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I. INTRODUCTION

At the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Italy Comrade Togliatti launched an open attack on the Chinese Communist Party and provoked a public debate. For many years, he and certain other comrades of the C.P.I. have made many fallacious statements violating fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism on a whole series of vital issues of principle concerning the international communist movement. From the very outset we have disagreed with these statements. However, we did not enter into public debate with Togliatti and the other comrades, nor did we intend to do so. We have always stood for strengthening the unity of the international communist movement. We have always stood for handling relations between fraternal Parties in accordance with the principles of independence, equality and the attainment of unanimity through consultation as laid down in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. We have always held that differences between fraternal Parties should be resolved through inter-Party consultation by means of bilateral or multilateral talks or conferences of fraternal Parties. We have always maintained that no Party should make unilateral public charges against a fraternal Party, let alone level slanders or attacks against it. We have been firm and unshakable in thus standing for unity. It was contrary to our expectations that Togliatti and the other comrades should have utilized their Party Congress to
launch public attacks against the Chinese Communist Party. But since they directly challenged us to a public debate in this way, what were we to do? Were we to keep silent as we had done before? Were the "magistrates to be allowed to burn down houses, while the common people were forbidden even to light lamps"? No and again no! We absolutely had to reply. They left us no alternative but to make a public reply. Consequently, our paper Renmin Ribao (People's Daily) carried an editorial on December 31, 1962, entitled "The Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us".

Togliatti and certain other comrades of the C.P.I. were not at all happy about this editorial and they published another series of articles attacking us. They declared that our article "often lacked explicit clarity", was "highly abstract and formal" and "lacked a sense of reality". They also said that we were "not accurately informed" on the situation in Italy and on the work of the C.P.I. and had committed an "obvious falsification" of the views of the C.P.I. They accused us of being "dogmatists and sectarians who hide their opportunism behind an ultra-revolutionary phraseology", and so on and so forth. Togliatti and the other comrades are bent on continuing the public debate. Well then, let it continue!

In the present article we shall make a more detailed analysis and criticism of the fallacious statements made by Togliatti and the other comrades over a number of years, as a reply to their continued attacks against us.

When Togliatti and the other comrades have read our reply, we shall see what attitude they will take — whether they will still say that we “often lack explicit clarity”, that we are “highly abstract and formal” and “lack a sense of reality”, that we are “not accurately informed” on the situation in Italy and on the work of the C.P.I., that we are committing an “obvious falsification” of the views of the C.P.I., and that we are “dogmatists and sectarians who hide their opportunism behind an ultra-revolutionary phraseology”. We shall wait and see.

In a word, it will not do for certain persons to behave like the magistrate who ordered the burning down of people’s houses while forbidding the people so much as to light a lamp. From time immemorial the public has never sanctioned any such unfairness. Furthermore, differences between us Communists can only be settled by setting forth the facts and discussing them rationally, and absolutely not by adopting the attitude of masters to their servants. The workers and Communists of all countries must unite, but they can be united only on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, on the basis of setting forth the facts and discussing them rationally, on the basis of consultations on an equal footing and reciprocity, and on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. If it is a case of masters wielding batons over the heads of servants, incanting “Unity! Unity!”, then what is actually meant is “Split! Split!” The workers of all countries will not accept such splittism. We desire unity, and we will never allow a handful of people to keep on with their splitting activities.
II. THE NATURE OF THE PRESENT GREAT DEBATE AMONG COMMUNISTS

As a result of the challenge the modern revisionists have thrown out to Marxist-Leninists, a widespread debate on issues of theory, fundamental line and policy is now unfolding in the international communist movement. This debate has a vital bearing on the success or failure of the whole cause of the proletariat and the working people throughout the world and on the fate of mankind.

In the last analysis, one ideological trend in this debate is genuine proletarian ideology, that is, revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, and the other is bourgeois ideology which has infiltrated into the ranks of the workers, that is, an anti-Marxist-Leninist ideology. Ever since the birth of the working-class movement, the bourgeoisie has tried its utmost to corrupt the working class ideologically in order to subordinate the movement to its own fundamental interests, weaken the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries and lead the people astray. For this purpose, bourgeois ideological trends assume different forms at different times, now taking a Rightist form and now a "Leftist" form. The history of the growth of Marxism-Leninism is one of struggle against bourgeois ideological trends, whether from the Right or the "Left". The duty of Marxist-Leninists is to act as Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin did, not to run away from the challenge presented by any bourgeois ideological trend, but to smash attacks in the fields of theory, fundamental line and policy whenever they are made and to chart the correct road to victory for the prole-
tariat and the oppressed people and nations in their struggles.

Since Marxism became predominant in the working-class movement, a number of struggles have taken place between Marxists on the one hand and revisionists and opportunists on the other. Among them there were two debates of the greatest historic significance, and now a third great debate is in progress. Of these the first was the great debate which Lenin had with Kautsky and Bernstein and the other revisionists and opportunists of the Second International; it advanced Marxism to a new stage of development, the stage of Leninism, which is Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. The second was the great debate which the Communists of the Soviet Union and of other countries, headed by Stalin, conducted against Trotsky, Bukharin and other "Left" adventurists and Right opportunists. It successfully defended Leninism and elucidated Lenin's theory and tactics concerning the proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the revolution of the oppressed nations and the building of socialism. Side by side with this debate there was the fierce and fairly protracted debate inside the Chinese Communist Party, which Comrade Mao Tse-tung carried on against the "Left" adventurists and Right opportunists for the purpose of closely integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution.

The current great debate was first provoked by the Tito clique of Yugoslavia through its open betrayal of Marxism-Leninism.

The Tito clique had taken the road of revisionism long ago. In the winter of 1956, it took advantage of the anti-
Soviet and anti-Communist campaign launched by the imperialists to conduct propaganda against Marxism-Leninism on the one hand and, on the other, to carry out subversive activities within the socialist countries in co-ordination with imperialist schemes. Such propaganda and sabotage reached a climax in the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary. It was then that Tito made his notorious Pula speech. The Tito clique did its utmost to vilify the socialist system, insisted that “a thorough change is necessary in the political system”\(^1\) of Hungary, and asserted that the Hungarian comrades “need not waste their efforts on trying to restore the Communist Party”.\(^1\) The Communists of all countries waged a stern struggle against this treacherous attack by the Tito clique. We had published the article “On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat” in April 1956. Towards the end of December 1956, aiming directly at the Titoite attack, we published another article “More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat”. In 1957, the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers’ Parties of the socialist countries adopted the famous Moscow Declaration. This Declaration explicitly singled out revisionism as the main danger in the present international communist movement. It denounced the modern revisionists because they “seek to smear the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, declare that it is ‘outmoded’ and allege that it has lost its significance for social progress”. The Tito clique refused to sign the

---

Declaration, and in 1958 put forward their out-and-out revisionist programme, which they counterposed to the Moscow Declaration. Their programme was unanimously repudiated by the Communists of all countries. But in the ensuing period, especially from 1959 onwards, the leaders of certain Communist Parties went back on the joint agreement they had signed and endorsed, and made Tito-like statements. Subsequently, these persons found it increasingly hard to contain themselves; their language became more and more akin to Tito’s, and they did their best to prettify the U.S. imperialists. They turned the spearhead of their struggle against the fraternal Parties which firmly uphold Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles laid down in the Moscow Declaration, and made unbridled attacks on them. After consultation on an equal footing at the 1960 Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers’ Parties, agreement was reached on many differences that had arisen between the fraternal Parties. The Moscow Statement issued by this meeting severely condemned the leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists for their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism. We heartily welcomed the agreement reached by the fraternal Parties at this meeting, and in our own actions have strictly adhered to and defended the agreement. But not long afterwards, the leaders of certain fraternal Parties again went back on the joint agreement they had signed and endorsed, and they made public attacks on other fraternal Parties at their own Party Congresses, laying bare before the enemy the differences in the international communist movement. While assailing fraternal Parties, they extravagantly praised the Tito clique and wilfully wallowed in the mire with it.
Events have shown that the modern revisionist trend is a product, under new conditions, of the policies of imperialism. Inevitably, therefore, this trend is international in character, and, like the previous debates, the present debate between Marxist-Leninists and the modern revisionists is inevitably developing into an international one.

The first great debate between the Marxist-Leninists and the revisionists and opportunists led to the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the founding of revolutionary proletarian parties of a new type throughout the world. The second great debate led to victory in the building of socialism in the Soviet Union, the victory of the anti-fascist world war, in which the great Soviet Union was the main force, the victory of the socialist revolution in a number of European and Asian countries and the victory of the great revolution of the Chinese people. The present great debate is taking place in the epoch in which the imperialist camp is disintegrating, the forces of socialism are developing and growing stronger, the great revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America is surging forward, and the mighty working class of Europe and America is experiencing a new awakening. In starting the present debate, the modern revisionists vainly hoped to abolish Marxism-Leninism at one stroke, liquidate the liberation struggles of the oppressed people and nations and save the imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries from their doom. But Marxism-Leninism cannot be abolished, the peoples' liberation struggles cannot be liquidated, and the imperialists and reactionaries cannot be saved from their doom. Contrary to their aspirations, the modern revisionists are doomed to fail in their shameful attempt.
The working-class movement of the world sets before all Marxist-Leninists the task of replying to the general revision of Marxism-Leninism by the modern revisionists. Their revisions serve the current needs of world imperialism, of the reactionaries of various countries or of the bourgeoisie of their own countries, and are aimed at robbing Marxism-Leninism of its revolutionary soul; they throw overboard the most elementary principle of Marxism-Leninism, the principle of class struggle, and all they want to retain is the Marxist-Leninist label.

In discussing international and social problems, the modern revisionists use the utterly hypocritical bourgeois "supra-class" viewpoint in place of the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint of class analysis. They concoct a host of surmises and hypotheses, which are purely subjective and devoid of any factual basis and which they substitute for the scientific Marxist-Leninist investigation of society as it actually exists. They substitute bourgeois pragmatism for dialectical materialism and historical materialism. In a word, they indulge in a lot of nonsensical talk, which they themselves must find it hard to understand or believe, in order to fool the working class and the oppressed people and oppressed nations. In the past few years, a great number of international events have testified to the bankruptcy of the theories and policies of the modern revisionists. Nevertheless, every time their theories and policies are disgraced before the people of the world, they invariably "glory in their shame",¹ as Lenin once remarked, and, stopping

at nothing and disregarding all consequences, they direct their fire at the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists — their brothers in other countries — who have previously advised them not to entertain illusions nor to act so blindly. By venting their venom and fury on others in the same ranks, they try to prove that they have gained a “victory”, in a vain attempt to isolate the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists, to isolate all their brothers in other countries who are defending revolutionary principles.

In the circumstances, what can all true revolutionary Marxist-Leninists do but take up the challenge of the modern revisionists? With regard to differences and disputes on matters of principle, Marxist-Leninists have the duty to differentiate between right and wrong and to straighten things out. For the common interests of unity against the enemy, we have always stood for a solution through inter-Party consultation and against making the differences public in the face of the enemy. But since some people have insisted on making the dispute public, what alternative is there for us but to reply publicly to their challenge?

Latterly, the Chinese Communist Party has come under preposterous attacks. The attackers have vociferously levelled many trumped-up charges against us in total disregard of the facts. The hows and whys of these attacks are not hard to understand. It is also as clear as daylight where those who have planned and carried out these attacks put themselves, and with whom they align themselves.

Whoever is acquainted with statements made by Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades of the C.P.I. in recent years will see that it is no accident that at the last C.P.I. Congress they added their voice to the attacks
on the Marxist-Leninist views of the Chinese Communist Party. An ideological thread alien to Marxism-Leninism runs right through the Theses for the C.P.I. Congress and Comrade Togliatti's report and concluding speech at the Congress. Along this line, they employed the same language as that used by the social-democrats and the modern revisionists in dealing both with international problems and with domestic Italian issues. A careful reading of the Theses and other documents of the C.P.I. reveals that the numerous formulations and viewpoints contained therein are none too fresh, but by and large are the same as those put forward by the old-line revisionists and those propagated from the outset by the Titoite revisionists of Yugoslavia.

Let us now analyse the Theses and other relevant documents of the C.P.I. so as to show clearly how far Togliatti and the other comrades have moved away from Marxism-Leninism.

III. CONTRADICTIONS IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

COMRADE TOGLIATTI'S NEW IDEAS

Comrade Togliatti and some other comrades of the Communist Party of Italy make their appraisal of the international situation their fundamental point of departure in posing questions.

Proceeding from their appraisal, they have formed their new ideas, of which they are very proud, concerning international as well as domestic issues.
1. "It is necessary, in the world struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence, to fight for a policy of international economic co-operation, which will make it possible to overcome those contradictions at present preventing a more rapid economic development which will be translated into social progress." \(^1\)

2. "In Europe, in particular, it is necessary to develop an integral initiative in order to lay the foundation for European economic co-operation even among states with diverse social structures, which will make it possible, within the framework of the economic and political organs of the United Nations, to step up trade, eliminate or lower customs barriers, and make joint interventions to promote the progress of the underdeveloped areas." \(^1\)

3. "One should demand . . . the unfolding of systematic action to overcome the division of Europe and the world into blocs while breaking down the political and military obstacles which preserve this division," \(^1\) and "the rebuilding of a single world market." \(^1\)

4. In the conditions of modern military technique, "war becomes something qualitatively different from what it was in the past. In the face of this change in the nature of war, our very doctrine requires fresh deliberations." \(^2\)

5. "Fighting for peace and peaceful coexistence, we wish to create a new world, whose primary characteristic will be that it is a world without war." \(^1\)

---

\(^1\) "Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I."

6. "The colonial regime has almost completely crumbled."¹ "... there are no longer any spheres of influence preserved for imperialism in the world."²

7. "In fact, there exists in the capitalist world today an urge towards structural reforms and to reforms of a socialist nature, which is related to economic progress and the new expansion of productive forces."¹

8. "... the very term 'dictatorship of the proletariat' can assume a content different from what it had in the hard years of the Civil War and of socialist construction for the first time, in a country encircled by capitalism".³

9. In order "to realize profound changes in the present economic and political structure" in the capitalist countries, "a function of prime importance can fall ... on parliamentary institutions".⁴

10. In capitalist Italy "the accession of all the people to the direction of the state"¹ is possible. In Italy, the democratic forces "can oppose the class nature and class objectives of the state, while fully accepting and defending the constitutional compact".³

11. "Nationalization", "planning" and "state intervention" in economic life can be turned into "instruments of struggle against the power of big capital in order to hit, restrict and break up the rule of the big monopoly groups".¹

12. The bourgeois ruling groups can now accept "the concepts of planning and programming the economy, considered at one time a socialist prerogative", and "this can

¹ Togliatti's report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
² Togliatti, "Today It Is Possible to Avoid War", speech at the session of the Central Committee of the C.P.I., July 21, 1960.
³ "Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I." See L'Unita supplement, September 13, 1962.
⁴ "Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I."
be a sign of the ripening of the objective conditions for a transition from capitalism to socialism”.

To sum up, the new ideas advanced by Comrade Togliatti and others present us with a picture of the contemporary world as they envisage it in their minds. Despite the fact that in their Theses and articles they employ some Marxist-Leninist phraseology as a camouflage and use many specious and ambiguous formulations as a smokescreen, they cannot cover up the essence of these ideas. That is, they attempt to substitute class collaboration for class struggle, “structural reform” for proletarian revolution, and “joint intervention” for the national liberation movement.

These new ideas put forward by Togliatti and the other comrades imply that antagonistic social contradictions are vanishing and conflicting social forces are merging into a single whole throughout the world. For instance, such conflicting forces as the socialist system and the capitalist system, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, rival imperialist countries, imperialist countries and the oppressed nations, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and working people in each capitalist country, and the various monopoly capitalist groups in each imperialist country, are all merging or will merge into a single whole.

It is difficult for us to see any difference between these new ideas put forward by Togliatti and other comrades and the series of absurd anti-Marxist-Leninist views in the Tito clique’s Programme which earned it notoriety.

Undoubtedly, these new ideas advanced by Togliatti and other comrades constitute a most serious challenge

---

1 Togliatti’s report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
to the theory of Marxism-Leninism and an attempt to overthrow it completely. It reminds us of the title Engels gave to the book he wrote in his polemic against Dühring, *Herr Eugen Dühring’s Revolution in Science*. Can it be that Comrade Togliatti now intends to follow in Dühring’s footsteps and start another “revolution” — in the theory of Marxism-Leninism?

**A PRESCRIPTION FOR CHANGING THE WORLD IN WHICH THE PRESCRIBER HIMSELF SCARCELY BELIEVES**

How can “those contradictions at present preventing a more rapid economic development which will be translated into social progress”\(^1\) be overcome? In other words, how can the antagonistic social forces, international and domestic, be merged into a single whole? The answer of Togliatti and other comrades is:

For the socialist countries, and for the Soviet Union in the first place, to challenge the bourgeois ruling classes to a peaceful competition for the establishment of an economic and social order capable of satisfying all the aspirations of men and peoples towards freedom, well-being, independence and the full development of and respect for the human personality, and towards peaceful co-operation of all states.\(^1\)

Does this mean that it is possible, merely through peaceful competition between the socialist and the capitalist countries, and without a people’s revolution, to establish the same “economic and social order” in capitalist countries as in the socialist countries? If so, does it not mean that capitalism need no longer be capitalism, that impe-

---

\(^1\) “Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.”
rialism need no longer be imperialism, and that the capitalists may cease their life-and-death scramble for profits or superprofits at home and abroad, but instead may enter into "peaceful co-operation" with all people and all nations in order to satisfy all the aspirations of men?

This is the prescription Comrade Togliatti has invented for changing the world. But this panacea has not proved effective even in the actual movement in Italy. How can Marxist-Leninists lightly believe in it?

It is common knowledge — and Marxist-Leninists particularly should remember — that soon after the October Revolution Lenin advanced the policy of peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist countries and favoured economic competition between the two. During the greater part of the forty years and more since its founding, the socialist Soviet Union has in the main been in a state of peaceful coexistence with the capitalist countries. We consider the policy of peaceful coexistence, as pursued by Lenin and Stalin, to be entirely correct and necessary. It indicates that the socialist countries neither desire nor need to use force to settle international disputes. The superiority of the socialist system as demonstrated in the socialist countries is a source of great inspiration to the oppressed people and nations. After the October Revolution Lenin reiterated that the socialist construction of the Soviet Union would set an example for the rest of the world. He said that the communist system can be created by the victorious proletariat and that "this task is of world significance". In 1921

---

the Civil War had more or less come to an end and the Soviet state was making the transition to peaceful construction, Lenin set socialist economic construction as the main task for the Soviet state. He said: "At present it is by our economic policy that we are exerting our main influence on the international revolution."¹ Lenin’s view was correct. Precisely as he foresaw, the forces of socialism have exerted increasing influence on the international situation. But Lenin never said that the building of a Soviet state could take the place of the struggles of the people of all countries to liberate themselves. Historical events during the forty years and more of the Soviet Union’s existence also show that a revolution or a transformation of the social system in any country is a matter for the people of that country, and that the policy of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition followed by socialist countries cannot possibly result in a change of the social system in any other country. What grounds have Togliatti and other comrades for believing that the pursuit of the policy of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition by the socialist countries can change the face of the social system in every other country and establish an "economic and social order" capable of satisfying all the aspirations of men?

True, Comrade Togliatti and the others are by no means so whole-hearted in believing their own prescription. That is why they go on to say in the Theses, "However, the ruling groups of the imperialist countries do not want to renounce their domination over the whole world."

¹ Lenin, “Tenth All-Russian Conference of the R.C.P.(B)”, Collected Works, Moscow, 4th Russian ed., Vol. 32, p. 413.
But Comrade Togliatti and the others do not base themselves on the laws of social development to find out why the ruling groups of the imperialist countries “do not want to renounce their domination over the whole world”. They simply maintain that this is so because the ruling groups of the imperialist countries have a wrong conception or “understanding” of the world situation, and also that “the uncertainty of the international situation”\(^1\) arises precisely from this wrong conception and “understanding”.

From a Marxist-Leninist point of view, how can one reduce the attempt of imperialism to preserve its domination, the uncertainty of the international situation, etc. to a mere question of understanding on the part of the ruling groups of the imperialist countries, and not regard them as conforming to the operation of the laws of development of capitalist imperialism? How can one assume that once the ruling groups of the imperialist countries acquire a “correct understanding” and once their rulers become “sensible”, the social systems of different countries will be radically changed without class struggle and revolutions by the peoples of these countries?

TWO FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT VIEWS ON CONTRADICTIONS IN THE WORLD

In analysing the present-day international situation, Marxist-Leninists must grasp the sum and substance of the political and economic data on various countries and comprehend the following major contradictions: the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist

\(^1\) “Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.”
camp, the contradiction among imperialist countries, the contradiction between the imperialist countries and the oppressed nations, the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and other working people in each capitalist country, the contradiction among different monopolist groups in each capitalist country, the contradiction between the monopoly capitalists and the small and medium capitalists in each capitalist country, etc. Obviously, only by comprehending these contradictions, by analysing them and their changes at different times and by locating the focus of the specific contradictions at a given time, can the political parties of the working class correctly appraise the international and domestic situation and provide a reliable theoretical basis for their policies. Unfortunately, these are the very contradictions that Togliatti and other comrades have failed to face seriously in their Theses, and consequently their whole programme has inevitably departed from the orbit of Marxism-Leninism.

Of course, Togliatti and the other comrades do mention many contradictions in their Theses, but strangely enough Comrade Togliatti, who styles himself a Marxist-Leninist, has evaded precisely the above major contradictions.

The following contradictions in the international situation are listed in the Theses in the part concerning the European Common Market:

... the increased economic rivalry among the big capitalist countries is accompanied by an accentuated trend not only towards international agreements among the big monopolies, but also towards the creation of organic commercial and economic alliances among groups of states. The extension of markets, which has
been the outcome of one of these alliances (European Common Market) in Western Europe, has stimulated the economic development of certain countries (Italy, the German Federal Republic). Economic integration accomplished under the leadership of the big monopoly groups and linked to the Atlantic policy of rearma-
ment and war has created new contradictions both on an international scale and in individual countries be-
tween the progress of some highly industrialized re-
gions and the permanent and even relatively increasing backwardness and decline of others; between the rate of growth of production in industry and that in agri-
culture, which is everywhere experiencing a period of grave difficulties and crises; between fairly broad zones of well-being with a high level of consumption and the broadest zones of low wages, underconsumption and poverty; between the enormous mass of wealth which is destroyed not only in rearmament but in un-
productive expenditures and unbridled luxury, and the impossibility of solving problems vital to the masses and to progress (housing, education, social security, etc.).

Here a long list of so-called contradictions, or “new contradictions”, is given. Yet no mention is made of contradictions between classes, of the contradiction be-
tween the imperialists and their lackeys on the one hand and the peoples of the world on the other, etc. Togliatti and other comrades describe the contradictions “on an international scale and in individual countries” as con-
tradictions between the industrially developed and industri-
ally underdeveloped areas and between areas of well-
being and areas of poverty.
They admit the existence of economic rivalry between the capitalist countries, of big monopoly capitalist groups and of groups of states, but the conclusion they draw is that the contradictions are non-class or supra-class contradictions. They hold that the contradictions among the imperialist countries can be harmonized or even eliminated by “international agreements among the big monopolies” and “the creation of organic commercial and economic alliances among groups of states”. In fact this view plagiarizes the “theory of ultra-imperialism” held by the old-line revisionists and is, as Lenin put it, “ultra-nonsense”.

It is well known that in the imperialist epoch Lenin put forward the important thesis that “uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism”. The uneven development of the capitalist countries in the imperialist epoch takes the form of leaps, with those previously trailing behind leaping ahead, and those previously ahead falling behind. This inexorable law of the uneven development of capitalism still holds after World War II. The U.S. imperialists and the revisionists and opportunists have all along proclaimed that the development of U.S. capitalism transcends this inexorable law, but the rate of economic growth in Japan, West Germany, Italy, France and certain other capitalist countries has for many years since the War surpassed that in the United States. The weight of the United States in the world capitalist economy has declined. U.S. industrial production accounted for 53.4 per cent of that of the whole capitalist world in 1948, and fell to 44.1 per cent in 1960 and to 43 per cent in 1961.

Although the rate of economic growth of U.S. capitalism lags behind that of a number of other capitalist countries, the United States has not altogether lost its monopolistic position in the capitalist world. Hence, on the one hand, the United States is trying hard to maintain and expand its monopolistic and dominant position in that world, and on the other, the other imperialist and capitalist countries are striving to shake off this U.S. imperialist control. This is an outstanding and increasingly acute real contradiction in the politico-economic system of the capitalist world. Besides this contradiction between U.S. imperialism and the other imperialist countries, there are contradictions among other imperialist countries and among other capitalist countries. The contradictions among the imperialist powers are bound to give rise to, and in fact have given rise to, an intensified struggle for markets, outlets for investments, and sources of raw materials. Here lies an interwoven pattern of struggles between the old colonialism and the new and between the victorious and the vanquished imperialist nations. The case of the Congo, the recent quarrel over the European Common Market and the quarrel arising from the recent U.S. restrictions on imports from Japan are striking instances of such struggles.

Although according to the Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I. "the absolute economic supremacy of U.S. capitalism is beginning to disappear by one of those processes of uneven development and leaps peculiar to capitalism and imperialism", Togliatti and the other comrades have failed to perceive from this new phenomenon the fact that the contradictions in the capitalist world are growing in breadth and in depth, and they have also failed to perceive that this new phenomenon will bring about
a new situation with sharp life-and-death struggles among the imperialist powers, and sharp struggles among the various monopoly groups in each imperialist country and between the proletariat and working people and the monopoly capitalists in each capitalist country. In particular, the imperialist-controlled world market has substantially contracted in area as a result of the victory of the socialist revolution in a series of countries; moreover, the emergence of many countries possessing national independence in Asia, Africa and Latin America has shaken the imperialist economic monopoly in those areas. In these circumstances, the sharp struggles raging in the capitalist world have become not weaker, but fiercer, than in the past.

There now exist two essentially different world economic systems, the socialist system and the capitalist system, and two mutually antagonistic world camps, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp. In the course of events the strength of socialism has surpassed that of imperialism. Undoubtedly, the strength of the socialist countries, combined with that of the revolutionary people of all countries, of the national liberation movement and of the peace movement, greatly surpasses the strength of the imperialists and their lackeys. In other words, in the world balance of forces as a whole, the superiority belongs to socialism and the revolutionary people, and not to imperialism; it belongs to the forces defending world peace, and not to the imperialist forces of war. As we Chinese Communists put it, "The East wind prevails over the West wind." It is utterly wrong not to take into account this tremendous change in the world balance of forces after World War II. However, this change has not done away with the various inherent con-
tradictions in the capitalist world, has not altered the jungle law of survival in capitalist society, and does not preclude the possibility of the imperialist countries splitting into blocs and engaging in all kinds of conflicts in the pursuit of their own interests.

How can it be said that the distinction between the two social systems of capitalism and socialism will automatically vanish as a result of the change in the world balance of forces?

How can it be said that the various inherent contradictions of the capitalist world will automatically disappear as a result of this change in the world balance of forces?

How can it be said that the ruling forces in the capitalist countries will voluntarily quit the stage of history as a result of this change in the world balance of forces?

Yet, those very views are to be found in the programme of Togliatti and other comrades.

THE FOCUS OF CONTRADICTIONS IN THE WORLD AFTER WORLD WAR II

Togliatti and other comrades live physically in the capitalist world, but their minds are in cloud-cuckoo-land.

As Communists in the capitalist world, they should base themselves on the Marxist-Leninist class analysis and, proceeding from the world situation as a whole, analyse the contradiction between the socialist and imperialist camps and lay stress on analysing the contradictions among the imperialist powers, between the imperialist powers and the oppressed nations, and between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and other working people in each imperialist country, in order to chart the
right course for the proletariat of their own country and all the oppressed people and nations. But, to our regret, Togliatti and the others have failed to do so. They merely indulge in irrelevant inanities about contradictions while actually covering them up and trying to lead the Italian proletariat and all the oppressed people and nations astray.

Like Tito, Comrade Togliatti describes the contradiction between the imperialist and socialist camps as the “existence and contraposition of two great military blocs”,¹ and holds that by “changing this situation” a new world “without war”, a world of “peaceful co-operation”,¹ can be realized and that the contradiction between the two major social systems of the world will disappear.

