

Uphold the Red Flag of the Communist International and of its 7th Congress ¹



By Communist Party of Brazil – Red Fraction (today Communist Party of Brazil)

February 2020

¹ Prepared by Maoism Library from <https://ci-ic.org/blog/2022/01/04/communist-party-of-brazil-uphold-the-red-flag-of-the-communist-international-and-of-its-7th-congress/>

I - Introduction

The general crisis of imperialism greatly aggravates, sharpening the fundamental contradictions, principally the one that opposes the oppressed nations to imperialism, inciting the wide popular masses to rebel against exploitation, oppression, national subjugation and the imperialist wars of aggression. Among the upheaval of the masses, the armed struggles of national liberation and especially the heroic persistence of the People's Wars in Peru, India, Philippines and Turkey are highlighted. Furthermore, as a consequence of the aggravation of the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the imperialist countries, the growth and radicalization of the protests of the deepest parts of the proletariat against the brutal "policies of austerity" applied by their governments and increasingly against these same governments of the imperialist bourgeoisie. On the other hand, the inter-imperialist contradictions intensify in the struggle for a new partition of the world, through relations of collusion and contend. Within them, the USA, as the only sole hegemonic superpower, the enemy number one of the peoples of the world, has its hegemony questioned by the rivalry with the atomic superpower Russia and other powers like China, etc. From which Germany struggles to establish its hegemony in Europe and the contradictions that oppose other imperialist powers with each of the before-mentioned powers. All these events characterize the world situation as a growing revolutionary situation in uneven development; within which the constitution and reconstitution of militarized Communist Parties are taking place to unleash new people's wars as part of the struggle to impose Maoism as the only sole command and guide of the World Proletarian Revolution.

In this historical context and as a product of such sharpening of the class struggle in the world and the elevation of the two-line struggle in the International Communist Movement (ICM), whose process of dispersion has been reverted (fundamentally) with the advances of the reunification through the growing unity of its left, we are marching towards the realization of the First Unified Maoist International Conference (UMIC). A Conference which will give birth to the New International Organization of the Proletariat (NIOP), which will mean a new step forward in the struggle for the reconstitution of the Communist International under the command and guide of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. This event has such important meaning after decades of dispersion, when treating the most burning problems of the current class struggle and ICM, which assumes to itself, as indispensable task, taking the position that fully and decidedly demarcates with revisionism, Trotskyism and all opportunism regarding fundamental problems of the historic experience of the struggle of international proletariat, the proletarian revolution in general and the ICM in particular.

Among those undoubtedly stands out, due to its grandiosity and transcendence, the 7th Congress of the Communist International (Comintern), celebrated in the midst of 1935, which confronted fundamental problems of the epoch and crucial for the ICM in this particular situation of ascension of fascism and a new unbridled imperialist race for a new partition of the world, a new world war and a serious threat for the Soviet Union and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, a situation of gigantic challenge for the World Proletarian Revolution (WPR)]. The 7th Congress in which masterful role of the leadership (Great Leadership) of comrade Stalin was condensed and portrayed.

In the last decades, the 7th Congress of the Communist International and the great figure of comrade Stalin were cast to the shadows due to the action and mystifier and arrogant influence of the revisionist ideas, criteria and positions within the ICM, as a repercussion of the ideological dynamic of the general counterrevolutionary offensive of imperialism, the reaction and revisionism.

The correct and just assessment of the Communist International and specially its 7th Congress, of the role of comrade Stalin and comrade Dimitrov, is not a secondary problem for the ICM. Under these glorious red banners, iron legions of communists and popular masses of the whole world rose up in arms through of the war of resistance to fight against fascism, for the defense of the URSS, the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the World Proletarian Revolution. This great epic of humanity, for which dozens of million masses have struggled in the whole world, is part of our soul and heart and therefore is a matter of life and death that separates Marxism from revisionism.

Against the policy of the Unified Anti-Fascist Front, the Nazi Germany promoted the so-called pact "Anti-Comintern": "At the National-Socialist Congress in Nuremberg, Hitler, Goebbels and Rosenberg opened a particular furious cannonade against the danger of the People's Front, which is menacing the fascist dictatorship, and against democracy in general. While directing the most vehement outbursts against the already existing People's Front in France and Spain, they at the same time thus expresses their alarm and fear of the People's Front movement which is taking shape in Germany itself." ²

In this sense, it's necessary to highlight that in an intern evaluation of the Yankee-CIA of 1947, in which is recognized that: "During the twenty-four years of its official existence the Third (Communist) International played a key role in the world-wide organization and development of the revolutionary Marxist movement. As the first global political machine in history, it coordinated the efforts of groups of determined and fanatical agitators and revolutionaries in almost every nation and colonized area of the world. To no small degree the enormous growth of world communism in our generation has been due to its integrating and compulsive force."

Chairman Gonzalo pointed out the necessity of making an evaluation of the 7th Congress of the Communist International, affirming that such an evaluation could only be carried out correctly taking this congress, the role of comrade Stalin in the direction of the Great Patriotic War and the Global Antifascist Front as a whole. He pointed out precisely the Marxist criteria to do it: "It is an urgent task for Communists, and for our Party, to make an evaluation on the Communist International, especially its IV Congress, connected to the World War and the role of Comrade Stalin." (PCP, International Line) When the PCP presented this problem, it was leading a hard two-line struggle inside and outside of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM), in order for the ICM to recognize and assume Maoism as the third, new and superior stage of Marxism. Situation in which the PCP could not open other fronts in the two-line struggle. Inside

² (Dimitrov, The People's Front, The Struggle against Fascism and War, 1938).

the RIM, the PCP faced, above all, the revisionist positions of Avakian, who had already begun with his foulmouthed attacks against comrade Stalin. Let's take a look at this:

"Especially after the crushing defeat of the communists in Germany with the rise of the fascist form of dictatorship (1933), heavy defensive and defeatist tendencies grew in the leadership of the Soviet Union and the Comintern. Together with the growing danger of world war, especially of attack on the Soviet Union, openly rightist deviations, of a fundamental nature, became predominant – the promotion of nationalism, reformism and bourgeois democracy, the subordination of everything to the defense of the Soviet Union, etc., in a qualitatively greater way than before [...] all this was concentrated in the Dimitroff Report to the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern (1935) and the implementation and further development of this line – which, as we know, involved, among other things, as one of its key ingredients, the basic repudiation of the Leninist position on „defense of the fatherland.“ This whole line was in its essence erroneous[...] the wrong line promoted under the leadership of Stalin had more than a little to do with the eventual triumph of counter-revolution. And just as certainly, the Spanish Civil War is a clear mile marker on a revisionist course embarked on by many Comintern parties and leaders.”³

Today, after more than 35 years since the beginning of the “Campaign for Maoism” by the Communist Party of Peru in 1982, the majority of Communist parties and organizations of the international proletariat have rejected the revisionism and have assumed Maoism and are struggling decidedly for its application to the concrete reality in their countries. At the same time, a growing number of parties and organizations of the ICM have advanced in assuming and comprehending the “contributions of universal validity of Chairman Gonzalo”. On this ideological basis and in the midst and through the storms of the class struggle, the militarized Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist parties are being constituted or reconstituted, developing and preparing more People's Wars in the whole world.

As we have pointed out we are in an auspicious advance that shows that we “have broken the ice” and that the ICM is entering in a new phase of its development. This advance takes us to the necessity of deepening our comprehension of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism at each of its stages and as a unity to elevate our application of Maoism, embodying it to keep the course.

Throughout the years, some parties have always published articles in defense of comrade Dimitrov, but it was especially in the last year that several declarations, documents and articles were published for the celebration the Centenary of the Communist International and the 70 years of the death of comrade Dimitrov. In these pronouncements, parties and organizations of different countries highlighted the great role played by comrade Dimitrov and the legacy of the 7th Congress of the Communist International for the World Proletarian Revolution. This is an important step forward and an important signal of advance.

On the other hand, among some Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties and organizations that rejected revisionism and took position for Marxism-Leninism-Maoism still confusion, limitations and erroneous positions of various orders regarding the evaluation of the 7th Congress of the Communist International persist. Among these positions, we distinguish those that are due to limitations that are part of the development, from those that are manifestations of serious

³ *The Line of the Comintern on the Spanish Civil War. Revolutionary Communist Party USA 1980*

ideological and political deviations, manifested in the form of a subjective and mechanistic idealism. Even though both could reach similar conclusions, the first are closer to Marxism than the latter, and as the Chinese proverb said: “the prejudice (rightism) is farther from the truth than ignorance”. These opinions represent the ballast of revisionism and its survival within the ranks of the ICM, and if they are not corrected, they will inevitably lead to part ways with the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

The “demolishing criticism” to the 7th Congress have its origin in the *saltimbanco* [T.N – From Michaelis Dictionary of Portuguese Language: saltimbanco: Italian origin, 1. Individual that shows his albitites at public places, says jests, sell drugs, etc.; fair charlatan. 2. Buffoon, trickster 3. individual of versatile opinions. 4. Subject that easily changes political party, according to individual convenience. 5. circus artist.] Trotsky. As a servant of imperialism, Trotsky centered all his attacks against the United Front policy of the Communist International and its 7th Congress, which was labeled by him as the “Congress of liquidation of the Comintern”; which had abandoned proletarian internationalism and replaced it with patriotism and the struggle for socialist revolution was replaced with the defense of the bourgeois regime:

“The Seventh Congress of the Comintern, [...] will sooner or later go down in history as the liquidation congress. [...] has liquidated Lenin’s teaching, making an abrupt about-face to opportunism and patriotism [...]. replace revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie by reformist and pacifist cooperation with the “left” bourgeois parties and with all the “friends of peace” in general. In the question of war, pacifism, and “civil war” there has thus been an almost 180-degree turn.”⁴

About Chairman Mao and the 7th Congress, Avakian had affirmed: “[...]only that the problem of Mao consists in him not criticizing the erroneous ideas of the 7th Congress, because inside himself he had nationalism”. And regarding comrade Stalin, among other things, what does this mister say?

“Stalin [...] “reversed” Leninism on a number of important questions. On internationalism, for example – and this was strikingly so during the period immediately leading into and during World War 2, when the interests of the Soviet Union as a state were, on a rather nakedly nationalist basis, put ahead of the overall advance of the world revolution [...] under Stalin’s leadership in the Soviet Union in the 1930s and 1940s [...] there was

explicitly a revising of the notion that the workers have no country and no basis and no interest in supporting the imperialist “fatherland.” (Bob Avakian, Breakthroughs, The Historic Breakthrough by Marx, and the Further Breakthrough with the New Communism. A Basic Summary. 2019)

These “lapidary” quotes of mister Avakian show that there is no way to go against comrade Stalin without resurrecting Trotsky and sinking in the quagmire of revisionism and opportunism.

These were the same arguments resurrected by Trotskyism, by the revisionism of Tito and his followers, converging with the anti-Stalin campaign of the imperialist reaction, that the Communist Party of the USSR (Bolshevik and the Communist International, under the direction of comrade Stalin, betrayed the world revolution in name of the defense of the USSR.

⁴ Trotsky, *The Congress of liquidation of the Comintern*, 23 of August 1935

A complete evaluation of the Communist International can only be realized by the reconstituted Communist International under the command and guide of Marxism-Leninism Maoism. However, for the communists to draw lessons from the historical experiences of its successes and errors will always be beneficial, given that they are correctly summed up according to historic reality and context and not by tergiversation.

The correct and justified evaluation can only be realized based on proletarian internationalism, in the interest of the World Proletarian Revolution as a whole and not from a point of view of “my” country, just as Lenin taught us: *“I must argue, not from the point of view of ‘my’ country (for that is the argument of a wretched, stupid, petty – bourgeois nationalist who does not realize that he is only a plaything in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie), but from the point of view of my share in the preparation, in the propaganda, and in the acceleration of the world proletarian revolution[...] That is what internationalism means, and that is the duty of the internationalist”*.⁵

Each new development of Marxism allows us and demands us to have a broader and deeper comprehension of the prior stages. What does Avakian preach with his “New Synthesis”, affirming that it takes Maoism as starting point, if not making a revision of all the prior stages? He declares:

*“Since the time of Marx up through Mao, communism has been mainly scientific in its method and approach. But there have been elements in it that have run counter to that scientific method and approach, and the new synthesis is taking what is positive, is building the essential parts that were positive, but is also rejecting, casting off or recasting in a more correct light some of the things from the earlier times in the development of communism that were not thoroughly scientific.”*⁶

Chairman Gonzalo defined Avakian, with the precision that is characteristic of him, as someone who *“every day reads only seeking to find the error”*. This is an exact synthesis of the Avakian method that keeps causing damage in the ICM. Marxism is completely opposed to the bourgeois rationalism of Avakian. To separate the development from our ideology from its material basis, from class struggle, is an attempt to negate the class character of truth.

