

The background is a solid red color. The top and bottom edges of the page are irregularly torn, revealing a bright yellow paper underneath. The text is centered on the red background.

**Basic Principles
For The Unity Of Marxist-Leninists
And For The Line Of The
International Communist Movement**

A Draft Position Paper for Discussion Prepared by
the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile
the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA

Introduction

As indicated in the communique from a meeting of Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations, "To The Marxist-Leninists, The Workers And The Oppressed Of All Countries" (reprinted as an appendix in this pamphlet), the parties and organizations signing that communique received and discussed the draft text which (with a few changes) is being published here, and they "hold that, on the whole, the text is a positive contribution toward the elaboration of a correct general line for the international communist movement. With this perspective, the text should be circulated and discussed not only in the ranks of those organizations who have signed this communique, but throughout the ranks of the international communist movement." It is on the basis of initial discussion of the draft, leading up to and at the meeting, and particularly in relation to the communique, that some changes have been made in the text in publishing it here. It should be pointed out, however, that this document is still a draft, which was prepared jointly by leaders of the Revolutionary Com-

munist Party of Chile and the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA, and that its purpose is to serve as a focus for and to further discussion within the international communist movement, including within these two parties themselves, and to contribute to the struggle to forge a correct general line for the international communist movement and unite all those who can be united around this line, in the context of the historic conjuncture now shaping up.

Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile
Revolutionary Communist Party, USA

January 1, 1981

Because this document is being published in several different languages, the paragraphs are numbered in the different language versions to facilitate study and moreover to provide synchronized reference points for discussion and exchanges concerning the text.

Table of Contents

Basic Principles for the Unity of Marxist-Leninists and for the Line of the International Communist Movement	1
I. The Objective Situation — Crisis and the Prospects for War and for Revolution	2
II. The Situation within the International Communist Movement and the Struggle Against Revisionism and Other Forms of Opportunism	13
III. The Basic Tasks of the Marxist-Leninists	32
Imperialist Countries	34
Colonial and Dependent Countries	39
<hr/>	
Appendix:	
To the Marxist-Leninists, the Workers, and the Oppressed of All Countries	45

Available from:
RCP PUBLICATIONS
P.O. Box 3486, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, IL, U.S.A. 60654
Also available in French and Spanish editions.

BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR THE UNITY OF MARXIST-LENINISTS AND FOR THE LINE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

(A Draft Position Paper for Discussion Prepared by the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA)

The present period is a momentous one in history. (1) The very workings of the imperialist system are once more dragging the world's people toward the brink of a global conflagration, in the interests of and arising directly out of the contention between two rival blocs of slavemasters and plunderers. And this threatens to be a world war even more destructive than in the past. More than one imperialist spokesman has warned, with both profound hypocrisy and profound concern, that the period ahead will be the most dangerous one in the history of humanity. Precisely dangerous for whom, for which class?—that is the most crucial question, because the crisis engulfing the imperialists and reactionaries throughout the world and their desperate lurching toward world war, and indeed the very workings of the imperialist system, also contain and will increasingly nurture the seeds of revolution on every continent. Already significant advances toward proletarian revolution have occurred in various parts of the world in recent years and the years ahead hold the possibility of far greater victories for the international proletariat.

This is so despite the very real and bitter setbacks (2) that have been suffered in the recent past, most especially the rise to power of revisionism in China and the reversal of the socialist revolution there, beginning with the reactionary coup d'état shortly after the death of Mao Tsetung, coming on top of the triumph of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, the world's first socialist state, and in a number of other formerly socialist countries—all of which has produced great turmoil in the communist movement internationally. History advances not in a straight line but through twists and turns, it advances in a spiral—but it does advance. And this is most certainly true for the historic process of the world proletarian revolution and the replacement of the bourgeois epoch

by the world-historic epoch of communism. Grasping and acting in accordance with this law in order to accelerate this advance is not merely a general and long-term requirement of proletarian revolutionaries but is of immediate, pressing importance in today's situation and with future developments in mind. The temporary defeats and reversals as well as the historic victories and leaps forward that have been achieved in socialist revolution and construction in many parts of the world must be seriously studied and the profound lessons, positive and negative, must be drawn. More than that, however, they must be acted upon. The situation faced by the Marxist-Leninists throughout the world demands not only serious reflection, study and struggle in the ideological realm—all of which is extremely important and an ongoing task—but also the forging of unity around basic principles as a guide to revolutionary action within the various countries and on the international level.

The situation is an urgent one, pregnant with great (3) dangers, great challenges and also great opportunities. We are rapidly approaching one of those times which Lenin referred to as rare and great moments in history, holding the prospect of historic changes in the entire world. This calls not for panic, nor still less for wavering, but for intensified and accelerated effort and struggle, to realize to the fullest the unified efforts of all who can be united around the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, especially around the most cardinal questions posing themselves in today's situation, and with the orientation of surging ahead, heightening and preparing to seize to the fullest the revolutionary possibilities, perhaps even unprecedented ones. It is with this understanding and in this spirit that we are presenting here our views on these questions.

I. The Objective Situation— Crisis and the Prospects for War and for Revolution

The most salient feature of the international situation today is the heightening rivalry between two imperialist blocs, one headed by the U.S. and the other by the Soviet Union, and their feverish preparation for world war. How is this development to be understood and what conditions and tasks does it present the international communist movement with? This must be examined in its separate aspects as well as overall. (4)

Today, the imperialist state of the USA, not only a powerful bastion of reaction throughout the world but for years and decades proclaimed as an unshakable example of the strength of capitalism, is enmeshed in a profound crisis and sinking deeper. (5)

In many ways the strengths of U.S. imperialism owing to its position coming out of World War 2 have turned into their opposite. For several decades chief bulwark of imperialism and world reaction, with overwhelming military superiority and a vast empire, U.S. imperialism has been increasingly marked by parasitic decay while during the same time it has been the main target of and been greatly weakened by revolutionary struggles in large parts of the world. And it now finds its top-dog position directly threatened by an imperialist rival, the Soviet Union, which arose out of the destruction of socialism in that country. Having such a far-flung empire and occupying such a superior position relative to its allies, U.S. imperialism, unlike in the periods preceding the two previous world wars and during them, cannot help but be on the front lines of conflict in all parts of the world. All this means not that U.S. imperialism is less reactionary, less aggressive or less of an enemy or danger to the proletariat and peoples of the world, but on the contrary that the U.S. imperialists, together with and at the head of their bloc, must not only squeeze more blood from those they exploit and oppress but more than that must once again seek a forcible restructuring of world relations, with all the destruction and misery that will mean for the peoples of the world. (6)

In a major way the American dollar is a symbol and key element of all this. Coming out of World War 2 the dollar was the center of an international monetary system and pivotal to the reorganization of capital throughout the entire imperialist world; its undisputed supremacy and role as "currency of last resort"—that it was "as good as gold"—within this camp reflected

and reenforced the overwhelmingly supreme position of the U.S. among the imperialists. In the late 1960s, as U.S. imperialism was going down to a devastating defeat in Vietnam and being weakened internationally, the first important challenges were made by U.S. imperialism's allies against the dollar's role (and some of the international economic relations this was a concentrated expression of). In 1971 the dollar was "unhinged" from gold, and in the years following there has been continuing instability within the international monetary system associated with the dollar, both manifesting and contributing to the growing economic crisis throughout the U.S.-led bloc. And finally, it is in the realm of the dollar and the related international monetary system that the U.S. today is carrying out the key economic moves to tighten up its bloc in preparation for the impending showdown with the rival Soviet bloc. *

Within this overall development, the recession of 1974-75 was a crucial turning point. It was marked by two very significant features: first, it was the most serious economic depression in the U.S. camp since the 1930s; and second, it occurred simultaneously throughout the imperialist countries of this camp. In the U.S. itself, actual unemployment reached more than 10 percent, and even the official rate among the basic industrial proletariat went as high as 12-13 percent. (8)

This recession represented the tendency of capitalist accumulation to lead to crises of overproduction asserting itself throughout these countries in a qualitatively greater and different way than at any time previously in the period since World War 2. In the earlier post-World War 2 years, especially among major powers in the U.S. bloc, economic "downturns" had represented essentially minor "interruptions" in an overall pattern of economic expansion, in some cases marked by very high growth rates. The 1974-75 recession, however, was not only more severe but signalled a new situation in which, for the U.S. specifically and the bloc on the whole, the prior kind of expansion could not take place. (9)

Further, while this recession and the overall crisis continuing since then have their basis in production—and are rooted in the fundamental contradiction of capitalism, between socialized production and private appropriation—in the sphere of finance and the international monetary system this crisis has assumed an acute, (10)

critical and volatile expression. More, the means by which these imperialists, with the U.S. playing the leading role, attempted to "pull out" of this crisis were centered mainly in currency relations and manipulations, with an explosion of credit and inflation reaching tremendous proportions in the U.S. itself and in the bloc overall. And again, specifically in the U.S. but also taking the bloc as a whole, what "recovery" there was after 1974-75 was not only partial but was followed within a few years by another major recession, one which hit deeply in the U.S. first of all and seriously affected the entire bloc.

Of great significance is the fact that in the face of this situation, the economic-political strategy adopted by the U.S. imperialists—which they have insisted on as the strategy for their allies as well, even though some have objected—has been the attempt to stabilize the international monetary system and bring the explosion of debt and inflation under more control, while at the same time expanding military expenditures. And this has been consciously done with the recognition that it will intensify the exploitation and hardships of the working class and broad masses of people in these imperialist countries themselves—with the U.S. among those where this will most be the case—and despite the understanding that this will generate significantly greater "social unrest and upheaval."

More and more the U.S. imperialists and their allies are acting upon the understanding that there is no way to reverse the downward spiral of crisis into which they have been plunged except through the waging—and winning—of world war, that the present international framework within which they are operating no longer allows for an overall recovery and economic expansion and that only a redivision of the world favorable to them can provide a "way out" . . . for a time. The ongoing crisis they face is occurring in the context of, and both its severity and their inability to solve it short of world war is the product of, a radically changed international situation, and most of all the emergence of a rival capable of and actually challenging the U.S. It is in the world arena that the key lies to the situation faced by the U.S. bloc imperialist countries, to how that situation has radically changed from the earlier period following World War 2 and how they must seek to deal with it. This is a manifestation of the fact that in the era of imperialism, while the basic laws of capitalist accumulation continue to exert themselves, this finds expression most decisively not in the classic business cycles within the individual capitalist countries but more importantly through extended cycles or spirals which take place on an international level and within the framework of the relation of forces in the world, in which inter-imperialist wars are nodal points.

For the U.S. imperialists and their bloc today it is the contest with the rival, Soviet-led bloc—the preparation for and then the carrying out of a global military confrontation—that is their immediate, greatest concern. It is the pivot on which their actions are now hinging.

At the same time, there are significant contradictions among the U.S.-bloc imperialist countries, especially in relation to this looming war. On the

economic level there is competition and at times rather sharp conflict not only between the U.S. and the other imperialists but also among these others, for example between the Common Market countries and Japan and among the Common Market countries themselves. These involve the areas of trade, investment and currency relations between these different countries, the export of capital to colonial and dependent countries and the different specific "spheres of influence" there, and economic relations with the Soviet bloc.

On the strategic-military plane, the U.S. insists on maintaining control over the nuclear weapons stationed in the countries of its bloc and in general would like to confine the war, both conventional encounters and nuclear exchanges (if, as is quite likely, they occur), to others' territories. Of course, this is not at all to the liking of its allies, who desperately want to prevent the nuclear devastation of the countries they rule. This is especially acute in Europe and it explains to a great degree the tendency, within some Western European ruling classes especially, to attempt to work out some limited agreements of their own with the Soviet Union—which the Soviet ruling class, in pursuit of its own imperialist aims and in carrying out its own preparations for world war, is anxious to develop as well.

But with all that, the fact remains that the imperialist countries of the West (and Japan and other imperialist states allied with the U.S.) are part of a bloc headed by the U.S. and that this bloc is being tightened up. Economically, while these countries are imperialist in character themselves—they are dominated by domestic monopoly and finance capital which also exports capital extensively, in accordance with the laws of capitalism in its highest and final stage, as analyzed by Lenin—at the same time they are heavily penetrated with U.S. capital and closely interconnected with the U.S. They have their own interests which they pursue, including the need to maintain and expand "spheres of influence," spurred on by the same laws of imperialism, and it is in pursuit of these interests that they are confronted with the increasingly pressing need to seek a redivision of the world more favorable to them. The point is, however, that they do this in the overall context of being part of the U.S. bloc and in that sense through this bloc. In the present world framework, they all depend on the U.S. nuclear umbrella, even those which are developing (or may develop) their own nuclear weapons to one degree or another, and in any case they can pursue their own interests in the final analysis only as part of a military bloc headed by a nuclear superpower—none of them is strong enough to stand up to either nuclear superpower in a military showdown, nor is the likelihood of their trying to do so on their own, either separately or even all together, a serious one.

Further, the U.S. imperialists, for their part, cannot allow any of their major imperialist allies to make any really significant separate "arrangement" with the Soviet social-imperialists, nor still less to actually "desert" to the Soviet bloc. And in fact the U.S. is using various means to try to drive a wedge into the Soviet bloc itself.

Thus, while jockeying and scrambling by various ruling classes in pursuit of their own interests is an aspect of the current situation that cannot be ignored, and in particular while efforts will no doubt be continued by various forces among the imperialist ruling classes in the U.S.-led bloc to seek some kind of agreements with the Soviet Union, all this in no way negates or stands above the increasing tendency among the imperialists (and other reactionary ruling classes) to line up in two blocs in preparation for war, nor should it be taken as a counter-current to the feverish war preparations of the imperialists and the accelerating drive of the rival blocs toward world war. Quite the opposite. These and other maneuvers in various parts of the world, including the actual "switching of sides" by some states, are a part of and another important indication precisely of the heightening developments toward world war.

Why do we say that the danger of world war is great and growing now? It is not simply because of certain striking phenomena in various parts of the world that indicate the intensifying rivalry between the two blocs headed by the two superpowers. In 1962, for example, the U.S. and the Soviet Union came to a sharp confrontation over Cuba, and yet no world war resulted, nor was it very likely then that this would happen. To understand the basic differences between the situation and the danger of world war then and now, and to fully grasp the situation and tasks the international communist movement is presented with at this historic conjuncture, it is necessary not only to correctly analyze and take account of the developments within and the serious crisis engulfing the U.S.-led bloc but also, and in dialectical relationship with this, to scientifically assess the nature of, the developments within and the forces driving the Soviet Union and its bloc. Confusion on these questions and especially on the basic character of and laws governing the development and actions of the Soviet Union and its ruling class can only have a serious negative effect on the communist movement, the proletariat and the masses of people throughout the world.

First of all, it is necessary to really understand that the Soviet Union is an imperialist state and no longer a socialist one. As Mao Tsetung summed up in a concentrated way, "the rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie." The rise to power of the revisionists in the Soviet Union under the leadership of Khrushchev in the mid-1950s meant, and could only mean, that the bourgeoisie—a new bourgeoisie, with its core and most powerful sectors and representatives concentrated in the highest levels of the party and state apparatus—had seized power from the proletariat. From there—unless the process was reversed by the revolutionary overthrow of this bourgeoisie through the action of the masses with genuine proletarian revolutionaries at the head—the destruction of the socialist economic base, and the restoration of capitalism in the sphere of the economy as well as in every other realm of society, was inevitable. And this is precisely what happened.

But, given the level of development of Soviet society, the restoration of capitalism there was bound to and

did mean that the Soviet Union would be characterized by and constitute capitalism in its highest and final stage, as analyzed by Lenin himself—imperialism, where monopoly and finance capital dominate and the export of capital is an inevitable and distinguishing feature—and that the Soviet Union would emerge onto the world scene as a reactionary, expansionist force, compelled to seek "spheres of influence" and to contend with other, rival imperialists in looting the world in pursuit of profit. Here it is useful and important to contrast the Soviet Union with Yugoslavia. Under the leadership of Tito, Yugoslavia never really advanced onto the socialist road, and Tito's revisionist line, given the backwardness of the country, meant that it was sold into economic bondage and political and military dependency on imperialism after World War 2, playing a special role as an ideological and practical detachment of the imperialist camp headed by the U.S., especially in its aggression and subversion against the socialist camp and in opposition to the rising liberation struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America. And, while economically indebting itself to the Soviet bloc as well as the U.S. bloc in recent years and still putting up a pretense of "independence," Yugoslavia continues to play the role of a front and vehicle for U.S. imperialism and its allies, especially in the so-called "non-aligned movement," of which Yugoslavia is a main exponent. On the other hand, when in the mid-1950s and afterward the external force of the imperialists and their agents, including Tito, and more than that the internal class struggle within the Soviet Union and other socialist countries led to the restoration of capitalism there, this brought into being a powerful reactionary force that would after a fairly brief period of time begin to mount a serious challenge to and more and more directly confront the imperialist bloc headed by the U.S. in a struggle for world domination.

Speaking especially of the Soviet Union, however, it is also very important to stress that this process has gone through two general phases. The first, which largely corresponds to the period of Khrushchev's leadership, was marked by the thorough destruction of the socialist economic base and superstructure: a frontal assault on basic Marxist-Leninist principles, including a perverse attack on Stalin, the promotion of "peaceful" collaboration with and capitulation to imperialism and reaction, the notion of the party and state of the "whole people"; the purging of proletarian revolutionaries from all levels of the party and the transformation of the party from a revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat into a "party of production" serving the new ruling bureaucratic bourgeoisie; the unleashing of forces favoring and fostering capitalism in the city and countryside; and, certainly not the least important, the establishment of the principle of "profit in command" of the economy.

In the international arena, the actions of the ruling Soviet revisionists were mainly characterized by their efforts to establish a "peaceful coexistence" with the imperialist camp headed by the U.S. at the expense of and in direct opposition to the genuine socialist countries and the revolutionary struggles in the world,

especially those sweeping Asia, Africa and Latin America. At that time the Soviet revisionists sought to avoid any serious confrontation with the U.S. imperialists and when faced with such a situation they backed down.

But increasingly since the time following (23) Khrushchev's fall, the relationship between the USSR and the U.S. has been characterized by contention between them. The carrying out of capitalist restoration and the emergence on that basis of Soviet social-imperialism meant that the ruling class there had the need to challenge U.S. dominance and the division of the world favoring the U.S. bloc. And, especially as the U.S. was tied down, battered and heading for a major defeat in Indochina, the Soviet social-imperialists had increasing opportunity to expand and make significant gains in opposition to U.S. bloc interests in various parts of the world, and they did not fail to take advantage of this. On the other hand, in the face of its defeat in Indochina and the growing Soviet bloc challenge, and with the deepening of crisis within the U.S. and throughout its bloc, the U.S. imperialists were forced to and did regroup, reorient and reorganize their international deployment of forces and alliances and tighten up their bloc in intensifying rivalry with the Soviet social-imperialists.

In this light the role, and particularly the reasons for (24) the fall, of Khrushchev can be seen in basic terms. He was ousted by the revisionist Soviet bourgeoisie he once headed partly because he had made a mess of things within the Soviet Union itself and perhaps was incapable of leading in the "orderly" restructuring of the society along capitalist lines, and at least as importantly because his policies of collaborating with and capitulating to U.S. imperialism no longer conformed to the needs of this bourgeoisie. "Khrushchevite revisionism" was replaced by the revisionism of Brezhnev, Kosygin and Co. Among other things, this was marked by a formal and partial appearance of returning to certain "Leninist norms" which, in complete betrayal of everything Lenin stood for, the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique use to cover a profoundly reactionary content and to better carry out their completely reactionary aims. This has included such things as reversing Khrushchev's policies of weakening the role of the state in the economy—under Brezhnev and Kosygin this role has been strengthened along with the institution of policies that better enable the revisionist bureaucratic bourgeoisie controlling the state to use it to accumulate surplus value into their own hands according to capitalist principles. And it has included the flaunting from time to time of such phrases as "the dictatorship of the proletariat" and "internationalism" in the service of suppressing the proletariat and the masses of people in the Soviet Union itself and other countries and carrying out plunder of other nations and contention with the rival bloc of imperialists, not infrequently under the guise of rendering "fraternal assistance" to struggles aimed against these rival imperialists.

Here it is important to re-emphasize that, while it is (25) governed by the same basic laws as other imperialisms,

Soviet imperialism has arisen on the basis of the restoration of capitalism in a developed socialist state and it has emerged as an imperialist power in a position where it has a smaller "sphere of influence" and is less powerful economically than its main rival, U.S. imperialism. This determines that there are certain particularities to its internal and international relations, including the specific policies it carries out in its drive to challenge the present division of the world.

For one thing, the new ruling Soviet bourgeoisie con- (26) tinues to shamelessly misuse the respect and prestige earned by the Soviet Union when it was in fact a socialist state which represented the first great leap toward the communist future of humanity. True, the prestige of the Soviet Union is not the same as it was when it was in fact socialist, because the nature and features of its present ruling class, the society they rule and their actions internationally can by no means be entirely covered up, but even if limited by this, such prestige and the ability of the Soviet imperialists to use it for their reactionary aims is still considerable and should in no way be underestimated. It is an indispensable ideological and political weapon for them in seeking to subvert and turn into their own instrument the movements and struggles in various countries where the peoples have long suffered under the jackboot of U.S. imperialism and other imperialists allied with it. On the other hand, this "socialist" mask of the Soviet ruling class is used by the U.S. imperialists and others who point to certain aspects of the suffering of the peoples in the revisionist countries and the international marauding of the Soviet bloc, and use this to promote their own reactionary interests, to serve their war preparations and to slander and combat real Marxism-Leninism and socialist revolution. It is exactly because Soviet imperialism arose out of the reversal of socialism but still uses the cover of socialism that we label it social-imperialism, and the exposure of its true nature and role in the world is of great importance for the genuine Marxist-Leninists in building the revolutionary movement in opposition to all imperialism and reaction toward the goal of genuine socialism and ultimately communism throughout the world.

Further, the Soviet social-imperialists and the revisionist (27) rulers of other countries who are allied with and to varying degrees dependent on them have, through the very process of restoring capitalism, subjected their economies to its laws and consequences. In these countries, along with such things as unemployment and inflation (whether open or disguised) and such "socialist" phenomena as "exporting" workers to other countries (while in some cases "importing" them for the purposes of super-exploitation), there is the wide gap between industry and agriculture characteristic of capitalist society, and in general this problem is becoming more acute—in the Soviet Union itself it is quite severe. The basic reason for this is exactly that pointed to by Lenin in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. As long as capitalism reigns, Lenin pointed out, emphasizing particularly the features of capitalism in its imperialist stage, surplus profit will

not be utilized to raise the standard of living of the masses or to overcome the gap between agriculture and industry but instead will be exported abroad, especially to backward and dependent countries, to gain super-profits. And this is precisely what the Soviet Union, in particular, is doing, though its export of capital and wringing of super-profits often revolves around the sale of arms and/or takes the appearance of unequal trade and of "aid" and loans whose terms require the recipients to purchase Soviet goods at prices well above the world market price.

Moreover, being driven by the laws of imperialism (28) and subjected to all the consequences of this, while finding the current division of the world a fetter to their imperialist drive to expand, the Soviet social-imperialists together with the rest of their bloc, are also acting on the understanding that a redivision of the world through military confrontation with and the defeat of the U.S. bloc is a compelling necessity for them.

That they too are now hinging their actions on this as (29) well as how they are going about it is revealed in some major policies of the Soviet social-imperialists. First, while seeking generally to penetrate, dominate and plunder throughout the colonial (and neo-colonial) and dependent countries, the Soviet social-imperialists are concentrating much of their "aid" in areas that are key in strategic-military terms—including the Middle East and parts of Africa—areas rich in strategic materials such as oil and/or crucial as springboards and buffers in preparation for and then in fighting a world war. More than seeking in the short run to outcompete the U.S. imperialists in sucking the blood of the peoples in the "underdeveloped countries," the Soviet social-imperialists are laying the basis to forcibly recast the whole framework within which the imperialist vampires compete.

Secondly, the Soviet Union has for a number of years (30) invited in capital from the U.S. bloc to jointly exploit the peoples of the USSR and piled debt upon debt to the countries of this bloc, including the U.S. itself—by 1980 Soviet bloc indebtedness to its rival bloc had reached 68 billion dollars! * This demonstrates not that the Soviet Union is in danger of being reduced to a status of neo-colonial dependency on the U.S. bloc but that its rulers have a calculated plan for world war against this bloc. Put simply, they are luring the rival imperialists with the prospect of fat profits and borrowing heavily from them not only or mainly with the purpose of encouraging some U.S. allies to "switch sides" or "remain neutral," but most of all in order to strengthen the technical base of the Soviet bloc war machine. It is with the same orientation and objectives that the Soviet social-imperialists are organizing the "international division of labor" within their bloc, which through COMECON and other forms and means not only subordinates and distorts the economies of the other countries to suit the needs of the Soviet social-imperialists above all but is the economic basis for "integrating" the bloc under Soviet direction in pre-

* 68 thousand million dollars.

paration for war. Though such relations heighten the economic crisis in the various countries and in the bloc overall and accentuate political contradictions within it, the Soviet social-imperialists are determined to strengthen and not loosen these relations. In sum, they are counting on the fact that debts can be cancelled, whole new terms dictated to the "other side" and contradictions within their own bloc handled by fighting and emerging victorious in world war.