These ideas of Comrade Togliatti’s are a bit too naive. Day after day he may go on hoping that the rulers of the imperialist countries will become “sensible”, but the imperialists will never comply with his wishes by voluntarily disarming themselves or changing their social system. In essence, his ideas can only mean that the socialist countries should abandon or abolish their defences and that there should be a so-called liberalization, i.e., “peaceful evolution” or “spontaneous evolution”, of the socialist system towards capitalism, which the imperialists have always hoped for.

The contradiction between the imperialist and socialist camps is a contradiction between the two social systems, a basic world contradiction, which is undoubtedly acute. How can a Marxist-Leninist regard it as a contradiction between two military blocs rather than between two social systems?

¹ Togliatti’s report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
Nor should a Marxist-Leninist view the contradictions in the world simply and exclusively as contradictions between the imperialist and socialist camps.

It must be pointed out that by the nature of their society the socialist countries need not, cannot, should not and must not engage in expansion abroad. They have their own internal markets, and China and the Soviet Union, in particular, have most extensive internal markets. At the same time, the socialist countries engage in international trade in accordance with the principle of equality and mutual benefit, but there is no need for them to scramble for markets and spheres of influence with the imperialist countries, and they have absolutely no need for conflicts, and especially armed conflicts, with the imperialist countries on this ground.

However, things are quite different with the imperialist countries.

So long as the capitalist-imperialist system exists, the laws of capitalist imperialism continue to operate. Imperialists always oppress and exploit their own people at home, and always perpetrate aggression against other nations and countries and oppress and exploit them. They always regard colonies, semi-colonies and spheres of influence as sources of wealth for themselves. The “civilized” wolves of imperialism have always regarded Asia, Africa and Latin America as rich meat to contend for and devour. Using various means they have never ceased to suppress the struggles and uprisings of the people in the colonies and in their spheres of influence. Whatever policies the capitalist-imperialists pursue, whether old colonialist policies or new colonialist policies, contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed na-
tions is inevitable. This contradiction is irreconcilable and extremely acute, and it cannot be covered up.

Furthermore, the imperialist powers are constantly struggling with each other in the scramble for markets, sources of raw materials, spheres of influence and profits from war contracts. At times this struggle may grow somewhat less acute, and may result in certain compromises or even in the formation of "alliances of groups of states", but such relaxations of tension, compromises or alliances always breed more acute, more intense and more widespread contradictions and struggles among the imperialists.

Stepping into the shoes of the German, Italian and Japanese fascists, the U.S. imperialists have been carrying out a policy of expansion in all parts of the world ever since World War II. Under the cover of their opposition to the Soviet Union, they have embarked on a course of aggression, annexation and domination vis-a-vis the former colonies and spheres of influence of Britain, France, Germany, Japan and Italy. Again under the cover of their opposition to the Soviet Union, they have taken advantage of post-war conditions to place a string of capitalist countries—Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, Italy, Belgium, Canada, Australia and others—under the direct control of U.S. monopoly capital. This control is political and economic as well as military.

In other words, U.S. imperialism is trying to build a huge empire in the capitalist world, such as has never been known before. This huge empire which U.S. imperialism is seeking to build would involve the direct enslavement not only of such vanquished nations as West Germany, Italy and Japan, and of their former colonies
and spheres of influence, but also of its own wartime allies, Britain, France, Belgium, etc. and their existing and former colonies and spheres of influence.

That is to say, in its quest for this unprecedentedly large empire, U.S. imperialism concentrates its efforts primarily on the seizure of the immense intermediate zone between the United States and the socialist countries. At the same time, it is using every means to conduct subversion, sabotage and aggression against the socialist countries.

Here we may recall the well-known interview by Comrade Mao Tse-tung in August 1946 in which he exposed the anti-Soviet smokescreen the U.S. imperialists were then putting up and in which he gave the following concise analysis of the world situation:

The United States and the Soviet Union are separated by a vast zone which includes many capitalist, colonial and semi-colonial countries in Europe, Asia and Africa. Before the U.S. reactionaries have subjugated these countries, an attack on the Soviet Union is out of the question. In the Pacific the United States now controls areas larger than all the former British spheres of influence there put together; it controls Japan, that part of China under Kuomintang rule, half of Korea, and the South Pacific. It has long controlled Central and South America. It seeks also to control the whole of the British Empire and Western Europe. Using various pretexts, the United States is making large-scale military arrangements and setting up military bases in many countries. The U.S. reactionaries say that the military bases they have set up and are pre-
paring to set up all over the world are aimed against the Soviet Union. True, these military bases are directed against the Soviet Union. At present, however, it is not the Soviet Union but the countries in which these military bases are located that are the first to suffer U.S. aggression. I believe it won’t be long before these countries come to realize who is really oppressing them, the Soviet Union or the United States. The day will come when the U.S. reactionaries find themselves opposed by the people of the whole world.

Of course, I do not mean to say that the U.S. reactionaries have no intention of attacking the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is a defender of world peace and a powerful factor preventing the domination of the world by the U.S. reactionaries. Because of the existence of the Soviet Union, it is absolutely impossible for the reactionaries in the United States and the world to realize their ambitions. That is why the U.S. reactionaries rabidly hate the Soviet Union and actually dream of destroying this socialist state. But the fact that the U.S. reactionaries are now trumpeting so loudly about a U.S.-Soviet war and creating a foul atmosphere, so soon after the end of World War II compels us to take a look at their real aims. It turns out that under the cover of anti-Soviet slogans they are frantically attacking the workers and democratic circles in the United States and turning all the countries which are the targets of U.S. external expansion into U.S. dependencies. I think the American people and the peoples of all countries menaced by U.S. aggression should unite and struggle against the attacks of the U.S. reactionaries and their running dogs in these
countries. Only by victory in this struggle can a third world war be avoided; otherwise it is unavoidable.¹

Thus, sixteen years ago, Comrade Mao Tse-tung most lucidly exposed the attempts of the U.S. imperialists to set up a huge world empire and showed how to defeat the insane plan of the U.S. imperialists to enslave the world and how to strive to avert a third world war.

In this passage Comrade Mao Tse-tung explains that there is a vast intermediate zone between the U.S. imperialists and the socialist countries. This intermediate zone includes the entire capitalist world, the United States excepted. The U.S. imperialists’ clamour about a war against the socialist camp shows that while they are in fact preparing an aggressive war against the socialist countries and dreaming of destroying them, this clamour also serves as a smokescreen to conceal their immediate aim of aggression against and enslavement of the intermediate zone.

This policy of aggression and enslavement on the part of the U.S. imperialists with their lust for world hegemony runs up first against the resistance of the oppressed nations and people in the intermediate zone, and particularly those of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This reactionary policy has in fact ignited revolutions by the oppressed nations and people in Asia, Africa and Latin America and has fanned the flames of revolution which have now been burning in these areas for more than a decade. The flames of revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America are further damaging the foundations

of imperialist rule; they are spreading, and will certainly go on spreading to even wider areas.

Meanwhile, the U.S. imperialist policy of world hegemony inevitably intensifies the fight between the imperialist powers and between the new and old colonialists over colonies and spheres of influence; it also intensifies the struggles between U.S. imperialism with its policy of control and the other imperialist powers which are resisting this control. These struggles affect the vital interests of imperialism, and the imperialist contestants give each other no quarter, for each side is striving to strangle the other.

The policy of the U.S. imperialists and their partners towards the oppressed nations and people of Asia, Africa and Latin America who are struggling for their own liberation is an extremely reactionary policy of suppression and deception. The socialist countries, acting from a strong sense of duty, naturally pursue a policy of sympathy and support for the national and democratic revolutionary struggles in these areas. These two policies are fundamentally different. The contradiction between them inevitably manifests itself in these areas. The policy of the modern revisionists towards these areas in fact serves the ends of the imperialist policy. Consequently, the contradiction between the policy of the Marxist-Leninists and that of the modern revisionists inevitably manifests itself in these areas, too.

The population of these areas in Asia, Africa and Latin America constitutes more than two-thirds of the total population of the capitalist world. The ever-mounting tide of revolution in these areas and the fight over them between the imperialist powers and between the new and old colonialists clearly show that these areas are
the focus of all the contradictions of the capitalist world; it may also be said that they are the focus of world contradictions. These areas are the weakest link in the imperialist chain and the storm-centre of world revolution.

The experience of the last sixteen years has completely confirmed the correctness of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's thesis on the location of the focus of world contradictions after World War II.

HAS THE FOCUS OF WORLD CONTRADICTIONS CHANGED?

Tremendous changes have taken place in the world during the past sixteen years. The main ones are:
1. With the founding of a series of socialist states in Europe and Asia and with the victory of the people's revolution in China, these countries together with the Soviet Union formed the socialist camp, which comprises twelve countries, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Viet Nam, the German Democratic Republic, China, Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia, and has an aggregate population of one thousand million. This has fundamentally changed the world balance of forces.
2. The strength of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist world has greatly increased and its influence has greatly expanded.
3. In Asia, Africa and Latin America, the national liberation movement and the people's revolutionary movement have destroyed and are destroying the positions of U.S. imperialism and its partners over wide areas with the force of a thunderbolt. The heroic Cuban people have won great victories in their revolution after overthrow-
ing the reactionary rule of the running dogs of U.S. imperialism, and have taken the road of socialism.

4. There have been new activity and new developments in the struggle for democratic rights and socialism on the part of the working class and the working people in the European and American capitalist countries.

5. The uneven development of the capitalist countries has become more pronounced. There have been certain new developments in the capitalist forces of France, which are beginning to be bold enough to stand up to the United States. The contradiction between Britain and the United States has been further aggravated. Nurtured by the United States, the nations defeated in World War II, namely, West Germany, Italy and Japan, have risen to their feet again and are striving, in varying degrees, to shake off U.S. domination. Militarism is resurgent in West Germany and Japan, which are again becoming hotbeds of war. Before World War II, Germany and Japan were the chief rivals of U.S. imperialism. Today West Germany is again colliding with U.S. imperialism as its chief rival in the world capitalist market. The competition between Japan and the United States is also becoming increasingly acute.

6. While the capitalist countries develop more and more unevenly in relation to each other in the economic and political spheres, the competition among the monopoly capitalist groups in each capitalist country sharpens, too.

All these changes show that the people in various countries can defeat the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys and win freedom and emancipation for themselves, if they awaken and unite.
These changes also show that the greater the strength of the socialist countries, the firmer the unity of the socialist camp, the broader the liberation movement of the oppressed nations, and the more vigorous the struggle of the proletariat and the oppressed people in the capitalist countries, then the greater the possibility of manacling the imperialists in such a way that they will not dare to defy the universal will of the people, and the greater the possibility of preventing a new world war and preserving world peace.

Moreover, these changes show that the contradictions between U.S. imperialism and other imperialist countries are growing deeper and sharper and that new conflicts are developing between them.

The victory of the Chinese people’s revolution, the victories in construction in all the socialist countries, the victory of the national democratic revolution in many countries and the victory of the Cuban people’s revolution have dealt most telling blows to the U.S. imperialists’ wild plans for enslaving the world. In order to carry through their policy of aggression the U.S. imperialists, in addition to conducting anti-Soviet propaganda, have been particularly active in recent years in their propaganda against China. Their purpose in this propaganda is of course to perpetuate their forcible occupation of our territory of Taiwan and to carry on all sorts of criminal subversive activities menacing our country. At the same time, it is obvious that the U.S. imperialists are using this propaganda for another important practical purpose, namely, the control and enslavement of Japan, southern Korea and the whole of Southeast Asia. The “Japan-U.S. Mutual Co-operation and Security
Treaty”, SEATO, etc., are U.S. instruments for controlling and enslaving a host of countries in this area.

For years, the U.S. imperialists have given both overt and covert support to the Indian reactionaries and the Nehru government. What is their real objective? They are trying by underhand means to turn India, which was formerly a colonial possession of the British Empire and is still a member of the British Commonwealth, into a U.S. sphere of influence, and to turn the “brightest jewel” in the British Imperial Crown into a jewel in the Yankee Dollar Imperial Crown. To attain this object, the U.S. imperialists must first create a pretext, or put up a smokescreen, to fool the people of India and of the whole world; hence their campaign against China and against the so-called Chinese aggression, though they themselves do not believe there is any such thing as “Chinese aggression”. The U.S. imperialists see a golden opportunity for controlling India in the Nehru government’s current military operations against China. After Nehru provoked the Sino-Indian boundary conflict, the U.S. imperialists swaggeringly entered India on the pretext of opposing China and are extending their influence there in the military, political and economic fields.

These massive U.S. imperialist inroads represent an important step taken by the U.S. reactionaries in their neo-colonialist plans for India; they are an important development in the present overt and covert struggle among the imperialist countries to seize markets and spheres of influence and redivide the world. This U.S. imperialist action is bound to hasten a new awakening of the Indian people, and at the same time to intensify
the contradiction between British and U.S. imperialism in India.

With the loss of the old colonies, the extension of the national revolutionary movement and the shrinking of the world capitalist market, the scramble among the imperialist countries is not only continuing in many parts of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Australasia, but is also manifesting itself in Western Europe, the classical home of capitalism. Never in history has the tussle among the imperialist countries been so extensive in peace-time, reaching every corner of Western Europe, and never before has it taken the form of a fierce scramble for industrially developed areas like Western Europe. The European Common Market consisting of the six countries of West Germany, France, Italy and Benelux, the European Free Trade Association of seven countries headed by Britain, and the Atlantic Community energetically planned by the United States represent the increasingly fierce scramble of the imperialist powers for Western European markets. What Togliatti and other comrades call "the development of Italian commerce in all directions"¹ in fact demonstrates the reaching out of the Italian monopoly capitalists for markets.

Outside Western Europe, the recent open quarrel over the U.S. restriction on Japanese cotton exports shows that the struggle for markets between the United States and Japan is becoming more overt.

Comrade Togliatti and other comrades say: "The colonial regime has almost completely crumbled,"² and "there are no longer any spheres of influence preserved

¹ "Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I."
² Togliatti's report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
for imperialism in the world.” \(^1\) Others say, “There are only fifty million people on earth still groaning under colonial rule,” and only vestiges of the colonial system remain. In their view, the struggle against imperialism is no longer the arduous task of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Such a view has no factual basis at all. Most countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are still victims of imperialist aggression and oppression, of old and new colonialist enslavement. Although a number of countries have won their independence in recent years, their economies are still under the control of foreign monopoly capital. In some countries, the old colonialists have been driven out, but even more powerful and dangerous colonialists of a new type have forced their way in, gravely threatening the existence of many nations in these areas. The peoples in these areas are still a long way from completing their struggle against imperialism. Even for a country like ours which has accomplished its national democratic revolution and, moreover, has won victory in its socialist revolution, the task of combating the aggression of the U.S. imperialists still remains. Our sacred territory of Taiwan is still forcibly occupied by the U.S. imperialists; even now many imperialist countries refuse to recognize the existence of the great People’s Republic of China, and China is still unjustifiably deprived of its rightful position in the United Nations. To struggle against imperialism, against new and old colonialism, remains the cardinal and most urgent task of the oppressed nations

\(^1\) Togliatti’s speech at the session of the Central Committee of the C.P.I., July 21, 1960.
and people in the vast regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The changes occurring in the world in the past sixteen years have proved again and again that the focus of post-war world contradictions is the contradiction between the U.S. imperialist policy of enslavement and the people of all countries and between the U.S. imperialist policy of world-wide expansion and the other imperialist powers. This contradiction manifests itself particularly in the contradiction between the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys on the one hand and the oppressed nations and people of Asia, Africa and Latin America on the other, and in the contradiction between the old and new colonialists in their struggles for these areas.

**WORKERS AND OPPRESSED NATIONS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!**

Asia, Africa and Latin America have long been plundered and oppressed by the colonialists of Europe and the United States. They have fed and grown fat on the enormous wealth seized from these vast areas. They have turned the blood and sweat of the people there into “manure” for “capitalist culture and civilization”,¹ while condemning them to extreme poverty and economic and cultural backwardness. However, once a certain limit is reached, a change in the opposite direction is inevitable. Long enslavement by these alien colonialist and imperialist oppressors has necessarily bred hatred in the people of these areas, aroused them

from their slumbers and compelled them to wage unremitting struggles, and even to launch armed resistance and armed uprisings, for their personal and national survival. There are vast numbers of people who refuse to be slaves in these areas and they include not only the workers, peasants, handicraftsmen, the petty bourgeoisie and the intellectuals, but also the patriotic national bourgeoisie and even some patriotic princes and aristocrats.

The people’s resistance to colonialism and imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America has been continually and ruthlessly suppressed and has suffered many defeats. But after each defeat the people have risen to fight again. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has given a concise explanation of imperialist aggression against China and how it engendered opposition to itself. In 1949, when the great revolution of the Chinese people achieved basic victory, he wrote in “Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle”:

All these wars of aggression, together with political, economic and cultural aggression and oppression, have caused the Chinese to hate imperialism, made them stop and think, “What is all this about?” and compelled them to bring their revolutionary spirit into full play and become united through struggle. They fought, failed, fought again, failed again and fought again and accumulated 109 years of experience, accumulated the experience of hundreds of struggles, great and small, military and political, economic and cultural, with bloodshed and without bloodshed — and only then won today’s basic victory."

---

The experience of the Chinese people’s struggle has a practical significance for the people’s liberation struggles of many countries and regions in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Great October Revolution linked the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat with the liberation movement of the oppressed nations and opened up a new path for the latter. The success of the Chinese people’s revolution has furnished the oppressed nations with a great example of victory.

Following on the October Revolution in Russia and the revolution in China, the people’s revolutionary struggles in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America have reached unparalleled proportions. Experience has shown over and over again that although these struggles may suffer setbacks, the imperialists and their lackeys will never be able to withstand this tide.

Today, the imperialist countries of Europe and America are besieged by the people’s liberation struggle of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This struggle renders most vital support to the struggle of the working class in Western Europe and North America.

Marx, Engels and Lenin always regarded the peasant struggle in the capitalist countries and the struggle of the people in the colonies and dependent countries as the two great and immediate allies of the proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries.

As is well known, Marx expressed the following hope in 1856: “The whole thing in Germany will depend on the possibility of backing the proletarian revolution by some second edition of the Peasants’ War.”¹ The heroes

of the Second International evaded this direct instruction bequeathed by Marx, and Lenin bitterly denounced them, saying that “the statement Marx made in one of his letters — I think it was in 1856 — expressing the hope of a union in Germany of a peasant war, which might create a revolutionary situation, with the working-class movement — even this plain statement they avoid and prowl around it like a cat around a bowl of hot porridge”.¹ When discussing the importance of the peasants as an ally in the emancipation of the proletariat, Lenin said:

Only in the consolidation of the alliance of workers and peasants lies the general liberation of all humanity from such things as the recent imperialist carnage, from those savage contradictions we now see in the capitalist world. . . .²

And Stalin said:

. . . indifference towards so important a question as the peasant question on the eve of the proletarian revolution is the reverse side of the repudiation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is an unmistakable sign of downright betrayal of Marxism.³

We also know the celebrated saying of Marx and Engels: “No nation can be free if it oppresses other na-

tions.” In 1870 Marx made the following surmise in the light of the then existing situation:

After occupying myself with the Irish question for many years I have come to the conclusion that the decisive blow against the English ruling classes . . . cannot be delivered in England but only in Ireland.¹

In 1853 during the Taiping Revolution in China, Marx wrote in his famous essay “Revolution in China and in Europe”:

. . . It may safely be augured that the Chinese revolution will throw the spark into the overloaded mine of the present industrial system and cause the explosion of the long-prepared general crisis, which, spreading abroad, will be closely followed by political revolutions on the Continent.²

Lenin developed Marx’s and Engels’ view, stressing the great significance of the unity between the proletariat in the capitalist countries and the oppressed nations for the victory of the proletarian revolution. He affirmed the correctness of the slogan “Workers and oppressed nations of the world, unite!”³ for our epoch. He pointed out:

The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would actually be a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and

America were not closely and completely united with the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of “colonial” slaves who are oppressed by capital.¹

Stalin developed the theory of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the national question and Lenin’s thesis that the national question is part of the general problem of the world socialist revolution. In his, The Foundations of Leninism Stalin pointed out that Leninism . . . Broke down the wall between whites and blacks, between Europeans and Asiatics, between the “civilised” and “uncivilised” slaves of imperialism, and thus linked the national question with the question of the colonies. The national question was thereby transformed from a particular and internal state problem into a general and international problem, into a world problem of emancipating the oppressed peoples in the dependent countries and colonies from the yoke of imperialism.²

In discussing the world significance of the October Revolution in his article “The October Revolution and the National Question”, Stalin said that the October Revolution “erected a bridge between the socialist West and the enslaved East, having created a new front of revolutions against world imperialism, extending from the proletarians of the West, through the Russian Revolution, to the oppressed peoples of the East”.³

Thus, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin very clearly pointed out the two basic conditions for the emancipa-

³ Ibid., Vol. 4, p. 170.
tion and victory of the proletariat of Europe and America. As far as the external condition is concerned, they maintained that the development of the struggle for national liberation would deal the ruling classes of the metropolitan capitalist countries a decisive blow.

As is well known, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has devoted considerable time and energy to the exposition of the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the two great allies of the proletariat in its struggle for emancipation. He concretely and successfully solved the peasant question and the question of national liberation in the practice of the Chinese revolution under his leadership, and thus ensured victory for the great Chinese revolution.

Every struggle of the oppressed nations for survival won the warm sympathy and praise of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Although Marx, Engels and Lenin did not live to see the fiery national liberation struggles and people's revolutionary struggles now raging in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America or their successive victories, yet the validity of the laws they discovered from the experience of the national liberation struggles of their own times has been increasingly confirmed by life itself. The tremendous changes in Asia, Africa and Latin America following World War II have in no way outmoded this Marxist-Leninist theory of the relationship between the national liberation movement and the proletarian revolutionary movement, as some people suggest; on the contrary, they more than ever testify to its great vitality. Indeed, the revolutionary struggles of the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America have further enriched this theory.
A fundamental task is thus set before the international communist movement in the contemporary world, namely, to support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and people of Asia, Africa and Latin America, because these struggles are decisive for the cause of the international proletariat as a whole. In a sense, the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat as a whole hinges on the outcome of the people’s struggles in these regions, which are inhabited by the overwhelming majority of the world’s population, as well as on the acquisition of support from these revolutionary struggles.

The revolutionary struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America cannot be suppressed. They are bound to burst forth. Unless the proletarian parties in these regions lead these struggles, they will become divorced from the people and fail to win their confidence. The proletariat has very many allies in the anti-imperialist struggle in these regions. Therefore, in order to lead the struggle step by step to victory and to guarantee victory in each struggle, the proletariat and its vanguard in the countries of these regions must march in the van, hold high the banner of anti-imperialism and national independence, and be skilful in organizing their allies in a broad anti-imperialist and anti-feudal united front, exposing every deception practised by the imperialists, the reactionaries and the modern revisionists, and leading the struggle in the correct direction. Unless all these things are done, victory in the revolutionary struggle will be impossible, and even if victory is won, its consolidation will be impossible and the fruits of victory may fall into the hands of the reactionaries, with the country and the nation once again coming under im-
perialist enslavement. Experience, past and present, abounds in instances of how the people have been betrayed in the revolutionary struggle, the defeat of the Chinese revolution of 1927 being a significant example.

The proletariat of the capitalist countries in Europe and America, too, must stand in the forefront of those supporting the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and people of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In fact, such support simultaneously helps the cause of the emancipation of the proletariat in Europe and America. Without support from the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and people of Asia, Africa and Latin America, it will be impossible for the proletariat and the people in capitalist Europe and America to free themselves from the calamities of capitalist oppression and of the menace of imperialist war. Therefore, the proletarian parties of the metropolitan imperialist countries are duty bound to heed the voice of the revolutionary people in these regions, study their experience, respect their revolutionary feelings and support their revolutionary struggles. They have no right whatsoever to flaunt their seniority before these people, to put on lordly airs, to carp and cavil, like Comrade Thorez of France who so arrogantly and disdainfully speaks of them as being “young and inexperienced”.¹ Much less have they the right to take a social-chauvinist attitude, slandering, cursing, intimidating and obstructing the fighting revolutionary people in these regions. It should be understood that according to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, without a correct stand, line and

¹Thorez’s report to the session of the Central Committee of the C.P.F., December 15, 1960.
policy on the national liberation movement and the people’s revolutionary movement in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, it will be impossible for the workers’ parties in the metropolitan imperialist countries to have a correct stand, line and policy on the struggle waged by the working class and the broad masses of the people in their own countries.

The national liberation movement and the people’s revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America give great support to the socialist countries; they constitute an extremely important force safeguarding the socialist countries from imperialist invasion. Beyond any doubt, the socialist countries should give warm sympathy and active support to these movements and they absolutely must not adopt a perfunctory or a selfishly national attitude, or an attitude of great-power chauvinism, much less hamper, obstruct, mislead or sabotage these movements. Those countries in which socialism has been victorious must make it their sacred internationalist duty to support the national liberation struggles and the people’s revolutionary struggles in other countries. Some people take the view that such support is but a one-sided “burden” on the socialist countries. This view is very wrong and runs counter to Marxism-Leninism. It must be understood that such support is a two-way, mutual affair; the socialist countries support the people’s revolutionary struggles in other countries, and these struggles in turn serve to support and defend the socialist countries. In this connection, Stalin put it very aptly,

The characteristic feature of the assistance given by the victorious country is not only that it hastens the
victory of the proletarians of other countries, but also that, by facilitating this victory, it ensures the final victory of socialism in the first victorious country.  

Some persons hold that peaceful economic competition between the socialist and capitalist countries is now the chief and most practical way to oppose imperialism. They assert that the national liberation struggles, the people’s revolutionary struggles, the exposure of imperialism, etc. are nothing but “the cheapest methods of struggle” and “practices of medicinemen and quacks”. Like opulent and lordly philanthropists, they tell the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America not to display “sham courage”, not to kindle “sparks”, or hanker after “dying beautifully”, or “lack faith in the possibility of triumphing over the capitalist system in peaceful economic competition”, but to await the day when the socialist countries have completely beaten capitalism in the level of their productive forces, for then the people in these areas will have everything, and imperialism will automatically tumble. Strangely enough, these persons fear the people’s revolutionary struggle in these areas like the plague. Their attitude has absolutely nothing in common with that of Marxist-Leninists; it runs completely counter to the interests of all the oppressed people and nations, to the interests of the proletariat and other working people of their own countries, and to the interests of the socialist countries.

In short, the present situation is an excellent one for the people of the world. It is most favourable for the oppressed nations and people in Asia, Africa and Latin
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America, for the proletariat and working people of the capitalist countries, for the socialist countries and for the cause of world peace; it is unfavourable only for the imperialists and the reactionaries in all countries and for the forces of aggression and war. In such a situation, the attitude towards the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and people of Asia, Africa and Latin America becomes an important criterion for distinguishing between revolution and non-revolution, between internationalism and social chauvinism, and between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. It is also an important criterion for distinguishing between those who genuinely work for world peace and those who encourage the forces of aggression and war.

SOME BRIEF CONCLUSIONS

Here we shall recapitulate our theses on the international situation.

First, U.S. imperialism is the common enemy of the people of the world, the international gendarme suppressing the just struggle of the people of various countries and the chief bulwark of modern colonialism. Since World War II, the U.S. imperialists have been making frenzied efforts to seize the vast intermediate zone between the United States and the socialist countries; they are not only enslaving the vanquished powers and their former colonies and spheres of influence but are also getting their wartime allies under their control, and grabbing their existing and former colonies and spheres of influence by every means. But the U.S. imperialists are besieged by the people of the world, and their unbridled ambition has led to their increasing isola-
tion among the imperialist countries; actually their power is being constantly curtailed and the united front of the peoples of the world against the imperialists headed by the United States is steadily broadening. The American people and the oppressed people and nations of the world will be able to defeat the U.S. imperialists by struggle. The prospects are not so bright for the imperialists headed by the United States and for the reactionaries in all countries, whereas the strength of the people of the world is in the ascendant.

Second, the struggles among the imperialist powers for markets and spheres of influence in Asia, Africa and Latin America and in Western Europe are bringing about new divisions and alignments. Contradictions and clashes among the imperialist powers are objective facts, which are determined by the nature of the imperialist system. In terms of the actual interests of the imperialist powers, these contradictions and clashes are more pressing, more direct, more immediate than their contradictions with the socialist countries. Failure to see this point is tantamount to denying the sharpening of the contradictions which arises from the uneven development of capitalism in the era of imperialism, makes it impossible to understand the specific policies of imperialism and thus makes it impossible for Communists to work out a correct line and policy for fighting imperialism.