Chairman Gonzalo taught us that when studying a document, we must correctly see its context and know what each document means, what is its political meaning. It’s not about “finding the error”, as Avakian proposes. This is why to study and understand the Rectification Movement put forward by the Communist Party of China in 1941 is of utmost importance. This profound rectification movement was a condition for the correct integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice in the Chinese Revolution, basis on which Mao Tsetung Thought was being forged. Chairman Mao defined the necessity of studying a problem in its diverse domains, the study of the political, military, economic and cultural situation on a national and international levels; the study of the history of the country at least its last hundred years; the study of the international experiences of Marxism, taking it as a contradiction; and not having unilateral points of view, combating the subjectivist method, which consists of not seeking the truth in the facts. He summarized that there are two ways of partial knowledge: the

⁵ Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*

⁶ Avakian, *The New Communism*

one that is acquired systematized in the books and the one that is, mainly, of sensible degree. That means, when analyzing the process of the International Communist Movement in general and of Marxism in particular, we need to approach it as a whole and not by isolated parts.

Chairman Gonzalo warned us about the necessity of taking Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as a unity, as a whole: *We, comrades, I believe we are taking the root in place of the leaves, we grasp a nail – from the little finger – we want to define men. Would it be correct? If one grasp the nail of the little finger and say what men are: a calcified crust, these is man. Would it be? It is not, comrades, because we have to consider it as a unity.*⁷

The evaluation of the Communist International, especially of its 7th Congress, cannot be separated from the evaluation of the role of comrade Stalin. At the end of the 1920 and 1930 years, comrade Stalin had to give great attention to the heating two-line struggle, which was developing itself within the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the USSR through which the great challenge of building Socialism for the first time in history and the preparation of the USSR facing the imminent imperialist aggression. It is false what pseudo-historians and other detractors affirm, that Stalin left the direction of the Communist International aside. The direction of the Communist International and the problems of the International Communist Movement were under growing attention and direction of comrade Stalin, in his condition of acknowledged Great Leader of the world revolution. To separate the role of comrade Stalin from the 7th Congress, from the problems of the Second World War and the Great Chinese Revolution is to negate his acknowledged condition of Great Leader of the World Revolution. Then we ask: after all, the great and glorious triumph over Nazi-Fascism was it or was it not due to the direction of comrade Stalin? And if we agree with the reality that yes, it was due to the magisterial direction of the great general Stalin, with which line was such a glorious triumph achieved? Isn't it clear that it was with the line of the 7th Congress or was it despite of it? Not having this clear is, in summary, to oppose Stalin against Chairman Mao and to fracture Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

No matter how clear this might be, we have to go to the bottom of the matter, go back to the facts, the quotes, the transcriptions and registries of the two-line struggle which engaged so much comrade Stalin at the leadership of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of USSR, of the Communist International, in the internal struggle presided by Chairman Mao in the Communist Party of China and the struggle in different Communist Parties in the decades of 1920 and 1930.

Marxism-Leninism-Maoism can only be understood as a unity in a dialectical process of development. In this process, each new great leap of quality in Marxism is composed of small and medium leaps, which synthesize it and elevate it, concentrating the solution of the fundamental problems of the World Proletarian Revolution a whole historical period, as Chairman Gonzalo explained: *“What lies behind this regarding the titans of thought and action that is linked to ‘three bright beacons stand out: Marx, Lenin, Chairman Mao Tsetung’, comrades, a chain of mountains does not have only three summits, there are also small summits, medium summits, but there are also very high summits[...] ‘and how does our ideology will develop itself being a dialectical process? Through great leaps; this is why the document says through great leaps and three great ones, of course!*

⁷ Chairman Gonzalo, First Congress

*Three great qualitative leaps: Marx, Lenin, Chairman Mao Tsetung. However, these three great qualitative leaps could not be understood without other big, medium and even small leaps and with these incessant leaps that, due to their such elementary magnitude, we do not consider".*⁸

The development of Marxism is product of the development of the class struggle of the international proletariat and the two-line struggle in the proletarian vanguard (ICM) in defense of the proletarian red line and against the bourgeois line and the other non-proletarian lines. Only the class struggle, whose center is the politics to conquer and defend the power of the class, can generate our ideology and in the same class struggle develop it through the two-line struggle. As such, it's necessary to see and understand the context in which Maoism develops itself. And this was of the most complex convergence of contradictions and the grueling class struggle in the center of the world revolution that had already been Germany, France, Russia and that had moved to China.

*"When it comes to CONTEXT in which Chairman Mao Tsetung developed and Maoism was forged, internationally on the basis of imperialism, world wars, International Proletarian Movement, national liberation movement, struggle between Marxism and revisionism and restoration of Capitalism in the USSR, three great historical milestones stand out in the current century, the 20th century. First, the October Revolution, 1917, which opens the era of Proletarian World Revolution; second, the Chinese Revolution, 1949, changing the correlation of forces in favor of Socialism; and third, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, started in 1966, as the continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat to keep the path towards Communism. It is enough to point out that Chairman Mao directed two of these glorious historical happenings. And in China, where as the center of world revolution Maoism was concreted."*⁹

For this reason, the Communist Party of China always maintained that the problem of how to justly and correctly appraise and focus the role and direction of comrade Stalin is the one of *"how to sum up the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the international communist movement since Lenin's death."* (CPC China, On the Question of Stalin).

After the death of Lenin, comrade Stalin had to face a complex situation represented by the hard internal struggle in the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the USSR that lasted almost 14 years. A struggle that affected particularly the direction of the Communist International, the defeat of the revolutions in Germany, Hungary, Italy, etc. and the emergence of the new phenomena, fascism, while facing the new problems that represented the construction of socialism and having to confront the feverish preparation for an imperialist aggression war against the USSR. Chairman Mao summarized the fundamental contributions of comrade Stalin as follows:

"Stalin led the CPSU and the Soviet people in upholding the line of socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization and in achieving great successes in socialist transformation and socialist construction."

⁸ Chairman Gonzalo, First Congress

⁹ Ibid

Stalin led the CPSU, the Soviet people, and the Soviet army in an arduous and bitter struggle to the great victory of the anti-fascist war.

Stalin defended and developed Marxism-Leninism in the fight against various kinds of opportunism, against the enemies of Leninism, the Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, and other bourgeois agents.

Stalin made an indelible contribution to the international communist movement in a number of theoretical writings which are immortal Marxist-Leninist works.

Stalin led the Soviet Party and Government in pursuing a foreign policy which on the whole was in keeping with proletarian internationalism and in greatly assisting the revolutionary struggles of all peoples, including the Chinese people.

Stalin stood in the forefront of the tide of history guiding the struggle, and was an irreconcilable enemy of the imperialists and all reactionaries.

Stalin's activities were intimately bound up with the struggles of the great CPSU and the great Soviet people and inseparable from the revolutionary struggles of the people of the whole world".

Thus, Chairman Mao put forward the criteria on the evaluation of the role of comrade Stalin is inseparable from the evaluation of theory and praxis of the World Proletarian Revolution since the death of Lenin. Regarding the errors of comrade Stalin, our party takes position for the established by Chairman Mao that Stalin was 70% right and 30% wrong and that Stalin was "a great Marxist":

"In his way of thinking, Stalin departed from dialectical materialism and fell into metaphysics and subjectivism on certain questions and consequently he was sometimes divorced from reality and from the masses. In struggles inside as well as outside the Party, on certain occasions and on certain questions he confused two types of contradictions which are different in nature, contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and contradictions among the people, and also confused the different methods needed in handling them. In the work led by Stalin of suppressing the counter-revolution, many counter-revolutionaries deserving punishment were duly punished, but at the same time there were innocent people who were wrongly convicted; and in 1937 and 1938 there occurred the error of enlarging the scope of the suppression of counter-revolutionaries. In the matter of Party and government organization, he did not fully apply proletarian democratic centralism and, to some extent, violated it. In handling relations with fraternal Parties and countries, he made some mistakes. He also gave some bad counsel in the international communist movement. These mistakes caused some losses to the Soviet Union and the international communist movement".¹⁰

Chairman Mao maintained that the 'question of Stalin' had repercussions in all the social classes and that a hundred years would be necessary to achieve a definitive conclusion about the topic, but he emphasized that within the international working class and the revolutionary peoples, his memory was more and more venerated.

Besides, when making the evaluation of the role of comrade Stalin's direction in the Communist International on each country, an investigation must be made on the mistakes that

¹⁰ CPC China, *On the Question of Stalin*, 1963

corresponded to the adopted line and instructions and the ones committed by the sinister role played by opportunist elements, such as Wang Ming, who later degenerated in putrid revisionists. Sufficient is to see that only after the Rectification Movement of 1942, when the opportunist lines of “left” and right were defeated, is that a great number of works by comrade Stalin on China were systematically edited by the Communist Party of China, and the book “Lenin and Stalin on the problems of China” became one of the twelve necessary works for the formation of cadres.

Chairman Mao himself established that *“we Chinese should bear the responsibility. In its struggle against “Left” and Right opportunism, therefore, our Party criticized only its own erring comrades and never put the blame on Stalin.”* The Communist Party of China itself declared that regarding some bad advice from comrade Stalin, it sufficed for the Chinese communists to resist a bit to Stalin *“[...]When Stalin did something wrong, he was capable of criticizing himself. For instance, he had given some bad counsel with regard to the Chinese revolution. After the victory of the Chinese revolution, he admitted his mistake”*.¹¹

Regarding the relationship with comrade Stalin, Chu En-Lai declared that when he made mistakes: *“When we held our ground, he could still accept our views and implicitly acknowledge his mistakes.”*¹²

Chairman Gonzalo underlined that *“Comrade Stalin has been a great Marxist-Leninist. Did he make mistakes? Yes, but he never sold the revolution, he may have been wrong, he may not have comprehended; as the Chairman has taught us, his mistake started from an insufficient comprehension of dialectics, there was metaphysics in himself, this is where the problem of comrade Stalin derives from; but no one can deny his enormous role nor take away his condition of Great Leader of the International Proletariat in decades, confronting for the very first time the construction of socialism, without precedents, nor the great effort that he led in the Second World War. He made contributions. Of course he did! It cannot be denied to him. We have to know how to appreciate. There we have then five. When adding the three, they are five; but it is a Pleiad, a considerable whole composed of great figures, of titans of thought and action. There then it is comprised. Why haven’t we enumerated them? That way it’s clear that there are three great figures: Marx, Lenin, Chairman Mao Tsetung. That is the reason. Can you see it?”*.¹³

In his theoretical and practical work, comrade Stalin defined Marxism-Leninism as a second stage of Marxism and added contributions to Marxism-Leninism and its development, shaping them in the construction and defense of socialism, in the dictatorship of the proletariat and the direction of the International Communist Movement.

Starting from the creative application of Marxism-Leninism, including the contributions of comrade Stalin to a new stage of its development, and of all the experience of the International Communist Movement, of the Great Socialist October Revolution (GSOR), of the defeats of the German and Hungarian revolution and the development of the antifascist wars with the World Antifascist Front, established by the 7th Congress of the Communist International, Chairman Mao was able to give a just and correct solution to the problems of the Chinese Revolution and

¹¹ *Commentary of the CPC China, On the Question of Stalin*

¹² *The Communist Party of China and the International, 1960*

¹³ *Chairman Gonzalo, First Congress*

the world revolution, elevating Marxism to a third, new and higher stage. Maoism is thus, product of the international and national class struggle and the arduous two-line struggle in the accumulated process of the International Communist Movement and the world revolution, of which the contributions of comrade Stalin are integrant parts of Maoism.

II – The 7th Congress of the Communist International

The 7th Congress of the Communist International was the first Congress to put forward the problem of the United Front in a complete form, defeating the opportunist right and “left” lines. In it, strategic and tactic problems of the world revolution that were only developed completely by the Chinese Revolution and Maoism are put forward. When studying the 7th Congress we ought to consider, what are its tactical aspects, such as the possibility of reaching a unity with Social Democracy, and what are the strategic problems that it presents.

Chairman Gonzalo established with straightforward clarity that the question of the United Front was presented by comrade Stalin and the International, and that Chairman Mao developed it: *“The problem of the front starts to develop when the Communist International, when Lenin himself, starts to propose this question[...]but I insist, Lenin dies on the 24th. The problem with the front will gain greater dimension in the struggle against fascism, there, that doesn’t mean that, for example, the front hadn’t been proposed for the question in China by Stalin. Of course he proposed it. Stalin was who proposed the Chinese communists should integrate to the Kuomintang and have two personal documents (identification card of the Party and identification card of the front). That is the reality. But it is the Chairman who establishes the laws of the front, the six laws of the front. This is in “Introducing [the magazine] ‘The Communist’”, as you know well.* ¹⁴

The policy of United Front of the 7th Congress of the Communist International represented the culmination of the two-line struggle initiated by Lenin in the Third Congress of the International against the opportunist positions disguised as left, petty-bourgeois positions, which negated the necessity of preparation of the Communist Parties and the role of the masses for the revolution.