This is linked directly with the fact that the Soviet (31) social-imperialists have devoted a very large percentage of their resources to building up their conventional and nuclear arsenals and getting their forces combat-ready. Such a tremendous military expenditure, on the same level as the U.S. but on a far weaker productive base than the U.S., has greatly heightened the parasitism and serious problems in the Soviet economy. . . . But, again, the Soviet social-imperialists are counting on dealing with this by *using* the military might they have thus built up to bring under their control and reorganize according to their interests a large part of the capital and productive forces in Western Europe and Japan and to seize a far greater part of the dependent and backward countries as sources of super-profits—through world war.

For their part, the U.S. imperialists in particular are (32) increasingly viewing and utilizing economic relations with the Soviet bloc not mainly in terms of immediate profit but as a chisel to drive into the Soviet bloc and perhaps pry some chunks loose even before war breaks out or at least to create more basis for doing so during such a war. In other words, here too the actions of the U.S. imperialists are determined by strategic considerations, by preparation for inter-imperialist war. Of course, such preparation—on both sides—consists not only in building up their military arsenals but also in active and intensifying international contention, involving stepped up attempts to lure certain ruling classes from one side to the other, the forcible ousting of regimes dependent on the "other side" and their replacement by reactionary regimes dependent on "your side," and including the fighting of local and regional wars through proxies and mercenaries armed and/or backed by the rival imperialist blocs (as for example in Africa and Asia).

But the decisive thing is precisely that such limited (33) battling back and forth and partial steps in seeking redivision are part of overall developments toward and preparations on both sides for an all-out showdown and cannot substitute for this nor eliminate the need for it. In one aspect, the crises they face, caused in part by the extreme parasitism of their economies, has led them necessarily to increased parasitism, including as an essential part of this spiralling military expenditures, and this in turn has deepened their crises. And more generally, the gains one side makes at the expense of the other not only heighten the rivalry between them but accelerate things toward the point where a major gain by one side or the other, or even the prospect of this, will force and trigger all-out war. How exactly this will unfold and come to a head cannot now be predicted, but the fact remains that all this will lead

to world war before too long a period, unless it is prevented by revolution.

The point, then, is not that the Soviet social-imperialists and their bloc have more of a necessity (34) than the U.S. imperialists and their allies to go to war, or vice versa. Nor is it our intention to speculate on which of the imperialist blocs is or will be in a stronger position as developments toward war continue to accelerate. Both are being driven on a collision course with each other—because of the serious crises they are faced with and because the division of the world cannot remain as it is and each needs to thoroughly recast it at the expense of the other—and both will muster their economic, political and military power for this showdown. Only the international proletariat and its allies, who are exploited, crushed and brutalized by the daily workings of the imperialist system even in its “peaceful times” and who will be the ones to suffer the horrors of a new world war, only their revolutionary struggles hold the possibility of preventing this war or of turning it into a war in their own interests, for the defeat and overthrow of the imperialists and other reactionaries and toward the final elimination of the imperialist system and ultimately of class society itself.

In sum on this point. The cause of war in this era is (35) the imperialist system, and it is the rivalry among the imperialists, and in particular the two imperialist blocs headed respectively by the two superpowers, and their necessity to yet again redivide the world that are more and more propelling things toward the brink of world war. As Lenin insisted, in opposition to the social-chauvinists who betrayed the proletariat and supported their own bourgeoisie and rallied to the defense of the imperialist “fatherland” at the time of the first world war, the role of all the imperialist ruling classes (and other classes allied with them) in such a war, and in the contention leading up to it, is reactionary and must be opposed by the revolutionary stand and actions of the proletariat and its allies. The two superpowers and their respective blocs are actively stepping up preparations for world war, and given the situation and the necessity they face, world war may break out soon—and there is a very great likelihood this will happen within the next ten years—unless it is prevented by revolution. Preventing this war through revolution, or, if that does not prove possible, seizing the opportunities to make revolution during this war are urgent questions for the Marxist-Leninists, the proletariat and the broad masses of people throughout the world.

Why is it necessary to put so much stress on inter-imperialist rivalry and the imminent danger of world war arising from it? It is because at the present time this is the most important factor in the international situation, and without correctly analyzing this it is impossible to grasp the historic conjuncture that is shaping up and not only the dangers but the dialectically related opportunities this holds. Overlooking, underestimating, or even attempting to deny this intensifying development toward world war—or attributing it to the evil designs and schemes of one or another group of reactionaries rather than scientifically assessing the (36)

problem and determining the actual, objective causes and forces underlying this development and propelling it forward at this time—such superficial and subjective methods can only contribute to disarming and disorienting the proletariat and the masses of people in the face of an extremely critical situation. It is not this kind of erroneous method and conclusions but the full recognition of the actual conditions, especially the imminent danger of world war, arrived at through the application of the Marxist-Leninist method and Marxist-Leninist analysis of the imperialist system and its laws and the acute expressions this is assuming in the present period, which alone can arm the proletariat and the peoples of the world with the means for fighting to prevent world war and to continue and intensify their revolutionary struggle if world war breaks out anyway.

Only revolution can prevent this world war from being (37) unleashed. This is not some kind of general truth divorced from present reality, nor is it an abstract slogan with no concrete and immediate application. Only a major realignment of the world by the proletariat and its allies—only the overthrow of imperialism and reaction and the establishment of revolutionary regimes where the proletariat rules or is playing the leading role and is carrying the struggle forward to socialism in large and/or strategic parts of the world—only this can prevent the world war looming on the horizon. It is with this understanding and toward this aim, and not in some illusory movement for “peace,” that the struggle of the proletariat and the peoples throughout the world must be directed. This does not mean of course that the communists and class-conscious proletarians are oblivious of or indifferent to the horrors of war, especially world war between the two imperialist blocs headed respectively by the two superpowers, nor can they fail to unite with the desire of the masses of people for peace or stand aside from the struggle against particular acts of aggression by the imperialists and their war preparations. But while uniting with and supporting these sentiments and struggles, they must imbue the masses with the understanding that in the immediate context it is revolution and the advance to socialism under the leadership of the proletariat that alone holds the possibility of preventing such a war and beyond that in the final analysis socialist revolution and its ultimate goal of communism worldwide is the road forward toward the elimination of the root cause of such wars and all the other evils inevitable in a society ruled by exploiters.

Further, communists must firmly grasp and arm the (38) masses with the understanding that if revolution is not able to prevent world war, this does not mean that they can only passively accept the horrible consequences and remain at the mercy of, and act in the service of, the imperialists. War, including especially world war, not only produces tremendous suffering for the peoples but also weakens and places tremendous strains on the ruling classes and raises to a concentrated peak and reveals more starkly the actual relations in society. Lenin was dealing precisely with the crisis occasioned by the first world war when he drew the general conclu-

sion that "it is the great significance of all crises that they make manifest what has been hidden; they cast aside all that is relative, superficial, and trivial; they sweep away the political litter and reveal the real mainsprings of the *class struggle*." ("Lessons of the Crisis," *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 213, Moscow English Edition.) And in discussing the collapse of the Second International during that war, Lenin pointed out that "for all the horror and misery they entail, wars bring at least the following more or less important benefit—they ruthlessly reveal, unmask and destroy much that is corrupt, outworn and dead in human institutions." ("The Collapse of the Second International," *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 208, Moscow English Edition.)

What Lenin was stressing above all is that wars tend (39) to create, or bring into being the objective conditions for, revolutionary situations and that the proletariat and its communist vanguard must learn how to seize such opportunities and not be paralyzed by the apparent strength and awesome destructive powers of the imperialists and the actual destruction they bring down on the peoples. As he scathingly insisted, contrasting the proletarian-revolutionary stand to the utopian and reactionary demand for disarmament in the midst of World War 1:

"If the present war rouses among the reactionary Christian Socialists, among the whimpering petty bourgeoisie, *only* horror and fright, *only* aversion to all use of arms, to bloodshed, death, etc., then we must say: capitalist society is always an *endless horror*. And if this most reactionary of all wars is now preparing a *horrible end* for that society, we have no reason to drop into despair." ("The War Programme of the Proletarian Revolution," in *Lenin on War and Peace, Three Articles*, p. 63, Peking 1966 English edition.)

It is with this orientation that communists must act (40) and educate and train the masses to act in the face of the current situation, particularly the growing danger of world war. In this way the maximum gains can be made and preparations carried out for the storms ahead, including the real possibility of the eruption of revolutionary situations in many countries, even some which today may seem relatively calm on the surface, before such a war breaks out. And if it is unleashed, this war will not itself represent the ending or mitigating of the crisis, but on the contrary the concentration of it on the highest level, and though it will almost certainly be even more destructive than the two previous world wars, it will also heighten further the possibilities for revolution. Even if, as is very likely, nuclear weapons are used in that war, this will in no way change the fact that the imperialists will have no choice but to drag the masses into the fighting on an unprecedented scale and draw them into political life, and force them to confront the major political questions of the day, nor certainly will it lessen the hatred of the masses for this war and their desire to find a way out of it. On the contrary, it will provide a powerful objective basis for the communists to divert the masses' heightened political life onto a revolutionary path, to

expose the cause of the war and the reactionary nature of all the ruling classes on each side and to lead them in fighting to overthrow these ruling classes. In short, it is essential to grasp what Stalin summed up about the first world war and apply it to the present situation with its growing danger of a new world war: "The significance of the imperialist war which broke out 10 years ago lies, among other things, in the fact that it gathered all these contradictions [of the imperialist era] into a single knot and threw them on to the scales, thereby accelerating and facilitating the revolutionary battles of the proletariat." ("The Foundations of Leninism; I. The Historical Roots of Leninism," in *Problems of Leninism*, p. 6, Peking 1976 English edition.)

In order to rise to the challenges and opportunities (41) ahead resulting from the profound crisis affecting in various ways all the imperialist and reactionary forces in the world, to strive to prevent world war through revolution or to carry forward the revolutionary struggle in the circumstances of such a war, it is crucial for the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard forces to base themselves on proletarian internationalism, not only on the ideological plane and in a general way but also in concrete application in the present situation. The essential content of the international struggle is the development of the revolutionary movement toward the overthrow of imperialism and reaction in all countries and the mutual support and assistance between these different detachments of the international proletariat and its allies, directed toward this common goal. As Lenin so powerfully expressed it: "There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism, and that is—working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in *one's own* country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy, and material aid) *this struggle, this, and only this*, line, in *every* country without exception." ("The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution," *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 75, Moscow English edition.)

This is the basic principle and basic guideline that (42) must be followed. But beyond that in this era there are two great forces or streams of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism in the world: the proletarian-socialist revolution in the capitalist-imperialist countries and the anti-imperialist democratic revolution in the colonial (including neo-colonial) and dependent countries, which is not only a powerful ally of the proletarian-socialist revolution in the advanced countries but which under the leadership of the proletariat and its party paves the way for and is followed by the socialist revolution and the construction of socialist society in the colonial and dependent countries themselves. All this flows from the fact that, as Lenin analyzed and insisted on, with the development of imperialism a major division in the world is between a handful of advanced capitalist countries and a great number of oppressed nations comprising a large part of the world's territory and population, which the im-

perialists parasitically pillage and maintain in an enforced state of backwardness, blocking the development of national capital, fostering capitalist relations only to the extent that these serve the interests of imperialism, and maintaining pre-capitalist relations, especially in the countryside.

While the economies of these nations are thus restricted and distorted in their development, the growth and concentration of the proletariat is stimulated to varying degrees and at the same time many other sectors of society, particularly the peasantry, but also the urban petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and even parts of the domestic bourgeoisie, are subjected to various forms and degrees of oppression, restriction and ruin. This provides the basis for the proletariat and its party to forge and march at the head of a broad united front to carry out the overthrow of the rule of imperialism and the domestic reactionaries allied with it and then carry the struggle forward to socialism. (43)

This anti-imperialist democratic revolution is a tremendous force contributing to the weakening and ultimate destruction of imperialism and reaction throughout the world; the downgrading of this revolution because, in its first stage, it is not directly a proletarian-socialist struggle, or the attempt to torture it into a proletarian-socialist revolution while it is still in this first stage, obliterating the necessary distinction between the two stages, can only do great harm to and cause serious setbacks for the proletariat in its advance toward socialism in these countries and on a world scale. At the same time, the downgrading of the potential for and importance of the proletarian-socialist revolution in the imperialist countries, or the attempt to distort it into some kind of bourgeois-democratic movement against the "excesses" of monopoly without striking at and overthrowing capitalism at its roots, speculating on the fact that at a given time the level of class consciousness and struggle of the proletariat may not have reached an advanced level—all this too can only do great harm to the proletarian revolution in those countries and worldwide. The international proletariat has the historic mission of carrying out the socialist revolution and bringing into being the epoch of communism throughout the world, and in the present situation it faces both great necessity and great opportunity for accelerating this process, but it can only do so by advancing through the two different paths in the two different types of countries, in mutual support and toward the one common final aim. (44)

Further and more specifically, in the present world situation, in addition to the necessity and importance of recognizing that the two superpowers are the only forces capable of heading up imperialist blocs for world war and the fact that they are presently doing so in preparation for such a war, it is also important and necessary to recognize that they are not only the two most powerful reactionary forces in the world but that they already are and will increasingly play a major role—at times jointly but more often separately and even in rivalry with each other—as bulwarks of reaction and as active forces in the attempt to suppress (45)

revolutionary struggles in many countries. Revolution, particularly in this era, is an extremely complex process, following a zig-zag course and full of twists and turns, and in the present and developing situation it is very likely that in a great number of cases the revolutionary movement will have to deal at one time or another and to one degree or another with the moves, including even direct armed intervention, of one or another (or both) superpowers to defeat the revolution. And this is likely to be the case even in many situations—for example, an imperialist country other than one of the superpowers—where the spearhead of the revolution is directly and immediately aimed at the domestic ruling class and/or some imperialists other than the superpowers.

More, it is an indispensable task to instill in the masses of all countries an understanding of the overall world situation and struggle, uniting them with their true allies and exposing the role and interests of the various reactionary forces, and in particular of the two rival imperialist blocs and the two superpowers heading them. Only by doing so will it be possible to educate the masses and develop the revolutionary struggle in the different countries in such a way that on the one hand it strikes against and overthrows the ruling classes there without on the other hand falling into alliance with and dependence on other, rival imperialists and enemies of the revolution—and fundamentally to develop the revolution in each country as part of and in mutual support with the same struggle in all countries, against the common enemy on a world scale, imperialism and reaction, of which the two superpowers are today the most powerful bastions. Under certain conditions it is possible and necessary to make use of contradictions in the enemy camp, including specifically between the two rival imperialist blocs, but this must never be done at the expense of the revolutionary movement in a particular country or on a world scale, and on the contrary it must be subordinate to and in the service of advancing this revolutionary movement. (46)

All this is of immediate, urgent and increasing importance for the international proletariat and the revolutionary struggle in the two basic types of countries and on a world scale. For not only is the development of the objective situation creating more fertile ground for revolutionary struggle in various countries, but there are actually growing revolutionary movements in many countries at the present time, and already within the last few years reactionary regimes, including some that had been powerfully entrenched and/or of strategic importance to the imperialists, have been overthrown or powerfully shaken by mass revolutionary struggle. While, as yet, none of these struggles has advanced to the stage of actually achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat, they clearly indicate the potential for this, in both the colonial (including neo-colonial) and dependent countries and in the imperialist countries as well, and the possibilities for this will further increase in the period ahead. (47)

In the former type of countries, under the domination of foreign imperialism in league with domestic (48)

reactionaries, the development of the imperialist crisis and the contention of the rival imperialists and their moves to line up countries for war have greatly intensified the contradictions in society and occasioned greatly increased exploitation and oppression of the working class and broad sections of the popular masses. All this is accelerating both revolutionary upsurges of the masses and political crises within the ruling classes, which resort to more vicious repression and to political maneuvering to try to preserve their ruling position and the domination of the one or the other imperialist group, for which they act as agents and which maintain them in power. At the same time, the growing severity of the crisis and the revolutionary struggles within these countries react upon and deepen the crisis in the imperialist countries themselves.

Lenin emphasized that the export of capital to and the plundering of the colonies and dependent countries was an indispensable source of super-profits for the imperialists. Not only is this true and of great significance in general, but specifically in the period since World War 2 it is a fact that the super-profits from the exploitation of these peoples has been a fundamental factor enabling the imperialists to experience a long period of relative stability and even in some cases marked economic expansion for a time in their "home" countries. On the other side, these areas have also been of great and strategic importance for the international proletariat: the revolutionary movements that have arisen there on a broad scale in opposition to colonial oppression, vicious political repression and life-stealing exploitation have constituted a powerful battering ram against these imperialists. And this is true despite the fact that in the final analysis these struggles were not carried through completely and did not advance to socialism under the leadership of the proletariat and its party, or were finally reversed even after socialism had been established. From all this it is clear both that the task of winning complete liberation from imperialism and bringing about the triumph of socialism remains to be fulfilled in these countries and that the possibility for making new and great qualitative leaps forward in this process is great and growing, precisely because the conditions of the masses are becoming even more intolerable and the crises of the imperialists are already and will increasingly make them and their allied domestic reactionaries more vulnerable to attack even as they attempt to tighten their death-lock on the peoples.

As their economic crisis has deepened, the imperialists have sought to extract even more blood from the peoples of these countries, in particular using the already dependent, debt-ridden state of the economies of these countries to enforce further dependency and debt, to dictate "austerity programs" and frequently a "reorganization" of these economies, driving even broader masses into deeper poverty and ruin. But this is a double-edged sword the imperialists are holding: after a certain point the bankruptcy or near bankruptcy of many of these countries becomes a threat to the whole financial structure of the imperialists themselves, and beyond that the increased suffering of

broad sections of the masses is bound to and does give rise to increased and more powerful rebellion. And yet the imperialists can in no way let go of this sword.

At the same time, the contention and war preparations of the rival imperialists require them to tighten even further their political stranglehold on these countries and integrate them more tightly into their war blocs. Precisely because of the intensifying inter-imperialist rivalry and because the situation in these countries is volatile, all this does not proceed smoothly but is characterized by a great deal of turmoil and the not infrequent "switching of sides" by the domestic ruling classes. This does not represent some so-called movement by these "third world" reactionary forces to assert their "independence" from imperialism—quite the opposite, it further reveals their dependency on imperialism and the fact that whichever side they are lined up on they are characterized not by "third world unity" against imperialism but by their even tighter integration into one imperialist bloc or the other. It does, however, provide the proletariat and its allies in these countries with further openings to expose and struggle against these reactionary ruling classes and their imperialist masters of whichever bloc.

To return to and re-emphasize a decisive point: At the time of the first inter-imperialist war, when Lenin made a thoroughgoing analysis of imperialism and pointed to the importance of the colonial and dependent countries not only as sources of super-profits for the imperialists but also as potential storm centers of revolution against imperialism, representing a powerful ally of the proletarian-socialist revolution in the advanced countries and in an overall sense a crucial component part of this revolution on a world scale, he noted that this latter aspect was largely a question for the future. Since then, and in particular through and in the aftermath of World War 2, both the turning of the colonial countries into major areas of exploitation and battlefields among the imperialists and the liberation struggle of the peoples of these countries against imperialism—as well as the links between this and the proletarian-socialist revolutions—became much more widespread, explosive and powerful. In the period ahead, the basis for all this will exist on an even grander scale.

In the imperialist countries themselves the prospects for the development of the objective conditions required for proletarian revolution are greater than they have been for years, even decades, and the revolutionary possibilities are bound to increase amidst growing crisis, turmoil and the qualitatively greater intensification of the contradictions of the imperialist system. In the imperialist states of the West (and Japan and other imperialist states in the U.S. bloc), including within the U.S. itself, while there have not been for many decades any actual attempts at the seizure of power by proletarian revolutionary movements led by a Marxist-Leninist vanguard—and while in fact there has not yet been a successful proletarian revolution in an advanced capitalist country—this time around things might well be different.

In the not too distant past, and especially during the

decade of the 1960s, more or less generally throughout these countries there have been powerful mass movements, with revolutionary currents of various kinds and with varying degrees of strength within them. At that time neither the objective nor subjective conditions for revolution had ripened, but the revolutionary potential haunted the ruling classes and inspired revolutionaries all the same. In the U.S., the violent uprisings of Black people that swept across the country and sent shockwaves throughout it, and the world, showed, as Mao Tsetung proclaimed at the time, what a tremendous revolutionary force was latent among this crucial section of the masses in the U.S. and its capacity to spark upsurges among even broader sections of the masses. And the great events of May 1968 in France demonstrated in particular the powerful revolutionary potential of the working class, even though that movement did not develop into a conscious revolutionary struggle for the seizure of power nor did the conditions exist for it to do so at the time. And, despite the fact that in general—and with some notable exceptions at certain points—there has been a temporary ebb in the level of the mass movements in those countries, much more importantly there has been the development and deepening of a serious crisis and the ever more pressing need for the ruling classes of these countries to prepare for world war, which has already begun to call forth various kinds of mass struggle. As this intensifies and accelerates, the possibility will grow greater that at least in some of these countries the revolutionary potential shown in an earlier period can be transformed and fully realized and that in some cases at least, in a certain way and to a certain degree, the experience of that earlier period can serve as a partial “dress rehearsal” for unprecedented struggles and perhaps unprecedented advances.

In the Soviet Union and the other revisionist-capitalist countries in its bloc, there is at one and the same time widespread hatred for the revisionist ruling class and a great deal of political confusion and demoralization, especially because the masses of people largely identify the system and ruling class they live under and the outrages produced by them with socialism and Marxism-Leninism. And these revisionist overlords use every means to prevent the dissemination of genuine Marxism-Leninism within these countries and to maintain the working class and broad masses in a backward and ignorant state politically. (55)

Nevertheless life, and in particular the laws of capitalism and imperialism, assert themselves, provoking conflicts, unrest and various forms of resistance by the masses. Despite the fact that the Soviet Union tightly controls the other revisionist countries in its bloc—and partly because of this—there are serious strains within this bloc, which are bound to become accentuated in the future. Even the bourgeois rivalries between the Soviet ruling class and those of other revisionist countries create some cracks through which a revolutionary movement in those countries would be able to maneuver, without falling into support for any of these revisionist bourgeoisies. Further, the (56)

rebellions of Polish workers, the resistance to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, riots and strikes and other outbursts in the Soviet Union itself—all these and other events, though they do not represent revolutionary movements, are indications of the contradictions that will reach much more explosive proportions within the Soviet bloc and within the Soviet Union itself, especially in the context of growing preparations for world war and in the war itself if it breaks out.

Already, Soviet military adventures in recent years, especially where the peoples victimized by this aggression respond with widespread resistance that cannot be quickly and overwhelmingly suppressed, send powerful reverberations through Soviet society itself, as the example of Afghanistan illustrates. And in a world war this will be magnified many times over while at the same time Soviet bloc troops in various theaters of war will be encountering soldiers in the armed forces of the “other side” who will be influenced by and promoting proletarian internationalism and a Marxist-Leninist analysis of that war, its class basis and the class interests of those responsible for it as opposed to those forced to fight it on both sides, and where and for what purpose the guns should actually be aimed. (57)

All of this emphasizes the decisive importance of Marxist-Leninist forces and their role within the various countries of both imperialist blocs as well as on an international level. And certainly this is no less true in the Soviet Union and the revisionist countries of its bloc than it is in the other countries. By whatever means, such forces must be assisted and supported in the effort to raise up once again the real banner of Marxism-Leninism in those countries and to rally the proletariat and the masses around it, seizing on whatever openings and opportunities arise out of the worldwide political earthquakes in the years to come. (58)

In all of the countries we have discussed, whether colonial (including neo-colonial) and dependent or capitalist-imperialist, state power—and in particular the control of the key pillar of state power, the armed forces—is in the hands of reactionary classes and, whatever the particular form of the regime, a reactionary dictatorship is exercised there over the proletariat and masses of people. Not only does this mean that in a thousand different ways repression is daily carried out against the masses but, especially in today's situation of deepening crisis and stepped up war preparations, this repression is being intensified, particularly in the face of growing mass rebellion. In the event that world war breaks out, such repression is bound to be even further intensified. (59)

In some of these countries the regimes can be described as fascist while in others the reactionary state power is exercised in the form of bourgeois democracy. Fascism is the open, terroristic dictatorship of the reactionary ruling class, while bourgeois democracy is reactionary class dictatorship in which there is only real democracy for the ruling class and curtailed, restricted rights for the masses, which are revoked or suppressed when the exercise of them poses any serious challenge to the ruling class. Obviously it (60)

is not a matter of indifference to the proletariat in building its revolutionary movement whether the form of rule is bourgeois-democratic or fascist, and it is correct and necessary not only to fight against repression in general but specifically against any attempt to institute a fascist form of dictatorship and to fight to overthrow such a dictatorship where it exists. The aim of the proletariat in this struggle, however, is not to preserve or restore bourgeois democracy—which means bourgeois dictatorship—but to advance toward the goal of overthrowing the reactionary state power altogether and establishing a new state power—the dictatorship of the proletariat or a popular democratic dictatorship in which the proletariat leads in making the transition to socialism, depending on the type of country and the type of revolution that must be carried out. While the revolution must proceed through different forms and stages in the different types of countries and according to the concrete conditions in each country, it shares the same ultimate goal: establishing the proletarian dictatorship, building a socialist society and continuing the revolutionary struggle together with the international proletariat toward communism worldwide.