Third, the socialist camp is the most powerful bulwark of world peace and of the cause of justice. Further consolidation and strengthening of this bulwark will make the imperialists more wary of attacking it. For the imperialists know that any attack on this bulwark will constitute a grave risk for themselves, a risk which
will involve not only their draining the cup of bitterness but their very existence.

Fourth, some persons regard the contradictions in the contemporary world simply as contradictions between the socialist and imperialist camps, and fail to see or actually cover up the contradictions between the old and new colonialist imperialists and their lackeys on the one hand and the oppressed nations and people of Asia, Africa and Latin America on the other; they fail to see or actually cover up the contradictions among the imperialist countries; they fail to see or actually cover up the focus of the contradictions in the contemporary world. We cannot agree with this view.

Fifth, while admitting the existence of contradiction between the socialist and imperialist camps, some persons hold that this contradiction can actually disappear and that the socialist and capitalist systems can merge and become one, if what they call “the existence and contraposition of two great military blocs”¹ can be eliminated, or if the socialist countries “propose a challenge of peaceful competition with the capitalist ruling classes”.² We cannot agree with this view.

Sixth, the development of state-monopoly capitalism in the imperialist countries shows that, so far from weakening its ruling position at home and its competitive position abroad, the monopoly capitalist class is striving to strengthen them. At the same time, the imperialists are frantically reinforcing their war machines not only for the purpose of plundering other nations and ousting foreign competitors but also for the purpose of intensify-

¹ Togliatti’s report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
² “Theses for the Tenth congress of the C.P.I.”
ing their oppression of the people at home. So-called bourgeois democracy in the imperialist countries has more nakedly revealed itself as the tyranny of a handful of oligarchs over their wage slaves and the broad masses of the people. What is it if not pure subjectivist delirium to say that state-monopoly capitalism in these countries is gradually passing into socialism and that their working people can come into and are actually coming into the direction of the state, and hence to maintain that “in fact, there exists in the capitalist world today an urge towards structural reforms and towards reforms of a socialist nature”?¹

History is on the side of the peoples of the world and not on the side of the imperialists headed by the United States and the reactionaries in all countries. In their desperation the imperialists are trying to find a way out. They most absurdly pin their hopes on what they call a “clash between China and the Soviet Union”. The imperialists and their apologists have long voiced this idea. The ludicrous attacks and slanders recently hurled at the Chinese Communist Party by the modern revisionists and their followers have encouraged them in this idea. They are overjoyed and are assiduously playing the dirty game of sowing dissension. However, these reactionary daydreamers are making far too low an estimate of the great strength of the friendship between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union and of the great strength of a unity based on proletarian internationalism, and far too high an estimate of the role the modern revisionists and their followers can play. Sooner or later, the hard facts of history will completely

¹ Togliatti’s report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
demolish their illusions and the reactionary daydreamers will inevitably come to grief.

The mistake of Comrade Togliatti and other comrades in their Theses, reports and concluding speech lies in their fundamental departure from the Marxist-Leninist scientific analysis, from the class analysis, of the international situation.

As Lenin said, ridiculing the Narodniks: “The whole of their philosophy amounts to whining that struggle and exploitation exist but that they ‘might’ not exist if... if there were no exploiters.” He went on to say, “And they are content to spend their whole lives just repeating these ‘ifs’ and ‘ans’.”

Surely a Marxist-Leninist cannot behave like a Narodnik!

And yet, the point of departure and positions of Togliatti and other comrades in their Theses and reports rest on exactly these “ifs” and “ans”. Hence, their original ideas are inevitably a bundle of extremely confused notions.

IV. WAR AND PEACE

THE QUESTION IS NOT ONE OF SUBJECTIVE IMAGINATION BUT OF THE LAWS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

In recent years, some so-called Marxist-Leninists have made endless speeches, written many prolix articles and flooded the market with books and pamphlets on the
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subject of war and peace. But they have refused to make a serious investigation of the root cause of war, of the difference between just and unjust wars and of the road to the elimination of war.

The anarchists demanded that the state should be done away with overnight. Certain self-styled Marxist-Leninists now call for the emergence some fine morning of a “world without weapons, without armies, without wars” while the system of capitalism and exploitation still exists. They proudly assert that this is a “great epoch-making discovery”, “a revolutionary change in human consciousness”, and a “creative contribution” to Marxism-Leninism, and that one of the crimes of the “dogmatists” is an obtuse failure to accept this scientific offering of theirs.

Apparently, Comrade Togliatti and some other Italian comrades are zealously peddling this offering. They claim that the only strategy for the creation of a new world “without war” is the “strategy of peaceful coexistence” as they interpret it. But the content of this “strategy of peaceful coexistence” differs radically from the policy of peaceful coexistence propounded by Lenin after the October Revolution and supported by all Marxist-Leninists.

In present-day, peace-time Italy, which is ruled by monopoly capital, there are over four hundred thousand troops in the standing army for the oppression of the people, about one hundred thousand police, nearly eight thousand gendarmes, and U.S. military bases equipped with missiles. When Togliatti and other comrades demand “peace and peaceful coexistence” in such a country, what do they really mean? If the demand means that the Italian government should follow a policy of peace
and neutrality and of peaceful coexistence with the socialist countries, that is of course correct. But, apart from this, do you also demand of the Italian working class and other oppressed masses that they should practise “peace and peaceful coexistence” with the monopoly capitalist class? Does this sort of peace and peaceful coexistence imply that the U.S. imperialists will voluntarily remove their military bases from Italy and that the Italian monopoly capitalists will voluntarily lay down their arms and disband their troops? And if this is impossible, how is “peace and peaceful coexistence” to be realized between the oppressors and the oppressed in Italy? By a logical extension of this point, how can a “world without war” be created in this way?

Would it not indeed be a fine thing if there were to emerge a “world without weapons, without armies, without wars”? Why should it not have our approval and applause?

However, as Marxist-Leninists see it, the question is clearly not one of subjective imagination but of the laws of social development.

In “Problems of Strategy in China’s Revolutionary War”, written in 1936, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: “War, this monster of mutual slaughter among men, will be finally eliminated by the progress of human society.”

During the War of Resistance Against Japan in 1938, Comrade Mao Tse-tung again expressed this ideal when he said in “On Protracted War”, “Fascism and imperialism wish to perpetuate war, but we wish to put an end to it in the not too distant future.”

In the same work, he stated that the war then being fought by the Chinese nation for its own liberation was a war for perpetual peace. He said that “our War of Resistance Against Japan takes on the character of a struggle for perpetual peace”. ¹

He wrote there that war is a product of the “emergence of classes”. ¹ He continued,

Once man has eliminated capitalism, he will attain the era of perpetual peace, and there will be no more need for war. Neither armies, nor warships, nor military aircraft, nor poison gas will then be needed. Thereafter and for all time, mankind will never again know war.¹

These theses of Comrade Mao Tse-tung’s fully accord with those reiterated by Lenin on the question of war and peace.

In 1905, the year in which the first Russian Revolution broke out, Lenin wrote:

Social-Democracy has never taken a sentimental view of war. It unreservedly condemns war as a bestial means of settling conflicts in human society. But Social-Democracy knows that so long as society is divided into classes, so long as there is exploitation of man by man, wars are inevitable. This exploitation cannot be destroyed without war, and war is always and everywhere begun by the exploiters themselves by the ruling and oppressing classes.²

¹ *Ibid*.
In 1915, during the first imperialist world war, Lenin wrote that Marxists have always condemned wars between nations as a barbarous and bestial affair. Our attitude towards war, however, differs in principle from that of the bourgeois pacifists (the partisans and preachers of peace) and the Anarchists. We differ from the first in that we understand the inevitable connection between wars on the one hand and class struggles inside of a country on the other, we understand the impossibility of eliminating wars without eliminating classes and creating Socialism, and in that we fully recognize the justice, the progressivism and necessity of civil wars, i.e., wars of an oppressed class against the oppressor, of slaves against the slave-holders, of serfs against the landowners, of wage-workers against the bourgeoisie. We Marxists differ from both the pacifists and the Anarchists in that we recognize the necessity of an historical study (from the point of view of Marx's dialectical materialism) of each war individually.¹

During World War I, Lenin as a most conscientious Marxist devoted himself to studying the problem of war, of which he made an extensive and rigorous scientific analysis. He sharply denounced the many absurdities regarding war and peace put about by the opportunists and revisionists of Kautsky's ilk and he showed mankind the correct road to the elimination of war.

Today, however, some self-styled Leninists talk drivel on the question of war and peace without the least

inclination to pause and consider how Lenin studied the
question of war or to consider any of his scientific con-
clusions on the question of war and peace. Nevertheless,
they vociferously accuse others of betraying Lenin and
claim that they alone are the “reincarnations of Lenin”.

IS THE AXIOM “WAR IS THE CONTINUATION OF
POLITICS BY OTHER MEANS” OUT OF DATE?

Some people may perhaps say, “There’s no need for
you to be so garrulous. We are just as familiar with
Lenin’s views on the question of war and peace, but now
conditions are different and Lenin’s theses have become
out of date.”

It was the Tito clique which first openly treated Lenin’s
fundamental theory on war and peace as outmoded. They
claim that, with the emergence of atomic weapons, the
axiom that “war is the continuation of politics by other
means”, which Lenin stressed as the theoretical basis for
studying all wars and for determining the nature of
different kinds of wars, is no longer applicable. In their
view, war has ceased to be the continuation of the politics
of one class or another and has lost its class content, and
there is no longer any distinction between just and unjust
wars. The assertion of Togliatti and other comrades that
with modern military technique the nature of war has
changed in fact repeats what the Tito clique has been
saying for a long time.

Clearly, the imperialists and the reactionaries of various
countries will not divest themselves of their armaments
and stop suppressing the oppressed people and nations,
or abandon their aggressive and subversive activities
against the socialist countries simply because the modern
revisionists deny the axiom that “war is the continuation of politics by other means”, nor will they on that account stop clashing with one another in their scramble for super-profits. The modern revisionists are actually striving to influence the oppressed people and nations by such assertions, and want to put false notions into their heads, as though the imperialists’ war moves to hold down the oppressed people and nations, their arms expansion and war preparations, their direct and indirect armed conflicts for the seizure of markets and spheres of influence were not all the continuation of imperialist politics. For example, in their view, the U.S. imperialist war to suppress the people of southern Viet Nam and the war engineered by the new and old colonialists in the Congo are not to be considered the continuation of imperialist politics.

Are the war the U.S. imperialists are carrying on in southern Viet Nam and the armed conflict in the Congo between the new and old colonialists to be regarded as wars or not? If they are not to be regarded as wars, what are they? If they are wars, is there not a connection between them and the system of U.S. imperialism and its politics? And what kind of connection?

Togliatti and certain other comrades of the C.P.I. hold that it is “possible to avoid small local wars”.¹ They also hold that “war would become impossible in human society even if socialism has not yet been realized everywhere”.¹ In all likelihood, these conclusions were reached by Togliatti and other comrades after their “fresh

¹Speeches of the C.P.I. Delegation to the Conference of the 81 Communist and Workers’ Parties, pamphlet published in January 1962, by the Central Department of Press and Propaganda of the C.P.I.
deliberations” on “our doctrine itself”. Now, these remarks by Togliatti and other comrades were made in November 1960. Let us leave aside the events prior to that year. In the year 1960 alone, there occurred in different parts of the world various kinds of military conflicts and armed interventions which are mostly of the category Togliatti and other comrades call “small local wars”:

The war waged by the French colonial forces to suppress the Algerian national liberation movement went on for its sixth year.

During this year the U.S. imperialists and their running dog Ngo Dinh Diem continued their brutal suppression of the people of southern Viet Nam, arousing still greater armed resistance by the latter.

In January and February, armed clashes broke out between Syria and Israel, which was supported by the United States.

On February 5, four thousand U.S. marines landed in the Dominican Republic in Latin America, intervening in its internal affairs by force of arms.

On May 1, an American U-2 plane intruded over the Soviet Union and was shot down by Soviet rocket units.

On July 10, Belgium launched armed intervention in the Congo. Three days later, the United Nations Security Council adopted a resolution under which a “United Nations force” arrived in the Congo to put down the national liberation movement there.
In August, the United States aided and abetted the Savannakhet clique in provoking civil war in Laos.

Perhaps the events of 1960 do not fall within the scope of discussion of Togliatti and other comrades. Well then, do world events of 1961 and 1962 serve to bear out their prediction?

Let us review the facts.

The French colonial forces continued their criminal war of suppression against the Algerian national liberation movement until they were forced to accept a ceasefire in March 1962. By then, the war had lasted more than seven years. The "special war" waged by the U.S. imperialists against the people in southern Viet Nam is still going on.

The "United Nations force" (mainly Indian troops) serving U.S. neo-colonialism continued its suppression of the Congolese people. Early in 1961, Lumumba, national hero of the Congo, was murdered by the hirelings of the U.S. and Belgian imperialists and on their instructions. From September 1961 to the end of the following year, the U.S.-manipulated "United Nations force" mounted three armed attacks on Katanga, which was under the control of the British, French and Belgian old colonialists.

In March 1961, the Portuguese colonialists, supported by U.S. imperialism, massed their forces and began their large-scale suppression and massacre of the peo-
ple of Angola who are demanding national independence. This bloody atrocity is still going on.

On April 17, 1961, U.S. mercenaries staged an armed invasion of Cuba and were wiped out at Giron Beach by the heroic army and people of Cuba within seventy-two hours.

On July 1, 1961, British troops landed in Kuwait. On the 19th, French troops attacked the port of Bizerta in Tunisia.

On November 19 and 20, 1961, the United States again intervened in the Dominican Republic by armed force, using naval and air units.

On January 15, 1962, the Dutch colonialists' naval forces attacked Indonesian naval units off the coast of West Irian.

In April 1962, the Indonesian people launched a guerrilla campaign in West Irian against the Dutch colonialists.

In May 1962, the United States plotted to expand the civil war in Laos and prepared direct intervention by armed force. On the 17th, U.S. forces entered Thailand, and on the 24th Britain announced the dispatch of an air squadron to Thailand. These military moves by the United States and Britain posed a direct threat to peace in Southeast Asia. After resolute struggle on the part of the Laotian people and concerted efforts by the socialist countries and the neutral nations, a Declaration on the Neutrality of
Laos and a protocol to the declaration were signed on July 23, 1962, at the enlarged Geneva Conference for the peaceful settlement of the Laotian question.

On August 24, 1962, U.S. armed vessels bombarded the seaside residential areas of Havana, the Cuban capital.

On September 26, 1962, when a military coup d’etat took place in the Yemen, the United States instigated Saudi Arabian armed intervention.

During 1962, the Nehru government of India made repeated armed intrusions into Chinese territory with U.S. imperialist support. On October 20, the Nehru government launched a massive military attack along the Sino-Indian border.

On October 22, 1962, the United States, resorting to piracy, imposed a military blockade and carried out a war provocation against Cuba which shocked the world. The Cuban people gained a great victory in their struggle to defend the sovereignty of their fatherland, supported as they were by the people of the socialist and all other countries in the world.

During these two years, ruthless exploitation, brutal repression and armed intervention by the imperialists and their lackeys continued to evoke armed resistance by the people in many countries and by many oppressed nations, such as the armed uprising of the Brunei people against Britain on December 8, 1962.
Time and again events have confirmed Lenin's statement that “war is always and everywhere begun by the exploiters themselves, by the ruling and oppressing classes”, and that “war is the continuation of politics by other means”. Present and future realities will continue to bear out these truths enunciated by Lenin.

WHAT HAS EXPERIENCE PAST AND PRESENT TO TEACH US?

Since the imperialists and reactionaries incessantly foment wars in various regions of the world to serve their own political ends, it is impossible for anybody to prevent the oppressed people and nations from waging wars of resistance against oppression.

Certain self-styled Marxist-Leninists may not regard the many wars cited above as wars at all. They acknowledge only wars which take place in “highly developed civilized regions”. Actually, such ideas are nothing new.

Lenin long ago criticized the absurd view that wars outside Europe were not wars. Lenin said sarcastically in a speech in 1917 that there were “... wars which we, Europeans, do not consider to be wars, because all too often they resembled not wars, but the most brutal slaughter, extermination of unarmed peoples.”

People exactly like those Lenin criticized are still to be found today. They think that all is quiet in the world so long as there is no war in their own locality or neighbourhood. They do not consider it worth their while to bother whether the imperialists and their lackeys are ravaging and slaughtering people in other localities,
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or engaging in military intervention and armed conflicts or provoking wars there. They only worry lest the “sparks” of resistance by the oppressed nations and people in these places might lead to disaster and disturb their own tranquillity. They see no need whatsoever to examine how wars in these places originate, what social classes are waging these wars, and what the nature of these wars is. They simply condemn these wars in an undiscriminating and arbitrary fashion. Can this approach be regarded as Leninist?

There are certain other self-styled Marxist-Leninists who think only of war between the socialist and imperialist camps whenever war is mentioned, as if there could be no wars to speak of other than one between the two camps. This thesis, too, was first invented by the Titoites, and now there are certain people who are singing the same tune. They are simply unwilling to face reality or to give thought to the facts of history.

If these people’s memories are not too short, they will remember that when World War I started, there was no socialist country in existence, let alone a socialist camp. All the same, a world war broke out.

If their memories are not too short, they may also recall World War II. From September 1939 to June 1941 when the German-Soviet war began, a war had been going on for almost two years in the capitalist world and among the imperialist countries themselves. This was not a war between socialist and imperialist countries. The Soviet Union, after Hitler attacked it, became the main force in the war against the fascist hordes, but even after June 1941 the war could not be looked upon as one simply between the socialist and imperialist countries. In addition to the land of socialism, the U.S.S.R., a num-
ber of capitalist countries — Great Britain, the United States and France — were part of the anti-fascist front and so were many colonial and semi-colonial countries suffering from oppression and aggression.

It is therefore clear that both world wars originated in the contradictions inherent in the capitalist world and in the conflict of interests between the imperialist powers, and that both were unleashed by the imperialist countries.

World wars do not originate in the socialist system. A socialist country has no antagonistic social contradictions, which are peculiar to the capitalist countries, and it is absolutely unnecessary and impermissible for a socialist country to embark on wars of expansion. No world war can ever be started by a socialist country.

Thanks to the victories of the socialist countries and to the victories of the national-democratic revolutionary movement in many countries, great new changes continue to take place in the world situation. Togliatti and other comrades say that in view of the changes in the world balance of forces the imperialists can no longer do as they like. There is nothing wrong with this statement. As a matter of fact, the point was made by Lenin not long after the October Revolution. Basing himself on an appraisal of the changes in the balance of class forces at that time, Lenin said: “The hands of the international bourgeoisie are now no longer free.”¹ But when the world balance of forces is becoming more and more favourable to socialism and to the people of all countries, and when we say that the imperialists can no

longer do as they please, does this now mean the spontaneous disappearance of the possibility of all sorts of conflicts arising from the contradictions inherent in the capitalist world, has it meant so in the past, and will it mean so in the future? Does it mean that the imperialist countries have ceased to dream about, and prepare for, attacks on the socialist countries? Does it mean that the imperialist countries have stopped their aggression against and oppression of the colonial and semi-colonial countries? Does it mean that the imperialist countries will no longer fight each other to the death over markets and spheres of influence? Does it mean that the monopoly capitalist class has given up its brutal grinding down and suppression of the people at home? Nothing of the kind.

The question of war and peace can never be understood unless it is seen in the light of social relations, of the social system, and of the laws of social development.

That old-line opportunist Kautsky held that “war is a product of the arms drive”, and that “if there is a will to reach agreement on disarmament”, it will “eliminate one of the most serious causes of war”.1 Lenin sharply criticized these anti-Marxist views of Kautsky and other old-line opportunists who examined the causes of war without reference to the social system and the system of exploitation.

In “The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution” Lenin pointed out that “only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world-historical mission, to throw all arma-
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1 Kautsky, The National State, the Imperialist State and the League of States.
ments on the scrap heap; and the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but only when this condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before.”¹ Such is the law of social development, and it cannot be otherwise.

Being incapable of explaining the question of war and peace from the historical and class angle, the modern revisionists always talk about peace and about war in general terms without making any distinction between just and unjust wars. Some people are trying to persuade others that the people’s liberation would be “incomparably easier” after general and complete disarmament, when the oppressors would have no weapons in their hands. In our opinion this is nonsensical and totally unrealistic and is putting the cart before the horse. As pointed out by Lenin, such people try to “reconcile two hostile classes and two hostile political lines by means of a little word which ‘unites’ the most divergent things”.²

On the lips of the modern revisionists, “peace” and “the strategy of peaceful coexistence” amount to pinning the hope of world peace on the “wisdom” of the imperialist rulers, instead of relying on the unity and struggle of the people of the world. The modern revisionists are resorting to every method to fetter the struggles of the people in all countries, are trying to paralyse their revolutionary will and induce them to abandon revolutionary action, and thus weakening the forces fighting against imperialism and for world peace. This can only result in increasing the reactionary arrogance of the im-

perialist forces of aggression and war and in increasing
the danger of a world war.

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM, OR THE THEORY THAT
"WEAPONS DECIDE EVERYTHING"?

The modern revisionists hold that with the emergence
of atomic weapons the laws of social development have
ceased to operate and the fundamental Marxist-Leninist
theory concerning war and peace is outmoded. Comrade
Togliatti holds the same view. The Renmin Ribao edi-
torial of December 31, 1962 has already discussed our
main differences with Comrade Togliatti on the question
of nuclear weapons and nuclear war. We shall now go
into this question further.

Marxist-Leninists give proper and adequate weight to
the role of modern weapons and military techniques in
the organization of armies and in war. Marx’s pamphlet,
Wage-Labour and Capital, contains the well-known pas-
sage:

With the invention of a new instrument of warfare,
firearms, the whole internal organization of the army
necessarily changed; the relationships within which
individuals can constitute an army and act as an army
were transformed and the relations of different armies
to one another also changed.¹

But no Marxist-Leninist has ever been an exponent
of the theory that “weapons decide everything”.

Lenin said after the October Revolution, “He wins in
war who has the greater reserves, the greater sources of

¹ Marx and Engels, Selected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1958,
strength, the greater endurance in the mass of its people.” Again, “We have more of all of this than the Whites have, and more than ‘universally-mighty’ Anglo-French imperialism, that colossus with feet of clay.”1

To elucidate the point, we might quote another passage from Lenin. He said:

In every war, victory is conditioned in the final analysis by the spiritual state of those masses who shed their blood on the field of battle. . . . This comprehension by the masses of the aims and reasons of the war has an immense significance and guarantees victory.2

On the question of war, it is a fundamental Marxist-Leninist principle to give full weight to the role of man in war. But this principle has often been forgotten by some self-styled Marxist-Leninists. When atomic weapons appeared at the end of World War II, some people became confused, thinking that atom bombs could decide the outcome of war. Comrade Mao Tse-tung said at that time: “These comrades show even less judgement than a British peer” and “these comrades are more backward than Mountbatten.”3 The British peer, Mountbatten, then Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Southeast Asia, had declared that the worst possible mistake would

be to believe that the atom bomb could end the war in the Far East.¹

Of course, Comrade Mao Tse-tung took the destructiveness of atomic weapons into full account. He said, "The atom bomb is a weapon of mass slaughter."² The Chinese Communist Party has always held that nuclear weapons are unprecedentedly destructive and that humanity will suffer unprecedented havoc if a nuclear war should break out. For this reason, we have always stood for the total banning of nuclear weapons, that is, the complete prohibition of their testing, manufacture, stockpiling and use, and for the destruction of existing nuclear weapons. At the same time, we have always held that in the final analysis atomic weapons cannot change the laws governing the historical development of society, cannot decide the final outcome of war, cannot save imperialism from its doom or prevent the proletariat and people of all countries and the oppressed nations from winning victory in their revolutions.

Stalin said in September 1946,

I do not believe the atomic bomb to be as serious a force as certain politicians are inclined to regard it. Atomic bombs are intended for intimidating the weak-nerved, but they cannot decide the outcome of war since atomic bombs are by no means sufficient for the purpose. Certainly, monopolist possession of the secret of the atomic bomb does create a threat, but at least two remedies exist against it: (a) monopolist pos-

¹Cf. ibid., p. 26, Note 27.
session of the atomic bomb cannot last long; (b) use of atomic bomb will be prohibited.¹

These words of Stalin’s showed his great foresight.

After World War I, some imperialist countries noisily advertised a military theory, according to which quick victory in war could be won through air supremacy and surprise attacks. Events in World War II exposed its bankruptcy. With the appearance of nuclear weapons, some imperialists have again noisily advertised this kind of theory and resorted to nuclear blackmail, asserting that nuclear weapons could quickly decide the outcome of war. Their theory will definitely go bankrupt too. But the modern revisionists, such as the Tito clique, are serving the U.S. and other imperialists, preaching and trumpeting this theory in order to intimidate the people of all countries.

The policy of nuclear blackmail employed by the U.S. imperialists reveals their evil ambition to enslave the world, and at the same time it reveals their fear.

It must be pointed out that if the imperialists should start using nuclear weapons, they will bring fatal consequences upon themselves.

First, if the imperialists should start using nuclear weapons to attack other countries, they will find themselves completely isolated in the world. For such an attack will be the greatest possible crime against human justice and will proclaim the attackers to be the enemy of all mankind.

Second, when they menace other countries with nuclear weapons, the imperialists put their own people

¹Stalin’s answer to Mr. A. Werth, correspondent of Sunday Times in Moscow, The Times, September 25, 1946.
first under threat and fill them with dread of such weapons. By clinging to the policy of nuclear blackmail, the imperialists will gradually arouse the people in their own countries to rise against them. One of the U.S. airmen who dropped the first atom bombs on Japan has attempted suicide because of post-war condemnation of atomic bombing by the people of the whole world, and has been sent to a mental hospital many times. This instance, in itself, shows to what extent the nuclear war policy of U.S. imperialism has been discredited.

Third, the imperialists unleash wars for the purpose of seizing territory, expanding markets, and plundering the wealth and enslaving the working people of other countries. The destructiveness of nuclear weapons, however, compels the imperialists to think twice, because the consequences of the employment of such weapons would conflict with the actual interests they are seeking.

Fourth, the secret of nuclear weapons has long since ceased to be a monopoly. Those who possess nuclear weapons and guided missiles cannot prevent other countries from possessing the same. In their vain hope of obliterating their opponents with nuclear weapons, the imperialists are, in fact, subjecting themselves to the danger of being obliterated.

Above, we have dealt with some of the consequences which will inevitably arise if the imperialists use nuclear weapons in war. It is also one of the important reasons why we have always maintained that it is possible to conclude an agreement for a total ban on nuclear weapons.

It must also be pointed out that the policy of frantic expansion of nuclear arms pursued by the imperialists,
and particularly the U.S. imperialists, aggravates the crises within the capitalist-imperialist system itself:

First, the unprecedentedly onerous military expenditures imposed on the people in the imperialist countries and the increasingly lopsided militarization of the national economy are arousing the growing opposition of the people to the imperialist governments and their policy of arms expansion and war preparation.

Second, the imperialists' arms drive, and especially their nuclear arms drive, exacerbates the struggle among the imperialist powers and among the monopoly groups in each imperialist country.

Engels said in *Anti-Dühring*, written in the 1870s, "Militarism dominates and is swallowing Europe. But this militarism also bears within itself the seed of its own destruction."\(^1\)

Today there is all the more reason to say that the policy of nuclear arms expansion pursued by the U.S. and other imperialists is dominating and swallowing North America and Western Europe, but that this policy, this new militarism, bears within itself the seed of the destruction of the imperialist system.

It can therefore be seen that the policy of nuclear arms expansion pursued by the U.S. imperialists and their partners is bound to be self-defeating. If they dare to use nuclear weapons in war, the result will be their own destruction.

What should one conclude from all this? Contrary to the pronouncements of Togliatti and other comrades about the "total destruction" of mankind, the only possible conclusions are:

First, mankind will destroy nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons will not destroy mankind.

Second, mankind will destroy the cannibal system of imperialism, the imperialist system will not destroy mankind.

Togliatti and other comrades hold that with the appearance of nuclear weapons “the destiny of humanity today is uncertain”.¹ They hold that with the existence of nuclear weapons and the threat of a nuclear war, there is no longer any point in talking about the choice of a social system. If one follows their argument, then what happens to the law of social development according to which the capitalist system will inevitably be replaced by the socialist and communist system? And what happens to the truth elucidated by Lenin — that imperialism is parasitic, decaying and moribund capitalism? Does not their view represent real “fatalism”, “scepticism” and “pessimism”?