Between 1917 and 1921, despite the great impulse towards revolution, especially in Europe, it could not maintain itself, because there were no mature Communist Parties to lead it. With the defeat of the revolution in Hungary and Germany, the first wave of revolution was temporarily thrown back.

The opportunist positions bearing the flag of the so-called “offensive theory”, defended by the “left” opportunists of the leadership of the Communist Party of Germany and supported by Zinoviev and Bukharin, opposed themselves to the tactic of the Open Letter and the correct line of Lenin on the United Front, which they qualified as a “step towards opportunism”. The opportunists defended the theory that the Communist Party should not win over the great majority of the working class, but only its “social determining part” and that through offensive – insurrectionist, adventurer – action of a small group they could carry out the revolution. This thesis had supporters in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Austria and France. The struggle was

¹⁴ Chairman Gonzalo, First Congress

so hard that Lenin himself had to resort to the discipline of the Bolshevik Party so that everyone voted for the thesis presented by the Bolshevik delegation against the “left” opportunists.

At January 8th, 1921, the Communist Party of Germany had published an “Open Letter” in which it made a call to all syndicalist, socialist and workers organizations to combat together the growing reaction and reject the offensive of the capital against the workers’ rights: *“we do not hide in any moment the working masses, nor do we hide ourselves, that the demands we have established cannot put an end to poverty. Without abandoning in any moment, the idea that within the working masses we will spread the slogan of the struggle and the dictatorship, as the only way towards liberation, without renouncing to call and guide the working masses in each favorable moment for the struggle for the dictatorship. The Unified Communist Party is ready to carry out, together with other parties that support themselves on the proletariat, actions to achieve the before-mentioned measures”*.¹⁵

The tactic of the Open Letter was based on the orientation of Lenin to the Communists of England: according to which *“the groups and sympathizers of Communism have to join the Labor Party, even though they are part of the 2nd International”*. Lenin considered the Open Letter to be an exemplary political step in attracting the majority of the working class. As a condition, Lenin emphasized that *“[...]the Communists should, without leave, take all the necessary measures and accept certain compromises in order to be able to influence the broader and deepest worker masses, to unmask their opportunist leaders from a higher tribune”*. In a letter from Lenin to Clara Zetkin and Paul Levy, Lenin declared: *“The only thing I have seen is the Open Letter, which I think is perfectly correct tactics”* ([...])

Back then Lenin had already proposed the law of gradual incorporation of the masses in the revolution: *“At the beginning of the struggle, a couple thousands of truly revolutionary workers were enough to talk about masses[...] If the Party, apart from taking its militants to the struggle, can put forward the workers without a party, that is the beginning of the conquest of the masses[...] during our revolution, there were moments in which a couple thousand workers represented the masses[...] When the revolution is prepared enough already, the concept of masses is different: a couple thousands of workers are not the masses anymore[...] the concept of the masses changes in the sense that it means the majority, and also not just a simple majority of workers, but a majority of all the exploited”*.

It is a grave error to underestimate the “left” deviations within the ICM, because Trotskyism took shelter in it. Comrade Stalin warned us, regarding the deviations by affirming that “the ones from the “left” [deviationists of the ‘left’] are the ones of the right that dress up their right positions with phrases like that”.

“It should not be forgotten that Rights and “ultra-Lefts” are actually twins, that consequently both take an opportunist stand, the difference between them being that whereas the Rights do not always conceal their opportunism, the Lefts invariably camouflage their opportunism with “revolutionary” phrases”. [Joseph V. Stalin, The Fight Against Right and “Ultra-Left” Deviations 1926].

These defeats reflected the lack of ideological and political maturity of the Communist Parties to lead revolution and, at the same time, expressed the necessity of solving what Lenin defined “as getting closer to the Proletarian Revolution”, in other words, on how to specify the experience of

¹⁵ Communist Party of Germany, Open Letter

the Great Socialist October Revolution, combat putschist tendencies and develop the strategy and tactics to make revolution. Until then, the tactics of waiting for the development of a revolutionary political crisis prevailed in the International Communist Movement, in order for the proletariat to be able to raise an armed insurrection. Lenin said the United Front was the path to solve how to *"get closer to the Proletarian Revolution"*.

After the death of the great Lenin, these opportunist tendencies resurrected in the Communist International, which until its 5th Congress was under the presidency of Zinoviev, with the predominance in the interior and in great part of the parties of the International Communist Movement.

The 14th Conference of the Communist Party of the USSR, in April 1925, condemned the thesis of Trotsky on the impossibility of constructing socialism in one country. The 14th Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR (Bolshevik), in December 1925, defeated the new "opposition" led by Zinoviev and Kamenev. The 5th expanded plenary session of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (ECCI), from March to April 1925, approved the thesis for the *"bolshevization" of the communist parties of the Communist International*", a campaign that elevated the ideological, political and organizational level of the parties in the whole world.

In this plenum, it is defined that the International is guided by Marxism-Leninism, because *"Leninism is Marxism of the epoch of monopolist capital, of the imperialist wars and the proletarian revolution"*. This important victory of the red line of comrade Stalin represented a great triumph and a huge number of communist cadres from the whole world were formed in the biggest school of communism in this epoch.

In 1926, Trotskyism had formulated its own "thesis" for the International, being that the pseudo-left positions of Zinoviev, Kamenev, were nothing but a mask of the rotten and demoralized Trotskyism. Comrade Dimitrov said that regarding the clique Zinoviev-Kamenev/Trotsky, *"in the Comintern an international fraction is already forming"*, emphasizing that this struggle should be coated with an international character in defense of the Comintern.

The 7th expanded plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (ECCI), November-December, 1926, marked a decisive victory of the left in the interior of the Communist International. Under the direct leadership of comrade Stalin, the Trotskyist-Zinovievite positions, which accused the Comintern of replacing internationalism with nationalism, were crushed. In its resolution, the plenum affirmed that:

"The enlarged plenum believes that the land of the Soviets [...] has demonstrated its internationalism in deeds and has given most magnificent examples of its internationalism. The enlarged plenum regards the accusation of national narrowness against the CPSU as a calumny." (Jane Degras, Ed., The Communist International: 1919-1943).

In the 7th expanded plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, on October 23, 1926, C. Zetkin, P. Togliatti, O. Geschke, B. Smerral, O. Kuusinen, H. Valecki, J. Dimitrov, Sen Katayama, K. Manner and others, in the name of their parties, presented, to the presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (ECCI), a resolution draft in which they declared that it was no longer possible that Zinoviev continued being the

Chairman of the Comintern, a resolution that was approved by the 7th Plenum, decisively crushing the usurpation of the Comintern apparatus by the Zinovievite clique.

Only in September 27th, in accordance with the resolution of the 8th Plenum, the presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (ECCI) excluded Trotsky from this organism. In its resolution, the 8th Plenum of the (ECCI) qualified Trotsky's position as "a desperate struggle of handful political deserters against the front of the communists of the whole world."

With these victories of the left, conditions were generated for the development and application of a correct line for the Communist International. The 8th Plenum of the (ECCI), of 1927, centered its attention in the preparation of the tasks of the Communist International, facing the race for a new imperialist war against the USSR.

In the resolution of the 8th Plenum of the (ECCI) it was said that: *"The workers masses of the whole world have to be more alert today more than ever. The communists of all countries have to close lines and mobilize their forces against the war already started in China and the one being prepared against the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics"* ¹⁶

The 8th Plenum pointed out that the politics of preparing a war that was adopted by the imperialists inherently brought the fascist, terrorist, methods against the working class and that the *"Internationalization of those methods to wage wars, capitalism needs a 'quiet rear'"*. Thus, the rise of fascism was correctly seen as a part of the aggressor's plans against the USSR and the World Revolution, and the tasks of the proletariat were defined as part of the defense of the homeland of socialism against the imperialist aggression.

In its resolutions, the 6th Congress of the CI (1928) denounced the preparation of an imperialist war, calling the communist movement and the peoples of the world to defend the USSR and struggle against the imperialist intervention in China, defend the Chinese revolution and the struggles of national liberation. Furthermore, This Congress also played an important role in the cohesion of the proletariat against right opportunism by struggling against the coalition of "social-democracy" with reactionary governments.

One has to point out the importance approbation, for the first time, of the Program of the Communist International, which established solid bases to advance by defining, among other things, that: *"The conquest of power by the proletariat does not mean peacefully "capturing" the ready-made bourgeois State machinery by means of a parliamentary majority ([...]) Hence, the violence of the bourgeoisie can be suppressed only by the stern violence of the proletariat ([...]) The conquest of power by the proletariat is the violent overthrow of bourgeois power, the destruction of the capitalist State apparatus (bourgeois armies, police, bureaucratic hierarchy, the judiciary, parliaments, etc.), and the substitution in its place of new organs of proletarian power, to serve primarily as instruments for the suppression of the exploiters"*. (Program of the Communist International, 1928). All developments

¹⁶ The Communist International in documents, page 699.

posterior to the Communist International has to take as a starting point the principles established in this important Congress.

While knowing the inevitability of the Imperialist War and that it would aim for the destruction of the USSR, comrade Stalin established the strategy and tactics to defend the dictatorship of the proletariat and advance the World Proletarian Revolution.

In the 17th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in 1934, Stalin masterly designed the tactics of the World Antifascist Front, as part of the defense of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the development of the World Proletarian Revolution. This Congress represented a powerful influx for the ICM, in which comrade Stalin defined a correct and brilliant characterization of the international situation, of the character of fascism, conceive the defense of the USSR and the nexus to rise the oppressed nations and unify the two great currents of the World Proletarian Revolution, the proletarian international movement and the movement of national liberation, impulsing it, thus showing his status of great Marxist and leader of the ICM: *"a second war against the U.S.S.R will lead to the complete defeat of the aggressors, to revolution in a number of countries in Europe and in Asia, and to the destruction of the bourgeois-landlord governments in those countries"*.¹⁷

Stalin pointed out the necessity of preparing a World Antifascist Front in defense of the USSR and the Proletarian Revolution as part of a war that also takes place at the rearguard of the enemy: *"Not only because the peoples of the U.S.S.R. would fight to the death to preserve the gains of the revolution; it would be the most dangerous war for the bourgeoisie for the added reason that it would be waged not only at the fronts, but also in the enemy's rear. The bourgeoisie need have no doubt that the numerous friends of the working class of the U.S.S.R. in Europe and Asia will endeavor to strike a blow in the rear at their oppressors who have launched a criminal war against the fatherland of the working class of all countries"*.¹⁸

Soon, he notes that:

"In the capitalist countries feverish preparations are in progress for a new war for a new redivision of the world[...]. And if the interests of the U.S.S.R. demand rapprochement with one country or another[...] we adopt this course without hesitation[...] (the war) is sure to unleash revolution and jeopardize the very existence of capitalism in a number of countries, as happened in the course of the first imperialist war".¹⁹

"The masses of the people have not yet reached the stage when they are ready to storm capitalism; but the idea of storming it is maturing in the minds of the masses – of that there can hardly be any doubt. This is eloquently testified to by such facts as, say, the Spanish revolution which overthrew the fascist regime, and the expansion of the Soviet districts in China, which the united counter-revolution of the Chinese and foreign bourgeoisie is unable to stop." (Stalin, Report to the Seventeenth Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.))

¹⁷ Stalin, Report to the Seventeenth Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)

¹⁸ Ibid

¹⁹ Ibid

Comrade Stalin correctly defined the essence of fascism and its connection to the imminent aggression towards the USSR: *“the ruling classes in the capitalist countries are so zealously destroying or nullifying the last vestiges of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy which might be used by the working class in its struggle against the oppressors, why they are driving the Communist Parties underground and resorting to openly terrorist methods of maintaining their dictatorship[...] Chauvinism and preparation of war as the main elements of foreign policy; repression of the working class and terrorism in the sphere of home policy as a necessary means for strengthening the rear of future war fronts – that is what is now particularly engaging the minds of contemporary imperialist politicians”*.

