed., Vol. 29, p. 168.
[538] Soviet revisionist Uchitelskaya Gazeta, February 5, 1970.
[539] Article by A.A. Grechko, Soviet revisionist Minister of Defense. See Soviet revisionist Kommunist, No. 3, 1969.

Like the U.S. imperialists, the handful of oligarchs of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism have become another arch-criminal preparing to start a world war.

Section V: The "Brezhnev Doctrine" Is an Outright Doctrine of Hegemony

In order to press on with its social-imperialist policy of expansion and aggression, the Brezhnev renegade clique has developed Khrushchev revisionism and concocted an assortment of fascist "theories" called the "Brezhnev doctrine."

Now let us examine what stuff this "Brezhnev doctrine" is made of.

First, the theory of "limited sovereignty." Brezhnev and company say that safeguarding their so-called interests of socialism means safeguarding "'supreme sovereignty." [540] They flagrantly declare that Soviet revisionism has the right to determine the destiny of another country "including the destiny of its sovereignty.'' [541]

What "interests of socialism"! It is you who subverted the socialist system in the Soviet Union and It is you who have pushed your revisionist line of restoring capitalism in a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic. What you call the "interests of socialism" ate actually the interests of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism, the interests of colonialism. You have imposed your all-highest "supreme sovereignty" on the people of other countries, which means that the sovereignty of other countries is "limited," whereas your own power of dominating other countries is "unlimited." In other words, you have the right to order other countries about, whereas they have no right to oppose you; you have the tight to ravage other countries, but they have no tight to resist you. Hitler once raved about "the tight to rule." [542] Dulles and his ilk also preached that the concepts of national sovereignty "have become obsolete" [543] and that "single state sovereignty" should give place to "joint sovereignty." [544] So, it is clear that Brezhnev's theory of "limited sovereignty" is nothing but an echo of imperialist ravings.

Secondly, the theory of "international dictatorship." Brezhnev and company assert that they have the right to "render military aid to a fraternal country to do away with the threat to the socialist system." [545] They declare: "Lenin had foreseen" that historical development would "transform the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national into an international one, capable of decisively influencing the entire world politics." [546]

This bunch of renegades has completely distorted Lenin's ideas.

---

[540] Soviet revisionist International Affairs, No. 11, 1968.
[541] Soviet revisionist Krasnaya Zvezda, February 14, 1969.
[542] The Nuremberg Trial, Vol. IL.
[543] Foreign Affairs (U.S.), October 1957.
[544] P.C. Jessup, A Modern Law of Nations.
[545] L.J. Brezhnev's speech at the Polish revisionist '5th Congress,"
November 12, 1968.
[546] K. T. Mazurov's report at the October Revolution "anniversary meeting" in Moscow, November 6, 1968.

In his article "Preliminary Draft of Theses on the National and Colonial Questions", Lenin wrote of:

> **"Transforming the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national one (i.e., existing in one country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (i.e., a dictatorship of the proletariat covering at least several advanced countries and capable of exercising decisive influence upon the whole of world politics)."** [547]

Lenin meant here to uphold proletarian internationalism and propagate proletarian world revolution. But the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has emasculated the proletarian revolutionary spirit embodied in this passage of Lenin's and concocted the theory of "international dictatorship" as the "theoretical basis" for military intervention in or military occupation of a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic. The "'international dictatorship" you refer to simply means the subjection of other countries to the new tsars' rule and enslavement. Do you think that by putting up the signboard of "aid to a fraternal country" you are entitled to use your military force to bully another country, or send your troops to overrun another country as you please? Flying the flag of "unified armed forces," you invaded Czechoslovakia. What difference is there between this and the invasion of China by the allied forces of eight powers in 1900, the 14-nation armed intervention in the Soviet Union and the "76-nation" aggression organized by U.S. imperialism against Korea!

Thirdly, the theory of "socialist community." Brezhnev and company shout that "the community of socialist states is an inseparable whole" [548] and that the "united action" [549] of "the socialist community" must be strengthened.

A "socialist community" indeed! It is nothing but a synonym for a colonial empire with you as the metropolitan state. 'The relationship between genuine socialist countries, big or small, should be built on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, on the basis of the principles of complete equality, respect for territorial integrity, respect for state sovereignty and independence and of non-interference in each other's internal affairs, and on the basis of the proletarian internationalist principle of mutual support and mutual assistance. But you have trampled other countries underfoot and made them your subordinates and dependencies. By "united action" you mean to unify under your control the politics, economies and military affairs of other countries. By "inseparable" you mean to forbid other countries to free themselves from your control and enslavement. Are you not brazenly trying to enslave the people of other countries ?