Today, in grasping firmly that although there have been serious setbacks and reversals in this historic process, the prospects for making great leaps toward that ultimate goal are increasingly and urgently before the proletarian revolutionaries throughout the world, one of the most important lessons of history as well as of revolutionary developments and struggles in a number of countries in the last several years is that, as Lenin taught, revolutionary crises can mature very rapidly and that communists must do everything possible to prepare for and accelerate developments toward such situations which, as Lenin also stressed, are times when months or even weeks count for more than years or even decades of “normal times.” These are times when, as Lenin put it, “there is a considerable increase

in the activity of the masses, who uncomplainingly allow themselves to be robbed in ‘peace time’, but, in turbulent times, are drawn both by all the circumstances of the crisis and by the ‘upper classes’ themselves into independent historical action.” (“The Collapse of the Second International,” *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 214, Moscow English edition.) “It is not so often,” Lenin summed up, “that history places this form of struggle on the order of the day, but then its significance is felt for decades to come.” (*Ibid.*, p. 254.)

While this has special relevance for the imperialist countries—where in general the experience has been that the intensity of the contradictions and the revolutionary sentiments of the masses reach a high level only after a fairly long period of the development and accumulation of these contradictions—nevertheless this principle emphasized by Lenin has great importance now in all countries and for the entire international proletariat and communist movement, precisely because on a world scale the contradictions of the imperialist system are once again approaching the point of explosion—holding not only the growing danger of world war, but also the possibility of greatly heightened revolutionary opportunities. As Lenin powerfully put forth in the midst of World War 1, in a statement that stands as a basic and crucial guideline:

“A sudden change in the mood of the masses is not only possible, but is becoming more and more probable, a change similar to that which was to be seen in Russia early in 1905 in connection with the ‘Gaponade’, when, in the course of several months and sometimes of several weeks, there emerged from the backward proletarian masses an army of millions, which followed the proletariat’s revolutionary vanguard. We cannot tell whether a powerful revolutionary movement will develop immediately after *this* war, or during it, etc., but at all events, it is *only* work in this direction that deserves the name of socialist work.” (*Ibid.*, p. 258.)

II. The Situation Within the International Communist Movement and The Struggle Against Revisionism and Other Forms of Opportunism

While, viewing the world as a whole, the objective (63) situation already holds and will increasingly hold great prospects for revolutionary advance, the subjective factor—the international communist movement, within the different countries and particularly on an international level—is presently lagging seriously behind this. In fact the international communist movement is presently passing through a serious crisis and facing a severe test, the resolution of which will significantly influence the degree to which the challenges ahead can be met and the revolutionary opportunities accentuated and seized to the greatest degree.

This problem within the international communist (64) movement, though it has long-standing and deep historical roots, was, in the recent past, intensified and brought to an open eruption by the revisionist takeover and reversal of the socialist revolution in China after the death of Mao Tsetung. As a consequence of this reversal, or at least in its aftermath, there have been a number of important developments affecting the international communist movement.

The revisionist rulers of China have more and more (65) clearly launched an all-out attack on Marxist-Leninist principles in general and Mao Tsetung Thought in particular as the theoretical basis for dragging one fourth of humanity back down the road to capitalism and domination by imperialism and stabbing the international proletariat in the back. They are stepping up their open, direct attacks on Mao's revolutionary line and leadership, while hypocritically upholding him as some kind of "national symbol" and presenting a bastardized version of Mao Tsetung Thought as some kind of "Chinese Marxism." Here what Lenin wrote in "The State and Revolution" about the revisionists of his time and the crimes they committed against Marxism in the name of Marxism is most relevant:

"What is now happening to Marx's theory has, in the course of history, happened repeatedly to the theories of revolutionary thinkers and leaders of oppressed classes fighting for emancipation. During the lifetime

of great revolutionaries, the oppressing classes constantly hounded them, received their theories with the most savage malice, the most furious hatred and the most unscrupulous campaigns of lies and slander. After their death, attempts are made to convert them into harmless icons, to canonise them, so to say, and to hallow their *names* to a certain extent for the 'consolation' of the oppressed classes and with the object of duping the latter, while at the same time robbing the revolutionary theory of its *substance*, blunting its revolutionary edge and vulgarising it." ("The State and Revolution," *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 390, Moscow English edition.)

On the philosophical level, the Chinese revisionists (66) are precisely vulgarizing Mao's summation that practice is the sole criterion of truth, perverting this into a narrow, pragmatic nostrum that denies the importance of theory—at least Marxist-Leninist theory—and basically says that whatever serves the interests of these revisionists in restoring capitalism and collaborating with imperialism is true and good. All this is in direct opposition to Mao's dialectical approach to the relationship between practice and theory, matter and ideas—a relationship that is dialectical in the real world even if not in the minds of the Chinese revisionists. Specifically, it flies in the face of Mao's analysis of how matter and consciousness can be and are constantly transformed into each other and on that basis his emphasis of the tremendously important role of consciousness, of proletarian ideology and Marxist-Leninist theory, in guiding the transformation of the material world and in particular of putting politics in command of economics in building socialism and advancing toward communism. In place of politics the Chinese revisionists put profit, and capitalist principles in general, in command of the economy. Hand in hand with this, they have completely repudiated and reversed Mao's line on continuously revolutionizing the superstructure—including culture, education, etc.—so as to make it serve the revolutionization of the

economic base and society as a whole in the advance toward communism. All these, and other, cardinal principles upheld and developed by Mao are being thrown overboard and attacked, and resistance to this cannot be allowed, because practice—revisionist practice—is the sole criterion of truth.

Along with this, in the ideological realm, the Chinese revisionists are not only perverting but directly opposing the advances Mao led in making in the sphere of communist morality and the revolutionization of the thinking, values and motivation of the people. Where Mao promoted the idea of "serving the people," the Chinese revisionists replace this with the time-worn bourgeois axiom—"serve yourself." When they do speak of serving the people they twist this to mean working hard, head down, where you are told and how you are told, in the interests of the new ruling Chinese bourgeoisie. Mao, of course, meant something completely different by serving the people—putting above self and above all else the needs of the masses of people, and most of all and fundamentally their need to make revolution and consciously transform all of society, including themselves, according to the outlook and interests of the proletariat, and he had in mind not only the masses of China and the Chinese revolution but the proletariat and oppressed peoples throughout the world and the international struggle for the final goal of communism. (67)

Mao not only fought for this orientation throughout the course of the Chinese revolution but he sharpened and further developed it in the struggle against Soviet revisionism and revisionist forces and tendencies within socialist China itself. When Khrushchev led the seizure of power by the new bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union, one of the main ideological weapons he used to demoralize and divide the cadre and masses and corrupt their thinking was the loudly-proclaimed vision of "goulash communism." By this Khrushchev meant that socialism, and in an even more luxurious way communism, was essentially a highly developed "consumer society," even exceeding such capitalist countries as the U.S. in this regard. This had nothing to do with the correct orientation of paying attention to and developing society's ability to meet the actual material needs of the masses, but was instead promoting as the guiding principle the rat-race for the attainment of personal consumption and comfort in competition with everyone else. (68)

Beyond that, this vision and these values were an important part of the national, great-power chauvinism promoted by the Soviet revisionists—the quest of the people in the Soviet Union to have more and better washing machines, refrigerators, television sets and blue jeans than anyone else (including their own neighbors) was put forward as a substitute for revolutionary struggle not only in the Soviet Union itself but throughout the world against imperialism and reaction. This was coupled with the smug promise that when these things were had in abundance in the Soviet Union, people everywhere would be well on their way to this "good life" too, because the failure of capitalism to keep pace in this lofty contest would make clear to

every sane person, even many capitalists, that socialism was a superior system and that capitalism should be—peacefully—replaced by "goulash communism."

In the ideological sphere this revisionist line not only corrupted those influenced by it but aided the imperialists and reactionaries, including the hypocritical religious apologists for imperialism and reaction, in their attempts to say that the materialism of Marxism means nothing but the grubbing after material things and that only religion, and a society where religion is promoted, can give expression to the higher morals, ideals and aspirations of the people. (70)

In exposing and combatting this revisionism, Mao also struck at certain mechanical materialist, narrow tendencies that had existed in the international communist movement even before the revisionist triumph in the Soviet Union. In many cases even genuine Marxist-Leninists had lost sight to a certain degree of the powerful lesson that Lenin pointed to in the first days of the new Soviet Republic, summing up the experience of the "subbotniks" (voluntary labor by workers to strengthen the positions of socialism won through the revolution). Communism begins, Lenin said then, when the masses work not for their immediate kith and kin but consciously for the advancement of society as a whole and the ultimate goal of a communist world. It was this spirit that Mao fully revived and raised to an even more concentrated level. And it is this truly communist morality and outlook that the revisionists in China, out of necessity, are systematically and treacherously repudiating and openly denouncing. (71)

Most centrally in terms of political line, the Chinese revisionists have directed their assault on Mao's pathbreaking summation of the character of socialist society itself—that it is a necessarily long transition period between capitalism and communism, all throughout which there are both contradictions among the people and those between the people and the enemy, that there are class contradictions and class struggle, and most decisively the antagonistic contradiction and struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and that because of this as well as the existence of imperialism and exploiting classes in the world generally, there remains the danger of capitalist restoration throughout the socialist transition period. Mao's conclusion that class struggle is the key link in socialist society and that the proletariat must grasp this key link in order to carry through the transition to communism—this the Chinese revisionists fear, hate and attack, and for good reason. In its place they have formulated a "new" definition of socialism—that it means state ownership and payment of people according to their work—which in reality is essentially the same as that long put forward by the Soviet revisionists and other renegades and which, of course, draws no real distinction between socialism and capitalism. In such a "socialist society," as in all capitalist society regardless of its particular outer forms, the position of the proletariat is that of exploited wage-slaves, robbed of any control over the means and organization of production and dictated over by the ruling bourgeoisie that sucks their blood. (72)

Of decisive importance in this connection is the point (73) on which Mao focused special attention in the last few years of his life in leading the struggle against these very revisionists: the persistence of remnants of capitalist production relations—including especially “bourgeois right” with regard to payment for work as well as the division of labor—in socialist production relations themselves. Mao stressed that the revisionists make absolutes out of “bourgeois right” and social inequalities left over from the old society in general. Particularly, in the name of upholding the socialist principle, “from each according to his ability, to each according to his *work*,” they seek to expand such inequalities, even to transform socialist production relations into capitalist ones by enforcing a strict division of labor, especially between mental and manual labor, and enabling those with more skilled and especially intellectual work to privately appropriate the product of the manual laborers’ work in the form of high salaries, bonuses, etc.

Combatting not only the revisionist line but also certain mechanical materialist tendencies that had existed in the Soviet Union even before revisionism triumphed there, Mao emphasized that while the ownership system is the most important part of the relations of production, the other aspects of the relations of production—the distribution system and the division of labor—as well as the superstructure, in particular the ideological and political line, react upon the ownership system. If bourgeois lines and policies are dominant in these spheres, socialist ownership (or public ownership by the state and collective farms) can actually be transformed into a mere outer shell, or formality, in which the content of the production relations is really capitalist. This, Mao summed up, is precisely what happened in the Soviet Union, in a thorough way, when the revisionists seized power there, and it was happening within many sectors and units of the economy in socialist China itself—and of course it is now happening fully there too, because revisionism has risen to power in society as a whole. (74)

For these reasons, in direct opposition to the revisionist line of praising and expanding “bourgeois right” and inequalities in general, Mao insisted on restricting them to the greatest degree possible at each point and striving consciously and concretely to *move toward* the eventual realization of the *communist* principle, “from each according to his ability, to each according to his *need*.” At the same time, he pointed out that only with the final attainment of the material and ideological conditions for communism could such social inequalities be fully overcome, that during the socialist transition, such things could only be restricted and that their persistence, as well as their ideological reflection, would continue throughout the socialist period to be an important source of the generation of a new bourgeoisie. Therefore, there is both the need to carry out a constant battle against the revisionist line and specific policies on these questions and to be prepared for long-term struggle against the new bourgeoisie, especially among the top ranks of the party, that is nurtured by and is determined to protect and

promote these inequalities and their ideological expressions. It is hardly surprising that the Chinese revisionists, once having seized power, brought this line under immediate and frantic fire.

What then can remain (for the Chinese revisionists) (76) of the greatest of Mao Tsetung’s many contributions to Marxism-Leninism and the proletarian revolution—the theory and basic line of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and the analysis that the main target of this revolution is the bourgeoisie that is newly engendered in socialist society itself, with its core and leading political representatives at the top ranks of the party, the people in authority taking the road of capitalism? Of course, this too must be thrown out and subjected to abuse and attack. And for that matter, while they occasionally use the words “dictatorship of the proletariat,” the theories and political line of the Chinese revisionists in fact deny the need for this as well and these words merely serve as a cover for the enforcement of their bourgeois dictatorship over the proletariat.

In line with this the Chinese revisionists hurl their (77) greatest abuse at the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. This represented an unprecedented revolutionary movement under socialism, which was aimed at and succeeded for a decade in preventing a revisionist takeover and capitalist restoration, strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat and carrying forward the socialist revolution in all spheres of society. In fact this Cultural Revolution was itself the transformation into a tremendous material force of the theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, involving literally hundreds of millions of people in revolutionary struggle, bringing forward tens of millions of class-conscious fighters in China, training revolutionary successors who are fighting today against the new capitalist rulers there and fostering on a grand scale the dissemination of the principles of proletarian revolution and Marxism-Leninism in all parts of the world. That the Chinese revisionists now declare this great revolution a “disaster” and a “calamity” is all the more proof of what an earth-shaking advance it represented for the international proletariat, and neither the Chinese revisionists’ seizure of power nor their slander of the Cultural Revolution can in any way diminish its world-historical significance.

On the international level, the guiding principle of (78) the Chinese revisionists is once again a pragmatic line of promoting the narrow, nationalist interests of this new bourgeois ruling class. And here again, while to a certain extent and at certain times the Chinese revisionists invoke the name and prestige of Mao to cover their counter-revolutionary policies and actions, in fact on this level too they are in fundamental opposition to Mao. Though he correctly determined in the more recent period that Soviet social-imperialism posed the main danger to socialist China—and though he made use of certain contradictions among the imperialists and reactionaries on this basis—and even if we admit the possibility that Mao made some errors in this regard, nevertheless he continued to support revolu-

tionary movements wherever they developed and he remained a firm proletarian internationalist to the end. Mao and the revolutionaries he led in China continued to uphold the principle that Mao himself had stressed right after World War 2, when the Soviet Union (then a socialist not a revisionist country) was attempting to maintain certain agreements with the U.S., British and French imperialists. "Such compromise does not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home," Mao emphasized, adding that "The people in those countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions." ("Some Points in Appraisal of the Present International Situation," *Selected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 87, English edition.) While Mao continued to uphold this principle down to the end, the Chinese revisionists trample on it and on revolutionary principle in general.

The international line of the Chinese revisionists (79) writes off revolution everywhere, it forbids the proletariat and oppressed peoples and nations from rising up against imperialism and says that at most, like the Chinese revisionists themselves, they can only ally themselves with and capitulate to one imperialist or another. Most fundamentally, this line violates and opposes Marxist class analysis and political economy and the Leninist analysis of imperialism and instead views everything from the point of view of countries—or more particularly, from the point of view of the reactionary ruling classes.

This line treats the two superpowers not as the heads (80) of two imperialist blocs in preparation for world war but as great powers whose existence and role is something new and qualitatively different in the world in such a way that the other imperialist powers are not really imperialist and neither are the two superpowers the same in nature as all imperialism nor really bound by the laws of imperialism. And distorting the truth that the two superpowers are the most powerful reactionary forces in the world, the Chinese revisionists say, at times at least, that the two superpowers alone are the only reactionary forces in the world, and further that really only one of them is reactionary while the other should be allied with. While at times they refer to the present era as that of imperialism and proletarian revolution and while on occasion they mention Lenin's line on imperialist war, in fact they do not base themselves on but oppose this analysis of the era we are living in and they cite Lenin's stand on "defense of the fatherland" in imperialist countries only to mangle its meaning and twist its whole thrust inside out to come up with the remarkable assertion that Lenin was championing "national wars" in these countries! Such is their logic and method and the "logical conclusion" of their complete distortion of Leninism.

Proceeding with their treachery, the Chinese revisionists (81) take with regard to the "third world" the very stand that the Chinese Communist Party, when it was a Marxist-Leninist party under the leadership of Mao Tsetung, attacked in exposing and combatting the Soviet revisionists' capitulation to and collaboration with U.S. imperialism. They say that the dependent

countries are not after all dependent and that colonialism is by and large a thing of the past, covering over and prettifying the neo-colonial oppression carried out by U.S. and other imperialism. Therefore, according to the Chinese revisionists, for all practical purposes and with very few exceptions, there is no need for the peoples of these countries to make revolution against imperialism and its "independent" domestic lackeys. In opposition to revolution, the Chinese revisionists blow all out of proportion the minor moves of certain "third world" ruling classes to get a better deal for themselves in their dependent relation with the imperialists, hailing these as quintessential examples of anti-imperialist struggle there, while they also laud as heroic "anti-hegemonism" the "struggles" carried out by ruling classes in these countries on behalf of one imperialist bloc against the other. In their view, not only socialist revolution in these countries but even the anti-imperialist democratic revolution as the first stage preceding and leading to the socialist revolution is unnecessary, and more than that prohibited.

As for the advanced countries, not only is proletarian (82) revolution unthinkable in the two superpowers in the eyes of the Chinese revisionists but in the other capitalist and imperialist countries—the so-called "second world"—it is also impossible and furthermore criminal. Rather, the task the Chinese revisionists set for the proletariat and masses in those countries is to be cannon fodder for the bourgeoisie in fighting an imperialist war and in "defending the fatherland" in pursuit of imperialist aims. Here the Chinese revisionists, using their distorted analysis of the two superpowers, of the other imperialist powers and of the relationship between them, particularly with reference to world war, directly and deliberately repudiate Lenin's completely correct and still valid insistence that with regard to the advanced countries "Whoever refers today to Marx's attitude towards the wars of the epoch of the *progressive* bourgeoisie and forgets Marx's statement that 'the workers have no fatherland', a statement that applies *precisely* to the epoch of the reactionary, obsolete bourgeoisie, to the epoch of the socialist revolution, shamelessly distorts Marxism and substitutes the bourgeois for the socialist point of view." ("Socialism and War," *Lenin on War and Peace, Three Articles*, p. 17, Peking 1966 English edition.) As Lenin said in another context, miraculous prophecy is a fairy tale but scientific prophecy is a fact, and it seems that Lenin quite insightfully prophesied what the Chinese revisionists are now doing.

In the attempt to justify this brazen renegacy, the (83) Chinese revisionists insist that the workers' movement in the advanced countries can in the present period—and they mean indefinitely—only remain at the level of reformism, which means tailing after the bourgeoisie. This, they say, is because of the betrayal and widespread influence—and apparently the unbreakable hold—of the revisionist parties, in particular those that follow the Soviet social-imperialists, over the masses of workers. Here the Chinese revisionists' reasoning is tautological, bourgeois logical, grounded in idealism and metaphysics and reeking with self-

serving pragmatism.

It is true that in these countries in general the working class movement has been in a rather prolonged period of ebb and it is also true that in many of these countries the revisionist parties have considerable influence within the working class. But, first of all, the Chinese revisionists ignore the most important basis for this—the objective situations in those countries over the past period—and never even address the question, why do these revisionist parties have rather extensive influence?—which is also rooted in the objective situation over the same period. And second, as the other side of their same stupidity, the Chinese revisionists ignore the very important, potentially decisive changes in the objective situation which are already beginning to occur and which are bound to occur on a qualitatively greater level in the period ahead, precisely with the deepening of the crisis and the accelerating developments toward world war—all of which will provide crucial opportunities to win the masses of workers away from the influence of the revisionists and the bourgeoisie in general and to a revolutionary position. This is the Chinese revisionists' idealism and metaphysics with regard to this question. They refuse to recognize the revolutionary potential already indicated in the recent past in these countries and beyond that they are determined to oppose the possible realization of that potential in perhaps the not too distant future, because that would strike a devastating blow to their schemes of capitulating to and collaborating with imperialism. Here stands out again the self-seeking pragmatism of these revisionists.

At times the Chinese revisionists more or less openly attempt to rationalize their counter-revolutionary international line on the basis that it is necessary to follow such a line in order to defend China, and after all the defense of a socialist country is a crucial task for the international proletariat. First, it must be said that even if China were today a socialist country, its international line would still be wrong and very harmful to the international proletariat. Writing off and even sabotaging revolution throughout the world is not an internationalist contribution to achieving the worldwide advance toward the goal of communism, which after all must be the aim of the international proletariat in every aspect of its struggle, including the defense of genuine socialist countries. At best, if China were a socialist country, its international line today would represent carrying to an extreme certain very serious errors made before by the international communist movement and in particular the Soviet Union when it was a socialist country, especially in relation to World War 2—when there was a general and widespread tendency to concentrate everything on the defense of the socialist country, at the expense of the revolutionary struggle in many countries and at the cost of fostering significant deviations from a revolutionary line in the international movement overall.

But more than that China is *not*—is *no longer*—a socialist country, precisely because power has been seized there by the very revisionist new bourgeoisie which is responsible for China's counter-revolutionary

line and role with regard to the international situation and struggle today. The determination of whether China today is a socialist or revisionist country depends not on the declarations of the leaders of China, or anyone else, but on the actual nature of Chinese society and most decisively by which class rules there. It is the fact that revisionism, that a new bourgeoisie headquartered in the Communist Party itself, especially at its top ranks, has seized power in China and, in accordance with its class interests, is rapidly restoring capitalism there in an all-round way—it is this that determines the nature of Chinese society today. And it is this that determines that China's international line and role does not merely contain errors from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism, nor is it only strongly influenced by revisionist forces—as was the case even when China *was* socialist and overall followed a revolutionary line under the leadership of Mao Tsetung—but rather it is thoroughly counter-revolutionary, consisting of and seeking to force on others the capitulation to and collaboration with imperialism and reaction in the service of the bourgeois interests of China's new ruling class.

The Chinese leaders' self-serving pragmatism also shows itself strongly in their relationship with the Soviet Union. Despite certain echoes from the Chinese revisionists of Mao Tsetung's scientific analysis of the Soviet Union as social-imperialist, in fact they do not actually apply this analysis or the Marxist-Leninist method on which it is based. Divorcing politics from economics in the manner of all revisionists, and specifically given their own definition of socialism (referred to earlier), the Chinese leaders can only conclude that the Soviet Union is after all a socialist country whose leaders have chauvinist, big power ambitions. The Chinese revisionists' quarrel with their counterparts in the Soviet Union centers around the fact that the latter's expansionism—which in fact if not in the Chinese leaders' view stems from the capitalist-imperialist economic base of the USSR today—conflicts with the Chinese revisionists' own bourgeois ambitions. Not only do these two groups of renegades and "socialist" capitalists have no fundamental differences of principle but some form of "reconciliation" between them—which would objectively find the Soviet social-imperialists in the superior position—is not at all unthinkable or even unlikely.

Like the Soviet social-imperialists, the Chinese revisionists have aspirations of becoming an international exploiter and oppressor worthy of the name "superpower," but unlike them they have no basis for becoming such an imperialist power, in the next period ahead. Apparently, the Chinese revisionists have studied the experience of their Soviet predecessors, and in any case they are trying to implement a similar policy of luring in U.S. bloc capital, with the hope of building up their economy and military apparatus and with the notion that they will be able to emerge in a position to rival, perhaps even take the place of, the Soviet Union and/or the U.S. imperialists before or as the outcome of a new world war. But, given the still relatively backward state of its economy, a legacy of its semi-colonial, semi-

feudal past which socialist construction had made great strides in overcoming but had not yet eliminated, capitalist restoration and imperialist penetration in China can only result in its being reduced to a state of dependency on one major imperialist power or another. Thus, while the Chinese revisionists have wild ambitions which they are pursuing in direct opposition to Mao's often repeated call to "never seek hegemony," and while they can push their weight around to a certain degree in some situations, especially with regard to other countries in the "third world," their abilities do not match up to their appetites, and they can only play a subordinate part in an alliance headed by one or the other of the two superpowers.

The Chinese revisionists have widely and loudly promoted their counter-revolutionary international line in the form of their "three worlds" theory, and the declaration that the Soviet Union is the main danger and main enemy not only of China but in the world as a whole, a fundamental part of which is the insistence that U.S. imperialism is playing a progressive role in its opposition to the Soviet Union (see, for example, *Peking Review* 45, 1977). Like all opportunists, however, the Chinese revisionists are quite capable of adjusting this "theory" or even of concocting a new one in its place to justify and cover for a new turn in their actions and maneuvers, a new alignment they enter into, etc. What is essential to grasp is that, given the class nature of these revisionists, whatever tactical turns they may take, whatever alignment they may enter into, the content of their line and actions will remain counter-revolutionary. (88)

Again, our purpose is not to speculate on which bloc China will be enlisted in, the Soviet or U.S.-led one, but to point to the fact that it will be in one or the other and further that the role of the Chinese ruling class in world war as well as in general can only be thoroughly reactionary, both within China and internationally. The "switching from one side to another" of various reactionary states is, once again, an important part and important indication of the intensifying developments toward and preparations for world war, and whatever the particular alignment among the imperialists and reactionaries and regardless of the specific components of the two blocs, both must be exposed, opposed, and fought against as enemies of the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations. The actions of the Chinese revisionists will certainly affect all this, and in a significant way, in a tactical sense, but will not change it fundamentally or in its nature nor alter the fact that the rival imperialist blocs are set on a collision course and that only the international proletariat and its allies can, through their revolutionary struggles, radically transform the historic conjuncture shaping up in the interests of the great majority of the world's people. (89)

Finally in analyzing the nature and role of the Chinese revisionists and the basic content and effects of their policies, it is necessary to point out that while they have been widely opposed by many different forces, with varying stands and interests, they do have a coterie of sychophants in various parts of the world,

and some groups formerly within the international communist movement have fully embraced the lines and actions of the Chinese leaders, whatever they are, and have gone completely into the sewer, following the Chinese revisionists. This has been particularly true in a number of countries where U.S. imperialism and its bloc are dominant: some so-called "communists" or former communists there who have in fact given up on revolution have found that tailing after the Chinese revisionists is a convenient way to capitulate to your own ruling class while maintaining a "socialist" cover and the backing of a "socialist" country as capital or bargaining chips, however tattered and pitiful they may be. In general these forces are growing more demoralized and losing what influence they have had among the masses. Although it is possible that the ruling classes in some of these countries may move to breathe life into them, it is becoming more and more difficult to follow and parrot the vagaries, maneuverings and machinations of the Chinese revisionists, and overall these groups will continue to experience further disintegration and slow or fast death by revisionist-capitulationist poison.