In the 13th Plenum of the ECCI, 1933, Dimitrov defined fascism as follows: *“Fascism is the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital. Fascism tries to secure a base of masses for the monopoly capital amount he petty bourgeoisie, appealing to the peasantry, the artisans, the office and civil service workers that were taken out of the normal way of their lives, and particularly the declassified elements of the big cities, trying also to penetrate into the working class[...]The possibility to prevent [the fascist dictatorship] depends on the strength of the combative proletariat, who are paralyzed by the corrupting [disintegrating] force of social-democracy more than by any other thing”*. [Extracts from the Thesis of the Thirteenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on Fascism, the Danger of War, and the Tasks of the Communist Parties (December 1933), in Jane Degras, ed.; The Communist International: 1919-1943: Documents, vol. 3, London, 1971, pages 296-7]

It's only with the realization of the 7th Congress in 1935, with the defeat of the Trotskyist, Zinovievite and Bukarinist positions, that the ICM is going to assume and decidedly apply the necessity of constructing the United Front and establish the basic guideline of a strategy and tactics of the proletarian revolution. On this basis, the International Communist Movement was able to open a new stage in its development, the one of the existence of Communist parties with mass character, developing guerilla warfare and the united front as instruments to make revolution, as was applied in dozens of countries during the resistance against fascism, the triumph of the Great Patriotic War and the victory of the USSR, culminating with the triumph of the Great Chinese Revolution.

One of the experiences of major importance, over which the thesis of the 7th Congress of the Communist International were established, was the uprising of the Austrian workers in February, 1934. In this great experience, many ideological problems that would develop in posterior years were already concentrated. In a letter addressed to the Austrian comrades, comrade Dimitrov made the following evaluation:

“No, the armed struggle of the Austrian working class was not a mistake. The mistake consisted in the fact that this struggle was not organized and was not waged in a revolutionary, a Bolshevik fashion. The main weakness of the February struggle of the Austrian workers lay in the fact that, owing to the pernicious influence of the Social Democrats, they failed to grasp that it was not enough to resist the attack of fascism, but that they should have turned their armed resistance into a fight for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and for seizing power by the proletariat. The armed fight of the Austrian proletariat was not transformed into an actual armed uprising. Herein lies the main error”. (Georgi Dimitrov, Letter to the Austrian Workers, March of 1934)

Thus, in 1934, Dimitrov had already clearly warned that the proletariat shouldn't limit its struggle only against fascism, but it should keep developing its armed resistance to overthrow the whole bourgeoisie and capitalism, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialism. By pointing out that the main responsibility for this defeat was the bourgeois leadership represented by the social-democracy of Otto Bauer, comrade Dimitrov stressed that:

"The fighting workers, however, who had passed through the school of Austrian social democracy, preferred to starve rather than infringe on sacrosanct private property by a confiscation of provisions[...] It is necessary to make use of the lessons to be drawn from this struggle, which reflects the whole bankruptcy of social democratic policy[...] Your armed struggle was essentially a struggle for the restoration of the Constitution which had been violated by Dollfuss. it did not go beyond those limits and was never transformed into a struggle for power. In the century of the general crisis of capitalism, however, when the bourgeoisie is no longer in a position to rule with the methods of parliamentary democracy and when it embarks on the road of fascism, the decisive question in the workers' struggle is no longer the restoration of the outdated bourgeois democracy, but that of the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the fight for the proletarian dictatorship."

While defending the armed struggle and denouncing the role of social-democracy, comrade Dimitrov affirmed: *"The armed struggle is not an action detached from the general policy of the party. A party which always retreats, which in the course of 15 years urges the workers to avoid fighting, can in no case reconstruct itself politically and organizationally within 24 hours to wage an armed struggle[...] It is a question, comrades, of your organizational break with the Social Democratic Party, and of establishing, together with the communist workers, a genuine fighting unity of the Austrian working class. This fighting unity is possible only on the basis of the revolutionary struggle."*

About the evaluation of these struggles Dimitrov sentenced: *"There is no power on earth that can check the historical development of mankind towards socialism. A battle has come to an end, the fighters are counting their dead, but they have not been crushed. The great proletarian army continues its march forward to the final victory"*. (G. Dimitrov, Letter to the Austrian Workers)

III- THE REPORT OF COMRADE DIMITROV TO THE 7th CONGRESS OF THE COMINTERN

The 7th Congress represented the overcoming of a whole long two-line struggle within the Communist Party Bolshevik of the USSR and the Executive Committee of the Communist International, that took more than 17 years to be resolved. It was only in the 7th Congress of the Communist International, in which the opportunist positions of Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev-Bukharin were finally defeated, that for the first time an Executive Committee subject to the leadership of comrade Stalin was established.

The Report of comrade Dimitrov to the 7th Congress *"The fascist offensive and the tasks of the Communist International in the struggle of the working class against fascism"* was guided by the red line established by comrade Stalin in the 14th Congress of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the USSR and represented a synthesis of all the accumulated experience of the proletarian revolution until then, thus arming the international proletariat to confront the tasks that the World Proletarian Revolution demanded.

In the class struggle at world level and of each country there is a whole set of contradictions, both principal and secondaries, from which derives the principal and secondary enemies in each case and in each stage of a determined revolutionary process.

Leading the Communist International, comrade Stalin knew how to masterly handle the principal contradiction, and, through its solution, the World Proletarian Revolution could develop. This was undeniably proven by the powerful impulse that represented the victory over Nazi-fascism and the triumph of the Great Chinese Revolution, which raised the World Proletarian Revolution to its stage of strategic stalemate.

In middle of the preparation and unfolding of the Second World War, the defense of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat represented by the USSR, facing the imminent imperialist aggression, was converted into the principal problem for the ICM and the Fascist Front became the main enemy to be combated in the whole world.

Dimitrov demonstrated that fascism was the spearhead of imperialism to stop the development of the Proletarian Revolution and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, that means, the principal enemy to be defeated in order to impulse the World Proletarian Revolution and conceived the World Antifascist United Front as an instrument to defeat it, from its preparation, also pointed out the role of China:

“Attacking the Soviet Union, enslaving and partitioning China, and by all these means preventing revolution[...] 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”.²⁰

“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[...]joint struggle against the approaching danger of an imperialist war, a struggle that will make the preparation of such a war more difficult”.²¹

Dimitrov revealed the true class character of fascism, against the social-democrat and Trotskyist pseudo-theories that sought to place fascism over the social classes, as well as the “left” opportunism that underestimated it for not seeing its character and the danger it represented.

“The open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital[...] 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

²⁰ Dimitrov, The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle of the Working Class against Fascism

²¹ Ibid

intelligentsia. In foreign policy, fascism is jingoism in its most brutal form, fomenting bestial hatred of other nations".²²

Did he wanted to say with this, just as some pure critics intend, that the demo-liberal form of the bourgeois dictatorship would not be dictatorship? Evidently not. Dimitrov himself points out that it is an "open dictatorship", of the most reactionary elements that applies terror to attempt stopping the revolution.

Chairman Gonzalo underlined against those that try to equal fascism with the demo-liberal regime, that "fascism is the worst enemy due to the plan it seeks to set up, for the negation of every right, starting by the people's, for undoing all principles of a structuring, to which we use, (e.g.) for the legal defenses that are made. What it seeks is to stop revolution"²³

Chairman Mao affirmed, "Fascism is war"; this is perfectly true". Later on, he complements in a footnote at the end of the corresponding page: In August 1935, in the report to the 7th Congress of the Communist International, titled "The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle of the Working Class against Fascism", comrade Georgi Dimitrov affirmed that "fascism is unbridled chauvinism and predatory war". In July of 1937, comrade Dimitrov published an article titled "Fascism Is War". (Chairman Mao Tsetung, On Protracted War Volume II).

Against those that defended a capitulationist position facing fascism, denying the possibility of developing mass work under fascism, Chairman Gonzalo pointed out:

*"Fascism is violence, it sweeps everything away, this is why one has to wait to be able to organize" [say the capitulationist]; such ignorance. Fascism sweeps everything it can destroy away, and it is on us to build apparatuses that they could not destroy; the Communist International itself, at the 7th Congress, provides the example of the Austrian comrades and tells us that it is feasible to work, develop and organize the masses under fascism and that it is even feasible to legality or semi-legality, every vestige that law provide. Did Chairman Mao not taught us to use the laws, manners and customs, all possible vestiges as well? It is in "expanding rapidly the anti-Japanese forces", point 6, 2nd Volume. Clear things comrades: terror to fascism."*²⁴

Comrade Dimitrov demonstrated the particular mission that fascism was charged with: to defeat revolution through terror and the corporativization of the masses. Furthermore, he has shown the reason behind that: defeating revolution, which was what made it the main enemy. This was a justified and correct definition at that historical situation, which was capable of demonstrating that the essence of fascism, as a policy of imperialism, the financial bourgeoisie and its counterrevolutionary mission, demanded by the situation, needed to deny the demo-liberal order, apply the open terror and the manipulation of the masses through its corporativism.

²² Ibid

²³ Chairman Gonzalo, Put the MRDPP in motion

²⁴ Chairman Gonzalo, PCP, First Congress

Chairman Gonzalo pointed out the contribution made by comrade Stalin and comrade Dimitrov in the characterization of fascism:

"The origin of fascism is in Japan; this is never told. The action is polarized between revolution and counterrevolution and the demo-bourgeois forms and the demo liberal ideas are insufficient to contain revolution, there is the necessity for fascism. In 35, the 7th Congress of the Communist International would take place and Dimitrov would analyze the problem of fascism, would put forward that fascism is the state expression of the financial bourgeoisie, of the financial oligarchy that applies the most shameless terror. A definition like this focuses on terror. Before that, Dimitrov would analyze fascism together with Clara Zetkin and the proposition is that one has to see the negation of bourgeois liberties which fascism represents. There is a quote from Stalin in which is put forward that it is a shameless terror and there is also more written works by him and there is the need to Study what was said by Stalin. In this Congress, Dimitrov would put forward the possibility of unity of the demo-liberal against fascism. That make us see that not everything was terror, to understand that fascism was the negation of the demo-liberal, but the party said that this does not fit us, because the situations are different. Dimitrov considers fascism as the state that represents and defend the interests of the financial bourgeoisie (big bourgeoisie), rejecting the demo-liberal criteria, its principles, introducing the fascist criteria of negation of its own demo-liberal principles, rejecting demo-bourgeois parliamentary order to put forward corporatism and that besides they use terror, soft politics and hard politics. Terror, what fascism does is to develop further violence as a paralyzing instrument for domination to achieve the application of their fascist goals and the corporatist order (political goals). Stalin put forward the union with bourgeois democrats (alliance of certain sectors to smash fascism). In the process of the bourgeois state, the demo-bourgeois system carries on with the danger of taking bad measures to restrict and hinder the struggles, it is not that the demo-liberal make a leap toward fascism, but with the restriction laws they make, they prepare the path to it. Dimitrov would analyze that fascism is not the same everywhere, it has concrete forms according to the conditions in which it develops and the degree of revolution, and it can coexist with parliament for some time. But it has some general things that are common, it sweeps away everything that is bourgeois democracy, potentiate nationalism, use social demagoguery (struggle against the rich), points out to the banks, is a clear expression, even by their buildings, of wealth. Great offerings to the masses, to the workers, they offer employment to the unemployed, land to the peasants, study to the youth, education to the intellectuals, capacity to develop their faculties (anything like that[...]). They are cynical and base themselves in the most shameless lie." (Mentioned work, underlined on the original)

In another document Chairman Gonzalo affirms:

"Some identify fascism and violence. Violence is a method to have the masses subjected; violence is a manifestation of every state. Dimitrov is badly interpreted. The state has a process of development: the bourgeoisie builds a demo-liberal state, but when imperialism comes, such state becomes outdated [...] Violence is an ingredient but the essence of fascism, its essence is the questioning of the demo-liberal order and thus, it develops a frame from the past, renewed, to oppose the struggle of the masses; carry out the implantation of institutions acknowledged as 'natural', its fundamental norms are: personality, property, family and together with these the State, the Church, 'magnifier of men', and the Army as the 'living spirit of nationality'. Fascism is not a simple problem of military and civilians, but the efficiency to fulfill

*it. it must be clarified the character of the corporate state. The government is not openly presented as fascist nor corporate to avoid its discredit; however, its measures show its ideology and its goals.”*²⁵

That’s why comrade Dimitrov correctly upheld the necessity for the communists to defend the democratic rights, placing the defense of these discredited rights as a part of the proletarian revolution and of the open struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat:

“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”.

The right opportunists were seeking to place the struggle against fascism as a stage itself, of bourgeois-democratic character, prior the socialist revolution in the capitalist countries. In crystal clear form, Comrade Dimitrov crushed these positions as he made visible that the struggle against fascism was part of the struggle for the socialist revolution and the possibility of a government of united front.