We stated in the article “Long Live Leninism!”:

As long as the people of all countries enhance their awareness and are fully prepared, with the socialist camp also possessing modern weapons, it is certain that if the U.S. or other imperialists refuse to reach an agreement on the banning of atomic and nuclear weapons and should dare to fly in the face of the will of all the peoples by launching a war using atomic and nuclear weapons, the result will only be the very speedy destruction of these monsters themselves encircled by the peoples of the world, and certainly not the so-called annihilation of mankind. We consistently oppose the launching of criminal wars by imperialism, because

¹“Political Resolution of the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.”
imperialist war would impose enormous sacrifices upon the peoples of various countries (including the peoples of the United States and other imperialist countries). But should the imperialists impose such sacrifices on the peoples of various countries, we believe that, just as the experience of the Russian revolution and the Chinese revolution shows, those sacrifices would be rewarded. On the ruins of imperialism, the victorious people would very swiftly create a civilization thousands of times higher than the capitalist system and a truly beautiful future for themselves.

Is this not the truth?

During the past few years, however, some self-styled Marxist-Leninists have wantonly distorted and condemned these Marxist-Leninist theses, stubbornly describing the ruins of imperialism as “the ruins of mankind” and equating the destiny of the imperialist system with that of mankind. In fact, this view is a defence of the imperialist system. If these people had read some of the Marxist-Leninist classics, it would have been clear to them that building a new system on the ruins of the old was a formulation used by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Engels said in Anti-Dühring, “The bourgeoisie broke up the feudal system and built upon its ruins the capitalist order of society. . . .”¹ Did the ruins of the feudal system, which Engels spoke of, mean the “ruins of mankind”? In his article “The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat”, written in December 1919, Lenin spoke of the proletariat “organizing

¹Engels, Anti-Dühring, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1959, p. 368.
socialism on the ruins of capitalism”.¹ Did the ruins of capitalism, which Lenin mentioned, mean the “ruins of mankind”? 

To describe the ruins of the old systems mentioned by Marxist-Leninists as the “ruins of mankind” is to substitute frivolous quibbling for serious debate. Can this be the non-“discordant note” which Togliatti and the other comrades want? Is this the polemic carried on in an “admissible tone” which they demand? In fact, at the time of the collapse of Italian fascism, Comrade Togliatti himself said, “A great task rests upon us: we should establish a new Italy on the ruins of fascism, on the ruins of reactionary tyranny.”²

Every serious Marxist-Leninist must consider the possibility of the imperialists adopting the most criminal means to inflict the heaviest sacrifices and the keenest suffering on the people of all countries. The purpose of such consideration is to awaken the people, mobilize and organize them more effectively, and to find the correct course of struggle for liberation and a way to deliver mankind from suffering, a way to win peace in the face of the threats of imperialism, and a way effective in preventing a nuclear war.

That no socialist country will ever start an aggressive war is known by everybody, even by the U.S. imperialists as well as by all the other imperialists and reactionaries. The national defence of each socialist country is designed for protection against external aggression, and absolutely not for attacking other countries. If the aggressors

¹ Lenin, Collected Works, 4th Russian ed., Vol. 30, p. 239.
² Quoted in The Italian Communist Party, published by the C.P.I. in May 1950.
should impose a war on a socialist country, then the war waged by the socialist country would above all be a war of self-defence.

Possession of nuclear weapons by the socialist countries has a purely defensive purpose, the purpose of preventing the imperialists from unleashing nuclear war. Therefore, with nuclear superiority in their hands, the socialist countries will never attack other countries with such weapons; they will not permit themselves to launch such attacks, nor will they have any need to do so. Being firmly opposed to the policy of nuclear blackmail, the socialist countries advocate the total banning and destruction of nuclear weapons. Such is the attitude, line and policy of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China on the question of nuclear weapons. Such is the attitude, line and policy of all Marxist-Leninists. The modern revisionists deliberately distort our attitude, line and policy on this question and fabricate mean and vulgar slanders and lies; their purpose is to cover up the nuclear blackmail of the imperialists and to conceal their own adventurism and capitulationism on the question of nuclear weapons. It must be pointed out that adventurism and capitulationism on this question are very dangerous and are an expression of the worst kind of irresponsibility.

A STRANGE FORMULATION

In accordance with the nature of their social system, socialist countries give sympathy and support to all oppressed people and oppressed nations in their struggles for liberation. But socialist countries will never launch external wars as a substitute for revolutionary struggles
by the peoples of other countries. The emancipation of
the people of each country is their own task — this is the
firm standpoint held since the time of Marx by all true
Communists, including the Communists who wield state
power. It is identical with the standpoint consistently
advocated by all Marxist-Leninists that “revolution cannot
be exported or imported”.

If the people of any country do not want a revolution,
no one can impose it from without; where there is no
revolutionary crisis and the conditions for a revolution
are not ripe, nobody can create a revolution. And of
course, if the people in any country desire a revolution
and themselves start a revolution, no one can prevent
them from making it, just as no one could prevent the
revolutions in Cuba, in Algeria or in southern Viet Nam.

Togliatti and other comrades say that peaceful co-
existence implies “excluding . . . the possibility of foreign
intervention to ‘export’ either counter-revolution or rev-
olution”.¹ We should like to ask: When you talk
about “export of revolution” by foreign countries,
do you mean that the socialist countries want to export
revolution? This is just what the imperialists and reactionaries have been alleging all along. Should a Com-
munist talk in such terms? As for the imperialist coun-
tries, they have always exported counter-revolution.
Can anyone name an imperialist country which has not
done so? Can we forget that the imperialists launched
direct intervention against the Great October Revolution
and the Chinese revolution? Can anyone deny that the U.S imperialists are still forcibly occupying our terri-
tory of Taiwan today? Can anyone deny that the U.S.

¹“Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.”
imperialists have all along been intervening in the Cuban revolution? Is not U.S. imperialism playing the international gendarme and trying its utmost to export counter-revolution to all parts of the world and interfering in the internal affairs of the other countries in the capitalist world?

Togliatti and other comrades make no distinction between countries whose social systems differ in nature; they do not understand the Marxist-Leninist view that “revolution cannot be exported or imported”; and in discussing peaceful coexistence they ignore the fact that the imperialists have all along been exporting counter-revolution and speak of “export of counter-revolution” and “export of revolution” in the same breath. This strange formulation cannot but be considered an error of principle.

THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS' BASIC THESES ON THE QUESTION OF WAR AND PEACE

On the question of war and peace, the Chinese Communists, now as always, uphold the views of Lenin.

In the above quotations, Lenin pointed out that proletarian parties “unreservedly condemn war” and “have always condemned wars between peoples”. But Lenin always maintained that unjust wars must be opposed and that just wars must be supported; he never indiscriminately opposed all wars. There are people today who unblushingly compare themselves to Lenin and allege that Lenin, and Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, too, opposed war in the same way as they do. They have emasculated Lenin’s theories and policies on the question of war and peace. It is common knowledge
that during World War I, Lenin resolutely opposed the imperialist war. At the same time he maintained that once war broke out among the imperialist countries, the proletariat and other working people of these countries should turn the imperialist war into just revolutionary wars inside the imperialist countries, i.e., into just revolutionary wars of the proletariat and other working people against the imperialists of their own countries. The day after the outbreak of the October Revolution, the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, under the chairmanship of Lenin, adopted the famous Decree on Peace. This Decree was an appeal to the international proletariat, and particularly to the class-conscious workers of Britain, France and Germany, trusting that they "will understand the duty that now faces them of saving mankind from the horrors of war and its consequences, that these workers, by comprehensive, determined, and supremely vigorous action, will help us to bring to a successful conclusion the cause of peace, and at the same time the cause of the emancipation of the toiling and exploited masses of the population from all forms of slavery and all forms of exploitation". ¹

The Decree pointed out that the Soviet government "considers it the greatest of crimes against humanity to continue this war over the issue of how to divide among the strong and rich nations the weak nationalities they have conquered, and solemnly announces its determination immediately to sign terms of peace to stop this war on the conditions indicated, which are equally just for all

nationalities without exception”.¹ This Decree proposed by Lenin is a great document in the history of the proletarian revolution. Yet there are people today who dare to distort and mutilate it; they have tampered with Lenin’s description of a war waged by imperialist countries to divide the world and oppress weak nations as constituting the greatest of crimes against humanity, and deliberately twisted it into “war is the greatest of crimes against humanity”. These people portray Lenin, the great proletarian revolutionary, the great Marxist, as a bourgeois pacifist. They brazenly distort Lenin, distort Leninism, distort history, and yet they presumptuously assert that others “do not understand the substance of the Marxist doctrine of revolutionary struggle”. Isn’t this kind of argument absurd?

We Chinese Communists are being abused by the modern revisionists because we oppose all the ridiculous arguments that are used to distort Leninism and because we insist on restoring the original features of Lenin’s theory on the question of war and peace.

Marxist-Leninists hold that, in order to defend world peace and prevent a new world war, we must rely on the unity and growing strength of the socialist countries, on the struggles of the oppressed nations and people, on the struggles of the international proletariat, and on the struggles of all the peace-loving countries and people in the world. This is the correct line for defending world peace for the people of all lands, a line which is in full accord with the Leninist theory of war and peace. Some people maliciously distort this line, calling it “a ‘theory’ to the effect that the road to victory for socialism runs

¹ Ibid., p. 329.
through war between nations, through destruction, bloodshed and the death of millions of people”. They place the defence of world peace in opposition to the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries, and they hold that in order to have peace the people of all countries should kneel before the imperialists, and the oppressed nations and people should give up their struggles for liberation. Instead of fighting for world peace by relying on the united struggle of all the world’s peace-loving forces, all these people do is to beg the imperialists, headed by the United States, for the gift of world peace. This so-called theory, this line of theirs, is absolutely wrong; it is anti-Leninist.

The Chinese Communists’ basic views on the question of war and peace and our differences with Togliatti and other comrades on this question were made clear in the Renmin Ribao editorial of December 31, 1962. We said in that editorial:

... on the question of how to avert world war and safeguard world peace, the Communist Party of China has consistently stood for the resolute exposure of imperialism, for strengthening the socialist camp, for firm support of the national liberation movements and the peoples’ revolutionary struggles, for the broadest alliance of all the peace-loving countries and people of the world, and at the same time, for taking full advantage of the contradictions among our enemies, and for utilizing the method of negotiation as well as other forms of struggle. The aim of this stand is precisely the effective prevention of world war and preservation of world peace. This stand fully conforms with Marxism-Leninism and with the Moscow
Declaration and the Moscow Statement. It is the correct policy for preventing world war and defending world peace. We persist in this correct policy precisely because we are deeply convinced that it is possible to prevent world war by relying on the combined struggle of all the forces mentioned above. How then can this stand be described as lacking faith in the possibility of averting world war? How can it be called “war-like”? It would simply result in a phoney peace or bring about an actual war for the people of the whole world if you prettify imperialism, pin your hopes of peace on imperialism, take an attitude of passivity or opposition towards the national liberation movements and the peoples’ revolutionary struggles and bow down and surrender to imperialism, as advocated by those who attack the Communist Party of China. This policy is wrong and all Marxist-Leninists, all revolutionary people, all peace-loving people must resolutely oppose it.

Here let us recapitulate our basic theses on the question of war and peace:

First, we have always held that the forces of war and aggression headed by U.S. imperialism are preparing in earnest for a third world war and that the danger of war exists. But in the last ten years or so, the world balance of forces has changed more and more in favour of socialism and in favour of the struggles for national liberation, people’s democracy and the defence of world peace. The people are the decisive factor. Imperialism and the reactionaries are isolated. By relying on the unity and the struggles of the people, and on the correct policies of the socialist countries and of the proletarian parties
of various countries, it is possible to avert a new world war and to avert a nuclear war, and it is possible to achieve an agreement for the total banning of nuclear weapons.

Second, if the people of the world wish to be successful in preserving world peace, preventing a new world war and preventing nuclear war, they must support one another, form the broadest possible united front, and unite all the forces that can be united, including the people of the United States, to oppose the policies of war and aggression of the imperialist bloc headed by the U.S. reactionaries.

Third, the socialist countries stand for and adhere to the policy of peaceful coexistence with countries having other social systems, and develop friendly relations and carry on trade on the basis of equality with them. In pursuing the policy of peaceful coexistence, the socialist countries oppose the use of force to settle disputes between states and do not interfere in the internal affairs of any other country. Some people say that peaceful coexistence will result in the transformation of the social system in all the capitalist countries, and that it is “the road leading to socialism on a world scale”.¹ Others say that the policy of peaceful coexistence is “the most advanced form of struggle against imperialism and for the peoples’ liberation”² by all the oppressed people and nations. These people have completely distorted Lenin’s policy of peaceful coexistence by jumbling together the

question of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, the question of class struggle in capitalist countries and the question of the struggles of the oppressed nations for liberation.

Fourth, we have always believed in the necessity of constantly maintaining sharp vigilance against the danger of imperialist aggression on the socialist countries. We have always believed, too, that it is possible for the socialist countries to reach agreement through peaceful negotiations and make the necessary compromises with the imperialist countries on some issues, not excluding important ones. However, as Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said:

Such compromise does not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in those countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions.¹

Fifth, the sharp contradictions among the imperialist powers exist objectively and are irreconcilable. Among the imperialist countries and blocs, clashes, big and small, direct and indirect and in one form or another, are bound to occur. They arise from the actual interests of the imperialists and are determined by the inherent nature of imperialism. To claim that the possibility of clashes among the imperialist countries arising from their actual interests has disappeared under the new historical conditions is tantamount to saying that imperial-

ism has undergone a complete change, and is, in fact, to embellish imperialism.

Sixth, since capitalist-imperialism and the system of exploitation are the source of war, no one can guarantee that imperialists and reactionaries will not launch wars of aggression against the oppressed nations, or wars against the oppressed people of their own countries. On the other hand, no one can prevent the awakened oppressed nations and people from rising to wage revolutionary wars.

Seventh, the axiom that "war is the continuation of politics by other means", which was affirmed and stressed by Lenin, remains valid today. The social system of the capitalist-imperialist countries is fundamentally different from that of the socialist countries, and their domestic and foreign policies are likewise fundamentally different from those of the socialist countries. From this it follows that the capitalist-imperialist countries and the socialist countries must take fundamentally different stands on the question of war and peace. As far as the capitalist-imperialist countries are concerned, whether they launch wars or profess peace, their aim is to pursue or to maintain their imperialist interests. Imperialist war is the continuation of imperialist policy in peacetime, and imperialist peace is the continuation of the war policy of imperialism. The bourgeois pacifists and the opportunists have always denied this point. As Lenin said, "The pacifists of both shades have never understood that 'war is the continuation of the politics of peace, and peace is the continuation of the politics of war'."

---

Eighth, the era of perpetual peace for mankind will come; the era when all wars will be eradicated will come. We are striving for its advent. But this great era will come only after, and not before, mankind has eradicated the system of capitalist-imperialism. As the Moscow Statement puts it, "The victory of socialism all over the world will completely remove the social and national causes of all wars."

These are our basic theses on the question of war and peace.

Our theses are derived from analysis, based on the Marxist materialist conception of history, of a host of phenomena objectively existing in the world, of the extremely complex political and economic relationships among different countries, and of the specific conditions in the new world epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Revolution. These theses are correct in theory and, moreover, they have been repeatedly tested in practice. Since the modern revisionists and their followers have no way of disproving these theses, they have freely resorted to distortions and lies in their attempt to demolish the truth.

But how can the truth ever be demolished? Should it not rather be said that those trying to do this will themselves, sooner or later, be demolished by the truth?

At the present time, certain self-styled "creative Marxist-Leninists" believe that world history moves to the waving of their baton, and not according to the objective laws of society. This reminds us of the words of the famous French philosopher Diderot, as quoted by Lenin in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*:
There was a moment of insanity when the sentient piano imagined that it was the only piano in the world, and that the whole harmony of the universe took place within it.¹

Let those historical idealists who think that they are everything and that everything is contained in their own subjectivism carefully think over this passage!

V. THE STATE AND REVOLUTION

WHAT IS THE “POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION” OF COMRADE TOGLIATTI’S “THEORY OF STRUCTURAL REFORM”? 

Togliatti and some other comrades describe their “fundamental line” of “structural reform” as “common to the whole international communist movement”,² they describe their thesis of structural reform as “a principle of the world strategy of the working class and communist movement in the present situation”.³

It seems that Togliatti and other comrades not only want to thrust the “Italian road” on the working class and working people of Italy but to impose it on the people of the whole capitalist world. For they consider their proposed Italian road to be “the road of advance to socialism” for the whole capitalist world today, and apparently the one and only such road. Comrade

² Togliatti’s concluding speech at the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
³ Togliatti’s speech at the April 1962 session of the Central Committee of the C.P.I.
Togliatti and certain other Italian comrades have an extraordinarily high opinion of themselves.

In order to make the issue clear, it may be useful first to introduce the reader to the main contents of their proposed Italian road and structural reform.

1. Is the most fundamental thesis of Marxism-Leninism that the state apparatus of bourgeois dictatorship has to be smashed and a state apparatus of proletarian dictatorship established, still wholly valid? In their opinion, this is “a subject for discussion”. They say that “it is evident that we correct something of this position, taking into account the changes which have taken place and which are still in the process of being realized in the world”.

2. “Today, the question of doing what was done in Russia is not posed to the Italian workers.” Comrade Togliatti expressed this view in April 1944 and re-affirmed it as being “programmatic” in his report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.

3. The Italian working class can “organize itself into the ruling class within the limits of the constitutional system”.

4. The Italian Constitution “assigns to the forces of labour a new and pre-eminent position” and “permits and envisages structural modifications”. “The struggle to give a new socialist content to Italian democracy has ample room for development within our Constitution.”

---

1 Togliatti, “The Italian Road to Socialism”, report to the June 1956 session of the Central Committee of the C.P.I.
2 Togliatti’s report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
4 “Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.”
5. "... We can talk of the possibility of the thorough utilization of legal means and also of Parliament to carry out serious social transformations. ..."¹ "Full power should be given to Parliament, allowing it to carry out not only legislative tasks, but also the functions of direction of and control over the activities of "the Executive. ..."² And they talk of the demand for "the effective extension of the powers of Parliament to the economic field".³

6. "... The building of a new democratic regime advancing towards socialism is closely connected with the formation of a new historical grouping, which, under the leadership of the working class, would fight to change the structure of society and which would be the bearer of an intellectual and moral as well as a political revolution."²

7. "... The destruction of the most backward and burdensome structures in Italian society and the beginning of their transformation in a democratic and socialist sense cannot and should not be postponed till the day when the working class and its allies win power. ..."⁴

8. The nationalized economy, i.e., state-monopoly capital, in Italy can stand "in opposition to the monopolies",⁵ can be "the expression of the popular masses"⁵ and can become "a more effective instrument for oppos-

¹ Togliatti’s report to the March 1956 session of the Central Committee of the C.P.I.
² "Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I."
³ "Political Theses Approved by the Ninth Congress of the C.P.I."
⁴ "Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the C.P.I."
⁵ A. Pesenti, "Is It a Question of the Structure or of the Super-Structure?" in *Rinascita*, May 19, 1962.
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ing monopolistic development". It is possible "to break up and abolish the monopoly ownership of the major productive forces and transform it into collective ownership . . . through nationalization".

9. State intervention in economic life can "fulfil the needs for a democratic development of the economy" and can be turned into all "instrument of struggle against the power of big capital in order to hit, restrict and break up the rule of the big monopoly groups".

10. Under capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship, "the concepts of planning and programming the economy, considered at one time a socialist prerogative", can be accepted. The working class, by "taking part in formulating and executing the planning policy in full realization of its own ideals and autonomy, with the strength of its own unity", can turn planning policy into "a means of satisfying the needs of men and of the national collective".

In short, the Italian road and the structural reform of Togliatti and other comrades amount to this — politically, while preserving the bourgeois dictatorship, "progressively to change the internal balance and structure of the state" and thus "impose the rise of new classes to its leadership" through the "legal" means of bourgeois democracy, constitution and parliament (as to what is meant by "new classes", their exposition has always been ambiguous); and economically, while

---

1 A. Pesenti, "Direct or Indirect Forms of State Intervention", in Rinascita, June 9, 1962.
2 "Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the C.P.I."
3 Togliatti’s speech at the April 1962 session of the Central Committee of the C.P.I.
4 Togliatti’s report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
5 “Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.”
preserving the capitalist system, gradually to "restrict" and "break up" monopoly capital through "nationalization", "programming" and "state intervention". In other words, it is possible to attain socialism in Italy through bourgeois dictatorship, without going through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Togliatti and other comrades consider their ideas to be "a positive contribution to the deepening and development of Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary doctrine of the working class". Unfortunately there is nothing new in their ideas; they are very old and very stale; they are the bourgeois socialism which Marx and Engels so relentlessly refuted long ago.

The bourgeois socialism Marx and Engels criticized belonged to a period before monopoly capitalism had emerged. If Togliatti and the other comrades have made any "positive contribution", it is to the development, not of Marxism, but of bourgeois socialism. They have developed pre-monopoly bourgeois socialism into monopoly bourgeois socialism. But this is the very development which the Tito clique proposed long ago, and Togliatti and the other comrades have taken it over after their "study and profound understanding" of what the Tito clique has done and is doing.

**COMPARE THIS WITH LENINISM**

Whether it is possible to pass over to and realize socialism before overthrowing the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and establishing the dictatorship of the pro-

---

1 Togliatti, "Let Us Lead the Discussion Back to Its Real Limit".
letariat has always been the most fundamental question at issue between Marxist-Leninists and every kind of opportunist and revisionist. In *The State and Revolution* and *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, two great works familiar to all Marxist-Leninists, Lenin comprehensively and penetratingly elucidated this fundamental question, defended and developed revolutionary Marxism and thoroughly exposed and repudiated the distortions of Marxism by the opportunists and revisionists.

As a matter of fact, “structural reform”, the “change in the internal balance of the state” and other ideas held by Togliatti and the other comrades are all ideas of Kautsky’s which Lenin criticized in *The State and Revolution*. Comrade Togliatti says, “The Chinese comrades want to scare us by reminding us of Kautsky, with whose views our policy has nothing in common.”¹ Are we trying to scare Comrade Togliatti and the others? Has their policy nothing in common with Kautsky’s views? As they did, we ask whether they will “permit us to remind them” to re-read carefully *The State and Revolution* and Lenin’s other works.

Togliatti and the other comrades refuse to pay attention to the fundamental difference between proletarian socialist revolution and bourgeois revolution.

Lenin said:

The difference between socialist revolution and bourgeois revolution lies precisely in the fact that the latter finds ready forms of capitalist relationships;

while the Soviet power — the proletarian power —
does not inherit such ready-made relationships. . . .

All state power in class society is designed to safeguard a particular social and economic system, that is, particular relations of production. As Lenin put it, "Politics are the concentrated expression of economics." Every social and economic system invariably has a corresponding political system which serves it and clears away the obstacles to its development.

Historically speaking, the slave-owners, the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie all had to establish themselves politically as the ruling class and take state power into their own hands in order to make their relations of production prevail over all others and to consolidate and develop these relations of production.

A fundamental point differentiating revolutions of exploiting classes from proletarian revolution is that, before the seizure of state power by any of the three great exploiting classes — the slave-owners, the landlords or the bourgeoisie — the relations of production of slavery, feudalism or capitalism already existed in society, and in certain cases had become fairly mature. But before the proletariat seizes power, socialist relations of production do not exist in society. The reason is obvious. A new form of private ownership can come into being spontaneously on the basis of an old one, whereas socialist public ownership of the means of production can

---

never come into being spontaneously on the basis of capitalist private ownership.

Let us compare the ideas and programme of Togliatti and the other comrades with Leninism.

Contrary to Leninism, Togliatti and the other comrades maintain that socialist relations of production can gradually come into being without a socialist revolution and proletarian state power, and that the basic economic interests of the proletariat can be satisfied without a political revolution which replaces the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the starting-point of the “Italian road” and the “theory of structural reform” of Comrade Togliatti and the others.

Who are right? Marx, Engels and Lenin, or Togliatti and the other comrades? Which ones “lack a sense of reality”? The Marxist-Leninists, or Togliatti and the other comrades with their ideas and programme?

Let us look at the reality in Italy.

Italy is a country with a population of fifty million. According to available statistics, Italy now has, in a period of peace, several hundred thousand government officials, over four hundred thousand troops in the standing army, nearly eighty thousand gendarmes, about one hundred thousand policemen, over one thousand two hundred law courts of all levels, and nearly one thousand prisons; this does not include the secret machinery of suppression with its armed personnel. In addition, there are U.S. military bases and U.S. armed forces stationed in Italy.

In their Theses, Togliatti and the other comrades delight in talking about Italy’s democracy, constitution, parliament and so forth, but they do not use the class
point of view to analyse the army, the gendarmes, the police, the law courts, the prisons and the other instruments of violence in present-day Italy. Whom do these instruments of violence protect and whom do they suppress? Do they protect the proletariat and the other working people and suppress the monopoly capitalists, or vice versa? When talking about the state system, a Marxist-Leninist must answer this question and not evade it.

Let us see what these instruments of violence are used for in Italy. Here are a few illustrations.

In the three years from 1948 to 1950, the Italian government killed or injured more than three thousand people and arrested more than ninety thousand, in the course of suppressing the mass opposition of the people.

In July 1960, the Tambroni government killed eleven people, injured one thousand and arrested another thousand, while suppressing the anti-fascist movement of the Italian working people.

In 1962 after the so-called centre-left government of Fanfani was formed, there were a succession of incidents as the government suppressed strikes or mass demonstrations — in Ceccano in May, in Turin in July, in Bari in August, in Milan in October and in Rome in November. In the Rome incident alone, dozens of people were injured, and six hundred arrested.

These are just a few instances, but do they not suffice to expose Italian democracy for what it really is? In an Italy with a powerful state machine, both open and secret, for suppressing the people, is it possible not to describe Italian democracy as the democracy, i.e., the dictatorship, of the Italian monopoly capitalist class?
Is it possible for the working class and all the working people of Italy to participate in the formulation of the Italian government’s domestic and foreign policy under the Italian democracy of which Togliatti and the other comrades boast? If you, Togliatti and the other comrades, think it possible, will you take responsibility for the numerous crimes of suppression of the people committed by the Italian government, for that government’s agreement to let the United States build military bases in Italy, for its participation in NATO, etc.? Naturally, you will say that you cannot be held responsible for these reactionary domestic and foreign policies of the Italian government. But since you claim a share in policy-making, why are you unable to achieve the slightest change in these most fundamental policies of the Italian government?

To laud “democracy” in general terms, without making any distinction concerning the class character of democracy, is to sing the tune which the heroes of the Second International and the Right-wing social democratic leaders played to death. Is it not strange for the self-styled Marxist-Leninists of today to claim these worn-out tunes as their own new creations?

Perhaps Comrade Togliatti does want to differentiate himself a little from the social-democrats. He maintains that as far as “abstract argument” is concerned, one may acknowledge the class character of the state and the bourgeois character of the present Italian state, but that “putting it in concrete terms” is another matter. In terms of “concrete argument”, he maintains that “starting from the present state structure . . . by realizing the profound reforms envisaged by the Constitution, it would
be possible . . . to obtain such results as would change the present power grouping and create the conditions for another grouping, of which the labouring classes constitute a part and in which they would assume the function which is their due . . .” and thus to make Italy “advance towards socialism in democracy and peace”.¹ When translated into language intelligible to ordinary people, these vague phrases of Comrade Togliatti’s mean that the nature of the state machine of the Italian monopoly capitalists can be gradually changed without a people’s revolution in Italy.

Comrade Togliatti’s “concrete argument” is at loggerheads with his “abstract argument”. In his “abstract argument” he comes a little closer to Marxism-Leninism, but when he gives the “concrete argument” he is far removed from Marxism-Leninism. Perhaps he thinks this is the only way to avoid being “dogmatic”!

When Togliatti and the other comrades are assessed in the light of their “concrete argument”, the hairline between them and the social-democrats vanishes.

Today, when certain people are doing their utmost to adulterate the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state and revolution, and when the modern revisionists are usurping the name of Lenin in their frenzied attacks on Leninism, we would like to draw attention to the following two paragraphs from Lenin’s speech at the First Congress of the Communist International in 1919:

The main thing that socialists fail to understand and that constitutes their short-sightedness in matters of theory, their subservience to bourgeois prejudices

¹ Cf. Togliatti’s report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
and their political betrayal of the proletariat is that in capitalist society, whenever there is any serious aggravation of the class struggle intrinsic to that society, there can be no alternative but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dreams of some third way are reactionary petty-bourgeois lamentations. That is borne out by more than a century of development of bourgeois democracy and the labour movement in all the advanced countries, and notably by the experience of the past five years. This is also borne out by the science of political economy, by the entire content of Marxism, which reveals the economic inevitability, wherever commodity economy prevails, of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie that can only be replaced by the class which the growth of capitalism develops, multiplies, welds together and strengthens, that is, the proletarian class.