The triumph of revisionism in China, the counter-revolutionary international line of its new rulers and their overall repudiation of Marxist-Leninist principles—including the concrete application, development and enrichment of these in many areas by Mao Tsetung, especially in analyzing and struggling against revisionism in and out of power—these reversals have fostered a great deal of confusion and disorientation among revolutionaries in general and specifically within the communist movement internationally. One of the more significant effects of this has been that the influence of the Soviet social-imperialists and their revisionist supporters and flunkys has been temporarily strengthened. In particular, the Chinese revisionists' line of "three worlds" and the Soviet Union as the main danger, main enemy, while on the one hand it has aided U.S. imperialism, has also, ironically, in another aspect aided the Soviet social-imperialists to a significant degree. This is particularly so given the fact that, in pursuit of its own imperialist aims and interests but under a "socialist" and even "internationalist" cover, the Soviet Union is more and more assuming a militant stance in opposition to U.S. imperialism, whose oppression many peoples have long suffered under and struggled against. And the Chinese revisionists' definition of socialism together with their repudiation of the polemics against Soviet revisionism and the analysis of the class nature and economic base of Soviet social-imperialism carried out by the Chinese Communist Party under Mao's leadership—all this strengthens and promotes the view that the Soviet Union may make errors, even serious ones, it may have chauvinist, even expansionist tendencies, but after all it is a socialist country and it does "stand up" to U.S. imperialism, and a socialist country, even a "bad" one, is preferable to imperialism. This is a viewpoint that in many respects and overall in today's situation is acceptable and helpful to the Soviet social-imperialists, while it is extremely harmful to the genuine communist (91)

movement, to the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations.

Of more direct service to Soviet social-imperialism (92) are the Vietnamese and Cuban revisionist leaders. Unfortunately, after the defeat of U.S. imperialism, through a protracted and heroic struggle by the Vietnamese people, revisionist tendencies within the leadership of the Vietnamese party were completely consolidated and Vietnam was brought under the domination of a new imperialist overlord, the Soviet social-imperialists. Since that time, speculating on the tremendous respect that the Vietnamese people earned among the oppressed masses throughout the world as a result of their inspiring resistance to and triumph over U.S. imperialism, and using the formidable armed forces built up during that struggle, along with Soviet-supplied weaponry, the Vietnamese revisionists have acted as a regional gendarme for the Soviet social-imperialists, while also pursuing their own expansionist aims. And their support for the Soviet social-imperialists and lavish praise of their "fraternal aid" in the struggle against U.S. imperialism have provided an important element of the cover the Soviet social-imperialists are using, particularly in their efforts to infiltrate, subvert and use for their own ends struggles against U.S. imperialism in various parts of the world. Of course this betrayal by the Vietnamese leaders has also been used by the U.S. imperialists themselves in the attempt to reverse the verdict on the Vietnam war, portray their role as just and in general to promote the line that any struggle against U.S. imperialism can at most result in the substitution of a new oppressor, the Soviet Union, in the place of the U.S. and its allies and agents. For these reasons, the exposure of the revisionist nature of the rulers of Vietnam and a Marxist analysis of the reasons for the setback there—which must include the upholding of the justness and great significance of the struggle against and defeat of U.S. imperialism by the Vietnamese people—is of real importance in rallying the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces and building the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and its allies within the various countries and on the international level.

Similarly, the exposure of the nature and role of the revisionist rulers of Cuba, and a Marxist analysis of the problems with and then complete degeneration of the revolution there, resulting in the position of Cuba today as a neo-colony of Soviet social-imperialism whose troops are used as an expeditionary force by the new imperialist master—this too is an important task for the genuine Marxist-Leninists. In the early period after U.S. imperialism was ousted from Cuba and before its new dependency on the Soviet Union was fully developed and consolidated, Cuba was looked to as an inspiration by class-conscious proletarians and oppressed peoples throughout the world. This was especially the case in Latin America. (93)

During this early period the Cuban leaders, even as they were more and more implementing a revisionist line in Cuba and capitulating to Soviet social-imperialism, not only maintained a militant posture against U.S. imperialism but more generally struck a

"revolutionary" pose, even at times voicing criticism of certain actions by the Soviet social-imperialists while overall supporting and promoting them and also praising their "fraternal assistance." It was during this period, especially in the mid-1960s, that the Cuban leaders championed the line of "focoism" as a substitute for the armed struggle of the masses under the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist party to defeat the imperialists and reactionaries, a "short cut" to the seizure of power which would leave the masses out of this struggle—and out of the exercise of power if somehow it did change hands in this way. Where this line was actually applied it did not of course lead to genuine revolution and in some significant cases resulted in crushing defeat of the "focoist" armed forces. This in turn was perverted by both the U.S. imperialists and their allies and lackeys on the one hand and the Soviet social-imperialists and their agents, including the Cuban leadership, on the other hand, into "proof" that real revolutionary warfare, which mobilizes and relies on the masses, is doomed to defeat, and that the masses can only play the part of pawns and perhaps "pressure groups" in the struggle between rival reactionaries.

Overall, then, even during the days of their more "revolutionary" posture, the Cuban leaders' line and actions served as a complement to and aided the openly right opportunist, pro-Soviet revisionist parties. In Latin America in particular, during the 1960s, these revisionists were becoming more widely exposed and opposed by revolutionary forces. But the influence of the Cuban leaders—their promotion of "focoist" adventurism divorced from the masses, their denial of the need for the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist party, and their opposition to the policy of a broad united front led by the proletariat and its party to carry out the struggle against imperialism and its domestic dependent reactionaries—this "leftism" not only led to defeat but fostered demoralization, disbelief in the possibility of victorious mass armed struggle against these powerful enemies and the discrediting of a genuine revolutionary alternative to the revisionist parties. This explains the "mysterious" fact that in many cases these same revisionist parties not only privately encouraged but even secretly funded such "leftist" adventurism. (95)

At the same time, while they feigned "neutrality" with regard to the struggle in the international communist movement between the revisionists, headed by the Soviet Union, and the Marxist-Leninists led by the Chinese Communist Party, in fact the Cuban leaders sided with and assisted the former at crucial times and on the crucial questions. As early as 1965, at an international conference in Havana, the Cuban leaders barred many genuine Marxist-Leninist organizations from attending while revisionist parties were playing a key role, and Fidel Castro took the occasion of this conference to launch scurrilous attacks on China and Mao Tsetung personally. This kind of thing became increasingly common on the part of the Cuban leaders. (96)

In 1970, on the eve of the election of the Popular Unity government in Chile, headed by Salvador Allende, (97)

Castro wrote an article in a revisionist journal in Chile citing that country as an example of the possibility of the electoral path to socialism. Later, during the Allende government and specifically when its reformist "peaceful road to socialism" was increasingly showing itself incapable of really carrying out a radical transformation of society, the Cuban leaders emphatically stated that there was no alternative to this "road" in Chile.

This stand was not determined by loyalty to Allende (98)—nor certainly to the advance to socialism, by peaceful or any other means—but served the aims of the revisionist Communist Party of Chile, which was using its extensive, even dominant, influence in the Popular Unity government as leverage to seek an "agreement" with the Christian Democratic Party that would bring about not socialism but a form of state capitalism in which the Communist Party, and the Soviet Union behind it, would gain a significant stronghold. It is this which explains why these revisionists consistently restrained the struggle of the masses, even supporting the armed forces in disarming the masses and calling on the masses not to resist with arms the reactionary coup d'état that brought a bloody end to the Allende period. It was the aims of the Chilean Communist Party and the Soviet social-imperialists behind them—who did not want a direct confrontation with U.S. imperialism and its henchmen in this situation—that the Cuban leaders, who by now had become unapologetic apologists for Soviet social-imperialism and its bloc, were consistently supporting and promoting. All this is a very important negative experience whose profound lessons must be fully grasped.

It is not the case, of course, that the Cuban leaders (99) have ceased to talk about "armed struggle" or to engage in it. But these words and deeds are not in the service of revolution but rather to ally with reaction and strengthen the efforts of the Soviet social-imperialists to establish their domination in league with and through the use of local reactionaries in various countries. For example, in Latin America the Cuban leaders have attempted to establish certain relations with and exert influence on sectors of the reactionary armed forces in some countries, hoping thereby to find a wedge with which to begin edging out U.S. imperialist influence and eventually replace it with the rule of reactionary forces that align themselves with and depend on the Soviet bloc. In Latin America itself this is difficult because the U.S. imperialists are able to, must and do maintain a very tight grip there, but especially where there are popular movements and uprisings against U.S. imperialism, the Cuban leaders along with the pro-Soviet revisionist party, if it has significant influence among the masses, will certainly step up their maneuverings of various kinds to bring into being a new reactionary regime, more to the liking of the Soviet social-imperialists, over the heads of the masses and through restraining, and at a certain point even joining in the violent suppression of, the mass movement.

At the same time, a significant phenomenon in recent (100)

years has been the use of Cuban troops as expeditionary forces for the Soviet social-imperialists, carried out under a "revolutionary" and "internationalist" cover of opposition to U.S. imperialism and its allies and lackeys, especially in Africa. In fact, the only revolution on the part of the Cuban and Soviet revisionists is counter-revolution and the kind of internationalism they are carrying out is international plunder and contention characteristic of and serving imperialist interests.

But, again, the task remains for the genuine Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries and proletarian internationalists (101) to thoroughly expose this, because while the Soviet social-imperialists and their Cuban and other agents and allies are more and more incurring the hatred of the masses of people in many countries, especially those who bear the direct brunt of their "benevolence," there is generally not as yet a widespread and deep understanding of the class nature of these revisionists. So, while they hold up Cuba as an example of how U.S. imperialism can be defeated and "socialism" built by relying not on the masses but on the "support" and strength of the Soviet Union, the U.S. imperialists and others point to the misery of the masses in such a "socialist model" and the obvious Cuban dependency on the Soviet Union as ammunition for the argument that, however oppressive the old-line ruling classes may be, the only alternative is "communist" oppression, which is worse, or just as bad—and certainly not worth sacrificing for. It is not possible to lead the masses out of the situation of being bounced back and forth between rival reactionaries, in making revolution and abolishing all forms of enslavement, without laying bare the true character of the Soviet-line revisionists and revisionism in general as well as that of openly anti-communist exploiters and counter-revolutionaries.

A crucial lesson in relation to all this is that it is a serious error to identify revisionism merely with the repudiation of "armed struggle," and this is all the more important in today's world. True, the Soviet social-imperialists and those who follow them, like the Cuban leaders, as well as other revisionist forces, will in certain circumstances promote the "peaceful road to socialism." This is not merely an illusion but a dangerous trap for the proletariat and its allies, and in fact the "peaceful road to socialism" is littered with the corpses of countless masses who were pointed down this road by revisionist betrayers. At the same time, however, in circumstances where it better suits their bourgeois aims, and increasingly in the current world situation, with the intensifying developments toward war between the rival imperialist blocs and toward revolution, these revisionists and other opportunists will frequently replace the principle of armed struggle of the masses with empty phrases about armed struggle which renounce all types of political and organizational preparations or with putschist theses and practices aimed at installing themselves as heads of regimes exploiting and oppressing the masses under a "revolutionary," a "socialist," even "communist" cover.

Today, despite the past experience of the "focoist" (102)

adventures promoted by the Cuban leaders, this same line, or a variant of it, continues to have some influence in various countries, and in some cases actually poses serious problems for and obstacles to the revolutionary movement. And this has to a certain degree been given some impetus by the reversal in China and the fact that the revolutionary line of Mao Tsetung, including on people's war and military strategy generally—a line which is based on and gives expression to the waging of the armed struggle as a war of the masses under the leadership of a proletarian vanguard party—has been under intensifying attack from many different quarters. Generally this "focoist" line, even when it is not promoted by direct agents of the Soviet social-imperialists, ends up apologizing for and preaching reliance on them, because failing to rely on the masses leads before too long to the search for some other powerful force to stand up to the ruling class and the U.S. bloc imperialists behind them—voilà the Soviet Union, a real superpower opposed to the U.S., and "socialist" too.

Another opportunist trend that has been given some impetus as a result of the reversal in China and its "after-shocks" is Trotskyism. The Trotskyites, of all different varieties, seize on the blatantly obvious fact that China is no longer a revolutionary country, on the repudiation of revolutionary principle by the revisionist rulers there and on the confusion and disorientation that has accompanied all this, to hurl further abuse at Mao Tsetung Thought and Marxism-Leninism in general. (103)

In general, the Trotskyites are characterized by certain "left" opportunist positions, especially the line that, more or less in all countries, the workers are the only force that can be won to support socialism and that in opposition to this all private owners of means of production, or at least all exploiters, even the most small-scale ones, are bound to end up in the enemy camp. Such a "workerist" line means the negation of the alliance with the peasantry or other non-proletarian forces and of the policy of a united front against the reactionary classes in power and in fact means repudiation of the proletariat's leading role and revolutionary mission. But at the same time, their politics are fundamentally rightist, and in many respects openly so, supporting economism in the workers' movement, reformist schemes such as nationalization under capitalism as an important step toward socialism, and reformist bourgeois-democratic policies in general. (104)

The Trotskyites have much in common with the revisionists. In particular though the Trotskyites deny the possibility of socialism in one country, especially a relatively backward one—and deny specifically that socialism ever existed in the Soviet Union, China or other countries where it was in fact established—nevertheless they share with the revisionists the notion that the essential ingredients of socialism are the absence of antagonistic classes, state ownership and a high level of development of the productive forces. At the same time, divorcing politics from economics, as is characteristic of the revisionists as well, but applying their own twist to this, the Trotskyites declare that the

Soviet Union, China and other countries, both when they were actually socialist and now that they are revisionist-capitalist, are in fact "deformed" or "degenerate" workers' states but that their economies are not socialist (apparently they are not highly developed enough) and they are not capitalist either. As Marx said in one of his criticisms of a point in the "Gotha Programme"—let him figure it out who can.

What is of significance, however, especially in the present situation, is that in general the Trotskyites adopt their own version of the line that a "bad socialist country"—in particular the big bad Soviet Union—is better than an imperialist country, except that they substitute "deformed" or "degenerate" workers' state for "bad socialist country." This is basically because the Trotskyites, like all "Marxist" opportunists, hate and fear the real revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the establishment and exercise of its dictatorship, and therefore they look elsewhere for some power to substitute for this in challenging the old ruling class (though the Trotskyites in particular like to keep their distance from this power). With the further developments toward world war there will be a significant tendency in many cases for the Trotskyites' line to converge more closely with that of the pro-Soviet revisionists, and where this is the case with Trotskyite groups that have some mass influence—and there are actually such cases—it will be a significant factor that the genuine Marxist-Leninists will have to combat while overall exposing the counter-revolutionary nature of Trotskyism and its fundamental unity with revisionism, in all its forms. (106)

It is also necessary to stress the increased danger posed by social democracy which holds power in a number of countries and which continues to serve as a Trojan horse for the interests of the Western imperialists. In addition to its usual conciliatory tactics, in some countries social democracy is attempting to form or influence armed groups in order to play a role in a situation of changing conditions. Marxist-Leninists must steadfastly combat their influence among the masses and must denounce all their tactics.

Another problem that has to be dealt with is the anarchist tendency that exists in a number of countries. This is finding some life in the general turmoil that is growing and in the fact that as a rule the development of the proletarian revolutionary movement is lagging significantly behind the development of the objective situation. And this tendency has also been given some impetus by the reversal in China, which meant the temporary end of a society that was seething with revolution—*under the leadership of the proletariat and a Marxist-Leninist line*. (107)

Lenin once pointed out that "Anarchism was not infrequently a sort of punishment for the opportunist sins of the working-class movement," referring here specifically to right opportunism. (See "*Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder*, p. 17, Peking 1970 English edition.) Lenin also pointed out in turn that "left-wing" deviations could easily give way to openly right opportunism itself and overall tended to strengthen the latter. And at the same time Lenin did not fail to unite with the genuinely revolutionary sen-

timents of a number of "left-wing communists," and even anarchists, stressing that the Marxists opposed them and their methods, including individual terror, on the grounds that they would not in fact lead to revolution and certainly not because they were "too revolutionary." In today's situation also it is necessary to distinguish between different kinds of "left" deviations, to unite with the genuinely revolutionary sentiments and even at times the positive actions of certain of these trends while struggling vigorously and uncompromisingly against their basically erroneous viewpoint and politics and seeking to win them to the Marxist-Leninist—the only thoroughly revolutionary—stand and ruthlessly exposing and combatting actual counter-revolutionary tendencies adopting a "left" camouflage.

The Albanian Party of Labor and its leadership have fallen completely into the revisionist swamp. Shortly after the counter-revolutionary coup in China the PLA attracted a number of genuine revolutionaries because they opposed some of the more hideous features of the Hua-Teng clique in China, especially regarding international line. Very quickly, however, they outdid even Hua and Teng in the virulence of their attack on Mao and Mao Tsetung Thought. The PLA leaders have adopted classic Trotskyite positions on a number of questions, including the nature of the revolution in semi-feudal, semi-colonial countries, e.g. excluding people's war as a form of revolutionary struggle. More significantly their position grows daily closer to the made-in-Moscow revisionist line on a number of cardinal questions and world events, as already shown by their stand on Vietnam's invasion of Cambodia, the workers' upheaval in Poland and their attacks on Mao, which are similar to the Soviets' attacks.

These attacks have not only been levelled against Mao's line and leadership after the victory of the anti-imperialist democratic (new-democratic) revolution in China but even before, basically during the whole of that stage of the Chinese revolution as well.

Because Mao correctly understood that the revolutionary upsurges of the peasants in China were of tremendous significance for the overall revolutionary process there and because more specifically he made the correct analysis that the Chinese revolution in its first stage must be centered mainly in the countryside, the Albanian leaders accuse Mao of abandoning the leading role of the proletariat in that revolution and adopting instead the line that the peasants must and would lead. In fact, Mao fought for and led in establishing the leading role of the proletariat, particularly as represented by its party, first of all among the masses of peasants and more generally among the masses of people, and he led the revolution to victory in this stage and in advancing to the socialist stage precisely on this basis.

Because Mao made a concrete analysis of concrete conditions in China and thereby determined that the armed struggle there must take the form of a protracted war first encircling the cities from the countryside and only then capturing the cities and winning nationwide political power, the Albanian leaders, with Enver Hoxha at the head, accuse Mao of advocating a war that is "an endless one without perspective," which they say is fur-

ther proof of Mao's "distrust in the working class, the negation of its hegemonic role." (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, pp. 235, 236, Tirana 1979 English edition.) In fact, with the overall guidance of Mao Tsetung's revolutionary line, the masses of Chinese people carried out revolutionary warfare not at all without perspective but with definite targets and aims and with brilliant strategy and tactics, and more than that they were victorious in two great revolutionary wars, first against Japanese imperialism and then against the Kuomintang backed by U.S. imperialism, and in this way they achieved complete victory in the new-democratic revolution and laid a powerful basis for advancing to socialism—all under the leadership of the proletariat and its party. And more generally, while the exact course of the revolution in any given country is dependent on the concrete conditions there, the teachings of Mao Tsetung concerning protracted people's war are of great relevance in the colonial and dependent countries. Those revisionists who attack Mao's theory of surrounding the city by the countryside as having failed to insure the hegemony of the proletariat or dogmatically insist that insurrection in the city is the sole form of seizing power in these types of countries are in fact attacking the revolutionary struggle there.

These distortions by Enver Hoxha and the Albanian Party of Labor are not very original but they are quite significant. In fact they echo attacks made for years by Wang Ming, a renegade from the Chinese Communist Party who defected to the Soviet revisionists, and by the Soviet revisionists themselves.

This opportunist position of the Albanian leaders is also part of a general tendency on their part to obliterate the distinction between the anti-imperialist democratic and socialist revolutions, despite their general acknowledgement that these are two different types of revolutions and represent two different stages in the overall revolutionary process in the colonial and dependent countries. Throughout his book, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Enver Hoxha makes only a few passing references to the existence of feudal forces and relations in these countries, even though feudal or semi-feudal relations are widespread in many of them, particularly in the countryside, and predominate in a number of them. The importance and implications of this for the revolutions in these countries are not even seriously addressed in this book.

Along with this, Hoxha repeatedly insists that the class in power in these countries is the bourgeoisie and this class must therefore be the target of the revolution. Although on the one hand in certain places he acknowledges that sections of the bourgeoisie may be allies of the proletariat in the revolution there in the first stage, on the other hand he also makes a number of statements like the following response to the Chinese revisionists' "three worlds" theory: "Both in the countries of the 'third world' and in those of the 'second world', it is the *bourgeois capitalist class*, the *same social forces*, which are ruling the proletariat and the peoples and which must be smashed." (*Ibid.*, p. 263, emphasis added.) This, again, is obliterating the distinction between these different types of coun-

tries—colonial and dependent on the one hand and imperialist on the other—and the two different types of revolution—anti-imperialist democratic and socialist. At best, Hoxha's treatment of this question is eclectic and leads to the conclusion that the essential difference between these two different types of countries is merely the *degree of foreign domination* they are subjected to—a line which can only produce serious errors with regard to revolution in both types of countries, because in the colonial and dependent countries there is not only the national but also the democratic character of the revolution (in its first stage) and in the imperialist countries the revolution can be neither national nor democratic in character but must be proletarian-socialist.

In fact, while they oppose the Chinese revisionists' "three worlds" theory, and point out that among other things it advocates that the proletariat in the imperialist countries (at least those opposed to the Soviet Union) should support the bourgeoisie there in waging imperialist war under the bogus slogan of "defense of the fatherland"—or fighting for "independence" from the Soviet social-imperialists—the Albanian leaders put forward their own version of this erroneous view that in these countries there is a legitimate fight for the "defense" or "independence" of the fatherland. For example, Enver Hoxha says the following:

"At the same time these hangers-on of the Chinese have become ardent defenders of the bourgeois capitalist state institutions, especially of NATO, the European Common Market, etc., which they consider as the main factors for the 'defence of independence'. Like the Chinese leaders, they whitewash and prettify these pillars of capitalist domination and expansion. They are assisting precisely those organisms which, in reality, have *seriously violated the independence and sovereignty of their countries.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 249, emphasis added.)

So the Albanian leaders agree with the Chinese leaders that there is a task for the proletariat in Western Europe in defending the "independence and sovereignty of their countries"—and this is obviously not put forward as a task only after socialism has been established there—but they disagree with the Chinese leaders on two points in connection with this. First, the Albanian leaders think that the struggle for this "independence and sovereignty" should be directed, immediately at least, against U.S. imperialism not the Soviet Union, and second they think that far from being the leaders of this struggle, the bourgeoisies in these countries are traitors to the "independence and sovereignty of their countries." Here it seems the Albanian Party is following a seriously erroneous position put forward by Stalin after World War 2—that the bourgeoisie in the imperialist countries (other than the U.S. at least) had thrown overboard the banner of national independence and sovereignty (and of democratic liberties) and that it fell to the communist parties there to pick up that banner and carry it forward. (See Stalin's "Speech at the Nineteenth Party Congress," October 14, 1952.) As bad as that position was in the

circumstances when Stalin put it forward, it is if anything even worse now. The truth is that it is the genuine Marxist-Leninists and the proletariat in the imperialist countries who must throw overboard the national banner (and the banner of bourgeois democracy). Here it is worth recalling Lenin's insistence that Marx's statement that the workers have no fatherland applies precisely to the imperialist countries.

In fact the tendency to promote "defense of the fatherland" in imperialist countries—which means national chauvinism and embellishment of imperialism—and in general to promote nationalism and bourgeois democracy within the international communist movement did not show itself strongly only after World War 2 but during and in the period leading up to it. This was closely connected with the very strong tendency to base everything on and reduce everything to the question of defending the Soviet Union. Unless this is summed up and criticized deeply and thoroughly this kind of error is bound to be repeated and in all likelihood carried to even greater extremes in one form or another. But the Albanian leaders not only refuse to make such a critical summation, they insist on defending the serious errors made by Stalin and others in this regard. Yet at the same time they not only attack the Chinese revisionists' counter-revolutionary international line but they also attack Mao for the analysis that in the recent period the Soviet Union had become the main danger. Again, this analysis was correct and important with regard to the dangers faced by China. And again, even if we admit the possibility that Mao made certain errors in connection with this, that certainly cannot justify the stand of the Albanian leaders, who opportunistically act as if Mao were the first to take positions of this kind and moreover falsely accuse him of selling out to imperialism while they steadfastly uphold the errors of Stalin, who after all declared the German-led bloc of imperialists the "main enemy" on a world scale even before World War 2—and certainly before the German imperialist invasion of the Soviet Union—and who in the same pre-war period described the German-led bloc of imperialists as the "aggressor states" in opposition to the "non-aggressive states, primarily Britain, France and the U.S.A." (See Stalin's "Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.) on the Work of the Central Committee," March 10, 1939, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 882, Peking 1976 English edition.) Such a method and such actions, among others, by the Albanian Party reflect and promote shallowness, narrowness, one-sidedness and the sticking (or retreat) to the beaten path of previous errors, and obstruct the crucial struggle against revisionism within the international communist movement.