In addition, He warned that the unfolding of the antifascist struggle would lead to the change in contradictions and the necessity of transiting to the offensive: *“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”.*

He also clearly indicated that the United Front should be applied according to the particular situation of each country, that means, according to the particularities of the revolution on each country and the necessities of the World Antifascist Front: *“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.”*

The Antifascist Popular Front was conceived as a Front that would develop on the basis of a united proletarian front. The condition for the construction of a broad popular antifascist front was the unity of the working class. That means, that the proletariat could exert its hegemony as an independent force. The tactic of unity of action with social-democracy was retaken from what Lenin defined; it was established as a tactic to break broad masses of workers that were still under its influence away. The possibility of concreting the Proletarian Front, was essentially due to an important separation between the right and left wings that took place between the 6th and 7th Congress. This differentiation was mainly defined on its attitude towards the united front, to the defense of the USSR and to the combat against fascism.

“In the first place, the crisis has severely shaken the position of even the most secure sections of the working class, the so-called aristocracy of labor which, as we know, is the main support of Social

²⁵ Chairman Gonzalo, V Extended Plenum of the Regional Committee of Ayacucho, 1972

Democracy. These sections, too, are beginning more and more to revise their views as to the expediency of the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

Second, as I pointed out in my report, the bourgeoisie in a number of countries is itself compelled to abandon bourgeois democracy and resort to the terroristic form of dictatorship, depriving Social Democracy not only of its previous position in the state system of finance capital, but also, under certain conditions, of its legal status, persecuting and even suppressing it.

*Third, under the influence of the lessons learned from the defeat of the workers in Germany, Austria and Spain, a defeat which was largely due to the Social Democratic policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie and, on the other hand, under the influence of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union as a result of Bolshevik policy and the application of revolutionary Marxism, the Social Democratic workers are becoming revolutionized and are beginning to turn to the class struggle against the bourgeoisie".*²⁶

The division within the opportunist parties of the 2nd International was analyzed by Chairman Mao in the "Interview with a New Daily Correspondent on the New International Situation" first in September 1939: "With Chamberlain and Daladier practicing intimidation and bribery, the social-democratic parties affiliated to the Second International are splitting up. One section, the reactionary upper stratum, is following the same old disastrous road as in the First World War and is ready to support the new imperialist war. But another section will join with the Communists in forming a popular front against war and fascism".

During the 16th Congress of the CP (Bolshevik) USSR, 1930, comrade Stalin had affirmed that: "The desertion of the masses of the workers from the Social-Democrats, however, signifies a turn on their part towards communism. That is what is actually taking place[...] It is the guarantee that our fraternal Communist Par-ties will become big mass parties of the working class. All that is necessary is that the Communists should be capable of appraising the situation and making proper use of it[...] [The Communist Parties] must definitely fortify themselves on this road; for only if they do that can they count on winning over the majority of the working class and successfully prepare the proletariat for the coming class battles. Only if they do that can we count on a further increase in the influence and prestige of the Communist International".²⁷

After the 7th Congress, this tendency was proven with the conquest of broad sectors of the masses coming from the social-democracy, however, the unity with social-democracy was not the essence of the proletarian united front, but a tactic to reach it. Dimitrov clearly pointed out that this could not be an ideological unity:

"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".

²⁶ Dimitrov, Unity of the Working Class against Fascism

²⁷ Joseph V. Stalin, Political Report of the Central Committee to the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.), in Works, vol. 12, Moscow, 1949, Page 260-1

When it comes to the fusion between the Communist Party and the social-democratic parties or one of its wings), this was defended under the condition of them abandoning revisionism and adhering the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat:

*“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. [...]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. [...]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.”*²⁸

Afterwards, in 1941, Dimitrov, demonstrating once more the tactic character of the unity proposed in 1935 and the necessity of combating revisionism, noted in his diary: “D. Z. [Manuilsky] and I discussed the draft theses on the Second International. (I offered him my observations: our intention is not evident in the theses; there is no clear orientation toward our goal: the final ousting of social democracy from the workers’ movement, the establishment of a united command for the workers’ movement in the person of the Communist Party; not to allow social democracy to rise again and reprise the counterrevolutionary role that it played at the end of the first imperialist war, etc.)” (page. 354)

Comrade Dimitrov linked the question of the United Front to the question of Power, establishing that the United Front should serve the destruction of the old order and that the government emerging from it would have to be an expression of the new power, of the revolutionary classes.

*“([...]) 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[...] I am not speaking here of a government which may be formed **after** the victory of the proletarian revolution[...]but of the possible formation of a united front government on the eve of and before the victory of the [Soviet] revolution”.*

Comrade Dimitrov aimed against the rightist conceptions that separated the formation of a government of united front from the destruction of the old order and the “left” opportunist conception that excluded the possibility for the formation of said government prior to the complete triumph of the revolution.

“[...]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

²⁸ Extracts of the Main Report delivered at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle of the Working Class against Fascism (20-8-25), Jane Degras, Ed., The Communist International: 1919-1943: Documents, vol. 3, London, 1971, Pages 368-9

ultra-Lefts, on the other hand, recognized only a workers' government formed by an armed insurrection after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie".

Comrade Dimitrov clearly pointed out the nexus between the question of the United Front and the destruction of the old State, establishing three conditions for the emergence of a united front government: 1) the destruction of the old state apparatus (disorganization and immobilization of the state apparatus), 2) unfolding of the mass political struggle against fascism and all reaction, and 3) hegemony of the communist party in the united front:

"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". (underlined by us)

At the 7th Congress of the Communist International, the left needed to inflict a decisive blow to the "left" opportunist tendencies rightists in fact, at the expense of not being able to forge and develop a broad world anti-fascist front. Right] opportunist elements necessarily took advantage of this struggle to hide their opportunist and revisionist positions. This is a law of class struggle in the ideological terrain, every time that struggles against right or "left" deviations develop, an opposite deviationist tendency tends to strengthen during a two-line struggle, another one hides. Aware of the dangers of right deviations: of supposing the existence of an intermediate stage between capitalism and socialism in the imperialist countries, comrade Dimitrov combated these positions in a totally clear form while affirming that:

"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".

This position was ratified in the final resolution of the 7th Congress regarding the report of comrade Dimitrov:

"[...]the toilers must be shown the impossibility of bringing about socialism so long as power remains in the hands of the bourgeoisie". (Resolution adopted by the 7th Congress of the Comintern regarding the report of Georgi Dimitrov, 20 of August 1935).

Highlighting the necessity of combating revisionism, he affirmed:

"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 [reformism, 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".²⁹

The resolutions showed the necessary link between the anti-fascist struggle and the conquest of the dictatorship of the proletariat, by affirming that:

"In the struggle to defend against fascism the bourgeois-democratic liberties and the gains of the toilers, in the struggle to overthrow fascist dictatorship, the revolutionary proletariat prepares its forces, strengthens its fighting contacts with its allies and directs the struggle toward the goal of achieving real democracy of the toilers – Soviet Power. ([...]) The capitalist world is entering a period of sharp clashes as a result of the accentuation of the internal and external contradictions of capitalism. ([...]) Only the welding of the proletariat into a single mass political army will ensure its victory in the struggle against fascism and the power of capital, for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the power of the Soviets."³⁰

"[...]the communists must increase their vigilance in guarding against the danger of right opportunism, and

must carry on a determined struggle against all its concrete manifestations, bearing in mind that the right danger will grow as the tactics of the united front are widely applied. The struggle for the establishment of the united front, of the unity of action of the working class, gives rise to the necessity that the social-democratic workers be convinced by object lessons of the correctness of the communist policy and the incorrectness of the reformist policy, and charges every communist party to wage an irreconcilable struggle against any tendency to gloss over the differences in principle between communism and reformism, against weakening the criticism of social-democracy as the ideology and practice of [class] collaboration with the bourgeoisie, against the illusion that it is possible to bring about socialism by peaceful, legal methods, against any reliance on automatism or spontaneity, whether in the liquidation of fascism or in the realization of the united front, against belittling the role of the party and against the slightest vacillation at the moment of decisive action".³¹

These are the clear warnings and an absolutely clear demarcation. Can there exist enough warnings to prevent revisionism? Evidently not, revisionism is a form of bourgeois ideology within the labor movement, distinct and opposed to Marxism. Those who think they can keep

²⁹ Resolution adopted by the 7th Congress of the Comintern regarding the report of Georgi Dimitrov, 20 of August 1935

³⁰ Resolution adopted by the 7th Congress of the Comintern regarding the report of Georgi Dimitrov, 20 of August 1935

³¹ Ibid

themselves from falling into sins, keeping themselves on the immaculate altar of pure criticism, are already condemned to it. Those who intend to justify the revisionist treason in the 7th Congress don't make a distinction between red and black, between Marxism and revisionism.

Within the context of strategic defensive of the World Proletarian Revolution, the policy established by the 7th Congress of the Comintern was a just and correct policy through which the international proletariat was able to defeat the offensive of the armed counterrevolution represented by fascism. It was with the impulse of this transcendental victory, for which the immense sacrifices and efforts of the Chinese people and the Communist Party of China were made that, with the triumph of their great revolution, four years later, the Proletarian World Revolution reached its stage of strategic stalemate.

IV – THE 7th CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

The Communist Party of China, from its very foundation, has its history intrinsically linked with the Communist International and the two-line struggle within it.

In 1935, the Communist International approved an important resolution affirming that its Executive Committee had to move its center of gravity to the elaboration of the fundamental line and tactic for the ICM, not directly intervening in the internal matters of the communist parties. Chu En-lai recognizes that since then until its dissolution in 1943, the Communist International did not directly interfere in the life of the Communist Party of China: *"In 1935 it adopted a resolution to the effect that it should not interfere with the internal affairs of the various Parties, and after that it did give them a freer hand."* (Zhu Enlai. The Communist International and the Communist Party of China, 1960)

It is false that the Communist International had centered its efforts in the countries of Western Europe. The situation of Germany had a great importance, once it had the biggest communist party on the West, where the opportunist and revisionist tendencies had more strength and influence for the whole struggle between revolution and counterrevolution in the continent. This importance was also for being the rear of the main enemy. Such conditions became the vertex of preparation for the war against the USSR, constituting itself as the problem of biggest magnitude for the USSR, given that the action of the communists would be used as a justification to attack the USSR, just as it was attempted with the phony burning of the Reichstag.

Comrade Stalin and the Communist International were fully conscious of the growing importance of the Chinese revolution. The revolution in China has always taken a central place in the attention of the Communist International. No other country received as many contributions as the Communist Party of China. It suffices to see that, given the central importance of the Chinese question, all the resolutions and telegrams directed to China signed by comrade Dimitrov in the name of the (ECCI), were debated and revised by comrade Stalin or, in other cases, by Molotov.

Comrade Stalin brilliantly established that *“In China, the troops of the old government are confronted not by an unarmed people, but by an armed people, in the shape of its revolutionary army. In China the armed revolution is fighting the armed counter-revolution”*. (Stalin, *The Prospects of the Revolution in China*). This affirmation has great transcendence and represented an enormous contribution to the Communist Party of China with the affirmation that *“the colonial and semicolonial question is in essence the peasant question”*. These two assertions have a great transcendence and played a very important role in the course of the Chinese Revolution. Throughout the Anti-Japanese War and the Third Revolutionary Civil War, chairman Mao studied and applied the correlation between these two fundamental principles.

The conception of the United Front, based on Marxism-Leninism and the contributions of comrade Stalin, could develop through the successive two-line struggles against the “left” and right deviations, with the realization of great rectification campaigns, until reaching the great 7th Congress of the Communist Party of China, that took place in 1945. During the eight years of the Second Revolutionary Civil War in China, the Communist Party of China incurred in three “left” deviations that were only corrected in the Conference of Tsunyi, in January 1935, and the following ten years until its glorious 7th Congress, 1945. These deviations were to some extent linked to the two-line struggle within the Communist International.

The victory of the left in the Communist Party of China, in 1935, is directly linked to the triumph of the left in the Communist International under the leadership of comrade Stalin. When refuting the Trotskyist chattering regarding the Chinese question, Stalin very clearly stated the main tactical principles of Leninism:

“1- The principle of necessity of taking into consideration the national peculiarities and the national characteristics of each country when elaborating the directives of the Comintern for the workers’ movement in that nation”.

“2 – The principle of necessity of each Communist Party of every country to use the smallest possibilities of conquering allies of masses for the proletariat, even if they are temporary, hesitant, indecisive, or untrustworthy”.

“3 – The principle of necessity of taking into account the truth that propaganda and agitation alone are not enough for the political education of the millions of masses of men, furthermore this political education requires the political experience of the masses”.

Stalin continues emphasizing the combination of the general Marxist-Leninist principles with the national characteristics. He wrote:

“Notwithstanding the ideological growth of our Party, unfortunately there is still in our Party a certain type of “leaders” who sincerely believe that it is possible to direct the revolution in China, so to speak, by telegraph on the basis of the known and universally recognized general principles of the Communist International without taking into consideration the national peculiarities of Chinese culture, Chinese customs and traditions. These “leaders” differ from the real leaders precisely in that they always have in their pockets two or three ready-made formulae that are “suitable” for all countries and “obligatory” in all conditions. For them there is no question of taking into account the national character and national peculiarities of each country. For them there is no question of coordinating the general principles of the

Communist International with the national peculiarities of the revolutionary movement in each country, of applying the general principles of the Communist International to the national and state peculiarities of different countries”.