Fourthly, the theory of "international division of labor." Brezhnev and company have greatly developed this nonsense spread by Khrushchev long ago. They have not only applied "international

[547] Lenin, Selected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 4, p. 292.
[548] Soviet revisionist Igvestia, July 2, 1968.
[549] The Fundamental Document" of the sinister Moscow meeting in June 1969.

division of labor" to a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic as mentioned above, but have extended it to other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. 'They allege that the Asian, African and Latin American countries cannot "secure the establishment of an independent national economy", [550] unless they "cooperate" with Soviet revisionism.

> "This co-operation enables the Soviet Union to make better use of the international division of labor. We shall be able to purchase in these countries increasing quantities of their traditional export commodities -— cotton, wool, skins and hides, dressed non-ferrous ores, vegetable oil, fruit, coffee, cocoa beans, tea and other raw materials, and a variety of manufactured goods.'' [551]

What a list of "traditional export commodities'!

It is a pity that this list is not complete. To it must be added petroleum, rubber, meat, vegetables, tice, jute, cane sugar, etc.

In the eyes of the handful of Soviet revisionist oligarchs, the people of the Asian, African and Latin American countries are destined to provide them with these "traditional export commodities" from generation to generation. What kind of "theory" is this? The colonialists and imperialists have long maintained that it is they who are to determine what each country is to produce in the light of its natural conditions, and they have forcibly turned Asian, African and Latin American countries into sources of raw materials and kept them in a state of backwardness so that industrial capitalist countries can catty on the most savage colonial exploitation at their convenience. The Soviet revisionist clique has taken over this colonial policy from imperialism. Its theory of "international division of labor" boils down to "industrial Soviet Union, agricultural Asia, Africa and Latin America" or "industrial Soviet Union, subsidiary processing workshop Asia, Africa and Latin America."

Mutual and complementary exchange of goods and mutual assistance on the basis of equality and mutual benefit between genuine socialist countries and Asian, African and Latin American countries are conducted for the purpose of promoting the growth of an independent national economy in these countries keeping the initiative in their own hands. However, the theory of "'international division of labor" is preached by the handful of Soviet revisionist oligarchs for the sole purpose of infiltrating, controlling and plundering the Asian, African and Latin American countries, broadening their own spheres of influence and putting these countries under the new yoke of Soviet revisionist colonialism.

Fifthly, the theory that "our interests are involved." Brezhnev and company clamor that "the Soviet Union which, as a major world power, has extensive international contacts, cannot regard passively events that, though they might be territorially remote, nevertheless have a beating on our

[550] L.J. Brezhnev's speech at the sinister Moscow meeting, June 7, 1969.
[551] A:N. Kosygin's report at the Soviet revisionist "23rd Congress," April 5, 1966.

security and the security of our friends." [552] They arrogantly declare: "Ships of the Soviet Navy" will "sail... wherever it is required by the interests of our country's security" [553]

Can a country regard all parts of the world as areas involving its interests and lay its hands on the whole globe because it is a "major power'? Can a county send its gunboats everywhere to catty out intimidation and aggression because it "has extensive international contacts"? This theory that "our interests are involved" is a typical argument used by the imperialists for their global policy of aggression. When the old tsars engaged in foreign expansion, they did it under the banner of "Russian interests." The U.S. imperialists too have time and again shouted that the United States bears responsibility "not only for our own security but for the security of all free nations," and that it will "defend freedom wherever necessary." [554] How strikingly similar are the utterances of the Soviet revisionists to those of the old tsars and the U.S. imperialists!

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique which has long gone bankrupt ideologically, theoretically and politically cannot produce anything presentable at all; it can only pick up some trash from imperialism and, after refurbishing, come out with "Brezhnevism." This "Brezhnevism" is imperialism with a "socialist" label, it is outright hegemonism, naked neo-colonialism.