Further, the line that the Albanian Party is taking today reveals that its own criticism of and struggle against revisionism, particularly Soviet revisionism, has been superficial and mechanical. There is, notably, throughout Enver Hoxha's book *Imperialism and the Revolution* the tendency to act as if "Khrushchevite revisionism" were the furthest development of revisionism in power in the Soviet Union and the essence of its policy and actions today. Linked with this is the un-

mistakable tendency to seriously downgrade the intensity of the rivalry between the two imperialist blocs and the danger of world war arising from this and to stress instead the collusion between the Soviet revisionists and the U.S. imperialists. Thus, while calling the Soviet ruling class "social-imperialist" and referring at times to the "fierce contradictions" among the imperialists and reactionaries and to the danger of world war, Enver Hoxha repeatedly talks about how all these reactionary forces together are "seeking a *modus vivendi*, a hybrid 'new society', in order to keep the bourgeois-capitalist system on its feet"; how the fear and dread of genuine communism is "driving the imperialists and the revisionists into each others' arms," etc. (Hoxha, *op. cit.*, pp. 22, 24.) Writing at the end of the 1970s (and not the early part of the 1960s) he even goes so far as to say that "U.S. imperialism considers the Khrushchevite Soviet system as a victory of world capitalism and from this it deduces that the threat of a conflict with the Soviet Union has become less intense, though it does not deny the contradictions and rivalry for hegemony with it." (*Ibid.*, p. 25.) In fact this assessment of U.S.-Soviet relations is not at all the viewpoint of the U.S. imperialists but of Enver Hoxha himself.

Such an analysis, it must be said, actually serves the Soviet social-imperialists in pursuit of their actual interests, aims and needs in the world today. They can live with denunciations of them, even the epithet "social-imperialist" (especially if it does not involve a thoroughly scientific analysis of what that really means and leads to), so long as there is a "tilt" in the direction of pointing to the rival imperialists as the more aggressive, warmongering, powerful and what have you. And in their own way, this is how the Albanian leaders present things. For example, Enver Hoxha writes that "the increase of U.S. military potential relatively weakens Soviet fighting strength and forces the Soviet Union to follow the United States of America step by step, in order to balance its military potential and aggressive power." (*Ibid.*, p. 289, emphasis added.) Linking this with the completely subjective assertion that a major factor for the danger of world war comes from China's incitement of it, and specifically its incitement of the U.S. against the Soviet Union—a line consistently put forward by the Soviet social-imperialists themselves—Hoxha, not failing of course to refer to the Soviet Union as imperialist, nevertheless makes the following remarkable statement: "Therefore, it is most likely that the policy of the United States of America and the wrong strategy of China itself, may impel the Soviet Union to increase its military strength even further, and as the imperialist power it is, to attack China first." (*Ibid.*, p. 366, emphasis added.)

All this must be taken in connection with Hoxha's very wide of the mark analysis that the essential thing about the Soviet Union's large indebtedness to the West is that it has "grave neo-colonialist consequences" and that "the Soviet Union has been reduced to this state of curtailed sovereignty." (*Ibid.*, pp. 348, 351.) To this must also be added Hoxha's statement that a further danger of this kind of indebtedness is

that inability to repay such debts may lead to a situation where "The American monopoly companies, for example, which impose their policy on the government, force it to protect their capital by every means, even to declare war, if need be, to defend them." (*Ibid.*, p. 352.) From all this the basis becomes even stronger for understanding how major aspects of the Albanian leaders' international line converge with that of the Soviet social-imperialists and serve them. Given the former's erroneous position that in imperialist countries national struggle against U.S. imperialism in defense of the "independence and sovereignty of their countries" is a legitimate and necessary task, does it not follow that such a "struggle," even in the form of war, would be legitimate and just on the part of the Soviet people in opposition to U.S. imperialism—that in a war with the U.S. they would be fighting a war of "national independence" and not an inter-imperialist war? This is especially the implication if it is kept in mind that, according to Enver Hoxha, they would be fighting against "curtailed sovereignty" and "grave neo-colonialist consequences" because of Soviet indebtedness to the U.S. bloc, that the U.S. imperialists have "forced" the Soviet Union to expand its military apparatus to keep up with the U.S. and that a war could well be imposed on the Soviet Union by the U.S. imperialists in order to collect unpaid debts. Even if the Albanian leaders curse the Soviet revisionists as "traitors" to the "sovereignty" of the Soviet Union, their line still serves Soviet social-imperialism in its preparation for world war—and of course would serve them in such a war as well—and leads away from a correct understanding of the nature of such a war, of the imperialist interests of both sides in such a war and of the task of converting such a war into a civil war in all the imperialist countries.

Overall, then, it can be seen that the Albanian leaders do not put forward a correct analysis of these life-and-death questions and that in particular they do not have a fundamentally correct understanding of the nature of revisionism in power in the Soviet Union, its role in the world today, the essential character of its relationship with its imperialist rivals and the tasks of the international proletariat and its allies in struggling against Soviet social-imperialism, U.S. imperialism and imperialism and reaction in general. And further, they have a fundamentally incorrect analysis of the sources and character of revisionism within socialist society, of the danger of capitalist restoration there and of the struggle against this.

It is in this latter sphere that the Albanian leaders direct the fiercest part of their opportunist attacks on Mao Tsetung Thought and Mao Tsetung's leadership of the Chinese revolution and within the international communist movement.

Because Mao recognized a partial and restricted role for certain sectors of capital, particularly among the national bourgeoisie, in carrying out the transition to socialism after victory in the new-democratic revolution, the Albanian leaders accuse him of advocating the establishment of a bourgeois-democratic regime in which capitalism would prevail and there would be no

advance to socialism. In fact, Mao led in bringing about the victory of the socialist sector over the capitalist sector in agriculture and industry and achieving the basic socialist transformation of ownership within seven years, by 1956.

After this great victory, Mao ever more deeply summed up that the contradictions within socialist society itself continually give rise to a new bourgeoisie and that in conditions where ownership is already (in the main) socialized this new bourgeoisie constitutes a far greater danger than the old capitalist elements and is the main target of the continuing revolution. Apparently unable or unwilling to recognize this, the Albanian leaders take a mechanical attitude toward the bourgeoisie, its main sources under socialism and the nature of the danger posed by this. Because of this and because, while dealing with the bourgeoisie as a class as the object of the proletarian dictatorship Mao sought in the conditions of China to unite with certain bourgeois-democratic personages and forces who were maintaining a patriotic stand and not opposing socialism, the Albanian leaders say that Mao conciliated with the bourgeoisie. In fact, he led the proletariat in China in exercising all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie—in controlling and transforming the superstructure and economic base in its class interests in opposition to those of the bourgeoisie—and in waging revolutionary struggle under this dictatorship to further strengthen socialism and carry forward the advance toward communism, reaching new heights for the international proletariat. (125)

Beyond that, Mao made the unprecedented analysis that, in the conditions where ownership is (in the main) socialized and where the party is both the leading political center of the socialist state and the main directing force of the economy—in which the state is the decisive sector—the contradiction between the party as the leading force and the working class and the masses under its leadership is a concentrated expression of the contradictions characterizing socialist society as a transition from the old society to fully communist, classless society. Therefore, Mao concluded, while the party must on the one hand continue to play its vanguard role, on the other hand the party itself, especially at its top levels, is also where the new bourgeoisie will assume its most concentrated expression, where its core and leading forces will be centered, among those who, as Mao described it, “take the capitalist road.” To defeat the attempts of these forces, and the reactionary social base they mobilize, to seize power from the proletariat and restore capitalism it is necessary, Mao summed up, to expose and wage struggle against the revisionist line and actions of these “capitalist roaders” and more than that to continually revolutionize the party itself as part of revolutionizing society as a whole by unleashing and developing the conscious activism of the masses and mobilizing them in ideological and political struggle in every sphere of society while directing the spearhead of that struggle against the revisionists in positions of authority. Because of this, the Albanian leaders claim that Mao denied and destroyed the proletarian character and

vanguard role of the party and “allowed” two lines within it. In fact these two lines exist independently of the will or “allowance” (or “disallowance”) of Mao or anyone else and Mao led in fighting for the victory of the proletarian over the bourgeois line in order to preserve and strengthen the proletarian character and vanguard role of the party in continuing the revolution.

Finally, Mao led the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary masses in China in the pathbreaking Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, a political uprising involving hundreds of millions of people, a genuine political revolution in socialist society itself, through which two revisionist headquarters—that led by Liu Shao-chi and then the one led by Lin Biao—were exposed and defeated, and more than that tremendous leaps forward were made in revolutionizing the economic base and the superstructure, including the party itself as well as the consciousness of millions and millions of people, inside and outside the party. Because of this the Albanian leaders (who once praised and proclaimed the Cultural Revolution along with Mao’s leadership in general) now say that the Cultural Revolution and Mao’s leadership in it really constituted nothing but chaos and palace intrigues and coup d’etats. In fact, real revolutions always involve a tremendous amount of chaos and in fact, as in all revolutions, the masses of Chinese people learned and accomplished a great deal more in the swirl and upheaval of the Cultural Revolution than they could in years or scores of years of “normal” and “stable” times; in fact the Cultural Revolution was a real class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat; in fact, while in the short run revisionism has triumphed in China it did so by defeating and reversing the Cultural Revolution and its accomplishments; and for all these reasons the Cultural Revolution remains an historical event of great significance, indicating a basic means for mobilizing the masses to combat revisionism and carry forward the socialist revolution. (127)

The basic problem of the Albanian leaders (whose attacks on Mao’s leadership in the socialist period are in many ways similar to those of the Soviet social-imperialists, and for that matter the Chinese revisionists) can be discerned in their view of socialism as expressed in Enver Hoxha’s *Imperialism and the Revolution*, where he says that socialism and communism are in essence “two phases of the one type, of the one socio-economic order, and which are distinguished from each other only by the degree of their development and maturity.” (*Ibid.*, pp.416-417.) What comes through is the notion that the socialist transition period to communism is not a tumultuous one, full of and conditioned by class contradictions and class struggle, but instead a process of uninterrupted advance. Unfortunately, however, it is a bitter but undeniable fact that this uninterrupted process has been “interrupted”—reversed—with the first great “interruption” coming in the Soviet Union and the second in China. From whence came this “interruption”?—that is the decisive question, and one the Albanian leaders seem unable to correctly answer. Therefore, with (128)

regard to the Soviet Union they act as if everything was proceeding smoothly under Stalin and then, after he died, Khrushchev and Co. suddenly arose and seized power, without any real social basis for this, being representatives only of foreign imperialism and/or the broken remnants of obsolete classes in the Soviet Union itself.

Though at times the Albanian leaders refer to the engendering of new bourgeois elements under socialism, they refuse to break with the erroneous analysis, made before them by Stalin, that after socialist ownership is (in the main) established there are no longer antagonistic classes within the socialist country, and therefore they do not draw correct conclusions even when they do acknowledge the engendering of these elements. Hence their references to "class struggle" in socialist society and even to "class struggle in the ranks of the party, as a reflection of the class struggle going on outside the party," are not based on a thoroughly materialist understanding of this question. That is why they also insist that "The party is not an arena of classes and the struggle between antagonistic classes, it is not a gathering of people with contradictory aims." (*Ibid.*, p. 400.) Not only is this statement obviously at variance with the experience of socialist society in general, and not only is it in fact eclectic to talk of class struggle in the party while at the same time denying the existence there of the antagonistic classes carrying out this struggle, but such a position is also strongly tinged with idealism, because the class struggle in the party tends to be reduced to simply one of ideas, certainly with no material basis in the party itself—specifically no antagonistic classes—and not really with a material basis in society as a whole, since there are not antagonistic *classes* there either nor the conditions giving rise to a new *bourgeois class*. Instead the enemy, inside and outside the party, is more or less treated as if it consists only of agents of hostile foreign powers, some remnants of old exploiting classes and at most some newly engendered bourgeois elements, but definitely not a bourgeois class, and most of all not such a class within the party. (129)

In sum, the Albanian leaders' analysis does not grasp the social basis for the antagonistic class struggle under socialism, including in the party, and for opportunist influences to exert themselves even on people who are not themselves part of the bourgeoisie (old or new). The logic of their position leads to underestimating the danger of capitalist restoration, especially in its manifestation within the party, an underestimation of the importance of mobilizing mass struggle to combat this danger, and on the other hand a tendency to treat all serious conflicts of ideas, especially within the party, as contradictions between the people and the enemy, antagonistic contradictions, which can only be resolved by antagonistic means. (130)

And with regard to events in China, the Albanian leaders' attempts at analysis assume an even more clearly absurd form: *there never really was socialism there*, they claim, hence no real reversal of socialism—which is as powerfully refuted by the facts as is their assertion that Mao led revolutionary warfare in China (131)

"without perspective."

The fact is that socialism does not mean the abolition of classes or even of antagonistic classes—only with the achievement of communism will that be the case, which is the decisive reason why it is, Hoxha notwithstanding, a qualitatively different society than socialism. What is the Soviet revisionist ruling group, if not a bourgeois class antagonistic to the proletariat, and where did it come from if not precisely within socialist society, on the basis of the contradictions existing there and characterizing it as a transition to but something qualitatively different than communism, containing significant features left over from the old society—"birth marks" as Marx called them? (132)

More, even before they had seized power throughout society, while the Soviet Union was still socialist, did not these revisionists exercise authority, power, in significant parts of society, in both the superstructure and the economic base? Isn't it the case that the basis for them to do so was not simply the existence of foreign imperialists and reactionaries but that in the USSR itself such things as the mental/manual, worker/peasant, city/countryside contradictions, the continuing existence of commodity production and the continuing if not regulating role of the law of value, the persistence of "bourgeois right," etc. were objective facts and had real consequences, including in their reflection in the political and ideological superstructure, along with the persistence of bourgeois ideas in general? (133)

Where these revisionists did exercise power, did they not implement, to a significant degree, a revisionist line, weren't they in fact "bourgeois elements sucking the blood of the workers" (as Mao said about their counterparts in China), even before revisionism triumphed throughout society? Were they not more than a mere handful but in fact a significant stratum of leading party members following the revisionist line, did they not seek each other out, form factions, argue for and pursue lines and policies opposed to socialism and favoring capitalist restoration—and was not all this happening in one form or another throughout the period of Stalin's leadership, despite the purges he carried out? For all these reasons, were not these renegades more than mere traitors but in fact a bourgeoisie, with their core and commanders "right in the Communist Party," at its top levels, as Mao said? Further, did they not have a significant social base, inside the party, especially among middle level cadre whose bureaucratic tendencies and privileges they defended, as well as outside the party? Really, isn't it a fact not only that all this happened but that in a fundamental sense such things were and will be inevitable under socialism, until the material and ideological conditions for communism have been achieved, throughout the world? (134)

Though Stalin combatted and purged a number of people of this type, the struggle against revisionism and the bourgeoisie in the party was hindered and not helped by the fact that, because the old exploiting classes had been expropriated and (he said) abolished, Stalin had erroneously concluded by the last part of the (135)

1930s that antagonistic classes no longer existed in the Soviet Union, that it consisted only of workers, peasants and intellectuals who "live and work in friendly collaboration" and that the dictatorship of the proletariat was then necessary only because of foreign imperialist encirclement and the infiltration of its agents. (See "Report to the Eighteenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B) on the Work of the Central Committee", March 10, 1939, *Problems of Leninism*, pp. 912, 927-35, Peking 1976 English edition.) Such mistakes contributed significantly to the fact that the masses were not mobilized in mass struggle to combat revisionist tendencies and forces nor sufficiently trained theoretically and ideologically to recognize and oppose revisionism, and on the other hand they contributed to a tendency to mix up contradictions among the people with those between the people and the enemy, at times putting those who merely made errors or followed an erroneous line in the same category as die-hard enemies, even agents of foreign imperialism. This experience and the basis for these mistakes must be summed up and similar errors combatted, rather than repeating them and attacking Mao Tsetung's crucial contributions in this sphere.

As for the assertion of the Albanian leaders that "the party is not an arena of classes and the struggle between antagonistic classes," what were the bourgeois forces led by Khrushchev and others like him but a class antagonistic to the proletariat and what were they doing in the party but waging antagonistic struggle against the proletariat over a long time? And as for the question of two lines and two-line struggle in the party, isn't it the case, for example, that Lenin and Stalin not only "allowed" Trotsky and others to remain in the party long after they had shown strong opportunist tendencies, but that they also led an extensive struggle, inside and outside the party, against the line of Trotsky, Bukharin and others, especially in the first part of the 1920s, including the publication and circulation of, and open debate around, the positions of the opposing sides? Didn't this struggle go on for a number of years and isn't it true that it was only after their opportunist lines were thoroughly defeated that these renegades were driven from the party, and then because they refused to accept defeat and continued to fight for counter-revolutionary positions? What is regrettable is not that such two-line struggle was carried out during that period, but that similar struggles, with the same degree of depth and sweep, were not later conducted in the Soviet Union, inside and outside the party.

It is precisely by applying materialist dialectics to sum up the experience, positive and negative, of the Soviet Union, as well as in China itself and other socialist countries, that Mao Tsetung made his great contributions in analyzing the existence—and more than that the centrality—of antagonistic class contradictions and class struggle in socialist society (even after ownership is in the main socialized) and developing the basic line of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat as the means for resolving these contradictions in the interests of the pro-

letariat and the advance to communism. Again, to repudiate this (and to retreat to and pose in opposition to it errors of the past) or to wish or pretend that the process of proletarian revolution and the advance to communism is or can be a simpler, more straight-line process if only one does not "allow" real contradictions to exist and exert their influence—all this cannot help but can only greatly harm the cause of the international proletariat, in which Mao Tsetung stands out as a far-sighted and courageous leader.

For all these reasons, the question of Mao Tsetung is a crucial dividing line within the international communist movement. The principle involved is nothing less than whether or not to uphold and build upon decisive contributions to and developments of the proletarian revolution and the science of Marxism-Leninism made by Mao Tsetung—including in the areas of the anti-imperialist democratic revolution leading to socialism, people's war and military strategy generally, philosophy (where he made important contributions on the analysis of contradiction, which is the essence of dialectics, and on the theory of knowledge and its links with practice and the mass line), revolutionizing the superstructure and continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, as well as in the struggle against revisionism on the practical and theoretical fronts—and therefore it is nothing less than the question of whether or not to uphold Marxism-Leninism itself. Mao's theoretical and practical leadership represent a quantitative and qualitative development of Marxism-Leninism on many fronts and the theoretical concentration of the historical experience of the proletarian revolution over the last several decades. We are still living in the era of Leninism, of imperialism and the proletarian revolution; at the same time we affirm that Mao Tsetung Thought is a new stage in the development of Marxism-Leninism. Without upholding and building on Mao's contributions it is not possible to defeat revisionism, imperialism and reaction in general.

The problem of the extensive revisionist influences within the working class and the oppressed peoples' movement in many countries has not only been heightened by the revisionist takeover in China and subsequent developments. More fundamentally it has both historical and present-day roots: in the international communist movement; in the growth over a period of time of revisionist forces and influences within the Soviet Union—despite Stalin's efforts to suppress certain counter-revolutionaries—and then the triumph of revisionism there with the rise to power of the Khrushchev clique, the restoration of capitalism in the USSR and its emergence as a social-imperialist superpower; and in the objective situation in the imperialist countries in particular, as well as some others, over the past several decades.

As the Chinese Communist Party wrote in 1963, when it was a genuine communist party, in its polemics against the Soviet revisionists, with regard to the history of the international communist (and national liberation) movement there are "many experiences and many lessons. There are experiences which people

should praise and there are experiences which make people grieve. Communists and revolutionaries in all countries should ponder and seriously study these experiences of success and failure, so as to draw correct conclusions and useful lessons from them." (25-point Letter, "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement," point 12.) Today, in light of further momentous experiences, positive and negative, since that time and with the present situation and the looming possibilities, both great dangers and great opportunities, clearly in mind, this orientation assumes all the more profound significance, and the need to dare to ponder and analyze more deeply and penetratingly in order to act more boldly and resolutely is all the more decisive.

Before modern revisionism revealed itself openly in the USSR and various other countries, there already existed within the international communist movement different erroneous conceptions which facilitated its development.

While recognizing the undeniable contributions made by the Third International to the unity of the international proletariat, to the founding of communist parties and to their struggles; and while recognizing the tremendous role played by the October Revolution, which initiated the epoch of proletarian revolutions and opened the way for the construction of socialism in the USSR, communists must endeavor to critically sum up these experiences, making it possible to explain in the light of Marxism-Leninism the seizure of power by the bourgeoisie in that country and in other socialist nations, and also making it possible to learn from the errors and deviations which were committed and to evaluate to what extent they had bearing on the degeneration into opportunism of the majority of the international communist movement. In the face of the demoralization caused by these facts among broad sectors of the masses, and given that the bourgeois sectors are taking advantage of these facts, claiming that they prove the "failure" of Marxism, it falls on us communists to show that it is not scientific socialism which has failed, and that, on the contrary, scientific socialism makes it possible for us to grasp what objective and subjective factors gave rise to these events. Among other things, we must investigate and struggle over the experiences of the Third International and the reasons which led to its self-dissolution; the way in which the relationship between the revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie and imperialism and the policy of forming an anti-fascist united front was handled during the last world war, and also the very reasoning behind this policy; the origin of the revisionist tendencies, such as Browderism, which spread faith in the idea that it would be possible to establish a lasting peace and improve the living conditions of the masses on the basis of agreements between the USSR and the imperialist powers who were fighting against the fascist states, and of the tendencies to conciliation which these gave rise to; the deep roots that led to the restoration of capitalism in the USSR and other socialist countries, paying particular attention to the way in which the development of the class struggle was handled and the question of how

the need to consistently apply the dictatorship of the proletariat was treated in those countries, to the handling of the relationship between politics and ideology, between politics and economic and technical questions, the question of the mass line, the question of the correct handling of contradictions among the people and with the enemy on the basis of mobilizing the masses, the relationship of centralism and democracy within the party and the relationship of the party to the masses. By throwing light on these questions, while staying clear of the slander of the Trotskyites and other enemies of the revolution, we will be able to draw important lessons for the development of the revolution.

In sum, in order to achieve the unity of the Marxist-Leninists, it is essential to deepen the study so as to make an evaluation of the theoretical and practical activity of the communists during the period of the Third International, the Second World War and especially the causes of the coming to power of the revisionists in the countries in which the proletariat held power, particularly in the USSR and in China.

One of the negative consequences of the experience of (141) the international communist movement and the influence of the objective situation is that there are today in many countries long-established revisionist parties which, even where they are not in power, are an especially formidable enemy of the revolution. This makes the task of exposing and defeating these revisionist parties one of special importance.

Here it is necessary to note some specific aspects of (142) such parties, in particular those that are generally pro-Soviet revisionist, which distinguish them to a certain degree from the revisionist parties in the Second International that Lenin exposed and combatted, especially when they revealed their full opportunist features in adopting a social-chauvinist "defend the (imperialist) fatherland" stand during World War 1. Lenin called these forces "social-imperialist," socialist in name, imperialist in deed, but by this he meant that they acted as agents of the imperialist bourgeoisie within the workers' movement and played a key role in opposing and even suppressing the development of the class-conscious revolutionary movement of the proletariat. Since then, however, there have been significant changes. Today, regardless of the extent to which they may pose as some kind of reformist "opposition" and in some cases advertise their "socialist tradition," the openly social-democratic descendants of the Second International are clearly linked to and serve the interests of the U.S. bloc imperialists, at times even heading up the bourgeois parliamentary governments of countries in this bloc. On the other hand, social-imperialism now has an additional dimension—the Soviet social-imperialist state. Thus, the pro-Soviet revisionist parties (speaking specifically of those not in power), while they share many features with traditional social-democrats—especially the essential feature of seeking to prevent proletarian revolution and preserve capitalism but also the fact that they represent a privileged stratum above the masses of workers, that they frequently have union positions, seats in parliament, positions in the state bureaucracy, etc.—at the same time they generally do not seek merely to preserve

the reactionary order in its old form but to bring about a reorganization of it into a form of state capitalism in which they play a major or if possible a dominant role in alliance with some sections of the traditional ruling class.