“They do not understand that the main task of leadership at the present time, when the Communist parties have already grown up and have become mass parties, consists in finding, grasping and skillfully combining the national and characteristic features of the movement in each country with the general principles of the Communist International in order to facilitate and make practically possible the carrying out of the basic aims of the Communist movement”.

*“Hence the attempts to stereotype the leadership for all the countries. Hence the attempts to apply mechanically certain general formulae regardless of the concrete conditions of the revolutionary movement in different countries. Hence the endless conflicts between formulae and the revolutionary movement in different countries, which are the essential outcome of the leadership of these miserable leaders”.*³²

The Tsunyi Meeting (January 1935), in which the leadership of Chairman Mao triumphed, represented the overcoming of two “left” opportunist deviations, which were manifested in the attitude of “closed doors” toward the formation of a United Front against the Japanese aggressors. It expressed an understanding on the united front, as an application of the Global Anti-Fascist Front in China, which was debated in the Comintern and would be sanctioned by the 7th Congress of the International. About these mistakes Chairman Mao affirmed:

“The present situation demands that we boldly discard all closed-doorism, form a broad united front and guard against adventurism. We must not plunge into decisive battles until the time is ripe and unless we have the necessary strength.”

The followers of the “closed doors policy” who considered that: *“The forces of the revolution must be pure, absolutely pure, and the road of the revolution must be straight, absolutely straight. Nothing is correct except what is literally recorded in Holy Writ. [...] The yellow trade unions must be fought tooth and nail. [...] Was there ever a cat that did not love fish or a warlord who was not a counter-revolutionary? Intellectuals are three-day revolutionaries whom it is dangerous to recruit. It follows therefore that closed-doorism is the sole wonder-working magic, while the united front is an opportunist tactic. Comrades, which is right, the united front or closed-doorism? Which indeed is approved by Marxism-Leninism? I answer without the slightest hesitation—the united front and not closed-doorism. Three-year-olds have many ideas which are right, but they cannot be entrusted with serious national or world affairs because they do not understand them yet. Marxism-Leninism is opposed to the “infantile disorder” found in the revolutionary ranks. This infantile disorder is just what the confirmed exponents of closed-doorism advocate. Like every other activity in the world, revolution always follows a tortuous road and never a straight one. The alignment of forces in the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary camps can change, just as everything else in the world changes.”*³³

While hoisting the Anti-fascist Front policy, Chairman Mao affirmed: *“Now, in the mounting tide of nation-wide struggle against Japan and of world-wide struggle against fascism, just wars will spread*

³² J. Stalin – Commentaries on questions of the moment: The question of China

³³ Mao On the tactic of struggle against Japanese imperialism, Volume II, p 177

*all over China and the globe. All just wars support each other, while all unjust wars should be turned into just wars—this is the Leninist line.”*³⁴

The Communist International, through its Executive Secretariat, personally commanded by comrade Dimitrov, played an important role in the concreting of the Anti-Japanese United Front. When the incident in Sian took place, in December 1936, comrade Dimitrov played an important role in the correct solution of the conflict. The Secretariat of the Communist International emitted a telegram supporting the position of Chairman Mao, against the position of Wang Ming, who comrade Stalin accused of having a position of an agent provocateur (See Dimitrov Diary, page 42), where it reads:

“1. Zhang Xueliang’s action, whatever his intentions were, objectively can only harm the consolidation of the Chinese people’s forces into a unified anti-Japanese front and encourage Japanese aggression with respect to China.

2. Since this action has been taken and we must reckon with the real facts of the matter, the Communist Party of China vigorously supports a peaceful resolution of the conflict on the following basis:

*a) Reorganizing the government through the inclusion of a few representatives of the anti-Japanese movement, supporters of the integrity and independence of China (The suggested text in our draft: “reorganizing the government from among the most conspicuous activists in the anti-Japanese movement, supporters of the integrity and independence of China”) b) Ensuring the democratic rights of the Chinese people c) Discontinuing the policy of destroying the Red Army and establishing cooperation with it in the struggle against Japanese aggression d) Establishing cooperation with states sympathetic toward the liberation of the Chinese people from the attack of Japanese imperialism”.*³⁵

At the debate of the Secretariat of the ECCI regarding the Chinese Question of August 10th 1937, comrade Dimitrov pointed out that: *“He knows well, and we have talked with him on more than one occasion as I am the one directly dealing with the Chinese party, that the problems confronting the Chinese party are extremely complex and the position of the party is exceptional. Imagine all that has occurred during the past two years. The Chinese Communist Party, which was leading the Red Army in China, takes a crucial turn. You will not find a single section of the Comintern that has been put into such a situation and that has made such a crucial change in its policies and its tactics during the past few years as has been done by the Chinese Communist Party. It fought for the Soviets in China, for Soviet regions, created a Soviet government, created an army, estranged a part of the army of Chiang Kai-shek from him in its aim of Sovietization etc. The cadre of the party, materials of the party and the strength of the party – all of this was concentrated up to 95% if not wholly 100% in these Soviet regions. And in the armed struggle against Nanking the cadre was educated, they matured and grew; good cadre emerged as did their political leaders. ([...]) But from this orientation it was required at this moment to turn around 180 degrees in the policies and the tactics of the party. And now the same cadres, not another party, not new people but the same members of the party, the same masses must conduct a different policy. ([...]) Is this policy correct? Certainly. It is being conducted in accordance with the general line of the VII Congress of the Communist International and is in accordance with the development of the Chinese*

³⁴ Ibid

³⁵ Telegram of the Secretariat of ECCI to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on the Necessity of a Peaceful Solution to the Xian Conflict

revolution. The issue in China today is not of Sovietization but about keeping the Chinese people from being devoured by Japanese imperialism. It is necessary to unite large forces of the Chinese people in the struggle against the Japanese aggression for upholding the independence, freedom and integrity of the Chinese people. And here the party was supposed to – and on the whole it did so – make the transition to the position of struggle not for the Sovietization of China but for democracy, for unification on a democratic base of the forces of the Chinese people against Japanese imperialism, against Japanese aggression.”

The resolution of the Secretariat of the ECCI regarding the Chinese Question of October 10th 1937, affirmed:

“1. The start of the all-Chinese armed resistance against the Japanese aggressor and the successful advances in creating the united national front would mark a new stage in the struggle of the Chinese people[...]

2. One of the most important tasks of the party consists in re-educating the old cadre politically, in military matters and in the use of new methods of work, and in promoting new cadre from the ranks of, above all, the workers and the activists and leaders of the mass revolutionary movement.

3. We must obtain by persistent pressure on the Kuomintang and the Nanking government and by means of mass campaigns the legalization of the functioning of the party in all the regions under the Kuomintang and must turn our attention towards setting up of a massive legal press in the major towns.

4. The Communist Party of China, as the party of the workers, must increase its work especially among the workers and their trade organizations, and draw them into active participation in the anti-Japanese struggle and in the united national front[...]”

In 1937, Wang Ming, who was back then in the Communist International, came back returned to China and went on to head a right capitulationist line at the initial period of the War of Resistance against Japan. Wang Ming negated back then the hegemony and the independence of the proletariat at the core of the Unite Front, he sought to place the Communist Party of China under the rule of the Kuomintang, making concessions to the anti-popular politics of the KMT, he didn't dare to mobilize the masses to struggle nor to expand the popular forces and extend the anti-Japanese bases in the zones occupied by Japan. Wang Ming then advocated the opportunist line “everything through the United Front”.

“During the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression, those comrades who had earlier committed “Left” opportunist mistakes swung over to Right opportunism. Their views were exactly like those of the Chen Tu-hsiu opportunism of 1927 in that they overlooked the anti-feudal aspect. They “saw only the bourgeoisie” and “failed to understand the decisive significance of China’s agrarian revolutionary movement.”

“They ‘do not consider it possible to unleash the revolution in the countryside, because they are afraid that the drawing of the peasantry into the revolution will undermine the united anti-imperialist front’ [...] Such erroneous views were, of course, in direct opposition to the teachings of Lenin and Stalin. According to Stalin: ‘The anti-imperialist united front in China will become stronger and more powerful, the sooner and more solidly the Chinese peasantry is drawn into the revolution’.”. (Chen Po-ta, Stalin and the Chinese revolution)

This opportunist line was combated in the 6th Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China from September to November, 1938, unifying the whole party around the left line of Chairman Mao Tsetung, according to which the proletariat should exercise independence and self-decision making in the heart of the United Front. The report made by Chairman Mao Tsetung with "The role of the Communist Party of China in the National War" (Selected Works, T II, page 201)

In a celebratory message for the 21st year of foundation of the Communist Party of China, comrade Dimitrov combated these capitulationist positions of Wang Ming: *"But there are also internal difficulties in the path of the Communist Party of China. It has to win against the resistance of the sectarian elements, which do not understand that in the present conditions the only way to assure the liberation of the Chinese people is by establishing a united national front against the Japanese aggressor. It also has to keep up the struggle against the capitulationist opportunists, who are on the verge of sacrificing political and organic independence of the Party and the Red Army, and to dissolve them in other organizations and armies"*.³⁶

Between 1942 and 1944, in the course of the great Rectification Movement developed in the Communist Party of China under the leadership of Chairman Mao Tsetung, the Communist Party of China dedicated itself into making a deep evaluation about the problems of its history. Especially on the period between 1931 and 1934, when sharp "left" opportunist deviations were manifested, which would only start to be overcome with the Conference of Tsunyi in January 1935. These discussions were part of the preparation of the great, historic and transcendental 7th Congress of the Communist Party of China (1945), with the triumph of Mao Tsetung Thought. With it, it was established that the communist Party of China was guided by Marxism-Leninism and the ideas of Mao Tsetung Thought.

In the course of this debate, Chairman Mao wrote in "Our Studies and the current Situation", 12th April 1944 (Selected Works, V. III) published together with an attachment "Some questions regarding the history of our party". Such documents, which stand out together with others, are of fundamental importance for the whole ICM. In *our study and the current situation*, he brilliantly systematized the situation when he affirmed:

"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."

Chairman Mao showed how, during the seven years that passed since July 1937, the democratic forces, led by the Communist Party of China, confronted three phases: 1) rise between 1937 and 1940, when the Japanese aggressors centered their attacks against the Kuomintang and underestimated the Communist Party of China. In this phase the Kuomintang undertook serious battle against the Japanese aggressors and politics of unity with the Communist Party of

³⁶ Dimitrov, The People's Front

China. Later, after the fall of Wuhan in October 1938, the Japanese aggressors started to center combat against the anti-Japanese bases led by the Communist Party of China, and the Kuomintang increasingly started to make active anti-communist politics and passive resistance towards Japan.

In this period, Chairman Mao masterly systematized the three fundamental instruments of revolution and their interrelation: *"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"*. (Mao, Introducing the Communist, Volume II, 1939)

2) descent, between 1941 and 1942, in order to prepare and wage war against the United States and England, the Japanese aggressors intensified their politics of centering their attacks against the Communist Party. During this period, the Kuomintang, feeling free-handed, undertook its second anti-communist campaign, attacking the bases of the Communist Party in coordination with the Japanese aggressors.

During this difficult period, the Communist Party initiated the politics of the "three thirds" within the organizations of power in the Front/New State. In this period, the Communist Party of China established the principle of struggling with "reason, advantage and limit without surpassing it" and underlined the necessity of practicing "unity and struggle at the same time and unity through struggle" within the united front. The system of three thirds, whose application is not made in the army, in which the Communist Party should hold *"...the 'three thirds system' should not be introduced into our main forces, but so long as the leadership of the army is kept in the hands of the Party (this is an absolute and inviolable necessity), we need not be afraid of drawing large numbers of sympathizers into the work of building up the military and technical departments of our army. Now that the ideological and organizational foundations of our Party and our army have been firmly laid, not only is there no danger in drawing in large numbers of sympathizers (not saboteurs of course).*

3) new rise starting from 1943: the Japanese aggressors kept centering their attacks against the Communist Party, but the Kuomintang, strongly beaten, kept up the politics of "running to the mountains" and "contemplate the fight". Chairman Mao Tsetung showed that through this relationship of unity and struggle within the united front, in middle of the combat with the main enemy, the Communist Party was able to develop and get stronger. Chairman Mao affirmed that the Kuomintang "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 ".³⁷

In "On New Democracy", regarding the character of the democratic revolution in China, Chairman Mao put forward that it doesn't belong to the old bourgeois revolutions, but to the

³⁷ Mao. Our Studies and the current situation. 12th April 1944, V III

“Socialist World Revolution”, he affirmed that *“This correct thesis advanced by the Chinese Communists is based on Stalin’s theory”*.³⁸

The problem of the uninterrupted revolution, developed by Chairman Mao, departs from Stalin and the International, as Chairman Gonzalo pointed out:

*“Did the Communist International knew? Of course it did. many things, my dear comrades, that are on Mariátegui are from the Communist International, this is why you do not know; I believe that we do not know history and we talk of things we do not know. Do you believe that the Communist International did not know that revolution was uninterrupted, you believe the Communist International did not know that? Comrade Stalin perfectly knew that. Was Stalin not a Marxist? Please, man!”*³⁹

In the course of war against the Japanese aggressors, the contradiction between the Communist Party of China and the Kuomintang turned into a secondary contradiction, although this one, by its own nature, has an antagonistic and irreconcilable character. When the main enemy was defeated, there was a change in the principal contradiction and the principal enemy and there was a new differentiation in the interior of the Antifascist Front. The secondary enemies, just like Yankee imperialism and the Kuomintang, allies at the time, increasingly became main enemies, and the revolution entered a new phase, starting the *Third Revolutionary Civil War*, developed until the conquest of Power in the whole country.