Section VI: The Soviet Revisionists' Dream of a Vast Empire

A hundred years ago, in exposing tsarist Russia's policy of aggression Marx pointed out:

> "**Its methods, its tactics, its manoeuvres may change, but the guiding star of this policy — world hegemony — will never change."** [555]

Tsar Nicholas I once arrogantly shouted: "The Russian flag should not be taken down wherever it is hoisted." [556] Tats of several generations cherished the fond dream, as Engels said, of setting up a vast "Slav empire" extending from the Elbe to China, from the Adriatic Sea to the Arctic Ocean. They even intended to extend the boundaries of this vast empire to India and Hawaii. **"To attain this goal, they "are as treacherous as they are talented."** [557]

The Soviet revisionist new tsars have completely taken over the old tsars' expansionist tradition, branding their faces with the indelible stigma of the Romanov dynasty. They ate dreaming the very dream the old tsars failed to make true and they are far more ambitious than their predecessors in their designs for aggression. They have turned a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic into their colonies and dependencies. They vainly attempt to occupy more Chinese territory, openly copying the old tsars' policy towards China and clamoring

---

[552] A.A. Gromyko's report at the "session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.," July 10, 1969.
[553] Speech of S.G. Gorshkov, Soviet revisionist naval commander-in-chief, on Soviet Navy Day, 1969.
[554] Former U.S. President Johnson's speeches, June 3 and June 20, 1964.
[555] Marx, "Speech at the Meeting of Poles in London on January 22, 1867," Marx and Engels Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 16, p. 226.
[556] G.I. Nevelskoi, The Exploits of Russian Naval Officers in the Russian Var East, p. 124.
[557] Engels, "Foreign Policy of Russian Tsardom," Marx and Engels Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 22, p. 17.

that China's northern frontier "was marked by the Great Wall." [558] They have stretched their arms out to Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Africa and even Latin America and sent their fleets to the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, the Pacific and the Atlantic in their attempt to set up a vast Soviet revisionist empire spanning Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The "Slav empire" of the old tsars vanished like a bubble long ago and tsardom itself was toppled by the Great October Revolution led by Lenin in 1917. The reign of the old tsars ended in thin air. 'Today too, in the era when imperialism is heading for total collapse, the new tsars' mad attempt to build a bigger empire dominating the whole world is nothing but a dream.

Stalin said:

> **"Lenin called imperialism 'moribund capitalism." Why? Because imperialism carries the Why? Because imperialism carries the contradictions of capitalism to their last bounds, to the extreme limit, beyond which revolution begins."** [559]

Since Soviet revisionism has embarked on the beaten track of imperialism, it is inevitably governed by the law of imperialism and afflicted with all the contradictions inherent in imperialism.

Comtrade Mao Zedong points out:

> **"The United States is a paper tiger. Don't believe in the United States. One thrust and it's punctured. Revisionist Soviet Union is a paper tiger too."** [560]

In carrying out rabid expansion and aggression, Soviet revisionist social-imperialism is bound to go to the opposite of what it expects and create the conditions for its own downfall. Soviet revisionism treats the other countries of the "socialist community" as its fiefs, but it can never succeed in perpetuating its colonial rule overt the people of these countries, nor can it alleviate its contradictions with these countries. East Europe today is just like a powder keg which is sure to go off. The intrusion of the Soviet revisionist tanks into Prague does not in the least indicate the strength of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism, on the contrary it marks the beginning of the collapse of the Soviet revisionist colonial empire. With its feet deep in the Czechoslovak quagmire, Soviet revisionist social-imperialism cannot extricate itself.

By its expansion and plunder in Asia, Africa and Latin America, Soviet revisionism has set itself against the people of these regions. It has so overreached itself and become so burdened that it is swollen all over like a man suffering from dropsy. Even the U.S. imperialist press says: "We've discovered that they (the Russians) blunder as badly as we do —if not worse.'' [561]

---

[558] "Statement of the Government of the U.S.S.R.," June 13, 1969.
[559] Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 6, p. 65.
[560] A talk of Chairman Mao's on January 30, 1964.
[561] 20.8. News ¢» World Report, January 5, 1970.

With Soviet revisionist social-imperialism joining the company of world imperialism, the contradictions among the imperialists have become more acute. Social-imperialism and imperialism are locked in a fierce rivalry to broaden their respective spheres of influence. The strife between social-imperialism and imperialism, which ate encircled ting upon ring by the world's people, must inevitably accelerate the destruction of the entire imperialist system.

At home the rule of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism also tests on a volcano. During the period of the Stolypin reaction, Lenin wrote that the upsurge of the struggle of the Russian working class **"may be rapid, or it may be slow," "but in any case, it is leading to a revolution."** [562] In the Soviet Union today the conflict and antagonism between the new-type bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class on the one hand and the enslaved proletariat, labouring peasants and revolutionaty intellectuals on the other ate becoming increasingly acute. Class struggle develops independently of man's will and must lead to revolution sooner or later.