This they hold up as the road to "socialism," pointing to the Soviet Union as a "great socialist power" and "natural ally" of this process in their own countries. And in fact an important part of realizing their own bourgeois aspirations is to move these countries into or toward the "orbit" of the Soviet social-imperialists. (143)

Along with the backing of this "great socialist power," these pro-Soviet revisionist parties often do have a significant mass following, because their politics are clearly not revolutionary but do have a "socialist" label, which generally makes them appealing to sections of the masses, including of the working class, where the objective and subjective conditions for revolution have not developed or fully ripened, and because, owing to their positions in the trade unions, the bureaucracies, etc., they are able to "deliver the goods" to a certain extent to sections of the masses. Their main social base is among more privileged workers and sections of the petty bourgeoisie but also includes some backward workers even among the more exploited and oppressed sections of the working class. This mass following, plus the fact that the ever growing parasitism of imperialism produces the necessity for the state to play an increasing role in the capitalist economy, and combined with the weight of the Soviet Union behind these revisionists, provides a basis for them to seriously pursue the strategy described here. And it is crucial to grasp that theirs is a conscious worked out policy and not merely a question of deviations or an erroneous view of how to achieve socialism. (144)

One of the essential aspects of this strategy is the attempt to reconcile or "merge" the "national interests" of their countries and of the Soviet Union. While in colonial and dependent countries such parties seek to replace one form of imperialist domination with another in which they can act as major comprador capitalists, especially through the state, in the imperialist countries they are genuine patriots—that is, defenders of the imperialism of their countries—seeking only to alter the form of the imperialist state and to move it from one imperialist bloc into or toward another. Thus, particularly in the latter countries, their stance of combining allegiance to the nation with support for the Soviet social-imperialists is not simply an attempt to appeal to the philistine chauvinism of their social base—a philistinism and chauvinism they actively promote—but represents these revisionists' actual highest aspirations and in particular their efforts to unite with sections of the bourgeoisie on the basis that their common interests are best served by moving toward accommodation with the Soviet bloc. (145)

All this, of course, involves sharp contradictions. There are sections of the bourgeoisie which the revisionists must seek to oust and replace, and in general there is the objective fact that the bourgeoisie on the whole in countries of the U.S. bloc has its interests (146)

strongly interwoven with those of the U.S. imperialists and the bloc overall. It is especially in this light that the relation of these revisionist parties to the mass movements in their countries should be viewed. At times they will mobilize the masses, even on occasion in militant activity—though always under their tight control. This is only in part to dissipate the masses' energy in narrow reformist channels and is generally done as a means of increasing the strength of the revisionist parties in bargaining with sections of the bourgeoisie in pursuit of their overall strategy. And, in pursuit of this overall strategy, including attempts to establish ties and footholds among the reactionary armed forces, they not only restrain the initiative and struggle of the masses but will at crucial points also join in or play their own special role in suppressing the masses, including by bloody means.

It is also true that these parties themselves do at different times and to varying degrees assume a posture in opposition to Soviet social-imperialism, or certain policies and actions it carries out. This is on the one hand because the leaders of these revisionist parties do after all have their own bourgeois aspirations, including the bourgeois nationalist expression of this, and on the other hand because there is, even among their social base, considerable bad feeling about the Soviet Union, owing both to the propaganda of the bourgeoisie (or the majority of it) and to the fact that after all the crimes of the Soviet social-imperialists are recognized even spontaneously, if not scientifically understood, by large sections of the people, requiring these revisionist parties to feign differences with the Soviet Union even where they do not have them. (147)

It is with all this in mind that the phenomenon of "Eurocommunism" must be assessed. This trend among revisionist parties historically associated with the Soviet Union but now declaring significant differences with it, strongly opposing certain of its actions, even supporting some measures and institutions of the country and the U.S. bloc aimed against the Soviet Union—this "Eurocommunist" tendency essentially represents a particular expression of the contradictions involved in carrying out the general kind of strategy we have discussed. Again, while this trend does reflect real differences between the leaders of these parties and the Soviet social-imperialists, it also involves some pretense of such differences and the deliberate exaggeration of real differences to both appeal to their mass base and most fundamentally to seek alliance and better bargain with sections of the bourgeoisie. The point is not that all this is simply a clever conspiracy by the Soviet social-imperialists and the local revisionists but precisely that there are real, often sharp contradictions involved, which assume different forms and expressions in different countries and different conditions at different times and exert contradictory pulls on the revisionist parties themselves. (148)

The U.S. imperialists and their allies are not, however, simply paranoid in expressing great concern that these revisionist parties—not only those more staunchly pro-Soviet but also those who put more distance between themselves and the Soviet Union and take stands in op- (149)

position to it, including the "Eurocommunist" trend—will in the final analysis pursue their aims through allegiance to the Soviet and not the U.S.-led bloc. The efforts of the U.S. imperialists and at least major sections of the bourgeoisie in these countries to combat these parties will overall intensify as the need grows to tighten up their bloc in preparation for world war, and where they are able to exert considerable pressure this will have sharp repercussions within these parties. At the same time the Soviet social-imperialists will increase their own pressure on these parties.

In such circumstances and looking to future developments, the real and potentially explosive conflicts within and between these various revisionist parties are bound to heighten, especially in relation to the sharpening contradictions between rival imperialist interests. This will provide the genuine Marxist-Leninists with some further "openings" to expose and combat these revisionists. But this can only be done by laying bare the real, bourgeois nature of these parties and of the Soviet ruling class. The "socialist" cover of the Soviet imperialists has on the one hand strengthened the hold of their revisionist supporters over some sections of the masses in different countries, and on the other hand it has strengthened anti-communism among other sections of the masses, because they confuse the Soviet Union and its rulers with genuine socialism and Marxism-Leninism, a confusion that is also promoted by the openly anti-communist imperialists and reactionaries to serve their own ends. All this must be vigorously opposed by propagating real communist principles, summing up among the masses the experience of socialist revolution and capitalist restoration, where this has occurred, carrying out living exposure of the common essential features of the imperialists and reactionaries of all types while specifically ripping off the "socialist" mask of the revisionists, and in an overall way, through all forms of work, imbuing the masses with an understanding of the need for and determination to fight for the revolutionary overthrow of the ruling class in the particular country as part of the overall struggle of the international proletariat and its allies against both imperialist blocs and the imperialist system and reaction in general. In the period ahead both the necessity and possibility for this will assume even greater proportions.

As Lenin said, the fight against imperialism is a sham and a humbug unless it is linked with the fight against opportunism. And as graphically shown by Lenin's uncompromising struggle against Kautsky, the fight against opportunism must include the fight against those who conciliate with and cover for open, already exposed opportunism. This is no less true or crucial today than it was in Lenin's time.

One of the most important aspects of the overall struggle against opportunism and imperialism today is the theoretical struggle. The openly anti-communist enemies of the revolution have seized on the major setbacks and reversals in the socialist revolution in the past few years and decades as vital ammunition in their overall attack on Marxism-Leninism. Here, they proclaim, is the "final proof" that Marxism-Leninism

is not a valid theory, that it cannot explain the world, that it fails to take into account what they claim are certain inexorable tendencies in society and people and that it is incapable of guiding the revolutionary transformation of them. The opportunists of various kinds, whether or not they acknowledge that there have been such reversals and setbacks—and whether or not they support this or that revisionist ruling class—also seize on the changes in these societies as key elements in their promotion, in one form or another, of collaboration with imperialism and the distortion of Marxism-Leninism.

All this makes the task of upholding and propagating Marxism-Leninism and its scientific, dialectical materialist method of great importance and urgency today. In opposition to its enemies, open and disguised, it must be shown that Marxism-Leninism is indeed the only thoroughly scientific outlook and that it not only provides the basis for understanding, and for changing, the world in general but specifically for correctly summing up such reversals and setbacks, drawing the appropriate lessons and applying them to accelerate the revolutionary process throughout the world. Of course, as a science, Marxism-Leninism must not only be seriously studied but systematically applied and developed further, but again this can only be done by upholding its basic principles and the profound truths they reveal, in opposition to open reactionaries and to opportunists who proclaim allegiance to Marxism-Leninism only to pervert it and cut the revolutionary heart out of it.

In the last few years within the international communist movement there has been an ongoing process of struggle and re-alignment among those who stand or at least claim to stand in opposition to opportunism, especially Soviet and Chinese revisionism. This has included the phenomenon of splits within a number of groups. Some forces have embarked on a path of retreat, under the influence of the line of the Albanian Party of Labor (and/or others). Some other forces are presently floundering in eclecticism and agnosticism, unable or unwilling to take a firm position on any cardinal question posing itself today or to draw clear lines of demarcation between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism, declaring that everything must be discussed but nothing—at least nothing of importance—can be decided or is decided, including the basic lessons and principles that can already be summed up and determined and must serve as a guide for discussion, decision—and action. But, on the other hand, a number of forces have risen to the challenge of upholding Marxist-Leninist principles and deepening the struggle against revisionism and other forms of opportunism within the international communist movement.

The forging, strengthening and developing of unity among the genuine Marxist-Leninists, in opposition to revisionism and opportunism of all forms, is of critical and urgent importance at this time in order to be able in the period ahead to rally the greatest force of revolutionary communists on a world scale, to unite the revolutionary and progressive forces more broadly against imperialism and reaction and in general in

order to build the revolutionary movement with the proletariat at the head and carry it through to victory. The fact that these forces now constitute a minority within the international movement, even among those who declare themselves in opposition to revisionism, stresses not the impotence of the genuine Marxist-Leninists, but instead the importance of uniting them firmly, in theory and practice, on a revolutionary basis—founded in a correct analysis of the objective situation and the developments and tendencies within the subjective factor, and thereby of the tasks of the genuine Marxist-Leninists—to rise to the great challenges and opportunities before them.

The situation of these forces today is in many ways (156) analogous to that faced by the genuine Marxists and proletarian internationalists prior to and at the outbreak of World War 1. The problems—and the possibilities—before the Marxist-Leninists today are no less significant than they were then. In fact, despite real and serious setbacks in the loss of socialist countries, the ob-

jective basis for proletarian revolution and the potential for the conscious forces to act to accelerate it are much greater in the world today than at the advent of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution: determined by its inherent contradictions and propelled by the struggles they give rise to, the motion of the imperialist system toward its ultimate extinction and replacement by communism worldwide has continued, and there are both positive and negative experiences which provide a great store of knowledge for the international proletariat in its revolutionary struggle. What is urgently demanded of the Marxist-Leninists is to do everything possible to bring the subjective factor into correspondence with the development of the objective situation and its revolutionary prospects—to unite firmly around basic principles and tasks, sum up deeply and strike penetratingly at the roots of revisionism in the international communist movement and wage a fierce struggle for the victory of Marxism-Leninism over opportunism in theory and practice—through determined struggle.

III. The Basic Tasks of the Marxist-Leninists

First, in order to build the unity of Marxist-Leninists (157) around the correct line, along with and in part as a summation of what has already been discussed, certain basic laws and lessons of the class struggle, historically and internationally, must be upheld and acted upon.

1.) There must be a Marxist-Leninist party as the proletarian vanguard in each country, based on Marxist-Leninist theory and the Marxist-Leninist method and style of work. Where such a party does not presently exist, it must be the aim of the Marxist-Leninists to establish it, and international support and assistance must be given in this, at least on the level of exchanges of experience and discussion of basic principles. Especially given the present situation and its implications, the establishment of such a party constitutes the main and immediate task of the Marxist-Leninists in countries where it has not yet been formed. This must be done by uniting those who can be united, be their number relatively large or small, on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist line and program, but it must also be carried out in connection with actively engaging in revolutionary work among the proletariat and the popular masses generally. Even after the party is formed, there will still be the ongoing task for the party of uniting with other Marxist-Leninists. But at the same time, the party must continue to play its vanguard role, based on its line and program, and must approach unity with others on the basis that ideological and political line is decisive and the determinant of organizational unity. And in general, where the party exists it must be continuously built, based on the correct ideological and political line, with deepening ties among the working class and oppressed masses, first and foremost the class-conscious workers. (158)

The leading role of the party in the revolution must be established in practice, through its ability to grasp and apply the correct line. In relation to the working class and the broad masses the party must correctly apply the mass line, and within its own ranks it must practice centralism founded on democracy, vigorously conduct ideological struggle and criticism and self-criticism and be marked by ruthless struggle against revisionism and all forms of opportunism. It must encourage and scien-

tifically concentrate the criticisms and political opinions and demands of the class-conscious workers and broader masses outside the party and ceaselessly raise their political consciousness and train them in the outlook, method and style of Marxism-Leninism. In all this, as in everything, the party must base itself on and imbue both its own members and those outside the party with an understanding of the whole world situation and struggle and historical and international experience.

Those who join the party should be fearless in the face (160) of the enemy and dedicated in the cause of the proletariat. They should expect and be prepared for persecution, imprisonment and murder at the hands of the enemy, and not a soft job, a comfortable position and a career. But beyond that, they must be guided by the largeness of mind characteristic of the proletariat, study energetically and actively apply the science of Marxism-Leninism and be prepared to go against any tide that is opposed to Marxism-Leninism, be vanguard fighters among the masses and be ready to take up any post, fulfill any task that serves the revolution, not only in the particular country but internationally. The party must be made up of people whose lives are devoted to the revolutionary struggle of the international proletariat and the achievement of its historic mission: worldwide communism.

The party must be a vigorous vanguard organization, (161) an active political force among the working class and broad masses, and must apply Marxism-Leninism in a living way. At the same time it must have revolutionary sweep and guard against and combat empiricism and narrow practicalism and must devote consistent and systematic effort to raise the theoretical level of party members and the party overall and to train ever broader ranks of the working class and popular masses in Marxist-Leninist theory and its application.

In order to achieve the revolutionary goal the party (162) must base itself on a scientific class analysis of the forces in society, determine the target and aims of the revolution at the given stage and strive to unite the allies of the proletariat and win over or neutralize vacillating middle forces, while consistently maintaining the initiative and independence of the party, bringing to the forefront the

revolutionary outlook and interests of the proletariat, establishing its leadership in the struggle and carrying it through on that basis. Beyond that, the party must not only fight for leadership in the struggle, based on a correct line, but it must always keep in mind and work to bring about the conditions that will ultimately enable the party itself to be superseded—when, finally, classes and the social distinctions and ideological conditions giving rise to them have been abolished and the masses have been drawn into the administration of society in every sphere. This is especially important for the vanguard party of the proletariat where it is in power, but this basic approach must be a guiding principle of the party even before power has been won.

2.) The revolutionary transformation of society is impossible without the armed overthrow of the reactionary state power. While taking into account and making a concrete analysis of the nature and specific conditions in different countries, communists everywhere must base themselves on and apply the fundamental principle, expressed in concentrated form by Mao Tsetung, that "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries." ("Problems of War and Strategy," *Selected Military Writings*, p. 269, Peking English edition.) (163)

Even where the correct analysis of the objective and subjective factors indicates that it is not possible to wage revolutionary warfare or to make armed struggle the main form of the struggle in a given country for a given period, communists must continue to conduct all their work and to use whatever forms of struggle are appropriate in such a way as to prepare for and build up to the armed struggle for the seizure of power. During such times as well, and not only when armed struggle is the main form, they must study the laws of warfare, especially revolutionary warfare, sum up experience and study the concrete conditions with the goal of mass armed struggle in mind. They must master all forms of struggle and learn how to apply correct tactics in different circumstances and be able to quickly and effectively substitute one form of struggle or tactic for another when conditions change, without ever compromising basic principle or being diverted from the strategic objective of armed revolution. (164)

Further, the armed struggle for power, though it will assume different forms and pass through different stages depending on the different conditions in the various countries, must in all cases involve, mobilize and rely on the broad masses under the leadership of the proletariat and its party. The party must undertake to lead in creating and directing the armed forces of the popular masses themselves as the principal factor in waging revolutionary warfare—and also in conducting political work within the reactionary armed forces to disintegrate them and to win over as many of their soldiers as possible during the course of the revolutionary struggle—and guide the armed struggle of the masses to final victory. And the party must lead in really and ever more thoroughly developing the revolutionary war as a war of the masses, in which they are trained ideologically and politically and (165)

on this basis organizationally and prepared to exercise political power when it is won through the mass armed struggle.

3.) The establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the aim of the Marxist-Leninist party in leading the overthrow of the reactionary state power. Although this proletarian dictatorship will be achieved as the outcome of struggle proceeding through different stages and forms and although it will involve different forms of class alliances in different countries, its establishment is in all cases the objective of the Marxist-Leninist party. (166)

However, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not an end in itself but represents the necessary transition to communism. During the entire period of this transition, even after socialist ownership has (in the main) been established, throughout the whole stage of socialism, until the world-wide victory of communism, there are still the material and ideological conditions, especially relating to "bourgeois right" and social inequalities in general left over from the old society, that constantly give rise to a new bourgeoisie in socialist society itself, there remain classes and class struggle and there are both contradictions among the people and between the people and the enemy—most centrally between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—and the danger of capitalist restoration remains. Thus, while socialist economic construction is very important, the key link and decisive task for the proletariat during this transition period is revolution—the class struggle against the bourgeoisie and other reactionary forces within the socialist countries and internationally against imperialism, reaction and all exploiting classes. (167)

The proletarian party must continue to play its vanguard role in each country in the revolutionary advance to communism, but at the same time under socialism the party is where the newly engendered bourgeoisie will be centered and pose the greatest danger to this revolutionary advance. The Marxist-Leninists must resolutely fight to safeguard and strengthen the proletarian-revolutionary character and vanguard role of the party, and in doing so they must act on the understanding of the objective law that in socialist society the party is not only an arena of class struggle but an arena where that struggle takes a concentrated form, between the two lines of Marxism and opportunism and the two roads of socialism and capitalism—and repeatedly between proletarian and bourgeois headquarters that are formed in the party. The party itself must be continuously revolutionized as a crucial part of revolutionizing all of society. As Mao Tsetung summed up, these contradictions can only be resolved by carrying out the line of continuing the revolution during the dictatorship of the proletariat and by mobilizing, educating and relying on the masses, inside and outside the party, to carry this revolution forward. (168)

4.) The Marxist-Leninist party must firmly uphold and educate and concretely train its own members and the proletariat and broad masses in proletarian internationalism—in fighting for proletarian revolution in the (169)

particular country and supporting that same struggle in all countries; in supporting all struggles throughout the world that objectively fight against and weaken imperialism and reaction, while also supporting the proletarian revolutionary forces within those struggles and their efforts to win leadership of the popular mass movements and guide them toward the final goal of socialism and ultimately communism throughout the world. This is based on the understanding that the proletariat is one class with one revolutionary interest and historic mission worldwide and that the overthrow and final defeat and elimination of the bourgeoisie and all exploiting classes and the final abolition of class distinctions is a worldwide struggle and can only be won through the unity in revolutionary struggle of the international proletariat.

Points of particular importance in this regard, especially in today's situation, include the following: (170)

The essential content of the international movement is the struggle for proletarian revolution, through whatever necessary forms and stages, in all countries and the mutual support and assistance between the different detachments of this same struggle, and along with this there is a great strategic importance to the revolutionary alliance of the workers and proletarian-socialist revolution in the advanced countries on the one hand with the national liberation struggles, the anti-imperialist democratic revolution (leading then to the socialist stage) in the colonial (including neo-colonial) and dependent countries under imperialist domination on the other. (171)

The proletariat in power in particular must view and develop the countries it rules as base areas for the world revolution and must give unstinting support to the revolutionary struggles of the working class and oppressed peoples and nations throughout the world and must never place national considerations above the interests of the international proletariat and the worldwide revolution. (172)

U.S. imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and all the ruling classes in the rival imperialist blocs, and imperialism and reaction in general, are the enemies of the international proletariat. The international proletariat and its allies must deal with the increasing danger of world war between the rival imperialist blocs by intensifying their revolutionary struggles, striving to prevent world war through revolution or, if that does not prove possible, to turn that war into revolutionary war—civil war in the imperialist countries and revolutionary warfare against foreign imperialism and domestic enemies in the colonial and dependent countries—directed immediately against the reactionary class forces in each country that must be overthrown in order to advance toward socialism but always carried out as part of and in unity with the overall world struggle against imperialism and reaction in general. (173)

There is an urgent need to build the unity of the international communist movement, ideologically, politically and organizationally, on the basis of adherence to and waging the struggle for the correct line and Marxist-Leninist principles. (174)

Imperialist Countries

In the imperialist countries the Marxist-Leninists must pay particular attention to some specific conditions and questions affecting their work and the development of a proletarian revolutionary movement. Some of the more important of these are the following. (175)

1.) It is a critical necessity to recognize and consciously resist the corrosion of several decades of relative stability that has generally characterized these countries and the conditions of the working class there over that period despite the existence at times of important mass movements and even mass upheavals. During that period there has not only continued to be the influence of the labor aristocracy but also in some of these countries extensive (though not permanent) bourgeoisification of significant sections of the working class, including sections of the basic industrial proletariat. (176)

Especially in this light, it is very important to combat the tendency and resist the pull to attempt to become a "mass party" before conditions allow it and at the expense of revolutionary principle. In building the party emphasis must at all times be placed on quality not quantity. The important thing is to bring forward the advanced, revolutionary-minded workers at any time and to train them both theoretically and in concrete struggle as Marxist-Leninist leaders of the proletariat. At the same time of course it is also very important to support the outbreaks of protest and rebellion of the masses, to actively work in and strive to give leadership, including tactical but most of all political leadership, to significant struggles they wage or can be organized to wage, and to influence the masses as broadly as possible in a revolutionary way. Here a principle stressed by the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Mao Tsetung in polemicizing against the Soviet revisionists is of great relevance—the proletariat party "should concentrate on the painstaking work of accumulating revolutionary strength, so that it will be ready to seize victory when the conditions for revolution are ripe or to strike powerful blows at the imperialists and the reactionaries when they launch surprise attacks and armed assaults." (25-Point Letter, "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement," point 11.) The party must take advantage of every possibility to carry out legal work (including parliamentary work where possible and advantageous) but always on the basis of and never at the expense of revolutionary principle and building the revolutionary movement. And it must also carry out and put strategic emphasis on illegal work and continually strengthen its ability to carry it out, for otherwise it will not be able to lead the revolution to victory even if the opportunity arises and it will actually facilitate the enemy's attempts to crush the revolutionary movement. (177)

2.) Closely linked with the above principles and lend- (178)

ing them even greater immediate importance is the need to recognize and prepare for the deepening of the present crisis and developments toward world war and the prospects connected with this, especially the possibility of sudden and dramatic changes in the objective situation and the mood and sentiments of the masses, within the imperialist countries themselves as well as others. This emphasizes all the more the need for the Marxist-Leninists to consistently and actively prepare their own ranks and the proletariat and broad masses for revolution, and the importance in particular of determined and sustained struggle against economic influences and of exposing bourgeois democracy and combatting bourgeois-democratic illusions.

In all this the importance of revolutionary agitation (179) and propaganda cannot be overestimated. This means not only the propagation of Marxist-Leninist theory and the basic principles of the party's line and its program but more than that the kind of exposure called for by Lenin. As he insisted:

"Working-class consciousness cannot be genuinely political consciousness unless the workers are trained to respond to *all cases, without exception*, of tyranny oppression, violence and abuse, no matter *what class* is affected. Moreover, to respond from a Social-Democratic [communist], and not from any other point of view. The consciousness of the masses of the workers cannot be genuine class consciousness, unless the workers learn to observe from concrete, and above all from topical (current), political facts and events, *every* other social class and *all* the manifestations of the intellectual, ethical and political life of these classes; unless they learn to apply in practice the materialist analysis and the materialist estimate of *all* aspects of the life and activity of *all* classes, strata and groups of the population." (*What Is To Be Done?*, p. 86, Peking 1975 English edition.)

As Lenin further pointed out, revolutionary propaganda (180) and agitation, and in particular exposure of this sort, is crucial in unleashing as well as giving leadership to mass struggles. And, while economic struggles of the workers against the capitalists, especially militant struggles that actually involve masses of workers in determined battle, are one element that can contribute to the development of a revolutionary working class movement, even where such struggles involve the fight against the government they are not the highest form of the working class movement, nor its most important form, in building up to the struggle for political power. Political struggles, over the major political and social questions, over "affairs of state" as Lenin called it, especially political struggles waged in a revolutionary way—challenging the established order and its rules, regulations, laws and conventions—are far more important for the proletariat and the development of a proletarian revolutionary movement. Special attention and effort must be devoted to promoting and leading struggles of this kind, in particular to activating the advanced workers as a class-conscious force in such struggles, in relation to all major events in society. This will in turn facilitate

the mobilizing of broader ranks of the working class itself and other strata of the masses in such struggles and will exert a tremendous, revolutionizing influence on them.

It is also very important to do work in relation to (181) political struggles that develop first among non-proletarian strata or do not take form, at first at least, as movements of the working class itself. Such struggles, including those based among oppressed nationalities, immigrants, youth, women and others, often involve a significant number of workers, or even where that is not the case at the start they often exert significant influence on many workers. The party must not only assist and strive to influence and give leadership to such struggles but as an important part of this, and of carrying out its overall tasks, it must show how only its program, and the socialist revolution as the goal to which that program points, can resolve the particular problems faced by these different strata and social forces. At the same time it must strive to instill in them the revolutionary outlook of the proletariat and to develop fighters on any particular front, including among non-proletarian strata, into fighters in the all-round battle to overthrow capitalism and abolish all of its evils through socialist revolution.

The party must build support for such struggles (182) among the workers themselves, and beyond that it must mobilize the workers, first and foremost the advanced workers, in important struggles of this kind and lead them in becoming a powerful material force in them and in infusing the outlook and qualities of the proletariat into such battles. All this is crucial in building a revolutionary movement under the leadership of the proletariat and its party and can have a great radicalizing effect on the working class itself and play an important part in combatting the influence of the agents of the bourgeoisie, revisionists and other opportunists who have sections of the working class under their sway and control, and in breaking the working class movement out of the narrow, suffocating confines imposed and promoted by these counter-revolutionary forces and the bourgeoisie in general.