V – The Great Patriotic War

“After the first imperialist war the victor states, primarily Britain, France and the United States, had set up a new regime in the relations between countries, the post-war regime of peace. The main props of this regime were the Nine-Power Pact in the Far East, and the Versailles Treaty and a number of other treaties in Europe. The League of Nations was set up to regulate relations between countries within the framework of this regime, on the basis of a united front of states, of collective defense of the security of states. However, three aggressive states, and the new imperialist war launched by them, have upset the entire system of this post-war peace regime. Japan tore up the Nine-Power Pact, and Germany and Italy the Versailles Treaty. In order to have their hands free, these three states withdrew from the League of Nations. The new imperialist war became a fact.” (Stalin. Report on the 18th Congress of the party regarding the work of the Central Committee of the CP USSR)

In 1935, fascist Italy had thrown itself and occupied Abyssinia. In the summer of 1936, Italy and Germany intervened in Spain against the Republic. In 1937, Japan, after occupying Manchuria, advanced over the northern and central region of China, occupying Beijing, Tientsin and Shanghai. In the beginning of 1938, Germany occupied and annexed Austria and, in autumn, the region of the Sudetes in Czechoslovakia. At the end of 1938, Japan occupied Canton. In March 1935, Hitler proclaimed a new law establishing obligatory military service, breaking with the Treaty of Versailles and exceeding France in troops.

Only the USSR made systematic efforts for a broad pact of collective security with the western powers, against the expansion of the fascist aggression and to breaking the attempt of isolating

³⁸ Mao. On New Democracy, 1940, T II

³⁹ Chairman Gonzalo, First Congress

the USSR. The revolutionary diplomacy of the USSR spent the 1930 decade trying to obtain a treaty of non-aggression with England and France without reaching it. England and France systematically rejected signing a pact with the USSR, adopting the lying “appeasing policy”. Which means, While Hitler threatened to annex countries of Europe, Austria and others, invaded Czechoslovakia and Poland, nothing was done to stop it, in the attempt to push Germany against the USSR. Politics that ended in the treaty of the Munich Conference, celebrated on the 29th and 30th of September 1938, between Hitler, Chamberlain, Mussolini and Daladier, who gave up Czechoslovakia. Regarding this, comrade Stalin affirmed, during in the 18th Congress of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the USSR, celebrated in March 1939:

“The policy of non-intervention means conniving at aggression, giving free rein to war, and, consequently, transforming the war into a world war. The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire, not to hinder the aggressors in their nefarious work : not to hinder Japan, say, from embroiling herself in a war with China, or, better still, with the Soviet Union : to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply into the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this, to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another; and then, when they have become weak enough, to appear on the scene with fresh strength, to appear, of course, “in the interests of peace,” and to dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents.”

The USA had made so many campaigns demonizing the USSR up to this point, that for it to enter the war it had to mount the coward machination of Pearl Harbor. Hundreds of North-Americans, military and civilians, were massacred and wounded in it, due to having been taken by surprise by the operation Tora Tora of Japan. An attack on the naval base in Hawaii of which the Yankee government knew beforehand, but needed something that would cause popular indignation and national commotion so that the Congress would be obliged to approve entering the war.

Counting with his expertise, the great Stalin succeeded in a non-aggression pact with Nazi Germany in one week and in the next one with fascist Japan, gaining valuable time to prepare for the German invasion. The secret correspondence between Stalin, Churchill, Roosevelt, and soon after with Atle and Eisenhower, is a proof of how comrade Stalin applied with mastery the World Antifascist Front, placing the Soviet State as the axis and in the defense of the popular forces led by the communist parties in each country involved in the conflict. This is fact and is extensively documented.

When Germany invaded the USSR on 22nd of June 1941, the next day Chairman Mao affirmed: *“For Communists throughout the world the task now is to mobilize the people of all countries and organize an international united front to fight fascism and defend the Soviet Union, defend China, and defend the freedom and independence of all nations. In the present period, every effort must be concentrated on combating fascist enslavement”*. ⁴⁰

Soon after he specified the form and content that should be assumed in China:

“For the Chinese Communist Party, the tasks throughout the country are as follows: 1. Persevere in the National United Front Against Japan, persevere in Kuomintang-Communist co-operation, drive the

⁴⁰ Mao. On the International Anti-Fascist United Front. 1941. T II

Japanese imperialists out of China, and by these means assist the Soviet Union. 2. Resolutely combat all the anti-Soviet and anti-Communist activities of the reactionaries among the big bourgeoisie. 3. In foreign relations, unite against the common foe with everybody in Britain, the United States and other countries who is opposed to the fascist rulers of Germany, Italy and Japan".⁴¹

Again, we point out that Chairman Gonzalo put forward: "To make the evaluation of the Communist International, especially its 7th Congress, linked to the world war and the role of comrade Stalin". In the exposition in front of the First Congress of the Communist Party of Peru Chairman Gonzalo, fundamenting substantiate the definition of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, affirmed:

"The World war II is a milestone of transcendence in world history, is strictly began on 1939 and ended in 1945 ([...]) it is a world war in which on the one hand there is the imperialist plunder, the dispute for world hegemony, which Germany, under Hitler, claimed to itself; but on the other hand there is the defense of socialism and development of revolution, it is clear and correct that the war then unleashed by the USSR was a great patriotic war [...] it was a justified war of defense, a great patriotic war, this is how it was defined with all correctness, that is why; And development of the world revolution because more than that glorious defense that costed 20 million men to USSR, we have an anti-imperialist struggle that will develop in the oppressed countries, mainly in China ([...])"

It is the great war of resistance of the oppressed nations, like China, like Korea, like Birmania, like Indonesia, Philippines, etc. Where precisely the imperialists fled like rats and went to the peoples of those nations who took up arms; the ones who had luck to rely on a communist party had triumphed and advanced and the ones who did not, at least freed themselves of being colonies by means of transactions, as an example, Indonesia had ceased to be, as a consequence of this war, a colony of the Netherlands.

There was a sinister plan in this war: the crusade against the USSR, [...] (a word that expresses) clearly its reactionary innards and because this is how it was put forward by Hitler himself, as an anti-Bolshevik crusade, because the black dream they had was to sweep the USSR away from the face of Earth; futile, glass dream, it shocked against the power of the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the leadership of the party and comrade STALIN, the Russian proletariat, the Russian people. Comrades, heroic pages! Stalingrad [...] also there was clearly seen the dirty, tricky work of the imperialist allies [...] seeking that fascist Germany would defeat USSR [...] What could Russia do facing such smite? To apply a strategic defensive then, and that is what was done [...] together with razed grounds, not leaving anything to them, naked land ([...])

"Comrades, the dictatorship of the proletariat was at stake, revolution was at stake, we cannot stop in our minds nor simple let ourselves be stupefied as said by Chairman Mao, for the defense of pieces of land neither bases; this is how we are, the communists."

All this great deed of the World War II has shaken the world and marked men and given good results; not everywhere, but inclusively had given medium results, as example, France and Italy, the reason: revisionists, they let be carried away due to triumph, the results of victory having the 500 thousand men guerrillas, 300 thousand men, forged in this heroic struggle of the class and the European peoples that we also have to take into account. This is then, the World War II is a milestone of great transcendence. The

⁴¹ Chairman Gonzalo, PCP, First Congress

prestige of the USSR highly increased across the Earth. Enough is to see the newspapers at that time ([...]) given that, we can no more judge comrade STALIN, this is why the party said we have to look at the World War II".⁴²

We consider that this appreciation has a value of synthesis for the whole ICM. The victory against fascism on the Second World War is one of the great historic all events of the process of the Proletarian World Revolution, which has to be seriously studied for its just and correct comprehension, it has to be highlighted and celebrated.

After the end of the Great Patriotic War, the imperialist camp found itself deeply beaten, three important imperialist powers were defeated: Germany, Japan and Italy. Other powers such as France and England were weakened, as for the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the whole world enormously rose up. The socialist camp, covering the popular democracies had expanded and a powerful movement of national liberation was impulsed.

Chairman Mao warned us that it would be a grave mistake to underestimate the importance of the victory on the Second World War:

*"The world revolutionary united front, with the Soviet Union at its head, defeated fascist Germany, Italy and Japan. This was a result of the October Revolution. If there had been no October Revolution, if there had been no Communist Party of the Soviet Union, no Soviet Union and no anti-imperialist revolutionary united front in the West and in the East led by the Soviet Union, could one conceive of victory over fascist Germany, Italy, Japan and their running dogs? If the October Revolution opened up wide possibilities for the emancipation of the working class and the oppressed peoples of the world and opened up realistic paths towards it, then the victory of the anti-fascist Second World War has opened up still wider possibilities for the emancipation of the working class and the oppressed peoples of the world and has opened up still more realistic paths towards it. It will be a very great mistake to underestimate the significance of the victory of World War II".*⁴³

In the editorial of the Hongqi magazine of 1965, published for the occasion of the 20 years of the victory on the Anti-fascist War, the Communist Party of China affirmed, regarding the evaluation of this historic experience:

"Points out that surrounding the evaluation of the experience in the Anti-Fascist War questions of principles between Marxist and revisionist are defined: "There is an entire series of important differences of principle between Marxist-Leninist and modern revisionism in the question of how to evaluate the Anti-Fascist War and in the lessons that can be extracted from it"

They highlight the great role of the anti-fascist war in defense of Socialism, of the Peoples War and the United Front:

"In the first place, the history of anti-fascist war shows that the socialist system has an enormous vitality that can resist the most severe test and that a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is invincible.

⁴² Ibid

⁴³ Mao. Revolutionary Forces of the World, unite, Struggle against the imperialist aggression! November 1948. T IV

In second place, the history of the anti-fascist war shows that imperialism is the source of all wars in modern times, that the aggressive nature of imperialism will not change and because of that, to defend world peace it is necessary to persist in the struggle against imperialism.

In third place, the history of the anti-fascist war shows that the peoples war sure to attain victory, that it is completely possible to defeat the imperialist aggressors, that imperialism is a paper tiger, who is apparently strong, but in reality, is weak, and that the atomic bomb is also a paper tigress and it is the people and not the arms, of any class, who decide the outcome of the war.

In fourth place, the history of the anti-fascist war shows that, in order to defeat the imperialist aggressor, it is imperative to trust in the unity of the revolutionary forces of the people in all countries, to attract to our side all the forces that can be won, to form the broadest possible international united front and concentrate our blows on the main enemy of the peoples of the world”.

Still In the same editorial it is shown how Khrushchev, when he had to praise the role of the Great Patriotic War aiming to insufflate the “Great Russian” feeling among the masses, negated the role of the anti-fascist war, affirming that fascism was crushed only by the USSR, crashing this way against proletarian internationalism:

“The Soviet Union, which was the only socialist country of that time, was the main force to annihilate the German fascists and played the decisive function in the defeat of fascism. The Chinese people undertake its revolutionary war against Japanese imperialism, for a really long time on its part, and made one of the most significant contributions to the victory in the Anti-Fascist War. The peoples of many countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, Oceania and America made their own contribution to the Anti-Fascist War. The peoples of the countries occupied by the German, Italian, and Japanese fascists also persisted in the guerilla war and the clandestine struggles at home or organized in armies in foreign countries, which later came back to fight in their home countries. In the last period of the war, the people in some countries rose up successfully in revolting armies and liberated great parts of their territory, or sent troops to unite in the persecution of the hordes and to support the liberation struggles of the peoples of other countries after their own countries had been liberated. In Germany, Italy and Japan, the masses of the people under fascism also resisted at home in various ways, even including armed struggle, and supporting the struggle of other peoples that suffered the fascist aggression and slavery. All these struggles have contributed to the victory of the Anti-Fascist War and each one takes a place of honor in the history of the War. The revisionist Khrushchev, tries to write to erase from a pen stroke played against the peoples of all the other countries in the Anti-Fascist War, declaring arrogantly that the Soviet Union was the only force in “breaking the German fascist machine”. In this way they intend to promote great-power chauvinism and demand that other countries that were helped by the Soviet army had to obey their orders, give in to their control and harassment and put up with their exploitation”.