The Soviet Union was originally a union of multinational socialist states. Such a union can be built, consolidated and developed only under socialist conditions and on the basis of equality and voluntary affiliation. 'The Soviet Union, as Stalin indicated,

> **"Had before it the unsuccessful experiments of multi-national states in bourgeois countries. It had before it the experiment of old Austria-Hungary, which ended in failure**."
>
> Nevertheless, the union of Soviet multi-national states was "bound to stand every and any test," because "real fraternal cooperation among the peoples has been established" by the socialist system "within the system of a single federated state." [563]

Now the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has subverted the socialist system, exercised a bourgeois dictatorship and substituted national oppression for national equality and the jungle law of the bourgeoisie for mutual help and fraternity among the nationalities. Now that the proletarian basis, the socialist basis, of the original union has been discarded, will not the huge multi-national "union" under the tule of the bourgeoisie of a new type one day undergo the same crisis and end in failure, as the Austro-Hungarian empire did in the past?

To extricate itself from its impasse at home and abroad, Soviet revisionist social-imperialism, like U.S. imperialism, feverishly engages in missile-nuclear blackmail and seeks a way out through military adventures and large-scale war of aggression. But will war bring a new lease of life to imperialism and social-imperialism in their death throes? No. Just the opposite. History irrefutably proves that, far from saving imperialism from its impending doom, war can only hasten its extinction.

---

[562] Lenin, "The Beginning of Demonstrations," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 16, p. 357.
[563] Stalin, "On the Draft Constitution of the U.S.S.R.," Problems of Leninism, Chinese ed., People's Publishing House, 1964, pp. 649-50.

Chairman Mao points out:

"With regard to the question of world war, there ate but two possibilities: One is that the war will give rise to revolution and the other is that revolution will prevent the war."[564]

Chairman Mao also says:

"People of the world, unite and oppose the war of aggression launched by any imperialism or social-imperialism, especially one in which atom bombs ate used as weapons! If such a war breaks out, the people of the world should use revolutionaty war to eliminate the war of aggression, and preparations should be made right now!" [565]

This great call made by Chairman Mao on the basis of the present international situation indicates the orientation of struggle for the proletariat and the revolutionary people throughout the world. The people of the world must maintain high vigilance, make every preparation and be ready at all times to deal resolute crushing blows to any aggressor who dares to unleash war!

In recent years, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique, inheriting the old tricks of the old tsars, has been backing and engineering, half openly, half secretly, a new "Movement for Pan-Slavism'" and publicizing the "sacredness of the national spirit" of the Russians in a futile attempt to poison the minds of the Soviet labouring masses and younger generation with this reactionary trend of thought and induce the Soviet people to serve as tools for the policies of aggression and war of the handful of Soviet revisionist oligarchs. In all sincerity, we would like to remind the fraternal Soviet people never to be taken in by "'Pan-Slavism."

What is "Pan-Slavism'' ?

In exposing the old tsars, Marx and Engels pointed out incisively: **"Pan-Slavism is an invention of the St. Petersburg Cabinet."** [566] Engels said that the old tsars used this swindle in preparation for war **"as the last sheet anchor of Russian tsarism and Russian reaction."** Therefore, **"Pan-Slavism is the Russians' worst enemy as well as ours."** [567]

Like Hitler's "Aryan master race," the "Pan-Slavism" of the Soviet revisionist new tsars is exceedingly reactionary racism. They publicize these reactionary ideas only to serve expansion

---

[564] Quoted in Comrade Lin Piao's Report to the Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China.
[565] Quoted in "Usher in the Great 1970's" — 1970 New Yeat's Day editorial of Remmin Ribao, Honggi and Jiefang jun Bao. Renmin Ribao, January 1, 1970.
[566] Marx and Engels, "Socialist Democratic Alliance and the International Worker-Association," Marx and Engels Collected Works,
Chinese ed., Vol. 18, p. 492.
[567] Engels' Letter to Karl Kautsky, February 7, 1882, Marx and
Engels on Art, Chinese ed., People's Literature Publishing House,
1963, Vol. 3, p. 361.

abroad by the handful of reactionary rulers of their "superior race." For the broad masses of the people, these only spells catastrophe.