Another theoretical and political error of the socialists is their failure to understand that ever since the rudiments of democracy first appeared in antiquity, its forms inevitably changed over the centuries as one ruling class replaced another. Democracy assumed different forms and was applied in different degrees in the ancient republics of Greece, the medieval cities and the advanced capitalist countries. It would be sheer nonsense to think that the most profound revolution in human history the first case in the world of power being transferred from the exploiting minority to the exploited majority, could take place within the time-worn framework of the old, bourgeois, parliamentary democracy, without drastic changes, without the creation of new forms of democracy, new institu-
tions that embody the new conditions for applying democracy, etc.¹

Here we see that Lenin drew these clear-cut and definite conclusions on the basis of the whole of Marxist teaching, the whole experience of class struggle in capitalist society and the whole experience of the October Revolution. He held that within the old framework of bourgeois parliamentary democracy it was impossible for state power to be transferred from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat, impossible to realize the most profound revolution in human history, the socialist revolution. Have not these specific truths which Lenin expounded in 1919 been repeatedly confirmed since by the experience of every country where the socialist revolution has taken place? Has not this experience confirmed again and again that the road of the October Revolution, which Lenin led, is the common road for the emancipation of mankind?

Have not the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and the Moscow Statement of 1960 reiterated that this is the common road to socialism for the working class in all countries? Whether the working class uses peaceful or non-peaceful means depends, of course, “on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or another stage of the struggle for socialism”.² But, one way or the other, it is necessary

² “Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers’ Parties.”
to smash the old bourgeois state machine and to estab-
lish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Instead of taking the experience of the revolutionary
struggles of the proletariat or the living reality of Italian
society as their starting-point, Togliatti and other com-
rades start from the present Italian Constitution and
maintain that Italy can achieve socialism within the
framework of bourgeois parliamentary democracy with-
out smashing the old state machine. What they call the
“new democratic regime” is nothing but an “extension”
of bourgeois democracy. Small wonder that their “con-
crete argument” diverges so widely from the specific
truths of Marxism-Leninism.

A MOST MARVELOUS CONSTITUTION

The Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I. declare
that “the Italian road to socialism passes through the
building of the new state as described in the Constitu-
tion (a state which is profoundly different from the
present regime) and the accession of the new ruling
classes to its leadership”.

According to Togliatti and the other comrades, the
Constitution of Italy is indeed a most marvellous one.

1. The Constitution of the Republic is “a unitary
compact voluntarily binding on the great majority of
the Italian people. . . .”

2. The Constitution of the Republic “envisages some
fundamental reforms which . . . carry the marks of so-
cialism”.

---

1 “Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the C.P.I.”
2 Togliatti’s report to the March 1956 session of the Central
Committee of the C.P.I.
3. The Constitution of the Republic "affirms the principle of the sovereignty of the people".  
4. The Constitution of the Republic "proclaims it [the state] to be 'founded on labour'", and "assigns to the forces of labour a new and pre-eminent position".  
5. The Constitution of the Republic recognizes "the workers' right to enter into the direction of the state".  
6. The Constitution of the Republic "affirms the necessity of these economic and political changes which are essential for reconstructing our society and for moving it in the direction of socialism".  
7. The Constitution of the Republic has resolved "the problem of principle of the march towards socialism within the ambit of democratic legality".  
8. The Italian people "are able to oppose the class nature and class aims of the state while fully accepting and defending the constitutional compact".  
9. The Italian working class "can organize itself into the ruling class within the ambit of the constitutional system".  
10. "The respect for, the defence of, and the integral application of, the Constitution of the Republic form the pivot of the whole political programme of the Party."  

We do not, of course, deny that the present Italian Constitution contains some lofty phraseology. But how can a Marxist-Leninist take the high-sounding phrases in a bourgeois constitution for reality?

---

1 "Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I."
2 Togliatti, "For an Italian Road to Socialism. For a Democratic Government of the Working Class", report to the Eighth Congress of the C.P.I., December 1956.
3 "Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the C.P.I."
4 "Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I." See L'Unita supplement, September 13, 1962.
There are 139 articles in the present Italian Constitution. But, in the final analysis, its class nature is most clearly represented by Article 42, which provides that "private ownership is recognized and guaranteed by law". In terms of Italian reality, this article protects the private property of the monopoly capitalists. By virtue of this provision, the Constitution satisfies the demands of the monopoly capitalists, for their private property is made sacred and inviolable. To try to cover up the real nature of the Italian Constitution and to talk about it in superlative terms is only to deceive oneself and others.

Togliatti and the other comrades say that the Italian Constitution "bears the marks of the presence of the working class", "affirms the principle of the sovereignty of the people" and "recognizes certain new rights for the workers".¹ When they talk about this principle and these new rights, why do they not compare the Italian Constitution with other bourgeois constitutions before drawing conclusions?

It should be noted that the provision concerning the sovereignty of the people is found in practically every bourgeois constitution since the time of the Declaration of the Rights of Man in the French bourgeois revolution of 1789, and is not peculiar to the Italian Constitution. "Sovereignty belongs to the people" was once a revolutionary slogan which the bourgeoisie pitted against the feudal monarchs' dictum of L'etat, c'est Moi. But since the establishment of bourgeois rule this article has become a mere phrase in bourgeois constitutions to conceal the nature of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

¹ "Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I."
It should be noted, too, that the Italian Constitution is not the only one that provides for civil liberties and rights. Such provisions are found in the constitutions of nearly all the capitalist countries. But after stipulating certain civil liberties and rights, some constitutions go straight on to make other provisions to restrict or cancel them. As Marx said of the French Constitution of 1848, "Every one of its provisions contains its own antithesis — utterly nullifies itself."\(^1\) There are other constitutions in which such articles are not followed by restrictive or nugatory provisions, but the bourgeois governments concerned readily achieve the same purpose by other means. The Italian Constitution falls into the former category; in other words, it is a nakedly bourgeois constitution and can in no way be described as "fundamentally socialist in inspiration".\(^2\)

Lenin said, "Where laws are out of keeping with reality, the constitution is false; where they conform with reality, the constitution is not false."\(^3\) The present Italian Constitution has both these aspects; it is both false and not false. It is not false in such matters of substance as its open protection of the interests of the bourgeoisie, and it is false in its high-sounding phrases designed to deceive the people.


\(^2\) Togliatti, "The Communists' Struggle for Liberation, Peace and Socialism", report to the Fourth National Conference of the C.P.I.

At the Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of Italy held in January 1948, Comrade Togliatti said:

Our political and even constitutional future is uncertain, because one can foresee serious collisions between a progressive sector which will rely on one part of our constitutional charter, and a conservative and reactionary sector which will look for instruments of resistance in the other part. Therefore it would be committing a serious political error and deceiving the people if one confined oneself to saying: “Everything is now written in the Constitution. Let us apply what is sanctioned in it, and all the aspirations of the people will be realized.” That is wrong. No constitution is ever used to save liberty if it is not defended by the consciousness of the citizens, by their power, and by their ability to crush every reactionary attempt. No constitutional norm will by itself assure us of democratic and social progress if the organized and conscious forces of the labouring masses are unable to lead the whole country along this road of progress and smash the resistance of reaction.

From these words spoken by Comrade Togliatti in 1948, it would seem that he then still retained certain Marxist-Leninist views, since he admitted that the political and constitutional future of Italy was uncertain and that the Italian Constitution was two-sided in character and could be used both by the conservative reactionary forces and the progressive forces. Comrade Togliatti then held that to place blind faith in the Italian Constitution was “a serious political error” and was “deceiving the people”.

In January 1955, Comrade Togliatti said in a speech, “It is clear that we have in our Constitution the lines of
a programme, fundamentally socialist in inspiration, which is not only a political but also an economic and social programme.”¹ So by that time Comrade Togliatti had already taken the Italian Constitution as one “fundamentally socialist in inspiration”.

Thus, the Togliatti of 1955 came out in opposition to the Togliatti of 1948.

From then on Comrade Togliatti has gone into a precipitous decline, and has virtually deified the Italian Constitution.

In 1960 Comrade Togliatti said in his report to the Ninth Congress of the C.P.I.:

We move on the terrain of the Constitution, and as for all those who ask us what we would do if we were in power, we remind them of the Constitution. We have written in our Programmatic Declaration, and we repeat, that it is possible to carry out “in full constitutional legality the structural reforms necessary to undermine the power of the monopolist groups, to defend the interests of all workers against the economic and financial oligarchies, to exclude these oligarchs from power, and to enable the labouring classes to accede to power”.

That is to say, Comrade Togliatti demanded that the working class and other working people of Italy must act in full legality under the bourgeois constitution and rely on it in order to “undermine the power of the monopolist groups”.

At the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I. in 1962, Togliatti and some other comrades of the C.P.I. reasserted that they are “firm” on this point. They declared that “the

¹ Report to the Fourth National Conference of the C.P.I.”
Italian road to socialism passes through the building of the new state as described in the Constitution . . . and the rise of the new ruling classes to its leadership”;¹ that this road means to “demand and impose the transformation of the state in the light of the Constitution, to conquer new positions of power within the state, to push forward the socialist transformation of society”;¹ and that it means to form “a social and political bloc capable of carrying out the socialist transformation of Italy in constitutional legality”.¹ They also proposed to “oppose the class nature and class aims of the state while fully accepting and defending the constitutional compact, developing ample and articulated action tending to push the state along the road of a progressive democracy capable of developing towards socialism”.²

In brief, Togliatti and the other comrades intend to bring about socialism within the framework of the Italian bourgeois constitution, completely forgetting that though there are some attractively worded articles in the Italian Constitution, the monopoly capitalists can nullify the Constitution whenever they find it necessary and opportune, so long as they have control of the state machine and all the armed forces.

Marxist-Leninists must expose the hypocrisy of bourgeois constitutions, but at the same time they should utilize certain of their provisions as weapons against the bourgeoisie. In ordinary circumstances, refusal to make use of a bourgeois constitution and carry on legal struggle wherever possible is a mistake, which Lenin called a “Left” infantile disorder. But to call upon Communists

¹“Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.”
²“Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.” See L’Unita supplement, September 13, 1962.
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and the people to place blind faith in a bourgeois constitution, to say that a bourgeois constitution can bring socialism to the people, and that respect for, and defence and integral application of, such a constitution "form the pivot of the whole political programme of the Party"¹ is not just an infantile disorder but, again in Lenin's words, mental subservience to bourgeois prejudices.

CONTEMPORARY "PARLIAMENTARY CRETINISM"

Comrade Togliatti and certain other C.P.I. comrades admit that to realize socialism involves struggle, that socialism must be realized through struggle. But they confine the people's struggle to the scope permitted by the bourgeois constitution and assign the primary role to parliament.

In describing how the present Italian Constitution came into existence, Comrade Togliatti said, "This was due to the fact that in 1946 the Communists rejected the road of breaking legality by desperately attempting to seize power, and on the contrary chose the road of participation in the work of the Constituent Assembly."²

That is how Comrade Togliatti came to take the parliamentary road as the one by which the working class and other working people of Italy would "advance towards socialism".

For years Togliatti and other comrades have stressed the same point: "Today the thesis of the possibility of

¹ "Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the C.P.I."
² Togliatti's report to the March 1956 session of the Central Committee of the C.P.I.
a march towards socialism within the forms of democratic and even parliamentary legality has been formulated in a general way. . . . This proposition . . . was ours in 1944-46."

"It is possible to pass to socialism by taking the parliamentary road."

Here we should like to discuss with Togliatti and the other comrades the question of whether the transition to socialism can be brought about through parliamentary forms.

The question must be made clear. We have always held that taking part in parliamentary struggle is one of the methods of legal struggle which the working class should utilize in certain conditions. To refuse to utilize parliamentary struggle when it is necessary, but instead to play at or prattle about revolution, is something that all Marxist-Leninists resolutely oppose. On this question, we have always adhered to the whole of Lenin’s theory as expounded in his “Left-Wing” Communism, an Infantile Disorder. But some people deliberately distort our views. They say that we deny the necessity of all parliamentary struggle and that we deny that there are twists and turns in the development of the revolution. They ascribe to us the view that some fine morning the people’s revolutions will suddenly come in various countries. Or they assert, as Comrade Togliatti does in his reply of January 10 this year to our article, that we want the Italian comrades to “confine themselves to preaching and waiting for the great day of revolution”. Of late such distortion of the arguments of the other side in the

1 Togliatti’s report to the Eighth Congress of the C.P.I.
discussion has virtually become the favourite trick of the self-styled Marxist-Leninists in dealing with the Chinese Communists.

It may be asked: What are our differences with Comrade Togliatti and the others on the proper attitude towards bourgeois parliaments?

First, we hold that all bourgeois parliaments, including the present Italian parliament, have a class nature and serve as ornaments for bourgeois dictatorship. As Lenin put it: “Take any parliamentary country, from America to Switzerland, from France to England, Norway and so forth — in these countries the real business of ‘state’ is performed behind the scenes and is carried on by the departments, chancelleries and the General Staffs.”¹

“... the more highly [bourgeois] democracy is developed, the more the bourgeois parliaments are subjected by the stock exchange and the bankers.”²

Secondly, we are for utilizing parliamentary struggle, but against spreading illusions, against “parliamentary cretinism”. Again, as Lenin said, political parties of the working class “stand for utilising the parliamentary struggle, for participating in parliament; but they ruthlessly expose ‘parliamentary cretinism’, that is, the belief that the parliamentary struggle is the sole or under all circumstances the main form of the political struggle”.³

Thirdly, we are for utilizing the platform of the bourgeois parliament to expose the festering sores in bour-

geois society and also to expose the fraud of the bourgeois parliament. For its own interests, the bourgeoisie under certain conditions admits representatives of the working-class party to its parliament; at the same time this is a method by which it tries to deceive, corrupt and even buy over certain representatives and leaders of the workers. Therefore, in waging the parliamentary struggle the political party of the working class must be highly vigilant and must at all times maintain its political independence.

On the three points just mentioned, Togliatti and the other comrades have completely cast away the Leninist stand. Regarding parliament as being above classes, they exaggerate the role of the bourgeois parliament for no valid reason and see it as the only road for achieving socialism in Italy.

Togliatti and other comrades have become thoroughly obsessed with the Italian parliament.

They hold that given an “honest electoral law” and provided that “in parliament a majority is formed, which is conformable to the will of the people”,¹ it is possible to carry out “profound social reforms and “change the present relations of production, and consequently also the big property regime”.²

Can things really happen that way?

No. Things can only happen like this: So long as the bureaucratic-military state machine of the bourgeoisie still exists, for the proletariat and its reliable allies to win a parliamentary majority under normal conditions and in accordance with bourgeois electoral law is some-

¹ Togliatti, “Parliament and the Struggle for Socialism”.
² “Political Theses Approved by the Ninth Congress of the C.P.I.”
thing either impossible or in no way to be depended upon. After World War II, the Communist and Workers’ Parties in many capitalist countries held seats in parliament, in some cases many seats. In every case, however, the bourgeoisie used various measures to prevent the Communists from gaining a parliamentary majority — nullifying elections, dissolving parliament, revising the electoral laws or the constitution, or outlawing the Communist Party. For quite a while after World War II, the Communist Party of France had the largest popular vote and parliamentary representation of any party in the country, but the French monopoly capitalists revised the electoral law and the constitution itself and deprived the French Communist Party of many of its seats.

Can the working class become the ruling class simply by relying on votes in elections? History records no case of an oppressed class becoming the ruling class through the vote. The bourgeoisie preaches a lot about parliamentary democracy and elections, but there was no country where the bourgeoisie replaced the feudal lords and became the ruling class simply by a vote. It is even less likely for the proletariat to become the ruling class through elections. As Lenin put it in his *Greetings to Italian, French, and German Communists*:

> Only scoundrels or simpletons can think that the proletariat must win the majority in elections carried out under the yoke of the bourgeoisie, under the yoke of wage-slavery, and that only after this must it win power. This is the height of folly or hypocrisy; it is substituting voting, under the old system and with the old power, for class struggle and revolution.¹

History does tell us that when a workers’ party abandons its proletarian revolutionary programme, degenerates into an appendage of the bourgeoisie, and converts itself into a political party that is a tool of the bourgeoisie, the latter may permit it to have a temporary parliamentary majority and to form a government. This was the case with the British Labour Party. It was also the case with the social-democratic parties of several countries after they had betrayed their original socialist revolutionary programmes. But this sort of thing can only maintain and consolidate the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and cannot in the least alter the position of the proletariat as an oppressed and exploited class. The British Labour Party has been in power three times since 1924, but imperialist Britain is still imperialist Britain, and, as before, the British working class has no power. We would ask Comrade Togliatti whether he is thinking of following in the footsteps of the British Labour Party and of the social-democratic parties in other countries.

The Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I. declare that parliament must be given full powers to legislate and to direct and control the activities of the executive. We do not know who will give parliament the powers certain leaders of the Italian Communist Party desire for it. Are they to be given by the bourgeoisie or by Togliatti and the other comrades? In fact, the powers of a bourgeois parliament are given it by the bourgeoisie. Their extent is decided by the bourgeoisie according to its interests. No matter how much power the bourgeoisie allows parliament, the latter can never become the real organ of power of the bourgeois state. The real organ of power, by means of which the bourgeoisie rules over the people,
is the bureaucratic and military apparatus of the bourgeoisie, and not its parliament.

If Communists abandon the road of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, pin all their hopes on winning a majority in the bourgeois parliament by a vote and wait to be given powers to lead the state, what difference is there between their road and Kautsky’s parliamentary road? Kautsky said: “The aim of our political struggle remains, as hitherto, the conquest of state power by winning a majority in parliament and by converting parliament into the master of the government.”¹ Lenin said in criticism of this Kautskian road, “This is nothing but the purest and the most vulgar opportunism.”²

In March 1956, when talking about “utilization of legal means and also of parliament”, Comrade Togliatti stated, “What we do today would have been neither possible nor correct thirty years ago, it would have been pure opportunism, as we described it at that time.”³

What grounds are there for saying that what was neither possible nor correct thirty years ago has become so today? What grounds are there for saying that what was then pure opportunism has now suddenly become pure Marxism-Leninism? Comrade Togliatti’s words are in fact an admission that the road he and the other comrades are travelling is the same as that taken by the opportunists in the past.

However, when it was pointed out that they were travelling this parliamentary road, Comrade Togliatti

³ Togliatti’s report to the March 1956 session of the Central Committee of the C.P.I.
changed his tune, saying in June 1956: “I would like to correct those comrades who have said — as if it were undoubtedly a peaceful matter — that the Italian road of development towards socialism means the parliamentary road and nothing more. That is not true.”

He also said: “To reduce this struggle to electoral competitions for parliament and to wait for the acquisition of fifty-one per cent would be not only simple-minded but also illusory.” Comrade Togliatti argued that what they advocated was not only “a parliament which functions” but also “a great popular movement”.

To demand a great popular movement is a good thing, and Marxist-Leninists should of course feel happy about it. It should be recognized that there is a mass movement of considerable scale in Italy today and that the Communist Party of Italy has in this respect made achievements. The pity is that Comrade Togliatti looks at the mass movement only within a parliamentary framework. He holds that the mass movement “can bring about the raising in our country of those urgent demands which could then be satisfied by a parliament, in which the popular forces have won sufficiently strong representation”.

The masses raise demands, then parliament satisfies them — such is Comrade Togliatti’s formula for the mass movement.

The basic tactical principle of Marxism-Leninism is as follows: In all mass movements, and likewise in parliamentary struggle, it is necessary to maintain the political

---

1 Togliatti’s report to the March 1956 session of the Central Committee of the C.P.I.
2 Togliatti’s report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
independence of the proletariat, to draw a line of demarcation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, to integrate the present interests of the movement with its future interests, and to co-ordinate the current movement with the entire process and the final goal of the working-class struggle. To forget or violate this principle is to fall into the quagmire of Bernsteinism and, in reality, to accept the notorious formula that “the movement is everything, the aim is nothing”. We should like to ask: What difference is there between Comrade Togliatti’s formula concerning the mass movement and Bernstein’s formula?

**CAN STATE-MONOPOLY CAPITAL BECOME “A MORE EFFECTIVE INSTRUMENT FOR OPPOSING MONOPOLISTIC DEVELOPMENT”?**

Replying to the editorial in our paper Renmin Ribao, Comrade Luigi Longo, one of the chief leaders of the Communist Party of Italy, wrote in an article on January 4, 1963:

Our Tenth Congress has also forcefully reaffirmed that a firm point in what we call the Italian road to socialism is the recognition that already today, in the existing international and domestic situation, even when the capitalist regime continues to exist, it is possible and necessary to arrive at the liquidation of the monopolies and of their economic and political power.

These comrades maintain that by adopting the measures they have worked out it is possible to change the capitalist relations of production now existing in Italy and
to change the "big property regime" of the Italian monopoly capitalists.

The economic measures of "structural reform" which have been worked out by Togliatti and other comrades are, in their own words, the realization of "the demand for a definite degree of nationalization, the demand for programming, the demand for state intervention to guarantee democratic economic development, and so on";¹ and "the movement which tends to increase direct state intervention in economic life, through programming, the nationalization of whole sectors of production, etc."²

Probably Togliatti and the other comrades will go on to devise still more measures of this sort.

Of course, they have the right to think and say what they like, and no one has the right to interfere, nor do we want to. However, since they want others to think and speak as they do, we cannot but continue the discussion of the questions they have raised.

Let us take first the question of state intervention in economic life.

Has not the state intervened in economic life ever since it came into being, no matter whether it was a state of slave-owners, of feudal lords or of the bourgeoisie? When these classes are in the ascendant, state intervention in economic life may take one form, and when they are on the decline, it may take another form. State intervention in economic life may also take different forms in different countries where the state power is the same in its class nature. Leaving aside the question of how the state of slave-owners or feudal lords

¹ Togliatti's speech at the April 1962 session of the Central Committee of the C.P.I.
² "Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I."
intervenes in economic life, we shall discuss only the intervention of the bourgeois state in economic life.

Whether a bourgeois state pursues a policy of grabbing colonies or of contending for world supremecy, a policy of free trade or of protective tariffs, every such policy constitutes state intervention in economic life, which bourgeois states have long practised in order to protect the interests of their bourgeoisie. Such intervention has played an important role in the development of capitalism. State intervention in economic life is, therefore, not something new that has recently made its appearance in Italy.

But perhaps what Togliatti and the other comrades refer to by “state intervention in economic life” is not these policies long practised by the bourgeoisie, but mainly the nationalization they are talking about.

Well then, let us talk about nationalization.

In reality, from slave society onward, different kinds of states have had different kinds of “nationalized sectors of the economy”. The state of slave-owners had its nationalized sector of the economy, and so had the state of feudal lords. The bourgeois state has had its nationalized sector of the economy ever since it came into being. Therefore, the question to be clarified is the nature of the nationalization in each case, and what class carries it out.

A veteran Communist like Comrade Togliatti is certainly not ignorant of what Engels said in his “Socialism: Utopian and Scientific”:

In any case, with trusts or without, the official representative of capitalist society — the state — will ultimately have to undertake the direction of produc-
tion. This necessity for conversion into state property is felt first in the great institutions for intercourse and communication — the post office, the telegraphs, the railways.

To this statement, Engels added the following very important rider:

I say "have to". For only when the means of production and distribution have actually outgrown the form of management by joint-stock companies, and when, therefore, the taking them over by the state has become economically inevitable, only then — even if it is the state of today that effects this — is there an economic advance, the attainment of another step preliminary to the taking over of all productive forces by society itself. But of late, since Bismarck went in for state ownership of industrial establishments, a kind of spurious socialism has arisen, degenerating, now and again, into something of flunkeyism, that without more ado declares all state ownership, even of the Bismarckian sort, to be socialistic. Certainly, if the taking over by the state of the tobacco industry is socialistic, then Napoleon and Metternich must be numbered among the founders of socialism. If the Belgian state, for quite ordinary political and financial reasons, itself constructed its chief railway lines; if Bismarck, not under any economic compulsion, took over for the state the chief Prussian lines, simply to be the better able to have them in hand in case of war, to bring up the railway employees as voting cattle for the government, and especially to create for himself a new source

---

of income independent of parliamentary votes — this was, in no sense, a socialistic measure, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously. Otherwise, the Royal Maritime Company, the Royal porcelain manufacture, and even the regimental tailor shops of the Army would also be socialistic institutions, or even, as was seriously proposed by a sly dog in Frederick William III's reign, the taking over by the state of the brothels.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, footnote.}

Engels then went on to emphasize the nature of so-called state ownership in capitalist countries. He said:

But the transformation, either into joint-stock companies and trusts, or into state ownership, does not do away with the capitalistic nature of the productive forces. In the joint-stock companies and trusts this is obvious. And the modern state, again, is only the organization that bourgeois society takes on in order to support the external conditions of the capitalist mode of production against the encroachments as well of the workers as of individual capitalists. The modern state, no matter what its form, is essentially a capitalist machine, the state of the capitalists, the ideal personification of the total national capital. The more it proceeds to the taking over of productive forces, the more does it actually become the national capitalist, the more citizens does it exploit. The workers remain wage-workers — proletarians. The capitalist relation is not done away with. It is rather brought to a head. But, brought to a head, it topples over. State ownership of the productive forces is not the solution of the
conflict, but concealed within it are the technical conditions that form the elements of that solution.¹

Engels wrote all this in the period when monopoly capital was first emerging and capitalism had begun to move from free competition to monopoly. Have his arguments lost their validity now that monopoly capital has assumed a completely dominating position? Can it be said that nationalization in the capitalist countries has now changed and even done away with “the capitalist nature of the productive forces”? Can it be said that state-monopoly capitalism, formed through capitalist nationalization or in other ways, is no longer capitalism? Or perhaps this can be said of Italy, though not of other countries?

Here, then, we have to go into the question of state-monopoly capitalism, and in Italy in particular.

Concentration of capital results in monopoly. From World War I onward, world capitalism has not only taken a step further towards monopoly in general, but also taken a step further away from monopoly in general to state monopoly. After World War I, and particularly after the economic crisis broke out in the capitalist world in 1929, state-monopoly capitalism further developed in all the imperialist countries. During World War II, the monopoly capitalists in the imperialist countries on both sides utilized state-monopoly capital to the fullest possible extent in order to make high profits out of the war. And since the War, state-monopoly capital has actually become the more or less dominant force in economic life in some imperialist countries.

¹Ibid., pp. 148-49.
Compared with the other principal imperialist countries, the foundations of capitalism in Italy are relatively weak. From an early date, therefore, Italy embarked upon state capitalism for the purpose of concentrating the forces of capital so as to grab the highest profits, compete with international monopoly capital, expand her markets and redivide the colonies. In 1914, the Consorzio per Sovvenzione su Valore Industria was established by the Italian government to provide the big banks and industrial firms with loans and subsidies. There was a further integration of the state organs with monopoly capitalist organizations during Mussolini's fascist regime. In particular, during the great crisis of 1929-33, the Italian government bought up at pre-crisis prices large blocks of shares of many failing banks and other enterprises, brought many banks and enterprises under state control, and organized the Istituto per la Ricostruzione Industriale, thus forming a gigantic state-monopoly capitalist organization. After World War II, Italian monopoly capital, including state-monopoly capital, which had been the foundation of the fascist regime, was left intact and developed at still greater speed. At present, the enterprises run by state-monopoly capital or jointly by state and private monopoly capital constitute about 30 per cent of Italy's economy.

What conclusions should Marxist-Leninists draw from the development of state-monopoly capital? In Italy, can nationalized enterprise, i.e., state-monopoly capital, stand "in opposition to the monopolies",¹ can it be "the expression of the popular masses",¹ and can it become "a more

¹ A. Pesenti: "Is It a Question of the Structure or of the Super-Structure?"
effective instrument for opposing monopolistic development”,¹ as stated by Togliatti and certain other comrades of the C.P.I.?

No Marxist-Leninist can possibly draw such conclusions.