Lenin was stressing a cardinal and universal principle when he said that:

"Those who concentrate the attention, observation and consciousness of the working class exclusively, or even mainly, upon itself alone are not Social-Democrats; for its self-realization is indissolubly bound up not only with a fully clear theoretical—it would be even more true to say not so much with a theoretical, as with a practical understanding, of the relationships between *all* the various classes of modern society, acquired through experience of political life. That is why the idea preached by our Economists, that the economic struggle is the most widely applicable means of drawing the masses into the political movement, is so extremely harmful and extremely reactionary in its practical significance." (*Ibid.*)

And not only must the working class come to understand the class relationships in society but it must be led by its party in forging in political life an alliance

under its leadership with the broadest possible number of the masses from other strata in society, both in particular struggles and in the overall struggle against the capitalist system. Only in this way can a class-conscious movement of the working class be developed that is capable of marshalling and marching at the head of an army of millions of the masses powerful enough to actually overthrow the bourgeoisie and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

At the same time, it is not possible to build the revolutionary movement and lead it to victory without paying attention to the battles for daily existence of the working class and masses of other strata. While it must not direct its own or the masses' attention mainly to such struggles, nor foster the dissipation of its own and the masses' forces and energies in them, neither can the party fail to do work in relation to them. For one thing, the economic conditions of the masses, and especially sharp examples of the ways in which they are treated as mere human material for exploitation by the bourgeoisie, provide one important source of exposure of the nature of the system and its ruling class. But in addition where struggles, even economic struggles, are or have the potential to become genuinely mass, militant battles and significantly challenge the limits and conventions the bourgeoisie and its agents seek to impose, the party must not only support such struggles but seek to give tactical and organizational leadership to them and if possible develop them into political struggles while in all cases raising the political consciousness of the struggling masses. As Lenin also pointed out, such battles are one way in which masses, particularly more backward, still politically unenlightened masses, begin to awaken to political life, and this will happen on a broader scale when the situation in society approaches and finally reaches a revolutionary situation. This requires the proletarian party to take these struggles seriously into account, neither overestimating nor underestimating their importance and potential in relation to the overall task of building the proletarian revolutionary movement, and to conduct work in relation to these struggles in such a way as to facilitate the moving of the masses to the revolutionary position, especially as the conditions for revolution ripen.

The party must take a similar approach to work in the trade unions. It is generally the case that today these unions are controlled by ardent defenders of the capitalist system (in one form or another), and their purpose and the effect of their conduct of the day to day affairs of the unions is generally to stifle and even suppress the initiative and certainly the conscious struggle of the workers. For these as well as more fundamental reasons the party can neither center its work on controlling or influencing the day to day affairs of the unions, getting bogged down in petty battles with such union leaders, leaving the masses—inside and outside the unions—and mass struggle out of the picture, nor in building the class-conscious revolutionary movement of the proletariat can it fail to combat the influence and control of such leaders.

It is a basic principle that the party must carry out

political work wherever the masses are found in significant numbers, while at any given point it must concentrate its forces where it is most important in terms of building the proletarian revolutionary movement. This means that in an overall sense the party must work among the unions, including significant battles to form unions, and that more particularly it must apply the policy that especially where and to the extent that unions are arenas of real class struggle, including the struggle to form unions, actually involving masses of workers, the party must devote serious attention to work within the unions to influence the masses in a revolutionary direction, through agitation and propaganda and where appropriate calls to action and tactical guidance. But the party must never confine its work to the limits established by the trade unions at any point—nor still less tailor its politics to suit the opportunist and reactionary trade union leaders and their social base of more privileged and backward workers—and it must not act as if the trade unions are the only or even overall the most important arena of class struggle in which the masses are involved.

In certain conditions it may be correct and important to seek to win office in the unions, but this must always be done on the basis of putting forward a clear revolutionary line to the masses and relying on them in this way, and moreover it must be subordinate to and serve the building of the revolutionary movement and never be undertaken as a substitute for or at the expense of this. And where it is won, union office must be used as a basis for raising the level of political consciousness and struggle of the working class overall—not merely the workers in the particular union—and promoting and developing the revolutionary movement of the masses. In conditions where it is not possible to hold union office while carrying out this kind of political line, the union position and not the revolutionary politics must be sacrificed. As Lenin so vividly expressed it, the communist's ideal "should not be a trade union secretary, but a *tribune of the people*." (*Ibid.*, p. 99.)

Organizational leadership of the unions is not an indispensable requirement for the proletarian revolution, although work in the unions, on the basis summarized here, is very important. But what is indispensable is to carry out the all-round exposure of the capitalist system and the bourgeois dictatorship and to develop the workers' movement into an all-round political struggle against this system and the ruling class, with the class-conscious proletariat in the forefront, bringing forward the broader ranks of the working class and rallying around it other sections of the masses as well.

In this and overall in developing the revolutionary movement and winning the masses to a revolutionary position under its leadership, the party's press—in particular its frequently and regularly published newspaper—is a decisive weapon. Without such a weapon it is not possible to give the masses a true picture of the class relations in society and in particular to fully reveal the antagonism of interests between the two main classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; to shatter the lies and deceptions of the bourgeoisie and

its agents, especially their "democratic" mask and their promotion of bourgeois-democratic illusions and prejudices, and lay bare the fact that the essence of the present society is capitalist enslavement and bourgeois dictatorship; to show concretely the laws of the imperialist system and their consequences, within the country and internationally; and to thoroughly instill in the masses an understanding of the necessity and inevitability of proletarian revolution throughout the world and their own decisive role in achieving this historic advance.

As noted, agitation and propaganda, besides involving the general education of the masses concerning the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and the party's line and program, and addressing the specific problems faced by different sections of the masses, in relation to the overall revolutionary goal, must mean timely, scientific and therefore living exposure of the system and the ruling class, in all aspects of society. It must give the working class and popular masses generally a vivid picture of the conditions and outlook of the different classes and strata in their many varied manifestations, drive home from many different angles, from thousands of examples provided by life itself, the need for proletarian revolution, foster revolutionary consciousness and promote the development of the revolutionary movement. The press, particularly the newspaper, can and must play the role of organizer of the party and the class-conscious workers closely linked with it and of broader masses who are rising in struggle and awakening to political life. The newspaper especially must promote revolutionary forms and methods of struggle, in opposition to reformist ones. And more than that it must not only put forward but systematically explain the party's program, in its various aspects and overall, pointing to the real and thorough resolution of the problems of the masses and the transformation of society in their interests, actively opposing various reformist and opportunist dead-ends. (189)

All this is an important part of combatting the mirror-opposite errors of on the one hand merely issuing general calls for revolution without clearly indicating why that is necessary, how to achieve it and how specific questions and struggles relate to this basic goal, or on the other hand plunging down into particular struggles and tailing after the spontaneity of the masses, losing sight of and failing to consistently lead the masses toward the revolutionary goal. In particular, it is very important in combatting revisionist and other bourgeois forces in the working class and mass movements in an all-round way, not simply demanding more and fighting more militantly than these opportunists and agents, but directing the masses' sights to the decisive political questions and developing their struggle into a revolutionary movement. (190)

The use of this weapon must itself be a vigorous activity, not only disseminating it in ever wider circles but organizing networks among the masses to take it up and spread it even more broadly. In an overall sense, this weapon is crucial for the party in carrying

out a kind of political guerrilla warfare against the enemy, harassing and hounding it, subjecting it to glaring exposure, at every turn, over every significant event in society and the world as a whole. In addition, in relation to key struggles, it performs the role of political artillery, making the terrain more favorable for the marshalling of the masses in these struggles; and it gives assistance and guidance to the masses in carrying forward such struggles and in developing their struggles into a revolutionary movement with the party at the head.

Further, the use of the party's press, and the overall agitation and propaganda for which it serves as a guide, enables the party itself to both deepen its knowledge of and to affect the mood and sentiments of the masses, to more thoroughly and correctly apply the mass line. And not only does the party's press train the party members, advanced workers and other revolutionary fighters in Marxist-Leninist principles and in applying the dialectical materialist method, this press—and in particular the newspaper—plays a crucial role in guiding and uniting their revolutionary activity into an overall coordinated attack on the enemy. (192)

As Lenin pointed out, agitation and propaganda itself, especially penetrating political exposure, arouses and deepens in the masses the desire and determination to fight back against the enemy and the outrages perpetrated by it, and to better identify and grasp their essence and in what way, and toward what end, to fight against them. At the same time, party members must seize on the more favorable conditions created by this and initiate or plunge into important struggles and strive to develop them into more politically conscious ones and raise the political consciousness of the masses involved in or influenced by them. (193)

Lenin also stressed the principle that for the masses to move to the revolutionary position, agitation and propaganda alone are not enough, the masses must also have their own experience. And he emphasized the role of mass struggle as the most decisive part of this experience. In this regard, while he recognized the ways in which economic struggle could serve, and must be approached by communists in such a way as to make it serve, the development of a revolutionary movement, he summed up the vital lesson from the 1905 Revolution in Russia that: (194)

"The real education of the masses can never be separated from their independent political, and especially revolutionary, struggle. Only struggle educates the exploited class. Only struggle discloses to it the magnitude of its own power, widens its horizon, enhances its abilities, clarifies its mind, forges its will. That is why even reactionaries had to admit that the year 1905, the year of struggle, the 'mad year', definitely buried patriarchal Russia." ("Lecture on the 1905 Revolution," *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 241, Moscow English edition.)

Only through struggle, above all independent political and especially revolutionary struggle, can the

masses fully develop their revolutionary consciousness and fighting capacity and their ability to fully recognize and finally realize the revolutionary necessity and possibility. Agitation and propaganda alone are not enough for this, but on the other hand agitation and propaganda, expressed in concentrated form and given overall guidance in the party's press, are indispensable in stimulating and guiding the struggle of the masses onto that path and in enabling them to forge forward, through all the twists and turns, in the face of all the maneuvers and deceptions of the enemy and its agents, to carry the struggle through most powerfully and achieve the revolutionary goal.

For all these reasons, the use of the party's press, (196) especially its newspaper, is in no way incidental or of second-level importance for the party in carrying out its line overall. The party must at all costs forge and wield this weapon, ever more sharply, by illegal means when necessary, and spread the influence of the party's line and its political ties with the masses so broadly and deeply that it will be impossible for the enemy to uproot and destroy them.

In this way, and in general through activating the (197) advanced workers into a class-conscious force and training them theoretically and concretely as communist leaders of the broad masses, through uniting with the masses in struggle and diverting this struggle from the spontaneous, reformist path onto one which confronts the bourgeoisie and its state in an increasingly conscious, bold, resolute, fundamental and all-round way, the party carries out the preparation for the time when conditions fully ripen and it is both possible and necessary to bring the broadest masses to the revolutionary front and lead them in the armed overthrow of bourgeois state power and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

3.) In the imperialist countries a crucial aspect of (198) upholding and carrying out proletarian internationalism, without which it will be impossible for the working class there to succeed in proletarian revolution and make its contribution to the worldwide struggle, is the fight against national chauvinism, particularly that characteristic of an oppressor nation. Lenin repeatedly stressed that this division between oppressor and oppressed nations is one of the most important features of the imperialist era and he waged an uncompromising battle against chauvinist tendencies within the working class movement in the advanced countries. "The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would in fact be nothing but a sheer fraud," Lenin insisted, "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 that capital." ("The Second Congress of the Communist International," *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 271, Moscow English edition.)

And in order to unite with these colonial slaves it is (199) necessary for the proletariat in the advanced countries not only to support the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the colonies and dependent countries,

though that is of course fundamental, but also to support all struggles there that are directed against and weaken imperialism. Lenin further pointed out that, while fundamentally the objectives of the proletarians in these two different types of countries are the same, with regard to the national question in particular they must work from two different directions toward the same common aim. That is, in the oppressed nations, the proletariat, and specifically its vanguard party, must emphasize unity with the proletariat of the oppressor nations, while in the oppressor nations the emphasis must be placed on opposition to the subjugation of the oppressed nation and support for the struggle against this—and this is true even when that struggle is, at a given point, not led by the proletariat. Without doing this it is impossible for the proletariat in the oppressor nations to support the proletariat in the oppressed nations—and in fact it is impossible for the proletariat in the advanced countries to develop its revolutionary consciousness and struggle, and to break free of the ideological and political domination of the bourgeoisie, without whole-heartedly supporting the struggles in the colonial and dependent countries against imperialist domination, even when they are not led by the proletariat there.

As emphasized before, these struggles have assumed (200) even greater importance since Lenin's time and over the past several decades have delivered shattering blows to the imperialist system, and they will certainly do so on an even more powerful scale in the future. Of course this is true in a qualitatively greater and more thorough way when they are led by the proletariat, and the way in which the proletariat in the advanced countries can contribute to the establishment of this leadership is by supporting all such movements that fight against and weaken imperialism, whether led by the proletariat or not, *and also* opposing the repressive measures and all attacks by bourgeois and other forces there on the masses, openly explaining the class nature and interests of the different forces in those countries and supporting the proletariat there in its struggle to win leadership of the overall movement against imperialism and reaction and to carry it through to complete victory and on to socialism.

These movements are not only a powerful force (201) against the imperialist system in general but they are of tremendous assistance to the development of a proletarian revolutionary movement in the imperialist countries themselves, further exposing the real features of imperialism, its reactionary nature *and* its vulnerability, and arousing masses of people in the imperialist countries to political life and struggle. It is the task of the communists in these imperialist countries to build on this, to promote and lead mass action in support of these movements and to spread and deepen the political awakening of the masses, particularly among the working class. This is a crucial, indispensable part of educating and concretely training the workers and broad masses in the imperialist countries in proletarian internationalism and building the proletarian revolutionary movement there as part of the worldwide struggle.

4.) Another crucial aspect of proletarian internationalism, particularly in the imperialist countries, that is of decisive importance in the present situation, is the exposure of the moves of the imperialists toward world war. This is essential in laying the basis for the party itself to maintain, and for its struggle to win the masses to, a firm policy of revolutionary defeatism with regard to their "own" bourgeoisie in such a war. The proletariat must be taught to welcome and more than that to take advantage of every difficulty and defeat experienced by the imperialist ruling class in such a war.

In the face of all the accusations that it is an "agent" of the "other side," and all the intensified repression carried out against it under this cover, the proletarian party must steadfastly maintain its revolutionary defeatist stand and find the ways to implement it, concretely demonstrating to the proletariat and broad masses what the actual class interests are in such a war and ruthlessly exposing and combatting the calls to "defend the fatherland," the hypocritical cries that "the other side started it," is the "aggressor," etc. Not only must the party put forward the general stand of unity between the masses of people, including the masses in uniform, on "both sides," it must champion concrete expressions of this unity, including especially the promotion and spreading of fraternization between the soldiers of the "two sides."

All this is essential in not only propagating but actually preparing for and working to realize the line of turning the imperialist war into a civil war—which means creating and leading when conditions ripen the armed forces of the proletarian revolution, turning the armed might of the masses against "their own" ruling class right in the midst of the imperialist war and consistently carrying out political work to arouse proletarian class consciousness and internationalism among the ranks of the bourgeois armed forces, to disintegrate these armed forces and win over as many of their soldiers as possible in the course of the revolution. To recall again what Lenin emphasized, it is only work in this direction that deserves the name of socialist work, and it is precisely work in this direction that will make it possible to seize the opportunity for revolution at whatever point it arises.

Colonial and Dependent Countries

Not only the basic principles summarized above but much of what has been discussed in relation to the imperialist countries also applies to the colonial (including neo-colonial) and dependent countries. But, as distinguished from the imperialist countries, in these colonial and dependent countries, while the revolution has different specific features according to the concrete conditions in the different countries, which must be taken into account, the revolutionary process there generally involves two stages—first, that of the anti-

imperialist democratic revolution, which lays the basis for and is, upon victory in this stage, superseded by the socialist revolution. The key link in this process, which is indispensable for carrying through the anti-imperialist democratic revolution and advancing to the socialist revolution (and continuing it) is the leadership of the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist party. With this in mind, there are important questions that demand particular attention, including the following.

1.) In these countries in general there are very broad sections of the population that, to varying degrees and with different outlooks, desire a change in the social system. Imperialist domination, direct or indirect, together with the local reactionary class forces dependent on and serving imperialism, maintains the domestic economy in a backward and extremely distorted state in the interests of foreign capital. The masses of laboring people are subjected to brutal exploitation and grinding poverty while small-scale merchants, artisans and other individual producers are continually ruined or threatened with ruin and many intellectuals find their aspirations thwarted altogether or are offered only the opportunity to be underlings of imperialism and the reactionary regime. The bourgeoisie in these countries includes on the one hand large-scale capitalists, closely tied in with imperialism, who dominate and monopolize especially those sectors of industry that are developed in the interests of imperialism—a monopoly that is facilitated by the enforced backwardness and distortion of the economy. On the other hand there are sections of the bourgeoisie, especially smaller capitalists, which are largely or wholly excluded from these monopoly positions. While they are in one aspect dependent on imperialism they are at the same time significantly restricted in their development and not infrequently driven under. This is a contradiction the proletariat can, in certain conditions at least, make use of to win to its side or at least neutralize these sections of the domestic bourgeoisie in the anti-imperialist democratic revolution.

Along with these kinds of economic consequences of imperialist domination in these countries, the national culture there is suppressed, mutilated and mocked, and the people are inundated and assaulted with the notion that the culture of the imperialist countries—meaning particularly the decadent trash promoted by the imperialists and aped by their local lackeys—is superior to their own. Politically, the reactionary regime quite often takes the form of open terroristic dictatorship and even in those cases where some pretense of "democracy" is made it resorts quickly and on a wide scale to sanguinary suppression in the face of popular rebellion. Where "reforms" are carried out by the reactionary regime, besides the general aim of opposing revolution, it is also for the purpose of promoting the development of elite strata loyal to it, and the result of such "reforms" is that overall the masses are driven into even worse poverty, ruin and misery. All this provides the basis for rallying broad strata of the people in the struggle against imperialism and the local reactionary classes.

Imperialism does to a certain degree, and always (208) within the overall framework of stunting and distorting the domestic economy, stimulate the growth and concentration of the proletariat, but it does not stimulate the growth of a labor aristocracy and bourgeoisified strata among the workers on anything like the scale that this occurs in the imperialist countries. This strengthens the basis for the development of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and for the proletariat to win leadership in the overall revolutionary struggle, including in its first, anti-imperialist democratic stage.

The proletariat, under the leadership of its party, (209) must forge the worker-peasant alliance as the basic alliance of the broader united front that must be built and in which the proletariat must lead in order to succeed in the revolution. Generally in these countries the peasantry constitutes a large section—and in many cases the majority, often a large majority—of the popular masses. Further, it is usually the case that there are significant survivals of pre-capitalist relations and in many of these countries the majority of the peasants are exploited in feudal or semi-feudal relations. While a concrete analysis must be made in each country and mechanical tendencies must be avoided with regard to this, it is a general principle that the degree of importance of work in the countryside in building the revolutionary movement is closely linked with the relative size of the peasant population and the extent to which there are pre-capitalist relations in the countryside. At the same time, the party must give importance to building a base among and rallying forward the rural proletariat. But overall the worker-peasant alliance—in which the proletariat, including the rural proletariat, forges the firmest unity with the poor peasants but more broadly allies with the great majority of the peasantry—is decisive both for the development and ultimate victory of the revolution and specifically for the establishment of the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution.

On the basis of the worker-peasant alliance as the key (210) alliance, the proletariat, headed by its party, must also work and struggle to unite under its leadership the urban petty bourgeoisie and the intellectuals as broadly as possible. With regard to the bourgeoisie, as noted, one section of it—the big capitalists directly dependent on and serving imperialist domination—are an enemy and target of the revolution, along with the feudal and the large-scale capitalist landowners and exploiters in the countryside, but other sections of the bourgeoisie who find themselves hemmed in and restricted by imperialist domination and the relations it fosters and maintains will tend to put up some resistance to imperialism and may at times be a vacillating ally of the proletariat in the revolution. The proletarian party must make a scientific and concrete analysis of this at each point in the development of the revolution and even where it is determined that it is correct to strive to unite with or at least neutralize such sections of the domestic capitalists it must consistently reveal their class nature and interests, not sacrifice the interests of the working people as the price for unity with such bourgeois forces, combat their tendency to conciliate with the enemies of the

revolution, prepare for the possibility that they will suddenly turn against the revolution, even in its first stage, and never compromise the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution. Experience has shown that where such forces establish a government, while they may take some progressive measures, they are incapable of breaking the stranglehold of imperialism on the country, they resist the continuation of the revolution and they are either ousted by imperialist intrigue or aggression or, if they consolidate their power, they tend more and more to become retainers of the imperialist system and enemies of the revolution.

It is quite often the case that struggles and movements (211) develop against imperialism and the local reactionary classes (or sections of them) in these countries in which leadership is in the hands of bourgeois or other non-proletarian forces, and at times this takes the form of religious or quasi-religious movements. In all such cases, the proletarian party must make a materialist analysis of the different class forces involved and their relation to the overall anti-imperialist democratic revolution, and it must have a dialectical approach to these movements—striving for unity with the masses involved in or influenced by them and with these movements themselves, including leaders of them, where and to the extent that they do fight against imperialism and its domestic lackeys, but combatting and guarding against their tendency to misdirect and even to turn against the revolution the more thoroughgoing it becomes, even in its first stage. And in all cases the proletarian party must maintain its independence and initiative, combat reactionary tendencies and influences, including religious obscurantism, and insist on and establish through struggle the leading role of the proletariat in order to carry the revolution through to victory and advance to socialism.

There is an undeniable tendency for imperialism to introduce significant elements of capitalist relations in the countries it dominates. In certain dependent countries capitalist development has gone so far that it is not correct to characterize them as semi-feudal, it is better to call them predominantly capitalist even while important elements or remnants of feudal or semi-feudal production relations and their reflection in the superstructure may still exist. In such countries a concrete analysis must be made of these conditions and appropriate conclusions concerning the path, tasks, character and alignment of class forces must be drawn. In all events, foreign imperialism remains a target of the revolution.

2.) While in the imperialist countries it is a general rule (212) that it is only after a fairly long period of development of the objective and subjective conditions that the armed struggle becomes the main form of struggle—and then it must be carried out first in the form of mass insurrection in the cities—and while further it is the case that before then armed struggle is not usually the major form of struggle, in the colonial and dependent countries it is more generally and more frequently the case that there is both the possibility and the necessity to wage armed struggle as a major form of struggle well before the time that nationwide political power can be won, and in some circumstances it is both possible and necessary to make

the armed struggle the main form of struggle for a fairly protracted period leading up to the winning of nationwide political power. A number of factors may contribute to this. Among them are the fact that the exploitation and oppression of the proletariat and popular masses is extremely stark and intense more or less all of the time and popular struggles often develop into armed struggles, if only for a brief period, spontaneously; that the reactionary regime rules more openly through terror and resorts more readily to widespread bloody suppression, frequently provoking armed struggle of the masses in response; that there are often very acute conflicts within the reactionary camp itself, reflecting rivalries among the imperialists and providing at times opportunities to launch armed attacks against reactionary power in certain parts of the country; and the fact that there is generally a very great disparity between the urban and rural areas, with extreme backwardness, including backward means of transportation and communication in many cases, prevailing in the countryside, making it more difficult in general for the reactionary regime to secure its rule throughout the countryside and in certain cases providing opportunities not only to wage armed struggle there but perhaps to establish liberated areas where revolutionary power is exercised by the masses under the party's leadership.

A concrete analysis must be made in each of these countries (with the overall world situation in view) to determine at each point the role of armed struggle and how to carry out political work in such a way as to prepare for and build up to the point where armed struggle becomes the main form of struggle even when that is not yet the case. In some countries and in some circumstances, especially where the working class and the urban population is relatively large and where mass struggles in the cities have developed to a high level, it may be possible and necessary to launch insurrections in the cities and then spread the armed struggle to the countryside. In other situations, especially where the working class is much smaller relative to the peasant population and/or where struggles in the cities have suffered a severe setback at the hands of the enemy but conditions in the countryside are now favorable for armed struggle, it may be possible and necessary to begin the armed struggle in the countryside, even to capture power in parts of it and build up strength there, gradually encircling the cities and laying the basis to seize them and win nationwide political power as the struggle develops and conditions for this ripen.

Even where the armed struggle begins in the cities, and even if it succeeds in defeating the reactionary armed forces there, besides the general need to spread it to the countryside in order to thoroughly overthrow the reactionary state power and establish revolutionary state power, there is the real possibility that the imperialists will directly intervene militarily, and depending on the circumstances, this may require a temporary retreat into the countryside, though work must not be abandoned altogether in the cities. In another situation armed insurrections in the cities, especially where they are not led by the proletarian party, may result in the toppling of a particular regime but

lead to its replacement by a government that is controlled by bourgeois or aspiring bourgeois forces. In such circumstances, while work and struggle should not be given up in the cities and while it may or may not be necessary to shift the center of gravity of work to the countryside, in any case the importance of work there and of building up the countryside as a powerful base for the revolution presents itself very urgently.

In sum, whether or under what conditions the armed struggle should proceed from the countryside to the cities or the other way around must be determined by concrete analysis, study and summation of experience. But in all cases the proletarian party should conduct its work and develop the mass struggle with the concrete aim of taking up armed struggle as the main form of struggle at the earliest possible time; it should place great importance on revolutionary work and the role of armed struggle in the countryside, even when its center of gravity is correctly in the cities; it should prepare for complex and protracted armed struggle and be ready for surprise attacks by the reactionaries, including imperialist intervention; and it should most fundamentally be guided by and consistently apply the principle that the armed struggle must involve, rely on and mobilize the broad masses under the party's leadership and that the revolutionary war must really be a war of the masses in which they are prepared in an all-round way to exercise political power when it is won through the mass armed struggle.

3.) During the course of the anti-imperialist democratic revolution, it is crucial to make every possible preparation and lay the strongest possible basis for the transition to socialism once the first stage of the revolution is victorious. The most decisive thing in this is the leadership of the proletariat and its party, but this leadership is not an abstract slogan, it must be concretely realized, and there is a dialectical relationship between establishing and exercising this leadership in the first stage and making preparation for the socialist stage ideologically, politically, economically and organizationally.