Under the guns of the glorious Red Army, the Nazi German State and its capitalist relations of production were destroyed, Socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat arose in Eastern Germany. The Red Banner of the Communist Party and the USSR waving over the shadowed and destroyed German Reichstag is an undeniable great moment of the international proletariat that symbolize the whole heroic and glorious epic of the struggle against fascism in defense of the USSR and for the development of the Proletarian World Revolution. The sentence made by comrade Dimitrov when he embarked in the direction of USSR after the great victory in the Nazi Tribunal in Leipzig was thus accomplished: “we will make Germany Soviet!”.

This way the lapidary words of Chairman Gonzalo demand full value and understanding:

“Against history, what do the words do, comrades, what could the denials do, what could the questionings do, what could the interrogations do? Nothing! The reason: as time passes on, history has wider dimension and perspective, so, further clearly this shining peak will stand out.”

(Chairman Gonzalo, First Congress, Transcriptions)

The 7th Congress had its highest and fullest expression and development at the development of the Great Patriotic War to which the Anti-Japanese Resistance War against the Japanese aggressors in China is included. Through the Anti-Japanese United Front formulated by Chairman Mao, which he developed by applying unity and struggle and independence of the Communist Party, defining it as one of the three fundamental instruments of the revolution, fulfilling a fundamental role when stopping close to 60% of the Japanese army in the important East Front. Beyond this, all the other wars and anti-fascists actions of resistance in Italy, France, Austria, Yugoslavia, Japan, Spain, Greece, Belgium and dozens of other countries were added, as part of the Global Anti-fascist Front. This great historic experience is part of Maoism, and to negate its role, importance and meaning is revisionism.

The defeat of fascism meant the change in the principal contradiction in each country. During the course of the anti-fascist wars, the imperialist bourgeoisie of each country was weakened and the communist parties and the masses were enormously strengthened. The defeat of the fascist regime led to the consequent change of the main contradiction and the main enemy in the interior of these countries. At the Communist Parties of those times, wherever there was an opportunist leadership, they limited themselves to a struggle against fascism in favor of the old bourgeois order and didn't lead the revolution until the end.

While synthesizing the experiences of the United Front, Chairman Mao taught us that the correct handling of the politics of the United Front of the proletariat can be summarized in three fundamental questions: whom base oneself on, whom to ally and whom to combat ⁴⁴. A correct handling of these three questions and their interrelation, in each stage and phase of the revolution guarantee an asserted political leadership. The contradiction between the anti-fascist front and the fascist front, on the one hand, and the contradiction in the interior of the anti-fascist front on the other, between the popular forces and the anti-popular forces, the success or defeat of the revolution depended on the correct handling of these contradictions.

In the countries, such as Italy and France, where a right opportunist leadership prevailed, the communist party didn't lead the revolution to the end, leaving it in the middle of the way. The leadership of the respective parties didn't proceed with the struggle to defeat the whole imperialist bourgeoisie of their own country and capitulated in front of it thus betraying the revolution, handing over the weapons, degenerating themselves by following the putrid parliamentary way.

⁴⁴ 9th Commentary to the letter of the CPSU, July 1964: “The communism of Khrushchev and the lessons it gives to the world”.

Chairman Gonzalo summarized the problem with clarity, that it was not the anti-fascist front, but the revisionist criteria of Thorez, Togliatti, as also Earl Browder who centered only in the struggle against fascism: *"Two problems of great repercussion arose in the Communist International during the 1920s, the problem of Germany, which means the revolution in an advanced country, and the problem of China, which means, the revolution in a not advanced country. Later, the situation sharpened with the rise and triumph of fascism and the question on how to build the Front; there were revisionist criteria from Togliatti and Thorez who were seeking to maintain the order and not to overthrow it and focused only on the fight against fascism"*. (PCP. International Line).

The two-line struggle at the core of the Comintern during the period of the 7th Congress (1935-1943) fundamentally developed itself between the left line represented by comrade Stalin, Chairman Mao Tsetung and comrade Dimitrov, against the ideas, criteria, positions and right opportunist lines of Trotskyism, Browder, Tito, Togliatti and Thorez.

Chairman Mao established with clarity and correction that the revisionist line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union "arose in the 20th Congress and was systematized in the 22nd congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" (About the false Communism of Khrushchev and the Historical Lessons for the World). For revisionism to be able to impose itself on parties where right positions predominated, these parties had to make successive Congresses in order to modify their ideological and political line, which had then been oriented by the Communist International with its 7th Congress, and was substituted by the most putrid revisionism. Just as it happened with the 10th Congress of the Communist Party of Italy, the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of Bulgaria. The 10th Congress of the Communist Party of Italy substituted the struggle for the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat with the 'path of structural reforms'.

Chairman Mao defined that the rise of modern revisionism takes place *"starting at the Second World War, the international communist movement, on the side of great developments it developed its greatest anti-thesis inside its own lines, a revisionist counter-current opposed to socialism, to Marxism-Leninism and the proletarian revolution. This counter-current was mainly represented first by Browder, later by Tito and today by Khrushchev. Khrushchev's revisionism is nothing more than a continuation and the development of Browder's and Tito's revisionism.* (CPC The Proletarian Revolution and the Revisionism of Khrushchev)

The opportunist and revisionist right inside the international communist movement is clearly defined and developed in modern revisionism of Thorez, Togliatti, Tito and Khrushchev. And that *"Khrushchev is a disciple of Bernstein and Kautsky and also Browder and Tito[...]Browder's and Tito's revisionism as well as the theory of the "structural reforms" arose at the start the Second World War. These varieties of revisionism are local phenomenon in the international communist movement. Nevertheless, Khrushchev's revisionism arose and acquired predominance in the leadership of the CPSU, it became a great problem of general significance for the international communist movement, from which the success or the failure of the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat (considered in its whole) depends"*. (PCCH. The Proletarian Revolution and the Revisionism of Khrushchev, 1963)

The first person to put forward the positions of modern revisionism was Earl Browder, already in the 1930s. *"Browder had begun to reveal his revisionism around 1935. He worshiped the bourgeois*

*democracy renounced to the necessary criticism to the bourgeois government and took the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie for the paradise of communism. His motto was: 'Communism is Americanism of the 20th century'*⁴⁵

With the formation of the International and National Antifascist United Front during the World War Two, he was obsessed with 'democracy', 'progress' and the prudence of the bourgeoisie, he was totally bent facing the bourgeoisie and degenerated in a capitulationist from the bottom to the top[...] He preached that the Teheran Declaration of the Soviet Union, of the United States and Great Britain had permanently opened for the world an epoch of 'protracted trust and cooperation' between capitalism and socialism and could assure a 'stable peace for generations'," ⁴⁶(idem)

Browder pretended to give to the revolutionary debates and resolutions of the 7th Congress of the Communist International an interpretation convergent with his rightist position of class collaboration. The positions of Browder were fiercely combated by the Communist International.

The ones seeking to identify the origin of modern revisionism in the 7th Congress of the Communist International are repeating Browder, opposing Chairman Mao with Stalin, and doing nothing more than resurrecting Trotsky and the old paladins of revisionism. Under the leadership of comrade Stalin, hard struggles against revisionism were developed inside the Communist Party and the Communist International, while comrade Stalin was alive revisionism never managed to get its head up and was crushed. Revisionism could never raise its head and impose itself while Stalin was alive.

After the dissolution of the Comintern in 1943, the right deviations and revisionism, such as the Titoism, were fiercely combated by comrade Dimitrov: *"With frequency we can lose track of the fact that, although the Comintern does not exist, the communist parties form a united international communist front under the leadership of the most powerful men in the experience of the struggle against capitalism and the construction of socialism: the party of Lenin and Stalin; that all communist parties have scientific theory as their only guide for action – Marxism-Leninism -, and that all of them have a generally recognized teacher and leader – comrade Stalin – leader of the glorious Bolshevik party and the great land of socialism"*. (Dimitrov. Report to the 16th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Workers Party (Communist), July of 1948)

Regarding the mistakes of the 7th Congress, we consider that these mainly took place regarding the application of the resolutions in each country, due to the existence of many parties that were not mature enough and due to capitulationist opportunist leaders, who didn't lead the revolution to the end and sold it, of course. Regarding the limitations, these were overcome with the solution of the problems by Chairman Mao in the development of the Peoples War and the triumph of the revolution in China, which, with the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, its magisterial contributions developed in a new, third and superior stage of Marxism: Maoism.

⁴⁵ Willian Z Foster, quoting Browder at "History of the Communist Party of the United States"

⁴⁶ E. Browder "Teheran: Our Path in War and Peace"

It's the duty of the communist parties on each country to make a serious and well-thought evaluation of the historic process of the communist movement in their own country, clearly differentiating the errors that take place at the practical work (problems of application) from the errors of principle (problems with the conception), separating Marxism from revisionism, to serve the just, correct and full evaluation of these extraordinary milestone of world history, in general, and the Proletarian Revolution, in particular.

VI – Conclusion

The 7th Congress of the Communist International was a great Marxist-Leninist Congress led brilliantly by comrade Stalin who laid bases for the Proletarian World Revolution to be able to make a powerful leap, with Maoism and the Peoples War.

Chairman Gonzalo, when highlighting what was established by Chairman Mao, underlined in regards to the role of comrade Stalin that *“There are historical figures that always require time span for its full comprehension, there are multiple cases in history; it was not understood that even the figures are historically re-evaluated, and sometimes they are forgotten and soon they are again upheld or acknowledged in these or those contributions and, in every field this happens, even on music comrades. Let us put an example forward: nowadays everyone enjoys listening to Bach, was Bach acknowledged in the last century? No, it was then taken from him, it was re-evaluated and how much time had to pass? Do you know what does this Irani comrades speaks of? He Speaks as a restrained dog, with lent thought, is not good. One cannot condemn comrade Stalin like it is being done, to the letter! No this cannot be consent,”* (Chairman Gonzalo, I Congress PCP, 1988)

This affirmation is covered with a great significance. The Irani Avakianists cackle that “if there are a hundred years ahead to understand the historic figure of comrade Stalin, there are hundred years to combat him!” For our party, 67 years after the death of comrade Stalin, when one brings into the light the historic experience of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat under the leadership of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism with contributions of universal validity of Chairman Gonzalo, the great and unscathed figure of comrade Stalin elevates more and more.

The undertaking of the first Unified Maoist International Conference and the founding of the New International Organization of the Proletariat is a great event that will mark the history of the ICM and the Proletarian World Revolution for decades. Such event, facing the highest milestone of the glorious Communist International, its 7th Congress, at this point cannot make a criminal silence on it, not to say lowering oneself to the judgment of Trotskyist and other revisionist, as until recently Avakian and Prachanda stand out, but uphold it as a decisive and great event in the history of the ICM and of the proletarian revolution. At this historic moment, to remove the red flag of the 7th Congress, the role of comrades Stalin and Dimitrov at the leadership of the ICM from the shadows and to retrieve them to the golden pantheon of the world proletariat is an imperative demand for the communists of the whole world.

The history of the ICM is not simply for record or information. To our Party it's mainly a weapon of combat and of great positive and negative lessons, in the struggle against revisionism and opportunism, as a condition to fulfill what was foreseen by Chairman Mao that

“within the fifty to hundred years”, the complete razing of imperialism and the whole reaction from the face of the earth by the Proletarian World Revolution.

Long live the Centenary of the Glorious Communist International!

Long live the victory over Trotskyism, revisionism and all opportunism inside the Communist International!

Long live its great 7th Congress and the firm, resolute and wise leadership of comrade Dimitrov!

Long live the magisterial leadership of comrade Stalin in the Communist International and its 7th Congress, in the World Anti-fascist Front and the Great Patriotic War!

Long live the 75th anniversary of the victory against Nazi-fascism!

Long live Chairman Mao, developer of the Revolutionary United Front and the Theory of the Three Fundamental Instruments of the Revolution!

Long live Chairman Gonzalo, continuer of Marx, Lenin and Chairman Mao, greatest Marxist-Leninist-Maoist living on the face of the earth and his almighty Thought!

Down with revisionism and all opportunism!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism and the contributions of universal validity of Chairman Gonzalo!

Long live the invincibility of the People’s War and its universal validity!

Communist Party of Brazil (Red Faction) – C.P.B. (RF)

Central Committee

February 2020