State-monopoly capitalism is monopoly capitalism in which monopoly capital has merged with the political power of the state. Taking full advantage of state power, it accelerates the concentration and aggregation of capital, intensifies the exploitation of the working people, the devouring of small and medium enterprises, and the annexation of some monopoly capitalist groups by others, and strengthens monopoly capital for international competition and expansion. Under the cover of “state intervention in economic life” and “opposition to monopoly”, and using the name of the state to deceive, it cleverly transfers huge profits into the pockets of the monopoly groups by underhand methods.

The chief means by which state-monopoly capital serves the monopoly capitalists are as follows:

1. It uses the funds of the state treasury, and the taxes paid by the people, to protect the capitalists against risk to their investments, thus guaranteeing large profits to the monopoly groups.

For example, on all the bonds issued to raise funds for the Istituto per la Ricostruzione Industriale, the biggest state-monopoly organization of Italy, the state both pays interest and guarantees the principal. The bond-holders generally receive a high rate of interest, as high as 4.5 to 8 per cent per annum. In addition, they draw dividends when the enterprises make a profit.

¹ A. Pesenti: “Direct and Indirect Forms of State Intervention”.
2. Through legislation and the state budget a substantial proportion of the national income is redistributed in ways favourable to the monopoly capitalist organizations, ensuring that the various monopoly groups get huge profits. For example, in 1955 about one-third of the total state budget was allocated by the Italian government for purchasing and ordering goods from private monopoly groups.

3. Through the alternative forms of purchase and sale, the state on certain occasions takes over those enterprises which are losing money or going bankrupt or whose nationalization will benefit particular monopoly groups, and on other occasions sells to the private monopoly groups those enterprises which are profitable. For example, according to statistics compiled by the Italian economist Gino Longo, between 1920 and 1955, successive Italian governments paid a total of 1,647,000 million lire (in terms of 1953 prices) to purchase the shares of failing banks and enterprises, a sum equal to more than 50 per cent of the total nominal capital in 1955 of all the Italian joint-stock companies with a capital of 50 million lire or more. On the other hand, from its establishment to 1958, the Istituto per la Ricostruzione Industriale alone sold back to private monopoly organizations shares in profitable enterprises amounting to a total value of 491,000 million lire (in terms of 1953 prices), according to incomplete statistics.

4. By making use of state authority, state-monopoly capital intensifies the concentration and aggregation of capital, and accelerates the annexation of small and medium enterprises by monopoly capital. For example, from 1948 to 1958, the total nominal capital of the ten biggest monopoly groups, which control
the lifelines of the Italian economy, multiplied 15 times. The Fiat Company multiplied its nominal capital 25 times and the Italcemento 40 times. Although the ten biggest companies in Italy constituted only 0.04 per cent of the total number of joint-stock companies, they directly held or controlled 64 per cent of the total private share-holding capital in Italy. During the same period, the number of small and medium enterprises which went bankrupt constantly increased.

5. Internationally, state-monopoly capital battles fiercely for markets, utilizing the name of the state and its diplomatic measures, and thus serves Italian monopoly capital as a useful tool for extending its neo-colonialist penetration.

For example, in the period of 1956-61 alone, the Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi obtained the right to explore and exploit oil resources, to sell oil or to build pipe-lines and refineries in the United Arab Republic, Iran, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, Ethiopia, Sudan, Jordan, India, Yugoslavia, Austria, Switzerland, etc. In this way, it has secured for the Italian monopoly capitalists a place in the world oil market.

The facts given above make it clear that state monopoly and private monopoly are in fact two mutually supporting forms used by the monopoly capitalists for the extraction of huge profits. The development of state-monopoly capital aggravates the inherent contradictions of the imperialist system and can never, as Togliatti and the other comrades assert, "limit and break up the power of the leading big monopoly groups" or change the contradictions inherent in imperialism.

1 "Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I."
In Italy there is a view current among certain people that contemporary Italian capitalism is different from the capitalism of fifty years ago and has entered a "new stage". They call contemporary Italian capitalism "neo-capitalism". They insist that under "neo-capitalism", or in the "new stage" of capitalism, such fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles as those concerning class struggle, socialist revolution, seizure of state power by the proletariat and proletarian dictatorship are no longer of any use. In their view, this "neo-capitalism" can apparently perform the function of resolving the fundamental contradictions of capitalism within the capitalist system itself, by such means as "programming", "technical progress", "full employment" and the "welfare state", and through "international alliance". It was the Catholic movement and the social reformists who first advocated and spread these theories in Italy. Actually, it was in these so-called theories that Togliatti and the other comrades found a new basis for their "theory of structural reform".

Togliatti and the other comrades maintain that "the concepts of planning and programming the economy, considered at one time a socialist prerogative, are more and more extensively discussed and accepted today". ¹

It is Comrade Togliatti's opinion (1) that there can be planned development of the national economy not only in socialist countries but also under capitalism, and (2) that the economic planning and programming characteristic of socialism can be accepted in capitalist Italy.

Marxist-Leninists have always held that the capitalist state finds it both possible and necessary to adopt policies

¹ Togliatti's report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
which in some way regulate the national economy in the interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole. This idea is contained in the passages quoted above from Engels. In the era of monopoly capital, this regulatory function of the capitalist state mainly serves the interests of the monopoly capitalists. Although such regulation may sometimes sacrifice the interests of certain monopoly groups, it never harms, but on the contrary represents, the over-all interests of the monopoly capitalists.

Here is Lenin’s excellent exposition of this point. He said:

... the erroneous bourgeois reformist assertion that monopoly capitalism or state-monopoly capitalism is no longer capitalism, but can already be termed “state Socialism”, or something of that sort, is most widespread. The trusts, of course, never produced, do not now produce, and cannot produce complete planning. But however much they do plan, however much the capitalist magnates calculate in advance the volume of production on a national and even on an international scale, and however much they systematically regulate it, we still remain under capitalism — capitalism in its new stage, it is true, but still, undoubtedly, capitalism.¹

However, some comrades of the C.P.I. maintain that by carrying out “planning” in Italy under the rule of the monopoly capitalists, it is possible to solve the major problems posed by Italian history, including “the problems of the liberty and emancipation of the working class”.² How is this miracle possible?

² “Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.”
Comrade Togliatti says, “State-monopoly capitalism, which is the modern aspect of the capitalist regime in almost all the big countries, is that stage — as Lenin has affirmed — beyond which, in order to go forward, there is no other way but socialism. But from this objective necessity it is necessary to make a conscious movement arise.”

There is the well-known statement by Lenin that “capitalism, . . . advanced from capitalism to imperialism, from monopoly to state control. All this has brought the socialist revolution nearer and has created the objective conditions for it”. He also made similar statements elsewhere. Clearly, Lenin meant that the development of state-monopoly capitalism serves only to prove “the proximity . . . of the socialist revolution, and not at all as an argument in favour of tolerating the repudiation of such a revolution and the efforts to make capitalism look more attractive, an occupation in which all the reformists are engaged”. In talking about “structural reform” and “conscious movement”, Comrade Togliatti is using ambiguous language exactly as the reformists do to evade the question of socialist revolution posed by Marxism-Leninism, and he is doing his best to make Italian capitalism look more attractive.

REMEMBER WHAT THE GREAT LENIN TAUGHT

From the above series of questions it can be seen that the “theory of structural reform” advanced by Togliatti

1 Togliatti’s report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
and the other comrades is an out-and-out total revision of Marxism-Leninism on the fundamental question of the state and revolution.

Comrade Togliatti publicly hoisted the flag of total revision of Marxism-Leninism as early as 1956. In June of that year, at the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the C.P.I., he said:

First Marx and Engels and later on Lenin, when developing this theory [the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat — Hongqi ed.], said that the bourgeois state apparatus cannot be used for building a socialist society. This apparatus must be smashed and destroyed by the working class, and replaced by the apparatus of the proletarian state, i.e., of the state led by the working class itself. This was not the original position of Marx and Engels. It was the position they took after the experience of the Paris Commune and it was developed in particular by Lenin. Does this position remain completely valid today? This is a theme for discussion. In fact, when we affirm that a road of advance to socialism is possible not merely over democratic ground but also through utilizing parliamentary forms, it is evident that we correct something of this position, taking into account the changes which have taken place and which are still in the process of being realized in the world.

Here Comrade Togliatti was posing as a historian of Marxism while fundamentally distorting the history of Marxism.

Consider the following facts.

In the Communist Manifesto, which was written in 1847, Marx and Engels stated very clearly that “the first
step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise
the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win
the battle of democracy".¹ Lenin said of this statement,
"Here we have a formulation of one of the most remark-
able and most important ideas of Marxism on the subject
of the state, namely, the idea of the 'dictatorship of the
proletariat' (as Marx and Engels began to call it after the
Paris Commune)."²

Subsequently, after summing up the experience of the
period 1848-51, Marx raised the question of smashing
the old state machine. As Lenin said, here "the ques-
tion is treated in a concrete manner, and the conclusion
is extremely precise, definite, practical and palpable: all
the revolutions which have occurred up to now perfected
the state machine, whereas it must be broken, smashed..
Lenin added, "This conclusion is the chief and funda-
mental point in the Marxian teaching on the state."³

Basing himself on the experience of 1848-51, Marx
came to the conclusion that, unlike previous revolutions,
the proletarian revolution would not merely transfer the
bureaucratic-military machine from one group of peo-
ple to another. Marx did not then give a specific
answer to the question of what should replace the
smashed state machine. The reason, as Lenin remarked,
was that in presenting the question Marx did not base
himself simply on logical reasoning but stayed strictly
on the firm ground of historical experience.⁴ For this

¹ Marx and Engels, Selected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1958,
² Lenin, "The State and Revolution", Selected Works, F.L.P.H.,
³ Ibid., pp. 226, 227.
⁴ Cf. Ibid., p. 230.
specific question, in 1852 there was nothing in previous experience which could be drawn on, but the experience of the Paris Commune in 1871 put the question on the agenda. “The Commune is the first attempt of a proletarian revolution to smash the bourgeois state machine; and it is the political form ‘at last discovered’, by which the smashed state machine can and must be replaced.”\(^1\) From this we see that there are two questions, the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, and what should replace it, and Marx answered first one and then the other, on the basis of the historical experience of different periods. Comrade Togliatti says that it was only after the experience of the Paris Commune in 1871 that Marx and Engels held it was necessary for the proletariat to smash the bourgeois state machine. This is a distortion of the facts of history.

Like Kautsky, Comrade Togliatti believes in “the possibility of power being seized without destroying the state machine”.\(^2\) He holds that the bourgeois state machine can be preserved and the objectives of the proletariat can be achieved by using this ready-made state machine. It would be well if Comrade Togliatti noted how Lenin repeatedly repudiated Kautsky on this point. Lenin said,

Kautsky either rejects the assumption of state power by the working class altogether, or he concedes that the working class may take over the old, bourgeois state machine; but he will by no means concede that it must break it up, smash it, and replace it by a new, proletarian machine. Whichever way Kautsky’s argu-

ments are “interpreted”, or “explained”, his rupture with Marxism and his desertion to the bourgeoisie are obvious.¹

Since Comrade Togliatti boasts, that their programme is a “deepening and development of Marxism-Leninism, it must be noted that the so-called theory of structural reform was in fact first devised by Kautsky. In his pamphlet The Social Revolution, Kautsky said, “It goes without saying that we shall not achieve supremacy under the present conditions. Revolution itself presupposes a long and deep-going struggle, which, as it proceeds, will change our present political and social structure.” It is evident that Kautsky tried long ago to substitute the theory of structural reform for the theory of proletarian revolution and that Comrade Togliatti has simply inherited his mantle. Nevertheless, if we carefully examine their respective views, we shall find that Comrade Togliatti has jumped ahead of Kautsky — Kautsky admitted “we shall not achieve supremacy under the present conditions”, whereas Comrade Togliatti maintains that we can achieve supremacy precisely “under the present conditions”.

Togliatti and other comrades hold that what is needed for Italy to advance to socialism is to establish a “new democratic regime” under the marvellous, Italian Constitution and at the same time to form a “new historical bloc”, or a “new bloc of social and political leading forces”.² They maintain it is this “new historical bloc” rather than the Italian proletariat that is the

² Cf. “Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.”
“bearer of an intellectual and moral, as well as a political revolution”\(^1\) in Italy. No one knows what this “new historical bloc” actually is or how it is to be formed. At times Togliatti and other comrades say that it is “under the leadership of the working class”\(^1\) and at times that this “new historical bloc” is itself the “bloc of leading forces”. Is such a bloc a class organization of the proletariat, or is it an alliance of classes? Is it under the leadership of the working class, or of the bourgeoisie, or of some other class? Heaven alone knows! In the final analysis, the purpose of their fanciful and elusive formulation is simply to get away from the basic Marxist-Leninist ideas of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship.

Comrade Togliatti’s idea is: (1) there is no need to smash the bourgeois state machine, and (2) there is no need to set up a proletarian state machine. He thus repudiates the experience of the Paris Commune.

After Marx and Engels, Lenin repeatedly elucidated the experience of the Paris Commune and always insisted that it held good universally for the proletariat of all countries. Lenin did not separate the experience of the Russian Revolution from that of the Paris Commune but regarded it as a continuation and development of the experience of the Paris Commune. He saw in the Soviets “the type of state which was being evolved by the Paris Commune”,\(^2\) and held that “the Paris Commune took the first epochal step along this path [the path of smashing

---

\(^1\) Cf. *ibid.*, p. 230.

the old state machine] the Soviet government has taken the second step”.¹

In repudiating the experience of the Paris Commune, Comrade Togliatti is of necessity directly counterposing his ideas to Marxism-Leninism and flatly repudiating the experience of the October Revolution and of the people’s revolutions in various countries since the October Revolution; thus he counterposes his so-called Italian road to the common road of the international proletariat.

Comrade Togliatti says, “The problem of doing what was done in Russia is not posed to the Italian workers.”² Here we have the essence of the question.

The Elements for a Programmatic Declaration adopted by the Eighth Congress of the C.P.I. in 1956 stated, “In the first years after World War I, the revolutionary conquest of power by the methods that had led to victory in the Soviet Union revealed itself to be impossible.” Here again we have the essence of the question.

Referring to the experience of the Chinese revolution, Comrade Togliatti said that in the period of the Chinese people’s struggle for state power, the Chinese Communist Party applied a political line “which corresponded not at all to the strategic and tactical line followed by the Bolsheviks in the course of their revolution from March to October (1917)”.³ This is a distortion of the history of the Chinese revolution. Since it has occurred in the specific conditions of China, the Chinese revolution has had its own characteristics. However, as Comrade Mao

² Togliatti’s report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
³ Togliatti’s concluding speech at the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
Tse-tung has repeatedly explained, the principle on which the political line of our Party has been formulated is the integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. The Chinese revolution, we have always held, is a continuation of the Great October Revolution, and it goes without saying that it is also a continuation of the cause of the Paris Commune. With regard to the most fundamental question concerning the theory of the state and revolution, that is, the question of smashing the old warlord-bureaucratic state machine and setting up the state machine of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the basic experience of the Chinese revolution wholly corresponds to that of the October Revolution and the Paris Commune. As Comrade Mao Tse-tung said in 1949 in his famous essay *On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship*, “Follow the path of the Russians — that was the conclusion.”¹ To defend his revision of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, or his “modifications” as he and others put it, Comrade Togliatti says the experience of the Chinese revolution and the experience of the October Revolution are two different matters which do “not at all correspond” to each other. But how can this distortion possibly help the theory of structural reform of Togliatti and other comrades?

This theory is one of “peaceful transition” or, in their own words, of “advance towards socialism in democracy and in peace”.² Their whole theory and their entire programme are replete with praise of “class peace” in capitalist society and contain absolutely nothing about

---
² “Theses for the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.”
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"advance towards socialism"; there is only class "peace", and no social "transition" at all.

Marxism-Leninism is the science of proletarian revolution, and it develops continuously in revolutionary practice, and individual principles or conclusions are bound to be replaced by new principles or conclusions suited to the new historical conditions. But this does not imply that the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism can be discarded or revised. The Marxist-Leninist theory of the state and revolution is absolutely not an individual principle or conclusion, but a fundamental principle derived from the Marxist-Leninist summing-up of the experience of the struggles of the international proletariat. To discard or revise this fundamental principle is to turn one's back completely on Marxism-Leninism.

Here we would humbly offer Comrade Togliatti some sincere advice. Do not be so arrogant as to declare that you will not do what was done in the Russian October Revolution. Be a little more modest, and remember what the great Lenin taught in 1920, "... on certain very essential questions of the proletarian revolution, all countries will inevitably have to perform what Russia has performed."¹

To support the principles of proletarian strategy put forward by Lenin and corroborated by the victory of the Great October Revolution, or to oppose them — here is the fundamental difference between the Leninists on the one hand and the modern revisionists and their followers on the other.

VI. DESPISE THE ENEMY STRATEGICALLY, TAKE HIM SERIOUSLY TACTICALLY

AN ANALYSIS OF HISTORY

Lately, some people who call themselves Marxist-Leninists again burst out in noisy opposition to the thesis of the Chinese Communists that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers. One moment they say this is "underestimation of imperialism" and "demobilizing the masses", and the next moment they say this is "slightly the strength of socialism". One moment they call it a "pseudo-revolutionary" attitude and the next moment a thesis based on "fear". These people are now vying to outshout and outdo each other, with the latecomers striving to be first and prove they are not falling behind. Their arguments are full of inconsistencies and practically nonsensical — and all for the purpose of demolishing this thesis. But all their arguments suffer from one fatal weakness — they never dare to touch seriously on Lenin's scientific conclusion that imperialism is parasitic, decaying and moribund capitalism.

Comrade Togliatti started this attack at the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I. He said, "It is wrong to state that imperialism is simply a paper tiger which can be overthrown by a mere push of the shoulder."¹ He also said, "If they are paper tigers, why so much work and so many struggles to combat them?"² Now if Comrade Togliatti were a schoolboy answering a question about the meaning of

¹ Togliatti's report to the Tenth Congress of the C.P.I.
² Togliatti, "Let Us Lead the Discussion Back to Its Real Limit".
a word in his language lesson, his answer that a paper tiger is a tiger made of paper might well gain him a good mark. But when it comes to examining theoretical questions, philistinism will not do. Comrade Togliatti claims "to have made a positive contribution to the deepening and development of Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary doctrine of the working class",¹ and yet he gives a schoolboy’s answer to a serious theoretical question. Could there be anything more ludicrous?

Comrade Mao Tse-tung’s thesis that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers has always been crystal-clear. This is what he said:

For struggle against the enemy, we formed over a long period the concept that strategically we should despise all our enemies, but that tactically we should take them all seriously. This also means that in regard to the whole we should despise the enemy but that in regard to each and every concrete question we must take them seriously. If with regard to the whole we do not despise the enemy we shall be committing the error of opportunism. Marx and Engels were only two persons. Yet in those early days they declared that capitalism would be overthrown all over the world. But in dealing with concrete problems and particular enemies we shall be committing the error of adventurism if we do not take them seriously.²

There are none so deaf as those who will not hear the truth. Who has ever said that imperialism can be overthrown by a mere push of the shoulder? Who has ever

¹ Ibid., pp. 257.
² Comrade Mao Tse-tung’s speech at the 1957 Moscow Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers’ Parties.
said that it is not necessary to exert effort or wage struggles in order to overthrow imperialism?

Here we should like to quote another passage from Comrade Mao Tse-tung:

Just as there is not a single thing in the world without a dual nature (this is the law of the unity of opposites), so imperialism and all reactionaries have a dual nature — they are real tigers and paper tigers at the same time. In past history, before they won state power and for some time afterwards, the slave-owning class, the feudal landlord class and the bourgeoisie were vigorous, revolutionary and progressive; they were real tigers. But with the lapse of time, because their opposites — the slave class, the peasant class and the proletariat — grew in strength step by step, struggled against them and became more and more formidable, these ruling classes changed step by step into the reverse, changed into reactionaries, changed into backward people, changed into paper tigers. And eventually they were overthrown, or will be overthrown, by the people. The reactionary, backward, decaying classes retained this dual nature even in their last life-and-death struggles against the people. On the one hand, they were real tigers; they ate people, ate people by the millions and tens of millions. The cause of the people’s struggle went through a period of difficulties and hardships, and along the path there were many twists and turns. To destroy the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism in China took the Chinese people more than a hundred years and cost them tens of millions of lives before the victory in 1949. Look! Were these not living tigers,
iron tigers, real tigers? But in the end they changed into paper tigers, dead tigers, bean-curd tigers. These are historical facts. Have people not seen or heard about these facts? There have indeed been thousands and tens of thousands of them. Thousands and tens of thousands! Hence, imperialism and all reactionaries, looked at in essence, from a long-term point of view, from a strategic point of view, must be seen for what they are — paper tigers. On this we should build our strategic thinking. On the other hand, they are also living tigers, iron tigers, real tigers which can eat people. On this we should build our tactical thinking.1

This passage shows the dual nature of the three major exploiting classes not only in the various stages of their historical development but also in their last life-and-death struggle with the people. Clearly, this is a Marxist-Leninist analysis of history.

THE WATERSHED BETWEEN REVOLUTIONARIES AND REFORMISTS

History teaches us that all revolutionaries — including, of course, bourgeois revolutionaries — come to be revolutionaries because in the first place they dare to despise the enemy, dare to struggle and dare to seize victory. Those who fear the enemy and dare not struggle, dare not seize victory, can only be cowards, can only be reformists or capitulationists; they can certainly never be revolutionaries.

Historically, all true revolutionaries have dared to despise the reactionaries, to despise the reactionary ruling classes, to despise the enemy, because in the historical conditions then obtaining which confronted the people with a new historical task, they had begun to be aware of the necessity of replacing the old system with a new one. When there is need for change, change becomes irresistible and comes about sooner or later whether one likes it or not. Marx said: “It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.”¹ The necessity for social change calls forth revolutionary consciousness in men. Before the historical conditions have made a change necessary, no one can pose the task of revolution or make a revolution, however hard he tries. But when the historical conditions have made a change necessary, revolutionaries and vanguard fighters of the people come forward who dare to denounce the reactionary ruling classes and dare to regard them as paper tigers. And in everything they do, these revolutionaries always raise the people’s spirits and puncture the enemy’s arrogance. This is historical necessity, this is the inevitability of social revolution. As to when the revolution will break out, and whether after its outbreak it succeeds quickly or takes a long time to succeed or whether it meets many serious difficulties, setbacks and even failures before final victory, etc. — all these questions depend upon various specific historical factors. But even if they meet with serious difficulties, setbacks and

failures in the course of a revolution, all true revolutionaries will nevertheless dare to despise the enemy and will remain firm in their conviction that the revolution will triumph.

After the defeat of the Chinese revolution in 1927 the Chinese people and the Chinese Communist Party were in extreme difficulties. At that time, Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out to us, as a proletarian revolutionary should, the future course of development of the revolution and the prospects of victory. He maintained that it would be one-sided and wrong to exaggerate the subjective strength of the revolution and belittle the strength of the counter-revolution. At the same time, he stressed that it would be one-sided and wrong to exaggerate the strength of the counter-revolution and underestimate the potential strength of the revolution. Comrade Mao Tse-tung’s appraisal was later confirmed by the development and victory of the Chinese revolution. At present, the world situation as a whole is most favourable for the people of all countries. It is strange that in this favourable situation certain people should concentrate their efforts on wantonly attacking the thesis of despising the enemy strategically, should exaggerate the strength of imperialism, abet the imperialists and all reactionaries and help the imperialists to frighten the revolutionary people. Instead of enhancing the people’s spirits and puncturing the enemy’s arrogance, they are encouraging the enemy’s arrogance and trying to dampen the people’s spirits.

Lenin said, “Do you want a revolution? Then you must be strong!” Why must revolutionaries be strong,

why are they necessarily strong? Because revolutionaries represent the new and rising forces in society, because they believe in the strength of the people and because their mainstay is the great strength of the people. The reactionaries are weak, and inevitably so, because they are divorced from the people; however strong they may appear at the moment, they are bound to be defeated in the end. "The dialectical method regards as important primarily not that which at the given moment seems to be durable and yet is already beginning to die away, but that which is arising and developing, even though at the given moment it may not appear to be durable, for the dialectical method considers invincible only that which is arising and developing."¹

Why did Lenin refer time and again to imperialism with such metaphors as a "colossus with feet of clay" and a "bugbear"? In the last analysis, it was because Lenin based himself on the objective laws of social development and believed that the new-born forces of society would eventually defeat the decaying forces of society and that the forces of the people would eventually triumph over the forces ranged against them. And is this not so?

We would like to say to those who are trying to demolish the Chinese Communists' thesis that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers: You ought first to demolish Lenin's thesis. Why don't you directly refute Lenin's thesis that imperialism is a "colossus with feet of clay" and a "bugbear"? What else does this show other than your cowardice in the face of the truth?

For every sober-minded Marxist-Leninist, the metaphors used in Lenin’s formulation that imperialism is a “colossus with feet of clay” and a “bugbear” and the metaphor in the Chinese Communists’ formulation that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers are valid metaphors. These metaphors are based on the laws of social development and are meant to explain the essence of the problem in popular language. Great Marxist-Leninists and many scientists and philosophers have frequently used metaphors in their explanations, and often in a very precise and profound way.

While compelled to profess agreement with the metaphors used by Lenin to describe the essence of imperialism, some people single out for opposition the metaphor used by the Chinese Communists. Why? Why do these people keep on nagging at it? Why are they making such a hullabaloo about it just now? Besides revealing their ideological poverty, this of course shows that they have a specific purpose of their own.

What is it?

Since the end of World War II the socialist camp has grown much stronger. In the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America, revolutions against the imperialists and their running dogs have been advancing. The manifold irreconcilable contradictions which beset the imperialist countries both internally and externally are like volcanoes constantly threatening the rule of monopoly capital. The imperialist countries are stepping up the armaments race and doing their best to militarize their national economies. All this is leading imperialism into an impasse. The brain trusts of the imperialists have produced plan after plan to save their masters from the fate that is now confronting them or will confront them,
but they have been unable to find for imperialism a real way out of its predicament. In this international situation, certain people, although calling themselves Marxist-Leninists, have in actual fact become muddled and have allowed a kind of fin de siècle pessimism to take the place of cool reason. They have no intention of leading the people in delivering themselves from the disasters created by imperialism, and they have no confidence that the people can overcome these disasters and build a new life for themselves. It would be nearer to the truth to say that they are concerned about the fate of imperialism and all reactionaries than to say that they are concerned about the fate of socialism and the people of all countries. Their purpose in boosting and exaggerating the strength of the enemy and beating the drums for imperialism as they do today is not to oppose “adventurism” but simply to prevent the oppressed people and oppressed nations from rising in revolution; their so-called opposition to adventurism is merely a pretext to achieve their purpose of opposing revolution.

Speaking of the liberal parties in the Russian Duma (the Tsarist Parliament) in 1906, Lenin said:

The liberal parties in the Duma only inadequately and timidly back the strivings of the people; they are more concerned to allay and weaken the revolutionary struggle now proceeding than to destroy the people’s enemy.¹

Today we find in the ranks of the working-class movement just such liberals as Lenin referred to, to wit,

bourgeois liberals. They are more concerned with allaying and weakening the widespread revolutionary struggles of the oppressed people and nations than with destroying the imperialists and the other enemies of the people. Naturally, such persons can hardly be expected to understand the thesis that Marxist-Leninists should despise the enemy strategically.

**MAGNIFICENT MODELS**

After railing at the Chinese Communists’ thesis of “despising the enemy strategically”, some heroes go on to pour out their wrath on the thesis of “taking the enemy seriously tactically”. They say that the formulation of “despising the enemy strategically while taking him seriously tactically” is a “double approach” and is “constrary to Marxism-Leninism”. Ostensibly, they acknowledge that strategy is different from tactics and that tactics must serve strategic goals. But in actual fact they obliterate the difference between strategy and tactics and thoroughly confuse the concept of strategy with that of tactics. Instead of subordinating tactics to strategy, they subordinate strategy to tactics. They engross themselves in routine struggles, and in specific struggles they either make endless concessions to the enemy and thus commit the error of capitulationism, or act recklessly and thus commit the error of adventurism. In the last analysis, their purpose is to discard the strategic principles of revolutionary Marxist-Leninists and the strategic goals of all Communists.

We have already pointed out that historically all revolutionaries have been revolutionaries because in the first place they dared to despise the enemy, dared to wage
struggle and dared to seize victory. Here we would add that, similarly, all successful revolutionaries in history have been successful not only because they dared to despise the enemy but also because on each particular question and in each specific struggle they took the enemy seriously and adopted a prudent attitude. In general, unless revolutionaries, and proletarian revolutionaries in particular, are able to do this, they cannot steer the revolution forward smoothly, but are liable to commit the error of adventurism, thus bringing losses or even defeat to the revolution.