Lenin once pointed out:

"The oppression of 'subject peoples' is a double-edged weapon. It cuts both ways — against the 'subject peoples' and against the Russian people." [568]

It is precisely under the smokescreen of "Pan-Slavism" that the handful of Soviet revisionist oligarchs are now working against time both to plot wars of aggression and to step up their attacks on the Soviet people, including the Russian people.

The interests of the proletariat and the broad masses in the Soviet Union ate diametrically opposed to those of the Soviet revisionist new tsars but are in accord with the interests of the revolutionary people the world over. If the Soviet revisionist new tsars launch a large-scale war of aggression, then, in accordance with Lenin's principle in dealing with imperialist wars of aggression, the proletariat and the revolutionary people of the Soviet Union will surely refuse to serve as cannon-fodder for the unjust wat unleashed by Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. They will carry forward the cause of the heroic sons and daughters of the Great October Revolution and fight to overthrow the new tsars and te-establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Two hundred years ago, eulogizing the "achievements" of the wars of aggression of Tsarina Catherine II, a Russian poet wrote: "Advance, and the whole universe is thine!" [569] Now the Soviet revisionist new tsars have mounted the horse of the old tsars and "advanced." They ate dashing about recklessly, unable to rein in and completely forgetting that their ancestors were thrown from this same horse and that thus the Russian empire of the Romanov dynasty came to an end. It is certain that the new tsars will come to no better end than the old tsars. They will surely be thrown from their horse and dashed to pieces.

Section VII: People of the World, Unite and Fight to Overthrow U.S. Imperialism, Soviet Revisionism and All Reaction

Comrade Mao Zedong points out:

"The Soviet Union was the first socialist state and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was created by Lenin. Although the leadership of the Soviet Party and state has now been usurped by revisionists, I would advise comrades to remain firm in the conviction that the masses of the Soviet people and of Party members and cadres ate good, that they desire revolution and that revisionist rule will not last long." [570]

---

[568] Lenin, "National Equality," Collected Works, Chinese ed., Vol. 20,
Pp. 233.
[569] G.R. Dershavin, "To the Capture of Warsaw."
[570] Chairman Mao's Speech at the Working Conference (Enlarged) of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, January 30, 1962.

The Chinese people cherish deep feelings for the people of the Soviet Union. During the Great October Revolution led by Lenin, Chinese laborers in Russia fought shoulder to shoulder with the Russian proletarians. 'The people of our two countries have supported each other, helped each other and forged a close friendship in the course of protracted revolutionary struggles.

The handful of Soviet revisionist oligarchs ate perversely trying to sow dissension and undermine the relations between the Chinese and Soviet peoples, but in the end, they will be lifting a tock only to drop it on their own feet.

The Soviet people ate a great people with a glorious revolutionary tradition who were educated by Lenin and Stalin. They will under no circumstances allow the new tsars to sit on their backs for long. Though the fruits of the October Revolution have been thrown away by the Soviet revisionist renegades, the principles of the October Revolution are eternal. Under the great banner of Leninism, the mighty current of people's revolution is bound to break through the ice of revisionist rule, and the spring of socialism will surely return to the land of the Soviet Union!

Comrade Mao Zedong points out:

> **"Whether in China or in other countries of the world, to sum up, over 90 per cent of the population will eventually support Marxism-Leninism. There are still many people in the world who have not yet awakened because of the deceptions of the social-democrats, revisionists, imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries. But anyhow they will gradually awaken and support Marxism-Leninism. The truth of Marxism-Leninism is irresistible. The masses of the people will eventually rise in revolution. The world revolution is bound to triumph."** [571]

In commemorating the centenary of the birth of the great Lenin, we are happy to see that, under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the cause of the world proletarian revolution is advancing from victory to victory. The genuine Marxist-Leninist forces ate steadily growing throughout the world. The liberation struggles of the oppressed nations and people ate vigorously forging ahead. All countries and people subjected to aggression, control, intervention or bullying by U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism ate forming the broadest united front. A new historical period of struggle against U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism has begun. The death-knell is tolling for imperialism and social-imperialism.

Invincible Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is the powerful weapon of the proletariat for knowing and changing the world, the powerful weapon for propelling history forward. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, integrated with the revolutionary masses in their hundreds of millions and with the concrete practice of people's revolution in all countries, will

[571] *Ibid*.

certainly bring forth inexhaustible revolutionary strength to smash the entire old world to smithereens!

Long live great Marxism!

Long live great Leninism!

Long live great Mao Zedong Thought!