Throughout their life-long struggles in the cause of the proletariat, Marx, Engels and Lenin always despised the enemy strategically, while taking full account of him tactically. They always fought on two fronts according to the concrete circumstances against Right opportunism and capitulationism and also against "Left" adventurism. In this respect, they are magnificent models for us.

Marx and Engels ended the *Communist Manifesto* with the celebrated passage:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.1

This has always been the general strategic principle and goal of the whole international communist movement. But in the Communist Manifesto Marx and Engels also

---

took careful account of the different conditions the Communists in different countries faced. They did not lay down a stereotyped, rigid formula and force it on the Communists of all countries. Marxists have always held that the Communists in each country must define their own specific strategic and tactical tasks at each stage of history in the light of the conditions prevailing in their own country.

Marx and Engels themselves took direct part in the mass revolutionary struggles of 1848-49. While they regarded the bourgeois democratic revolution of the time as the prelude to a proletarian socialist revolution, they opposed making the slogan, “For a Workers’ Republic”, an immediate demand. Such was their specific strategy at that time. On the other hand, they opposed attempts to start a revolution in Germany by armed force from outside, characterizing this approach as “playing at revolution”. They proposed that the German workers abroad should return to their own country “singly” and throw themselves into the mass revolutionary struggle there. In other words, when it came to concrete tactics, the proposals and the approach of Marx and Engels were radically different from those of the “Left” adventurists. On matters concerning any specific struggle, Marx and Engels always did their best to proceed from a solid basis.

For a while in the spring of 1850, appraising the situation after the failure of the 1848-49 revolution, Marx and Engels held that another revolution was imminent. But by the summer, they saw that an immediate recurrence of revolution was no longer possible. Some people disregarded the objective possibilities and tried to conjure up an “artificial revolution”, substituting revolutionary phraseology for the actual state of revolutionary
development. They told the workers that they had to seize state power right away, or otherwise they might as well all go to sleep. Marx and Engels firmly opposed such adventurism. As Lenin said:

When the revolutionary era of 1848-49 ended, Marx opposed every attempt to play at revolution (the fight he put up against Schapper and Willich), and insisted on ability to work in the new phase which in a seemingly “peaceful” way was preparing for new revolutions.

In September 1870, a few months prior to the Paris Commune, Marx warned the French proletariat against an untimely uprising. But when the workers were compelled to rise, in March 1871, Marx paid glowing tribute to the heaven-storming heroism of the workers of the Paris Commune. In a letter to L. Kugelmann, Marx wrote:

What elasticity, what historical initiative, what a capacity for sacrifice in these Parisians! After six months of hunger and ruin, caused by internal treachery more even than by the external enemy, they rise, beneath Prussian bayonets, as if there had never been a war between France and Germany and the enemy were not still at the gates of Paris! History has no like example of like greatness! If they are defeated only their “good nature” will be to blame.

---

2 Marx and Engels, “Marx to L. Kugelmann”, *Selected Correspondence*, F.L.P.H., Moscow, p. 318.
See how Marx eulogized the workers of the Paris Commune for their heroic scorn of the enemy! Marx made this evaluation of the Paris Commune in the light of the general strategic goal of the international communist movement and said of the struggle of the Paris Commune that "history has no like example of like greatness!" True, the Paris Commune made several mistakes during the uprising; it failed to march immediately on counter-revolutionary Versailles, and the Central Committee relinquished power too soon. The Paris Commune failed. Yet the banner of proletarian revolution unfurled by the Commune will be for ever glorious.

Marx wrote in *The Civil War in France*:

Working men’s Paris, with its Commune, will be for ever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that eternal pillory from which, all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them.¹

Writing in commemoration of the 21st anniversary of the Paris Commune, Engels stated:

Its highly internationalist character imparted historical greatness to the Commune. It was a bold challenge to every kind of expression of bourgeois chauvinism. And the proletariat of all countries unerringly understood this.²

But now our Comrade Togliatti seems to feel that Marx’s and Engels’ high appraisal of the Paris Commune as of universal significance for the revolutionary cause of the world proletariat is no longer worth mentioning.

As Engels pointed out, after the defeat of the Paris Commune the Parisian workers needed a long respite to build up their strength. But the Blanquists advocated a new uprising regardless of the circumstances. This adventurism was sharply criticized by Engels.

During the period of peaceful development of capitalism in Europe and America, Marx and Engels continued their fight on two fronts in the working-class movement. On the one hand, they severely condemned empty talk about revolution and urged that bourgeois legality should be turned to advantage in the fight against the bourgeoisie; on the other hand, they severely — indeed even more severely — condemned the opportunist thinking then dominant in the social-democratic parties, because these opportunists had lost all proletarian revolutionary staunchness, confined themselves to legal struggles, and lacked the determination to use illegal means as well in the fight against the bourgeoisie.

From this it is evident that while Marx and Engels unswervingly adhered to the strategical principles of proletarian revolution at all times, including periods of peaceful development, they also took care to adopt flexible tactics in accordance with the specific conditions of a given period.

As a great Marxist, Lenin most lucidly formulated the revolutionary strategy of the Russian proletariat when he entered the historical arena of proletarian revolutionary struggle. In the concluding remarks of his first
famous work, *What the “Friends of the People” Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, he said:

When its advanced representatives have mastered the ideas of scientific socialism, the idea of the historical role of the Russian worker, when these ideas become widespread, and when stable organizations are formed among the workers to transform the workers’ present sporadic economic war into conscious class struggle — then the Russian WORKER, rising at the head of all the democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and lead the RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT (side by side with the proletariat of ALL COUNTRIES) along the straight road of open political struggle to THE VICTORIOUS COMMUNIST REVOLUTION.¹

This strategic principle of Lenin’s remained the general guide for the vanguard of the Russian proletariat and for the Russian people throughout their struggle for emancipation.

Lenin always firmly upheld this strategic principle. In doing so, he waged uncompromising struggle against the Narodniks, the “legal Marxists”, the Economists, the Mensheviks, the opportunists and revisionists of the Second International, and against Trotsky and Bukharin. In 1902, when the programme of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party was being drawn up, serious differences arose between Lenin and Plekhanov over principles of proletarian strategy. Lenin insisted that the Party programme should include the dictatorship of the proletariat and demanded that it should clearly define the leading role of the working class in the revolution.

During the 1905 Revolution, Lenin in his book, *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, reflected the heroic spirit of the Russian proletariat which had dared to lead the struggle and to seize victory. He put forward a comprehensive theory of proletarian leadership in the democratic revolution and of a worker-peasant alliance under the leadership of the working class, thus developing Marxist theory on the transformation of the bourgeois democratic revolution into a socialist revolution.

During World War I, Lenin raised proletarian thinking on strategy to a new level in *The Collapse of the Second International, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, and other most important Marxist classics. He held that imperialism was the eve of the proletarian socialist revolution and that it was possible for the proletarian revolution to achieve victory first in one country or in a few countries. These strategic concepts paved the way for the triumph of the Great October Revolution.

There are many more similar examples.

On specific questions of tactics, Lenin always charted a course of action for the proletariat in the light of varying conditions — for example, conditions in which the political party of the proletariat should participate in and in which it should boycott parliament; conditions in which it should form one kind of alliance or another; conditions in which it should make necessary compromises and in which it should reject compromises; in which circumstances it should wage legal struggles and in which illegal struggles, and how it should flexibly combine the two forms of struggle; when to attack and when to retreat or advance by a roundabout path; etc. In
his book, "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder, Lenin elucidated these questions profoundly and systematically.

He rightly stated:

... First, that in order to fulfil its task the revolutionary class must be able to master all forms, or aspects, of social activity without any exception ...; second, that the revolutionary class must be ready to pass from one form to another in the quickest and most unexpected manner.¹

Discussing the various forms of struggle, Lenin said further that it was necessary for all Communists to investigate, analyse, explore, appraise and grasp the national characteristics of their own country, when taking concrete measures there for the purpose of accomplishing the general international task, of overcoming opportunism and "Left" dogmatism within the working-class movement and of overthrowing the bourgeoisie and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was absolutely wrong not to take the national characteristics of one's own country into account in the struggle.

In the light of Lenin's ideas, it can be seen that the concrete tactics of proletarian parties all have as their aim the organization of the masses by the millions, the maximum mobilization of allies, and the maximum isolation of the enemies of the people, the imperialists and their running dogs, so as to attain the general strategic goal of the emancipation of the proletariat and the people. To use Lenin's own words,

... The forms of the struggle may and do constantly change in accordance with varying, relatively particular and temporary causes, but the substance of the struggle, its class content, positively cannot change while classes exist.\(^1\)

**THE STRATEGIC AND TACTICAL THINKING OF THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS**

Basing themselves on the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the Chinese Communists formulated the strategy and tactics of the Chinese revolution in concrete revolutionary practice.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung outlined the strategic and tactical thinking of the Chinese Communists in the following passage:

Imperialism throughout the world and the rule of the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek clique in China are already rotten and have no future. We have reason to despise them and we are confident and certain that we shall defeat all the domestic and foreign enemies of the Chinese people. But with regard to each part, each specific struggle (military, political, economic or ideological), we must never take the enemy lightly; on the contrary, we should take the enemy seriously and concentrate all our strength for battle in order to win victory. While we correctly point out that, strategically, with regard to the whole, we should take the enemy lightly, we must never take the enemy lightly in any part, in any specific struggle. If, with regard

to the whole, we overestimate the strength of our enemy and hence do not dare to overthrow him and do not dare to win victory, we shall be committing a Right opportunist error. If, with regard to each part, each specific problem, we are not prudent, do not carefully study and perfect the art of struggle, do not concentrate all our strength for battle and do not pay attention to winning over all the allies that should be won over (middle peasants, small independent craftsmen and traders, the middle bourgeoisie, students, teachers, professors and ordinary intellectuals, ordinary government employees, professionals and enlightened gentry), we shall be committing a "Left" opportunist error.¹

Comrade Mao Tse-tung here provides a very clear-cut and unequivocal explanation of the struggle of the proletariat as a whole, that is, of the question of strategy, and an equally clear-cut and unequivocal explanation of each part, each specific problem, in the struggle of the proletariat, that is, of the question of tactics.

Why is it that when taking the situation as a whole, i.e., strategically, we can despise the enemy? Because imperialism and all reactionaries are decaying, have no future and can be overthrown. Failure to see this results in lack of courage to wage revolutionary struggle, loss of confidence in the revolution and the misleading of the people. Why is it that in specific struggles, i.e., tactically, we must not take the enemy lightly but must take him seriously? Because the imperialists and the reactionaries

still control their apparatus for ruling and all the armed forces, and can still deceive the people. To overthrow the rule of imperialism and reaction, the proletariat and the masses of the people must go through bitter and tortuous struggles. The imperialists and the reactionaries will not automatically tumble from their thrones.

A revolutionary party will never carry on revolutionary struggle if it has abandoned the strategic goal of overthrowing the old system, and no longer believes that the enemy can be overthrown or that victory can be won. A revolutionary party will never achieve the hoped-for victory if it merely proclaims the target of revolution without seriously and prudently coming to grips with the enemy in the course of revolutionary struggle and without gradually building up and expanding the revolutionary forces, if it treats revolution simply as a matter for talk, or if it simply strikes out blindly. This is even more true of proletarian parties. If a proletarian party takes full account of the enemy on each and every concrete problem of revolutionary struggle and is skilful in combating him while adhering to proletarian strategic principles, then, to use Comrade Mao Tse-tung’s words, “as time goes on, we shall become superior as a whole,”¹ even though the proletariat may be inferior in strength at the outset. In other words, if the enemy is taken seriously in matters of tactics, on concrete questions of struggle, and if every effort is made to win in each specific struggle, the victory of the revolution can be accelerated, and it will not be retarded or postponed.

By taking full account of the enemy tactically and winning victories in specific struggles, the proletarian parties enable the masses in ever greater number to learn from their own experience that the enemy can be defeated, that there is every reason and every basis for despising the enemy. In China there are the ancient proverbs: Great undertakings have small beginnings; a huge tree grows from tiny roots; the nine-storey castle begins as a pile of earth; a thousand-li journey starts with a step. These hold true for revolutionary people who want to overthrow the reactionaries, that is to say, they can achieve their objective of finally defeating the reactionaries only by waging one struggle after another, by waging innumerable specific struggles, and by striving for victory in each one of them.

In “Problems of Strategy in China’s Revolutionary War”, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said, “Our strategy is ‘pit one against ten’ and our tactics are ‘pit ten against one’ — this is one of our fundamental principles for gaining mastery over the enemy.” He added, “We use the few to defeat the many — this we say to the rulers of China as a whole. We use the many to defeat the few — this we say to each separate enemy force on the battlefield.”¹ Here he was dealing with principles of military struggle, but they also apply to the political struggle. History shows that, to begin with, all revolutionaries, including bourgeois revolutionaries, are always in the minority, and the forces they lead are always comparatively small and weak. If in their strategy they lack the will to “use the few to defeat the many” and to “pit one against ten” in the struggle against the enemy, they grow flabby, impotent,

and are incapable of accomplishing anything, and they will never become the majority. On the other hand, in their tactics, that is, in specific struggle, unless revolutionaries learn to organize the masses, to rally all possible allies, and to utilize the objectively existing contradictions among the enemies, unless they can apply the method of “using the many to defeat the few” and of “pitting ten against one” in struggle, and unless they are able to make all the necessary preparations for specific struggles, they will never be able to gain victory in each specific struggle and multiply their small victories into large ones, and there will be the danger that their own forces will be smashed one by one by the enemy and the strength of the revolution dissipated.

A MIRROR

To sum up on the matter of the relationship between strategy and tactics, it is vital that the party of the proletariat pay the greatest attention to the ultimate goal of emancipating the working people and that it possess the courage and the conviction needed to overwhelm the enemy. It should not become so engrossed in minor and immediate gains and victories as to lose sight of the ultimate goal, and it should never lose faith in the triumph of the people’s revolution merely because of the enemy’s temporary and outward strength. At the same time, the party of the proletariat must pay serious attention to the very small, day-to-day struggles, even if they do not appear to be very noteworthy. In every specific struggle, it must prepare adequately, do a good job of uniting the masses, study and perfect the art of struggle and do all it can to win, so that the masses will receive
constant education and inspiration. It should take full
cognizance of the fact that a large number of specific
struggles, including the very small ones, can merge and
develop into a force that will rock the old system.

It is, therefore, perfectly clear that strategy and tactics
are different from each other and, at the same time,
united. This is an expression of the very dialectics
with which Marxist-Leninists examine questions. Certain
people describe "despising the enemy strategically and
taking him seriously tactically" as "scholastic philosophy"
or a "double approach". But just what kind of "philos-
ophy" and what "single approach" they have, are
beyond us.

In his essay, "Our Revolution", Lenin had the follow-
ing to say about the heroes of opportunism:

They all call themselves Marxists, but their concep-
tion of Marxism is impossibly pedantic. They have
completely failed to understand what is decisive in
Marxism: namely, its revolutionary dialectics.

In the same article, Lenin also said:

Their whole conduct betrays them as cowardly
reformists, who are afraid to take the smallest step
away from the bourgeoisie, let alone break with it, and
at the same time mask their cowardice by the wildest
rhetoric and braggadocio.2

To those who are attacking the Chinese Communist
Party we commend these lines of Lenin's for careful
reading. Assuredly, they may well serve as a political
mirror for certain people.

1 Lenin, Marx, Engels, Marxism, Moscow, 1951, p. 547.
2 Ibid., p. 548.
VII. A STRUGGLE ON TWO FRONTS

MODERN REVISIONISM IS THE MAIN DANGER IN THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

The Communist Party of Italy is one of the largest parties in the capitalist world today. It conducted heroic struggles in the extremely dark days of fascist rule. It has a glorious tradition of struggle. During World War II it led the Italian people in courageous armed uprisings and guerrilla warfare against fascism. The people’s armed forces arrested Mussolini and sentenced that fascist monster to death.

It is only natural that with this record of militant struggle the Italian Communist Party has won the sympathy and support of the people.

Since World War II, capitalism in Italy has found itself in a period of peaceful development, during which the C.P.I. has done a great deal of work, utilizing legal forms of struggle. In the activities of working-class parties, positive use can be made of conditions of legal struggle, but if while waging legal struggle the working-class party is lacking in revolutionary vigilance and firmness, these conditions may produce a contrary and negative effect. Marx, Engels and Lenin all constantly alerted the proletariat to guard against this.

Why is it that since World War II revisionism has been publicly recognized as the main danger in the international working-class movement? Because first, the legal struggles in many countries have made available manifold historical experience and taught many lessons; second, the conditions that breed opportunism and revi-
sionism actually exist; and third, there has in fact emerged modern revisionism, represented by the Tito clique.

Judging from the views of Togliatti and certain other comrades, we may say frankly that the danger of revisionism exists in the Communist Party of Italy, too. Certain comrades in the French Communist Party have recently written a series of articles attacking revolutionary Marxist-Leninists and attacking the Chinese Communists. The points they make on a number of basic questions concerning the international communist movement virtually duplicate those made by Togliatti and other comrades. Moreover, certain other people have recently come to the fore in the international communist movement who, as Lenin put it, “all belong to the same family, all extol each other, learn from each other, and together take up arms against ‘dogmatic’ Marxism”.¹ This is a strange phenomenon, but if one has some knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and if one analyses this phenomenon, one can see clearly that it is not accidental.

Modern revisionism has appeared in some capitalist countries, and it can appear in socialist countries, too. The Tito clique was the first to hoist the revisionist flag, and they have made previously socialist Yugoslavia gradually change its character. Politically, the Tito clique has long since become an accomplice of the United States and other imperialist countries, and, economically, it has turned Yugoslavia into an appendage of U.S. imperialism, gradually transforming her economy into what the imperialists call a liberalized economy.

At the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party in May 1921 Lenin said:

Milyukov was right. He very soberly takes into account the degree of political development and says that stepping stones in the shape of Socialist-Revolutionism and Menshevism are necessary for the reversion to capitalism. The bourgeoisie needs such stepping stones, and whoever does not understand this is stupid.¹

These telling words of Lenin's read like a prophecy of what the Tito clique was to do a few decades later.

How is it that revisionism can appear in socialist countries, too? As the Moscow Declaration of 1957 points out, "The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source."

Reiterating the important thesis of the Moscow Declaration that revisionism is the main danger in the international working-class movement, the Moscow Statement of 1960 condemns the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism. The Statement is completely correct in pointing out that,

After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist programme to the Declaration of 1957; they set the L.C.Y. against the international communist movement as a whole, severed their country from the

socialist camp, made it dependent on so-called “aid” from U.S. and other imperialists, and thereby exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through a heroic struggle. The Yugoslav revisionists carry on subversive work against the socialist camp and the world communist movement. Under the pretext of an extra-bloc policy, they engage in activities which prejudice the unity of all the peace-loving forces and countries.

The Moscow Statement also says,

Further exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists and active struggle to safeguard the communist movement and the working-class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists, remains an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist Parties.

This solemn document bears the signatures of the delegates of eighty-one Parties, including the Italian and French Parties, as well as of the Parties of socialist countries. But the ink was hardly dry on these signatures when the leading members of some of these Parties rushed to fraternize with the Tito clique.

Comrade Togliatti has openly declared that the stand taken in the 1960 Moscow Statement towards the Tito clique of Yugoslavia was “mistaken”, saying that “to direct invectives against ‘the Tito clique’ will not enable us to advance one step, but will make us go back a great deal”.1 Some people have said that “the Yugoslav Communists have taken steps towards rapprochement and

unity with the entire world communist movement”, and that between the Tito clique and themselves there is “coincidence and proximity” of positions “on a series of vitally important international problems”. What they are doing belies their commitments; they are treating the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement merely as empty official formalities. In order to justify themselves, they have no scruples about prostituting the Moscow Statement and, instead of regarding revisionism as the main danger in the international communist movement and working-class movement today, they allege that “latterly the danger of dogmatism and sectarianism has become the main danger”.¹ At the recent Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany when the Chinese Communist Party delegate in his speech upheld the Moscow Statement and condemned the revisionism of the Tito clique, he was treated with extreme rudeness. But the delegate of the Tito clique to the Congress was given a wild ovation. Can this be called “consistent observance of the commonly co-ordinated line of the communist movement”? Everybody knows that this action, which can only grieve our own people and gladden the enemy, was deliberately planned.

The result of all this is that the market price of the Tito clique has suddenly shot up tenfold. The purpose of those who have brought this about is to install the Tito clique as their ideological centre; they are trying to replace Marxism-Leninism by modern revisionism as represented by the Tito clique and to replace the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement by the Tito

¹The resolution adopted by the session of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party on December 14, 1962.
clique's modern revisionist programme, or by something else.

Don't some people frequently say that we ought to "synchronize our watches"? Now there are two watches, one is Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration and Statement, and the other is modern revisionism as represented by the Tito clique. Which is to be the master watch? The watch of Marxism-Leninism, of the Moscow Declaration and Statement, or the watch of modern revisionism?

Some people forbid us to fight modern revisionism, or even to mention the old-line revisionism of the period of the Second International, while they themselves revive the tunes of the old-line revisionists and revel in playing them over and over again. Writing of Proudhonism in the preface to the second edition of The Housing Question, Engels said, "Whoever occupies himself in any detail with modern socialism must also acquaint himself with the 'surmounted standpoints' of the movement." He believed that these standpoints or the tendencies emanating from them would inevitably reappear time and again so long as the conditions giving rise to them remained in society. "And if later on this tendency takes on a firmer shape and more clearly defined contours, ... it will have to go back to its predecessors for the formulation of its program."¹ Since we are fighting modern revisionism, we must naturally study its predecessors, the lessons of history, and how the modern revisionists have gone back to their predecessors. Should

we not do so? Why is this “a completely impermissible historical comparison”? Does it violate any taboo?

Since they are replaying the tunes of such old revisionists as Bernstein and Kautsky, and are using the latter’s viewpoints, methods and language to attack and smear the Chinese Communists and all Marxist-Leninists, they cannot reasonably forbid us to answer them with Lenin’s criticism of the old revisionists.

Lenin said:

In exactly the same way the Bernsteinians have been dinning into our ears that it is they who understand the proletariat’s true needs and the tasks of building up its forces, the task of deepening all the work, preparing the elements of a new society, and the task of propaganda and agitation. Bernstein says: We demand a frank recognition of that which is, thus sanctifying “movement” without any “ultimate aim”, sanctifying defensive tactics alone, preaching the tactics of fear “lest the bourgeoisie recoil”. So the Bernsteinians raised an outcry against the “Jacobinism” of the revolutionary Social-Democrats, against “publicists” who fail to understand the “workers’ initiative”, etc., etc. In reality, as everyone knows, revolutionary Social-Democrats have never even thought of abandoning day-by-day, petty work, the mustering of forces, etc., etc. All they demanded was a clear understanding of the ultimate aim, a clear presentation of the revolutionary tasks; they wanted to raise the semi-proletarian and semi-petty-bourgeois strata to the revolutionary level of the proletariat — not to reduce the latter level to that of opportunist considerations such as “lest the bourgeoisie recoil”.
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Perhaps the most vivid expression of this rift between the intellectual opportunist wing and the proletarian revolutionary wing of the Party was the question: *dürfen wir siegen?* “Dare we win?” Is it permissible for us to win? Would it not be dangerous for us to win? Ought we to win? This question, so strange at first sight, was however raised and had to be raised, because the opportunists were afraid of victory, were frightening the proletariat away from it, predicting that trouble would come of it and ridiculing slogans that straightforwardly called for it.¹

This quotation from Lenin can very well explain the revival of Bernsteinism in a new historical context and the essence of the difference between Marxist-Leninists and the modern revisionists.

“OUR THEORY IS NOT A DOGMA, BUT A GUIDE TO ACTION”

Some people who call themselves creative Marxist-Leninists say that times have changed, that conditions are no longer the same and that there is no need to repeat the fundamental principles stated by Marx and Lenin. They object to our quoting from the Marxist-Leninist classics to explain issues, and brand this practice “dogmatism”.

To discard Marxism-Leninism on the pretext of shaking off the chains of dogma is a convenient trick. Lenin exposed this trick of the opportunists long ago:

What a handy little word “dogma” is! One need only slightly twist an opposing theory, cover up this twist with the bogey of “dogma” — and there you are!\(^1\)

We all know that the days when Lenin lived and fought were greatly different from the days of Marx and Engels. Lenin developed Marxism comprehensively and carried it forward to a new stage, the stage of Leninism. In line with the new conditions and the new features of his own time, Lenin wrote many outstanding works which greatly enriched the treasury of Marxist theory and our ideas on the strategy and tactics of the proletarian revolution, and he advanced new policies and tasks for the international working-class movement. Lenin quoted abundantly and repeatedly from Marx and Engels in order to defend the fundamental principles of Marxism, to safeguard its purity and to oppose its distortion and adulteration by the opportunists and revisionists. For example, in *The State and Revolution* in particular, a great work of fundamental importance for Marxist theory, Lenin was not sparing in the use of quotations. In the very first chapter he wrote:

In view of the unprecedentedly widespread distortion of Marxism, our prime task is to re-establish what Marx really taught on the subject of the state. For this purpose it will be necessary to quote at length from the works of Marx and Engels themselves. Of course, long quotations will render the text cumbersome and will not help at all to make it popular reading, but we cannot possibly avoid them. All, or at

---

any rate, all the most essential passages in the works of Marx and Engels on the subject of the state must without fail be quoted as fully as possible, in order that the reader may form an independent opinion of the totality of the views of the founders of scientific Socialism and of the development of those views, and in order that their distortion by the now prevailing “Kautskyism” may be documentarily proved and clearly demonstrated.¹

It can be seen that Lenin quoted at great length from Marx and Engels at a time when Marxism was being outrageously adulterated. Today, when Leninism is being outrageously adulterated, no revolutionary Marxist-Leninist can fail to quote from Lenin. The reason is that this practice sharply brings out the contrast between the truth of Marxism-Leninism and the fallacies of revisionism and opportunism.

Clearly, it is no crime to quote from the literature of Marxism-Leninism, as some people allege. The question is whether quotations are called for, how Marxist-Leninist literature is quoted and whether it is quoted correctly.

There are people who deliberately evade the themes we are confirming by our quotations from the literature of Marxism-Leninism. They dare not even publish the quotations, but simply attack us for “citing paragraph after paragraph”.² *l’Humanité*, the organ of the French Communist Party, has gone so far as to accuse the Chinese Communist Party of “denaturing Marxism-Leninism

to the point of retaining only rigid formulas, and assuming the right to be high priests in charge of enunciating dogmas". What does it actually signify — this lashing out at us with acrimonious phrases in which they so obviously revel? It simply reflects their state of mind and their feelings, that is, the violent repugnance with which they react the moment they see the words of Marx, Engels and Lenin. These people who object to others as priests of Marxism-Leninism are themselves serving as priests of anti-Marxism-Leninism and of bourgeois ideology.

While violently attacking us for quoting from the literature of Marxism-Leninism to explain fundamental Marxist-Leninist truths, some people constantly repeat what is in essence the language of Bernstein, Kautsky and Tito, from whom they have borrowed many of their basic ideas.

There are even those who violently assail what they term “dogmatism”, yet who delight in biblical dogmas. Their heads are full of the Bible and similar matter but contain not a shadow of Marxism-Leninism.

Lenin constantly cited the words of Marx and Engels, “Our theory is not a dogma, but a guide to action.” Now that certain persons are spreading the notion that we are “dogmatists”, we have to tell them bluntly: The Chinese Communist Party is rich in experience in combating dogmatism. More than twenty years ago under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, we fought an outstanding struggle against dogmatism, and ever since we have paid attention to struggles of this kind.

The true Marxist-Leninist does not recline on a bed of books. He should be skilful in using the Marxist-Leninist method to analyse the concrete environment, situation and conditions of the time both at home and abroad, in studying the varied experience of actual struggles, and in thus working out his own line of action. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has repeatedly reminded us of Lenin’s celebrated dictum: “The most essential thing in Marxism, the living soul of Marxism, is the concrete analysis of concrete conditions.”¹ He criticized the dogmatists in our ranks as “lazybones” who “refuse to undertake any painstaking study of concrete things”.²

In a speech in 1942, “Rectify the Party’s Style of Work”, Comrade Mao Tse-tung criticized dogmatism in these sharp terms:

> Even now, there are not a few people who still regard odd quotations from Marxist-Leninist works as a ready-made panacea which, once acquired, can easily cure all maladies. These people show childish ignorance, and we should conduct a campaign to enlighten them. It is precisely such ignorant people who take Marxism-Leninism as a religious dogma. To them we should say bluntly, “Your dogma is worthless.” Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have repeatedly stated that our theory is not a dogma but a guide to action. But such people prefer to forget this statement which is of the greatest, indeed the utmost importance. Chinese Communists can be regarded as linking theory with practice only when they become good at applying the

---
Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method and the teachings of Lenin and Stalin concerning the Chinese revolution and when, furthermore, through serious research into the realities of China's history and revolution, they do creative theoretical work to meet China's needs in different spheres. Merely talking about linking theory and practice without actually doing anything about it is of no use, even if one goes on talking for a hundred years. To oppose the subjectivist, one-sided approach to problems, we must demolish dogmatist subjectiveness and one-sidedness.¹

Those who are now vigorously railing at dogmatism have absolutely no idea of what it really is, let alone of how to combat it. They keep on proclaiming that times and conditions have changed and that one must "develop Marxism-Leninism creatively", but actually they are using bourgeois pragmatism to revise Marxism-Leninism. They are utterly unable to grasp the essence of the changed times and conditions, to understand the contradictions in the contemporary world or to locate the focus of these contradictions. They cannot grasp the laws of development of things that objectively exist and they stagger to and fro, plunging now into capitulationism and now into adventurism. Accommodating themselves to the immediate turn of events, they forget the fundamental interests of the proletariat, and this is characteristic both of their thinking and their actions. Thus they do not have a policy founded on principle, frequently fail to differentiate between the enemy, ourselves and our friends, and even reverse the rela-

tionships between the three, treating enemies as if they were our own people and vice versa.

Lenin said that the philistine “is never guided by a definite world outlook, by principles of integral party tactics. He always swims with the stream, blindly obeying the mood of the moment”.¹ Now, are not these people exactly the same?

INTEGRATING THE UNIVERSAL TRUTH OF MARXISM-LENINISM WITH THE CONCRETE PRACTICE OF THE REVOLUTION IN ONE’S OWN COUNTRY

The well-known thesis of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution was formulated in our Party by Comrade Mao Tse-tung more than twenty years ago. It sums up the experience of the Chinese Communist Party in its long struggle on two fronts, against both Right opportunism and “Left” opportunism.

This thesis, the integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution in one’s own country, has two aspects. On the one hand, it is necessary at all times to adhere to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, or otherwise the error of Right opportunism or revisionism will be committed; on the other hand, it is necessary at all times to start from real life, link oneself closely with the masses, constantly sum up the experience of mass struggle and examine one’s work in the light of practical

experience, or otherwise the error of dogmatism will be committed.

Why must one adhere to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism? Why must one adhere to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism? Lenin said:

The Marxian doctrine is omnipotent because it is true. It is complete and harmonious, and provides men with an integral world conception which is irreconcilable with any form of superstition, reaction, or defence of bourgeois oppression.¹

The universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, or in other words, its fundamental principles, are not figments of the imagination or subjective fancies; they are scientific conclusions that sum up the experience of mankind in its entire history of struggle and sum up the experience of the international proletarian struggle.

From Bernstein onwards, all sorts of revisionists and opportunists have used the pretext of so-called new changes and new situations to assert that the universal truth of Marxism has been outmoded. Yet events throughout the world in the past century and more have all proved the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism to be valid everywhere. It applies both to the West and to the East; it has been confirmed not only by the Great October Revolution but also by the Chinese Revolution and by all the triumphant revolutions in other countries; it has been confirmed not only by the entire record of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries of Europe and America but also by the great revolution-

ary struggles which are going on in many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In 1913 Lenin wrote in “The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx” that each period of world history since the birth of Marxism “has brought Marxism new confirmation and new triumphs. But a still greater triumph awaits Marxism, as the doctrine of the proletariat, in the period of history that is now ensuing”.

In 1922 Lenin stated in his article “On the Significance of Militant Materialism”:

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

The events of recent decades have further confirmed Lenin’s conclusions.

The Moscow Declaration of 1957 sums up our historical experience and sets forth the principal laws universally applicable to the countries advancing on the road to socialism. The first general law thus stated in the Declaration is: “Guidance of the working masses by the working class, the core of which is the Marxist-Leninist

1 Lenin, Marx, Engels, Marxism, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1951, p. 88.
2 Ibid., pp. 559-60.
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Party, in effecting a proletarian revolution in one form or another and establishing one form or another of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” What Togliatti and other comrades call “the Italian road to socialism” is precisely the abandonment of this most fundamental principle, the principle of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, and a negation of this most fundamental law-reaffirmed in the Moscow Declaration.

Those who oppose the universal truth and the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism inevitably oppose the integral Marxist-Leninist world outlook and “undermine its basic theoretical foundations — dialectics, the doctrine that historical development is all-embracing and full of contradictions”.¹

This is what the Moscow Declaration says with regard to the Marxist-Leninist world outlook:

The theory of Marxism-Leninism derives from dialectical materialism. This world outlook reflects the universal law of development of nature, society and human thinking. It is valid for the past, the present and the future. Dialectical materialism is countered by metaphysics and idealism. Should the Marxist political party in its examination of questions base itself not on dialectics and materialism, the result will be one-sidedness and subjectivism, stagnation of human thought, isolation from life and loss of ability to make the necessary analysis of things and phenomena, revisionist and dogmatist mistakes and mistakes in policy. Application of dialectical materialism in practical work

and the education of the party functionaries and the broad masses in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism are urgent tasks of the Communist and Workers’ Parties.

Today, there are people who treat this extremely important thesis in the Moscow Declaration with the utmost contempt and place themselves in opposition to the Marxist-Leninist world outlook. They detest materialist dialectics, dismissing it as a “double approach” and “a scholastic philosophy”. They are just like the old-line revisionists who “treated Hegel as a ‘dead-dog’, and while they themselves preached idealism, only an idealism a thousand times more petty and banal than Hegel’s, they contemptuously shrugged their shoulders at dialectics”.¹

It is clear that these people attack materialist dialectics because they want to sell their modern revisionist stuff.

Of course, the Marxist-Leninist world outlook is opposed to dogmatism as well as to revisionism.

Adhering to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, we must oppose dogmatism, because dogmatism is divorced from actual revolutionary practice and regards Marxism-Leninism as a lifeless formula.

Marxism-Leninism is full of vitality, and it is invincible because it grows out of and develops in revolutionary practice, ceaselessly drawing new lessons from new revolutionary practice and therefore ceaselessly enriching itself.

Lenin often said that Marxism combines the greatest scientific strictness with the revolutionary spirit. He said,

Marxism differs from all other socialist theories in that it represents a remarkable combination of complete scientific soundness in the analysis of the objective conditions of things and of the objective course of evolution and the very definite recognition of the significance of the revolutionary energy, the revolutionary creative genius and the revolutionary initiative of the masses — and also, of course, of individuals, groups, organisations and parties which are able to discover and establish contact with these classes.¹

Here Lenin explained in exact terms that we must adhere to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and at the same time oppose dogmatism, which is divorced from revolutionary practice and from the masses of the people. Comrade Mao Tse-tung’s explanation of the interrelationship between adherence to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and opposition to dogmatism fully conforms with Lenin’s view. In discussing the question of cognition, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said:

As regards the sequence in the movement of man’s knowledge, there is always a gradual expansion from the knowledge of individual and particular things to the knowledge of things in general. Only after man knows the particular essence of many different things can he proceed to generalization and know the common essence of things. When man attains the knowledge of this common essence, he uses it as a guide and proceeds to study various concrete things which have not yet been studied, or studied thoroughly, and to discover the particular essence of each; only thus is he able to

supplement, enrich and develop his knowledge of the common essence and prevent that knowledge from withering or petrifying.¹

The mistake of the dogmatists lies in turning the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, i.e., the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, into something withered and petrified.

Dogmatists distort Marxism-Leninism in another way. Divorcing themselves from reality, they contrive abstract, empty formulas, or mechanically take the experience of foreign countries and force it on the masses. Thereby, they cramp the mass struggle and prevent it from achieving the results it should. Leaving time, place and conditions out of account, they obstinately stick to one form of struggle. They fail to understand that in every country the mass revolutionary movement takes highly complex forms and that all the forms of struggle required have to be used simultaneously and complement each other; they fail to understand that when the situation changes it is necessary to replace old forms of struggle by new ones, or to utilize the old forms but fill them with new content. Therefore, they very often cut themselves off from the masses and from potential allies, so falling into errors of sectarianism, and they just as often act recklessly, so falling into errors of adventurism.

If the leading body of a Party commits errors of dogmatism, it becomes unable to grasp the laws of the actual revolutionary movement. In the field of theory, it is bound to be lifeless, and in the field of tactics, it is bound to make all kinds of mistakes. A party of this

kind cannot possibly lead the people’s revolutionary movement in its country to victory.

During the struggle against dogmatism inside the Chinese Communist Party, Comrade Mao Tse-tung placed stress on integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution; he pointed out that the Marxist-Leninist attitude is to employ the Marxist-Leninist theory and method for systematic and comprehensive investigation and study of the environment. He said:

With this attitude, one studies the theory of Marxism-Leninism with a purpose, that is, to integrate Marxist-Leninist theory with the actual movement of the Chinese revolution and to seek from this theory the stand, viewpoint and method with which to solve the theoretical and tactical problems of the Chinese revolution. Such an attitude is one of shooting the arrow at the target. The “target” is the Chinese revolution, the “arrow” is Marxism-Leninism. We Chinese Communists have been seeking this arrow because we want to hit the target of the Chinese revolution and of the revolution of the East. To take such an attitude is to seek truth from facts. “Facts” are all the things that exist objectively, “truth” means their internal relations, that is, the laws governing them, and “to seek” means to study. We should proceed from the actual conditions inside and outside the country, the province, county or district, and derive from them, as our guide to action, laws which are inherent in them and not imaginary, that is, we should find the internal relations of the events occurring around us. And in order to do that we must rely not on subjective imagination, not
on momentary enthusiasm, not on lifeless books, but on facts that exist objectively; we must appropriate the material in detail and, guided by the general principles of Marxism-Leninism, draw correct conclusions from it.¹

The history of the Chinese Communist Party, the history of the triumph of the Chinese revolution, is one of ever-closer integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. Without such integration it is inconceivable that the Chinese revolution could have triumphed.

PRINCIPLE AND FLEXIBILITY

It is a well-known precept of Lenin's that "a policy based on principle is the only correct policy", Marxism was able to triumph over all sorts of opportunist trends and become predominant in the international working-class movement precisely because Marx and Engels persevered in policies based on principle. Leninism was able to continue to triumph over all sorts of revisionist and opportunist trends, to guide the October Revolution to victory and become predominant in the international working-class movement in the new era precisely because Lenin, and Stalin after him, carrying forward the cause of Marx and Engels, persevered in policies based on principle.

What does policy based on principle mean? It means that every policy we put forward and decide upon must be based on the class stand of the proletariat, on the fundamental interests of the proletariat, on the theory

of Marxism-Leninism and on the fundamental standpoint of Marxism-Leninism. The party of the proletariat must not confine its attention to immediate interests, veer with the wind and abandon fundamental interests, It must not simply submit to the immediate turn of events, approving or advocating one thing today and another tomorrow, and trading in principles as though they were commodities. In other words, the party of the proletariat must maintain its political independence, differentiating itself ideologically and politically from all other classes and their political parties — not only from the landlords and the bourgeoisie, but also from the petty bourgeoisie. Inside the party, the Marxist-Leninists must draw a line between themselves and both the Right and “Left” opportunists, who reflect various shades of non-proletarian ideology.

Only yesterday, some people put their signatures to the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, expressing approval of the fundamental revolutionary principles set forth in these two documents, and yet today they are trampling these principles underfoot. Hardly had they signed the Moscow Statement and agreed to the conclusion that the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia have betrayed Marxism-Leninism than they turned round and treated the Titoite renegades as dearly beloved brothers. They concurred in the conclusion in the Statement that “U.S. imperialism is the chief bulwark of world reaction and an international gendarme, that it has become an enemy of the peoples of the whole world”, and yet soon afterwards they maintained that the destiny of mankind depended on “co-operation”, “confidence” and “agreement” between the heads of the two powers,
the United States and the Soviet Union. They concurred in the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries laid down in the Declaration and the Statement, and yet soon afterwards they abandoned these principles and at their own Party congress publicly and wilfully condemned another fraternal Party and country. Though talking glibly about never allowing ideological differences between fraternal Parties to spread to the economic field and to state relations, these people have wantonly torn up numerous economic and technological contracts between fraternal countries, and have even gone to such lengths as virtually breaking off diplomatic relations with a fraternal country. They concurred in the conclusion in the Declaration and the Statement that revisionism is the main danger in the international working-class movement, and yet soon afterwards they began to spread the idea that “dogmatism is the main danger” far and wide. And so on and so forth. Is there any principle in these actions of theirs? What kind of principles are their policies based on?

While adhering to policies based on principle, the party of the proletariat must also exercise flexibility. In revolutionary struggle, it is wrong to refuse to adjust to changing circumstances or reject roundabout ways of advance. The difference between Marxist-Leninists and the opportunists and revisionists is that the former stand for flexibility in carrying out policies based on principle, while the latter practise a flexibility which is actually the abandonment of principled policies.

Flexibility based on principle is not opportunism. On the contrary, one can make opportunist mistakes if one does not know how to exercise the necessary flexibility
and to suit the action to the moment, in the light of the specific conditions and on the basis of persevering in principle, and one will thus bring unwarranted losses to the revolutionary struggle.

Compromise is an important problem in the practice of flexibility.

Marxist-Leninists approach the question of compromise as follows: They never reject any necessary compromise that serves the interests of the revolution, namely, principled compromise, but they will never tolerate a compromise that amounts to betrayal, namely, unprincipled compromise.

Lenin well said:

It is not without cause that Marx and Engels are considered to be the founders of scientific socialism. They were merciless enemies of all phrase-mongering. They taught us to pose the questions of socialism (including those of socialist tactics) in a scientific way. And in the seventies of the last century, when Engels had to analyse the revolutionary manifesto of the French Blanquists, refugees after the Commune, he said without mincing words that their boastful declaration “no compromises” was an empty phrase. One must not renounce compromise. The problem is to be able, through all the compromises which are sometimes necessarily imposed by force of circumstances even on the most revolutionary party of the most revolutionary class, through all such compromises to be able to preserve, strengthen, temper and develop the revolutionary tactics and organization, the revolutionary consciousness, determination and preparedness of the
working class and its organized vanguard, the Communist Party.¹

How can a Marxist-Leninist Party which conscientiously seeks truth from facts reject all compromises indiscriminately? The editorial on *Leninism and Modern Revisionism* in the first issue of *Hongqi* for 1963 contains this passage:

In the course of our protracted revolutionary struggle, we Chinese Communists reached compromises on many occasions with our enemies, internal and external. For example, we came to a compromise with the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek clique. We came to a compromise, too, with the U.S. imperialists, in the struggle to aid Korea and resist U.S. aggression.

It continues:

It is precisely in accordance with Lenin's teachings that we Chinese Communists distinguish between different kinds of compromise, favouring compromises which are in the interests of the people's cause and of world peace, and opposing compromises that are in the nature of treachery. It is perfectly clear that only those guilty, now of adventurism, now of capitulationism, are the ones whose ideology is Trotskyism, or Trotskyism in a new guise.

As is well known, Trotsky played a most despicable role in connection with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk as well as in the entire history of the Russian revolution and of Soviet construction. He opposed Lenin and Leninism on all

the main problems. He denied that the socialist revolution and socialist construction could triumph first in one country. He lacked all principle on the question of revolutionary strategy and tactics, and this manifested itself now in "Left" adventurism, now in Right capitulationism. In the case of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, he first blindly pressed for an adventurist policy; then, in violation of Lenin’s directive, he refused to sign the treaty at the Brest-Litovsk negotiations and at the same time made the traitorous statement to the German side that the Soviet Republic was preparing to end the war and demobilize. The German aggressors thereupon became more arrogant and laid down even more onerous terms. Such was Trotskyism in the matter of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk.

Now certain people have arbitrarily lumped together the Cuban events and those of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, although the two were completely different in nature, and they have drawn an historical analogy in which they liken themselves to Lenin and brand those who opposed sacrificing the sovereignty of another country as Trotskyites. This is most absurd.

Lenin was perfectly right in wanting the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk to be signed. Lenin’s purpose was to win time to consolidate the victory of the October Revolution. In his “Problems of Strategy in China’s Revolutionary War” written in 1936, Comrade Mao Tse-tung strongly criticized "Left" opportunist errors. Referring to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, he said:

After the October Revolution, if the Russian Bolsheviks had acted on the opinions of the “Left Communists” and refused to sign the peace treaty with
Germany, the new-born Soviets would have been in danger of early death.¹

Events confirmed Lenin’s foresight, and the signing of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk proved to be a revolutionary compromise.

How about the Cuban events? That was a completely different story. In the Cuban events, the Cuban people and their leaders were determined to fight to the death to defend the sovereignty of their fatherland; they displayed great heroism and high principle. They did not commit the error of adventurism, nor did they commit the error of capitulationism. But during the Cuban events certain people first committed the error of adventurism, and then committed the error of capitulationism, wanting the Cuban people to accept humiliating terms which would have meant the sacrifice of the sovereignty of their country. These persons have tried to cover themselves by using the example of Lenin’s conclusion of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, but this has turned out to be a clumsy sleight-of-hand, for they have actually uncovered themselves all the more clearly.

Comrade Liu Shao-chi explained the relation between principle and flexibility, on the basis of the experience of the Chinese Revolution, in the following remarks which he made at the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of China:

Our flexibility is based on definite principles. Flexibility without principle, concessions and compromises that go beyond principle, and ambiguity or confusion of principle, are all wrong. The criterion or

measure for all changes in policy or tactics is Party principle. And Party principle is the criterion and the measure of flexibility. For example, one of our unchangeable principles is to fight for the greatest interests of the largest majority of the people. This unchangeable principle is the criterion and the measure by which the correctness of all changes in policy or tactics should be judged. All changes in keeping with this principle are correct while those conflicting with it are wrong.1

This is our view on the relation between principle and flexibility, and we believe it to be the Marxist-Leninist view.

VIII. WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

“Workers of All Countries, Unite!” The great call made by Marx and Engels more than a century ago will for ever remain the guiding principle which the international proletariat must observe.

The Chinese Communist Party consistently upholds the unity of the international communist movement, the safeguarding of which it regards as its sacred duty. We reaffirmed our stand on this question in the editorial of Renmin Ribao on January 27, 1963:

Are the ranks of the international communist movement to be united or not? Is there to be genuine unity or sham unity? On what basis is there to be unity— is there to be unity on the basis of the Moscow Decla-

1 Liu Shao-chi, On the Party.
ration and the Moscow Statement, or "unity" on the basis of the Yugoslav revisionist programme or on some other basis? In other words, are differences to be ironed out and unity strengthened, or are differences to be widened and a split created?

The Chinese Communists, all other Marxist-Leninists and all progressive mankind unanimously desire to uphold unity and oppose a split, to secure genuine unity and oppose a sham unity, to defend the common foundation of the unity of the international communist movement and oppose the undermining of this foundation, and to uphold and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

This is the unswerving position of the Chinese Communist Party on the question of the unity of the international communist movement.

After launching and organizing a series of preposterous attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Parties, certain people have suddenly begun to strike up the tune of "unity". But what they call unity consists of giving themselves permission to abuse others, while not allowing the others to reason with them. By "calling a halt to open polemics", they mean permission for themselves to attack others as they please, while the others are forbidden to make whatever reply is called for. While talking of unity, they continue to undermine unity; while talking of calling a halt to open polemics, they continue their open attacks. What is more, they say threateningly that unless those whom they attack keep their mouths shut, it will
be “imperative to continue and even step up decisive struggle against them”.

But when it comes to the Tito clique, these people really seek unity. Their desire is unity with the Tito clique, not the unity of the international communist movement; they desire unity on the basis of modern revisionism as represented by the Tito clique, or unity on the basis of the baton of certain people, and not unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. In practice, therefore, their unity is a pseudonym for split. Using unity as a smokescreen, they are trying to cover up their actual splitting activities.

Revisionism represents the interests of the labour aristocracy, and hence also the interests of the reactionary bourgeoisie. Revisionist trends run counter to the interests of the proletariat, of the masses of the people and of all oppressed people and nations. Ever since the days of Bernstein, Marxism-Leninism has been repeatedly assailed by revisionist and opportunist trends, each in its day stirring up a commotion. But history has confirmed that Marxism-Leninism represents the highest interests of the largest number of people and is invincible. One after the other, all the revisionists and opportunists who challenged revolutionary Marxism-Leninism have collapsed in the face of the truth and have been spurned by the people. Bernstein was a failure and so were Kautsky, Plekhanov, Trotsky, Bukharin, Chen Tu-hsiu, Browder, and all the others. Those who are launching the new attacks on revolutionary Marxism-Leninism today are just as overbearing and arrogant; yet, if they continue to turn a deaf ear to all advice and persist in their wrong course, it can
be said for certain that their end will be no better than that of the old revisionists and opportunists.

There are people who are working frantically to create a split by resorting to many dishonest tricks, spreading rumours, slingling mud and sowing dissension. But the overwhelming majority of the people of the world want unity in the international communist movement and are opposed to a split. The activities of certain people in creating a split, attacking the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Parties, and undermining the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement, go against the desires of the overwhelming majority of the people of the world and are extremely unpopular. People can see through their tactics of sham unity and actual splitting. Historically, none of the splitters who betrayed Marxism-Leninism ever came to a good end. We have already advised those who are working to create a split to "rein in at the brink of the precipice", but certain people are unwilling to take our advice. They believe they are not yet at the "brink", and they are not ready "to rein in". Apparently they are very much interested in continuing their splitting activities. Let them go on creating trouble if they must. The masses, and history, will pass judgement on them.

Something very interesting is happening today on a wide scale in the international communist movement today. What is this interesting phenomenon? The doughty warriors who claim to possess the totality of Marxist-Leninist truth are mortally afraid of the articles written in reply to their attacks by the so-called dogmatists, sectarians, splitters, nationalists, and Trotskyites whom they have so vigorously condemned. They dare not
publish these articles in their own newspapers and journals. As cowardly as mice, they are scared to death. They dare not let the people of their own countries read our articles, and they have tried to impose a watertight embargo. They are even using powerful stations to jam our broadcasts and prevent their people from listening to them. Dear friends and comrades, who claim to possess the whole truth! Since you are quite definite that our articles are wrong, why don’t you publish all these erroneous articles and then refute them point by point, so as to inculcate hatred among your people against the “heresies” you call dogmatism, sectarianism and anti-Marxism-Leninism? Why do you lack the courage to do this? Why such a stringent embargo? You fear the truth. The huge spectre you call “dogmatism”, i.e., genuine Marxism-Leninism, is haunting the world, and it threatens you. You have no faith in the people, and the people have no faith in you. You are divorced from the masses. That is why you fear the truth and carry your fear to such absurd lengths. Friends, comrades! If you are men enough, step forward! Let each side in the debate publish all the articles in which it is criticized by the other side, and let the people in our own countries and the whole world think over and judge who is right and who is wrong. That is what we are doing, and we hope you will follow our example. We are not afraid to publish everything of yours in full. We publish all the “masterpieces” in which you rail at us. Then, in reply we either refute them point by point, or refute their main points. Sometimes we publish your articles without a word in answer, leaving the readers to judge for themselves. Isn’t that fair and reasonable? You, modern revisionist masters! Do you dare to do the same?
If you are men enough, you will. But having a guilty conscience and an unjust case, being fierce of visage but faint of heart, outwardly as tough as bulls but inwardly as timid as mice, you will not dare. We are sure you will not dare. Isn’t that so? Please answer!

The Chinese Communist Party believes that there is a way to settle the differences. It is the way pointed out in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. As we are nearing the end of this article, we should like to quote one of the important conclusions of the Moscow Declaration:

After exchanging views, the participants in the meeting arrived at the conclusion that in present conditions it is expedient, besides bilateral meetings of leading workers and exchange of information, to hold, as the need arises, more representative conferences of Communist and Workers’ Parties to discuss current problems, share experience, study each other’s views and attitudes and concert action in the joint struggle for the common goals — peace, democracy and socialism.

We should also like to quote the paragraphs of the Moscow Statement dealing with the fundamental principles guiding the relations among fraternal Parties:

At a time when imperialist reaction is joining forces to fight communism it is particularly imperative vigorously to consolidate the world communist movement. Unity and solidarity redouble the strength of our movement and provide a reliable guarantee that the great cause of communism will make victorious progress and all enemy attacks will be effectively repelled.
Communists throughout the world are united by the great doctrine of Marxism-Leninism and by a joint struggle for its realisation. The interests of the communist movement require solidarity in adherence by every Communist Party to the estimates and conclusions concerning the common tasks in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism, jointly reached by the fraternal Parties at their meetings. The interests of the struggle for the working-class cause demand ever closer unity of the ranks of each Communist Party and of the great army of Communists of all countries; they demand of them unity of will and action. It is the supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist Party to work continuously for greater unity in the world communist movement.

A resolute defence of the unity of the world communist movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism; and the prevention of any actions which may undermine that unity, are a necessary condition for victory in the struggle for national independence, democracy and peace, for the successful accomplishment of the tasks of the socialist revolution and of the building of socialism and communism. Violation of these principles would impair the forces of communism. All the Marxist-Leninist Parties are independent and have equal rights; they shape their policies according to the specific conditions in their respective countries and in keeping with Marxist-Leninist principles, and support each other. The success of the working-class cause in any country is unthinkable
without the internationalist solidarity of all Marxist-Leninist Parties. Every Party is responsible to the working class, to the working people of its country, to the international working-class and communist movement as a whole.

The Communist and Workers' Parties hold meetings whenever necessary to discuss urgent problems, to exchange experience, acquaint themselves with each other's views and positions, work out common views through consultations and co-ordinate joint actions in the struggle for common goals.

Whenever a Party wants to clear up questions relating to the activities of another fraternal Party, its leadership approaches the leadership of the Party concerned; if necessary, they hold meetings and consultations.

The experience and results of the meetings of representatives of the Communist Parties held in recent years, particularly the results of the two major meetings — that of November 1957 and this Meeting — show that in present-day conditions such meetings are an effective form of exchanging views and experience, enriching Marxist-Leninist theory by collective effort and elaborating a common attitude in the struggle for common objectives.

Since the incident over a year ago where one Party at its own congress publicly attacked another fraternal Party, we have appealed many times for the resolution of the differences between the fraternal Parties in accordance with the principles and procedures set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, as just quoted. We have pointed out many times that public
and unilateral attacks on any fraternal Party are not helpful in resolving problems, and are not helpful to unity. We have constantly maintained that the fraternal Parties having disputes or differences ought to stop the public debate and return to the course of inter-Party consultation, and that in particular the Party which first launched the attack ought to take the initiative. Our opinion today remains the same.

In April 1962, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party stated to the fraternal Party concerned that we whole-heartedly supported the proposal made by several Parties that a meeting of the fraternal Parties be convened, and that we believed it was appropriate to consider the convening of a meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of all countries to discuss problems of common concern.

At that time, we said that the convening of a meeting of the fraternal Parties and the success of such a meeting would depend on the prior overcoming of many difficulties and obstacles and on the doing of a great deal of preparatory work.

At that time, we expressed the hope that the fraternal Parties and fraternal countries which had disputes would thenceforth take steps, however small, to help ease relations and restore unity, so as to improve the atmosphere and prepare the conditions for the convening of such a meeting and for its successful outcome.

At that time, we proposed that the fraternal Parties concerned should stop making public attacks.

At that time, we maintained that for some of the fraternal Parties to conduct such bilateral or multilateral talks as were needed to exchange opinions would also help to make such a meeting successful.
These views which we put before the fraternal Party concerned in April 1962 are entirely reasonable and fully conform with the provisions on the settlement of differences between fraternal Parties set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. We have since explained these views many times, and we now do so again.

Recently, the leaders of certain Parties have expressed a certain degree of acceptance of our views. If this is sincere and if the deeds suit the words, that will certainly be very good. It is what we have always hoped for.

We hold that the ranks of the international communist movement must unite. They will certainly unite!

Let us proclaim:
Workers of all countries, unite!
All oppressed nations and all oppressed people, unite!
All Marxist-Leninists, unite!
論再陶里亚蒂同志同我們的分歧
一关于列寧主義在当代的若干重大問題
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