In this regard, it is essential for the proletarian party to carry out consistent communist agitation and propaganda during this first stage. In this first stage of course the unity the party must work to forge as broadly as possible is around the line and program for the anti-imperialist democratic revolution and not the socialist revolution. But at the same time the party must train the proletariat and broader masses in a scientific estimate of the different class forces and interests in society, including within the broad united front of forces opposed to the reactionary regime, and it must without fail propagate the need to carry the revolution forward to socialism upon victory in the first stage and to fight in unity with the international proletariat toward the ultimate goal of communism worldwide. Unless it does so it will not be possible to establish the leadership of the proletariat in the first stage of the revolution and carry it through, nor obviously to advance to socialism.

Similarly, in building and giving leadership to

various kinds of mass organizations during the first stage, the party must on the one hand direct its efforts toward the carrying out of the anti-imperialist democratic revolution. But on the other hand it must develop the conscious activism of the masses and their sense of organization in such a way as to prepare them to rule and transform society along the socialist road, once victory has been won in the first stage.

Further, not only must the armed struggle for power (219) be carried out according to the same principles and with the same objectives, but in those situations where the revolutionary war proceeds in such a way that it is possible and necessary to capture power and establish a revolutionary regime in parts of the country before nationwide political power is won, the masses must be drawn broadly into the actual process of administering these areas and must be relied on and mobilized as the backbone of revolutionary power. At the same time, while it would be a "left" error to attempt to introduce socialist economic relations in such areas, the party must pay attention to nurturing and developing the seeds of future socialist production relations, such as cooperatives, mutual labor, including voluntary labor in which party members play an exemplary role, public ownership by the revolutionary regime, and other factors. Even in situations where the revolutionary war begins with insurrections in the cities and then spreads to the countryside, during the course of that war these policies should be carried out to the greatest extent possible.

This will help lay the basis for carrying forward the (220) struggle in the economic sphere, once the revolution in its first stage has won victory throughout the country, to bring about the triumph of the socialist sector over the capitalist sector. In this of course the crucial factor will be state power in the hands of the popular masses led by the proletariat and its party, which as it is consolidated will in essence represent a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, involving an alliance with broad class forces. Especially during *this* transition period from victory in the anti-imperialist democratic revolution to the point where socialist production relations have become dominant, it will be necessary to continue to seek a basis of unity with even certain capitalists who were allied with in the first stage of the revolution and who are willing to support or at least accept the transition to socialism. And it will be necessary to allow and utilize a certain degree of capitalist production in carrying out this transition in the economic sphere, but this must be restricted and controlled by the state. Through its control of the key levers and lifelines of the economy—including finance and trade as well as state ownership of large enterprises, especially those expropriated from the imperialists and big capitalists in the country linked with the imperialists—the state sector will play a crucial role in this transition to a socialist economy. But fundamentally it will only be possible to make this transition (and to continue then the socialist transformation of society) by mobilizing and leading the masses of people, particularly the workers and the poor and middle peasants, to wage class struggle to achieve the

establishment of basic socialist production relations in industry and agriculture, the first great victory of socialism over capitalism in the economic sphere.

4.) A specific problem of great importance that the (221) proletarian party in these countries must pay consistent attention to and correctly handle, in order to establish proletarian leadership in the first stage of the revolution and then to make the transition to socialism and continue the revolution in the socialist stage, is the contradiction between the fact that the revolution in its first stage is national and democratic in its character and objectives while ideologically the party must unwaveringly uphold and educate the masses in proletarian internationalism and the communist outlook in general and politically it must keep firmly in mind and propagate its maximum program of proletarian dictatorship, socialism and ultimately world-wide communism.

As a rule the first stage of the revolution, with (222) whatever particular features it may have in different countries, can only be a fairly protracted process, and throughout this stage the party must focus its own attention and that of the masses immediately and mainly on actually carrying out the line and program for this stage. Further, the party must wage an active struggle against the notions of national inferiority imposed on the peoples of these countries by the imperialists and their local lackeys, and it must arouse in the masses the courage, determination and confidence to rise up against and defeat these enemies and take destiny into their own hands. This requires the party to take a patriotic stand and foster the national self-respect of the people. Without all this it will be impossible for the revolution to succeed, but because of it the contradictions involved in making the transition to socialism upon victory in the first stage, and more than that in continuing the socialist revolution, are made more acute.

Mao Tsetung devoted great attention to this problem, (223) and one of the main things he summed up and led struggle around was the way in which it takes effect within the party itself. Even though the party does consistently propagate its maximum political program and the communist outlook during the first stage, it is inevitable that significant numbers of people will join the party and in many cases genuinely play the role of vanguard fighters in the first stage of the revolution without however making a radical rupture with nationalist and bourgeois-democratic thinking. And, although many such people can be and are led to make such a rupture when the revolution enters and advances in the socialist stage, more than a few do not do so and, especially in the case of leading party members who exercise authority in the new society, those who do not make this radical rupture are transformed from leaders of the revolution into enemies and targets of it. But this contradiction not only assumes a concentrated expression within the party, it also exerts its influence broadly among the masses.

To correctly handle this contradiction, the pro- (224) letarian party, during the first stage of and throughout

the revolutionary process, must not only propagate the communist outlook and its maximum program and promote proletarian internationalism in general, but it must actively and thoroughly combat narrow nationalist (and in general bourgeois-democratic) perspectives and the nationalist outlook in the ideological sphere. Of particular importance in this regard is the need to foster and concretely build unity with and support for the proletarian-socialist revolution in the imperialist countries and mass struggles of the working class and other popular strata there. The feeling of indifference toward and estrangement from the workers and the proletarian revolutionary movement in the imperialist countries must be overcome through consistent ideological struggle and systematic education concerning the nature and features of the imperialist system as the common enemy of the proletariat and masses of all countries and the fact that, although in the imperialist countries on the one hand and the colonial and dependent countries on the other hand there are different conditions and different specific forms of oppression, in all cases the proletariat shares the common interest of overthrowing imperialism and burying all systems of exploitation.

More specifically, and of special importance in the present situation, the proletariat and masses in the colonial and dependent countries must be educated in an understanding of how the objective situation and the revolutionary process develops in the imperialist countries in some significantly different ways than in the colonial and dependent countries; and they must be made acutely aware of the fact that because of the accumulation and intensification of the contradictions in the imperialist countries, there are for the first time in many decades real and growing prospects for proletarian revolution there. In this way the proletariat and popular masses in the colonial and dependent countries will be aroused and led to carry forward their revolutionary struggle in unity and mutual support with the working class and the proletarian-socialist revolution in the imperialist countries and toward the achievement of the final goal of the international proletariat—a communist world. (225)

5.) In the colonial and dependent countries there is also the contradiction that arises in relation to the fact that it is most often the case that the revolutionary struggle must be directed, in an immediate sense, against one imperialist power (or imperialist bloc) and the domestic reactionaries dependent on and serving it, but this struggle must be carried out without joining in with—nor still less supporting or even becoming dependent on—rival imperialists (in particular the rival imperialist bloc) and their lackeys, and in a fundamental sense as part of the international struggle against imperialism and reaction in general. (226)

In certain specific conditions, particularly for example where one imperialist power (or bloc) actually carries out an invasion and attempts to occupy a particular colonial or dependent country, it may be necessary and correct not only to direct the spearhead of the struggle against that particular power (or bloc) but

even to ally with or at least seek to neutralize—“put to the side”—certain domestic reactionary forces who are dependent on and serve other imperialists (in particular the rival imperialist bloc). But in such cases it is all the more important to expose the class nature and interests and imperialist connections of such forces; to resolutely combat and defeat their treachery in the struggle and particularly their attempts to suppress the masses; to insist on and establish through struggle the leading role of the proletariat and the independence and initiative of its party; to continue the policy of refusing to join with or support any imperialist power or bloc; and to keep clearly in mind and lead the proletariat and popular masses toward the goal of victory not only in the immediate stage (or sub-stage) but in the anti-imperialist democratic revolution as a whole, and through that to the socialist revolution, in unity with the international proletariat and the worldwide struggle.

Situations and problems of this kind frequently pose themselves in different colonial and dependent countries and this is likely to become more so in the context of intensifying preparations for world war and especially in such a war. In this situation the need to expose the reactionary nature of all the rival imperialists and reactionaries, and to continue to fight in an overall way in unity with the international struggle against both blocs and all imperialism and reaction, is of decisive importance. The proletarian party must study, analyze and be prepared for such situations, in order to continue leading the revolution forward, through whatever twists and turns, never losing sight of the overall situation and struggle and the long-term goal and never compromising the fundamental interests of the international proletariat. (228)

Looking to the future, once the anti-imperialist democratic revolution wins victory, the party must pay serious attention to and lead in correctly handling the problem of how to go on and build socialism in the face of the frenzied opposition, subversion, pressure and the danger of outright military aggression by the local reactionaries and imperialism and reaction in general. While it is correct and necessary in these circumstances to make use of contradictions among the imperialists, this must not be done at the expense of but to serve and facilitate the transition to socialism and the continuation of the socialist revolution. And, while making use of such contradictions, any tendency to fall into dependency on one or the other of the imperialists must be guarded against, combatted and defeated. In this as in everything reliance must be placed on the masses of people in the country, in unity and mutual support with the international proletariat and its allies. (229)

On the international level, and in order to accelerate the development of the revolutionary movement in the various countries and on a world scale, the Marxist-Leninists must give great importance to and devote special attention to building an international com-

unist movement that is based firmly on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, in opposition to revisionism and all forms of opportunism. As Lenin emphasized, "Unity is a great thing and a great slogan. But what the workers' cause needs is the *unity of Marxists*, not unity between Marxists, and opponents and distorters of Marxism." ("Unity," *Collected Works*, Vol 20, p. 232, Moscow English edition.)

In this, as in everything, the question of ideological and political line is decisive. The principle that must guide this process is that ideological and political unity is the basis for and both makes possible and demands the strengthening and developing of organizational unity. (231)

In our view, the Marxist-Leninists must have the goal of establishing a new communist international. But in order to forge and wield this weapon on a correct basis and in the most powerful way for the international proletariat, thorough and deep-going study, analysis and summation must be made of the experience, positive and negative, of the international communist movement and the Third International in particular. While the establishment of a new international is a prospect for the future, it is a goal that must be worked for actively step by step. (232)

At the present time the key and most urgent task for building and advancing the international communist movement is to achieve the unity of the forces that can be united around the cardinal questions and principles that divide Marxism-Leninism from revisionism and other forms of opportunism and that set the correct

orientation for advancing the proletarian revolutionary movement. On this basis, these Marxist-Leninists must deepen and strengthen their unity through concrete political action and unified efforts in analyzing and summing up the crucial lessons from the experience of the international communist movement, and at the same time carry out an active ideological struggle among broader forces within the international movement, seeking over a period of time to win over as much of these forces as possible and to isolate and ultimately defeat the die-hard counter-revolutionaries masquerading as Marxist-Leninists or revolutionaries. By proceeding on this basis, the problems facing the international communist movement can be attacked at their roots, the crisis it is passing through can give way to an advance and the urgent tasks ahead can be boldly taken up.

The current conjuncture in the world and in the international movement presents the revolutionary proletariat, the oppressed peoples and the Marxist-Leninists with great tasks, trials and, above all, great opportunities. Marxism-Leninism, the science of the revolutionary proletariat, has always been forged and tempered in the furnace of class struggle. Today we must rise to meet the challenges before us, race to catch up with the rapid developments of the objective conditions, reconstruct the unity of Marxist-Leninists on the basis of a correct line and summing up the experience of the past, fight for proletarian internationalism—and in so doing push ahead the advance toward communism throughout the world.

TO THE MARXIST-LENINISTS, THE WORKERS AND THE OPPRESSED OF ALL COUNTRIES:

Joint Communique of

Ceylon Communist Party
Groupe Marxiste-Léniniste du Sénégal
Grupo para la Defensa del Marxismo-Leninismo (Spain)
Mao Tsetung-Kredsen (Denmark)
Marxist-Leninist Collective (Britain)
New Zealand Red Flag Group
Nottingham Communist Group (Britain)
Organizzazione Comunista Proletaria Marxista-Leninista (Italy)
Partido Comunista Revolucionario de Chile
Pour l'Internationale Proletarienne (France)
Reorganization Committee, Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist)
Revolutionary Communist Party, USA
Unión Comunista Revolucionaria (Dominican Republic)

Today the world is on the threshold of momentous events. The crisis of the imperialist system is rapidly bringing about the danger of the outbreak of a new, third, world war as well as the real perspective for revolution in countries throughout the world. During the last few years revolutionary struggles have erupted, including in certain areas of strategic importance. All the imperialist powers are preparing to lead the workers and the oppressed people to an unprecedented mutual slaughter to protect and expand their empires of profit and exploitation throughout the world. The imperialist powers and reactionary ruling classes are joined in two rival bands of cutthroats and slavemasters, two blocs which are led one by the U.S. imperialists, the other by the equally imperialist USSR. This war is looming on the horizon and will break out unless the revolutionary struggle of the masses, the seizure of power by the working class and oppressed people, is able to prevent it. Still if this does break out, it will represent an extreme concentration of the crisis of the imperialist system and will heighten the objective basis for revolutionary struggle that must be seized by the Marxist-Leninists.

But at the very time when such great dangers, challenges and opportunities are placed before the workers

and oppressed of all countries, a great crisis exists within the ranks of the Marxist-Leninists who have the responsibility of leading the working class and peoples in making revolution. After revisionism had clearly come to power in the USSR with Khrushchev, the international proletariat suffered a further grievous loss after the death of Comrade Mao Tsetung in 1976 with the seizure of power in socialist China by a new, counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie dragging one fourth of humanity back down the capitalist road. This great loss was further compounded by the attacks on the great contributions Mao Tsetung made to the revolutionary science of the working class, Marxism-Leninism. These attacks were not only launched by the new reactionary rulers of China, but have been joined by deserters from the revolutionary ranks, and clearly the Soviet revisionists themselves are mixed up in these attacks.

In the face of this sharpening situation, and recognizing the critical need to rise to the great challenge that this situation represents, delegates from a number of Marxist-Leninist Parties and organizations have held a meeting to discuss how to emerge and advance from this crisis on the basis of forging and uniting around a correct ideological and political line for the international

communist movement. Through the course of the meeting unity was achieved on the following points, which the undersigned Parties and organizations consider important elements for the development of this line:

I. THE CURRENT SITUATION

—Imperialism means war. This basic truth analyzed by Lenin holds particular meaning for today as another world war shapes up on the horizon. This is not a result of the desire of any particular bourgeois leader but stems from the very laws of the imperialist system.

—In the current historical conjuncture it is only the two most powerful imperialist powers, the U.S. and the USSR, who are capable of heading up imperialist blocs to go to world war. These two imperialist powers are also the most powerful bastions of reaction in the world today.

—All the other imperialist powers are also driven by their nature toward war—they are also big exploiters, thoroughly reactionary, aggressive and enemies of the proletariat and the peoples of the world.

—In the face of the growing danger of world war the proletariat and the oppressed people must develop their revolutionary struggle against imperialism and all reaction. If such a war breaks out they must strive to turn inter-imperialist war into a revolutionary war aimed at the overthrow of the reactionary ruling classes.

—In the last few years powerful revolutionary movements have developed in a number of countries, which have greatly battered or even toppled the reactionary regimes and shaken the imperialist system. While none of these revolutionary movements has yet led to the dictatorship of the proletariat, they are another clear indication of the possibility of doing so. The objective conditions for revolution are ripening throughout the world and in some countries these conditions are already mature. But the subjective conditions, especially the development of the Marxist-Leninist movement, are lagging seriously behind the objective conditions.

II. TASKS OF MARXIST-LENINISTS

It is necessary to rescue and build upon basic principles of Marxism-Leninism which revisionists and opportunists have done their best to obscure and bury.

—The dictatorship of the proletariat has been and remains a cardinal point of Marxism-Leninism. This principle too has been trampled on by revisionism. From the time of Karl Marx down to the present, fighting to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and to defend and strengthen it where it is established, have remained touchstone questions for Marxist-Leninists.

However, it is not correct and is especially harmful today, to fail to take into account the important experience, positive and negative, the proletariat has acquired in this respect since the time of the October Revolution. In particular the great teachings of Mao Tsetung on continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and the experience of the Cultural Revolution he led are of vital importance. Comrade Mao Tsetung correctly pointed out that during the entire

period of socialism, that is in the period of the transition to communism, classes and class struggle still exist. He pointed out the continued existence and constant regeneration of the bourgeoisie under socialism, its material and ideological base, and the means for combating it. Mao clearly indicated, for the first time in the history of the science of Marxism-Leninism, that the ringleaders and most important section of the bourgeoisie during the socialist period (after the socialist transformation of ownership has in the main been completed) are those leading people in the Party and the state apparatus taking the capitalist road. Mao made clear that it would be necessary to wage repeated mass revolutionary struggles, such as the Cultural Revolution, against the new bourgeoisie during the entire socialist transition.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was an unprecedented mass revolutionary movement which succeeded for ten years in blocking capitalist restoration, training revolutionary successors who are fighting today against the new capitalist rulers in China, and helped to spread Marxism-Leninism throughout the world. The fact that the Cultural Revolution did not succeed in the final analysis in preventing the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat in no way lessens its historic importance nor its important lessons for the world proletariat.

—“The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution.” This is universally true for all countries. The “peaceful road to socialism” is littered with the corpses of countless masses who were pointed down this road by revisionist betrayers.

The principle of armed struggle of the masses has also been abandoned by revisionists who replace it with putschist theses and practices or empty phrases which renounce all types of political and organizational preparations. No matter what stages the revolution may go through, the need to seize political power by the force of arms must be propagated broadly among the masses of people, the Marxist-Leninists must carry out the necessary ideological, political and organizational preparations with this goal in mind and must strive to launch the armed struggle for power as soon as the conditions are ripe. In short, communists are advocates of revolutionary warfare.

The armed struggle must be carried out as a war of the masses and through it the masses must be prepared ideologically, politically and organizationally to exercise political power.

Whatever the necessary forms and stages of the revolutionary process the principal reliance must be based on building up the armed forces of the masses led by the party, while it is also necessary to carry out political work among the armed forces of the enemy to help disintegrate these armed forces and win over as many of their soldiers as possible in the course of the revolutionary struggle.

—The existence and the leading role of the party of the proletariat is another cardinal principle. This is expressed in an organization of the vanguard of the proletariat which must be based on a Marxist-Leninist ideological,

political and organizational line on the principal problems of the revolution; which at every moment, inside and outside its ranks, combats all bourgeois and revisionist influences; which permanently practises criticism and self-criticism and centralism based on democracy; which has a conscious iron discipline, all in order to link closely with the masses, to raise, generalise and coordinate their struggles, particularly political struggles, leading them to seize power from the ruling classes. With this aim, the party must attach great importance to formulating and spreading, according to principles, a concrete strategy, line and policy in accordance with the concrete conditions of the country and the interests of the masses and their wish to liberate themselves. The party must give great attention to the illegal forms of struggle and organization, in order to preserve its independence and to educate the masses in the struggle against their enemies. From a strategic point of view, illegal forms of work are fundamental. At the same time the party must make use of legal opportunities in order to broaden its influence without falling into or promoting bourgeois democratic illusions and while preparing for the inevitable repression by the reactionaries.

The party must gain the leadership of the struggle of the masses and the revolution in practise, by correctly applying the mass line. The party must continually strengthen its leading role by ensuring that the masses and the working class continually raise their ideological, political and organizational level and that they take over an increasingly important part of the tasks of the revolution. In this way, the party will create the conditions for an authentic dictatorship of the proletariat and likewise the final withering away of the party with the withering away of social classes, communism.

Capitalism has long ago reached its final stage of imperialism, one of the most important features of which is the pillaging of the dominated countries and the exploitation of the oppressed peoples. In doing so, imperialism also greatly expands and strengthens the gravediggers destined to overthrow it.

As Lenin analysed, the world proletarian revolution, in the era of imperialism, consists of two great currents allied against the imperialist system—the proletarian socialist revolution in the capitalist countries and the new democratic revolution in the semi-feudal, colonial, semi-(or neo-) colonial countries subjected to imperialist enslavement. There are many features in common between the revolution in these two types of countries: above all that in both instances the revolution must be led by the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party, through whatever stages, and to the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialism. But there are also some important distinctions in the path of the revolution in the two types of countries.

COLONIAL AND DEPENDENT COUNTRIES

In the semi-feudal, colonial, semi-(or neo-) colonial countries the revolution must in general pass through two stages—first that of the new democratic revolution led by the proletariat which leads to the socialist stage. Those who insist on making a principle of skipping this stage or eclectically combining the democratic and the

socialist revolution do great harm to the revolution.

While the exact course of the revolution in any given country is dependent on the concrete conditions found there, the teachings of Mao Tsetung concerning protracted people's war are of great relevance in these types of countries. Those revisionists who attack Mao's theory of surrounding the city by the countryside as having failed to insure the hegemony of the proletariat or dogmatically insist that insurrection in the city is the sole form of seizing power in these types of countries are in fact attacking the revolutionary struggle there.

Experience has shown that without the leadership of the proletariat and a genuine Marxist-Leninist line it is impossible to free these types of countries from imperialist enslavement, still less to advance on the socialist road. While in general it is possible and necessary to build a very broad united front in such countries, even at times involving sections of the exploiting classes, experience has underscored the importance of the Marxist-Leninists maintaining leadership and political and organizational independence, of conducting widespread education on the need to advance to socialism and ultimately communism, to combat narrow nationalist tendencies even while waging a struggle for national liberation, and exposing and combatting in the appropriate ways the bourgeoisie, even the sections with which it may be allied in this struggle against foreign imperialism and the reactionary ruling classes in power.

There is an undeniable tendency for imperialism to introduce significant elements of capitalist relations in the countries it dominates. In certain dependent countries capitalist development has gone so far that it is not correct to characterize them as semi-feudal. It is better to call them predominantly capitalist even while important elements or remnants of feudal or semi-feudal production relations and their reflection in the superstructure may still exist.

In such countries a concrete analysis must be made of these conditions and appropriate conclusions concerning the path, tasks, character and alignment of class forces must be drawn. In all events, foreign imperialism remains a target of the revolution.

IMPERIALIST COUNTRIES

In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels pointed out that the "workers have no fatherland". Lenin stressed that this is particularly applicable in the imperialist countries. This, too, is not only a cardinal principle of Marxism-Leninism that must be rescued from decades of revisionist distortion but takes on special importance in the current conjuncture with the approach of a third world war. Communists combat every form of national chauvinism within the working class and other sections of the oppressed people. This means fighting against every tendency which identifies the interests of the proletariat with the interests of its "own" imperialist ruling class either in plundering people of the colonial and dependent countries or, especially in today's situation, in going to war to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie. If a third world war breaks out the proletariat must work actively for the defeat of its own bourgeoisie in the war, attempting to transform

the war into revolutionary civil war and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

While the road of the October Revolution is universally applicable in the sense of the need for the armed revolution, the leadership of a proletarian vanguard party, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the establishment of socialism, etc., in all countries; in addition in the capitalist and imperialist countries the October Revolution remains the basic point of reference for Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics. The Marxist-Leninists recognize that in each country the revolution will take specific forms and must analyse the concrete conditions and sum up the experience of the masses in struggle while upholding the basic Leninist line concerning the political and organizational measures necessary for the preparation for and the seizure of power by the proletariat. Again, the distortion and negation by the revisionists of basic Leninist principles in this regard is not only an historical fact but continues to be a current problem. While paying attention to concrete analysis of concrete conditions in each country, it is necessary to study and apply correctly Lenin's theses on the importance of raising the political consciousness of the working class to its historic mission and developing its political and revolutionary struggle, on the importance of the communist press, and of combatting the influence of economism while paying attention to the needs and conditions of the life of the masses. It's also necessary to study and apply Mao's teachings of the need to base oneself on the profound sentiments of the masses to liberate themselves.

III. ON THE UNITY OF THE MARXIST-LENINISTS

The proletariat is a single class worldwide with a single historic class interest in liberating humanity from all exploitation and oppression and in ushering in the era of communism throughout the globe. For this reason proletarian internationalism is something inseparable from Marxism-Leninism and a constant need of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard in all countries. In addition to this obvious, but often forgotten, truth, the current conjuncture also demands vigorous efforts to establish the unity of Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionaries in all countries if we are to meet the tests and opportunities facing us. In fact, the need for the unity of the Marxist-Leninists is not only objectively necessary but is increasingly demanded by revolutionaries and the masses throughout the world. In this process, as in all things, ideological and political line is decisive.

As Lenin emphasized, "Unity is a great thing and a great slogan. But what the workers' cause needs is the *unity of Marxists*, not unity between Marxists and opponents and distorters of Marxism".

In our view unity can only be achieved on the basis of drawing firm and clear lines of demarcation with revisionism and opportunism of all forms. These lines of demarcation are not something which have dropped from the sky or been concocted by sectarians nor can they be treated as mere topics for sterile, academic debates—they reflect the main, and decisive forms in

which revisionism confronts the revolutionary proletariat and the Marxist-Leninist movement in the world today.

Upholding the contribution of Mao Tsetung to the science of Marxism-Leninism represents a particularly important and pressing question in the international communist movement and among the class conscious workers today. The principle involved is nothing less than whether or not to uphold and build on decisive contributions to the proletarian revolution and the science of Marxism-Leninism made by Mao. Mao Tsetung made important developments of Marxism-Leninism in the area of the anti-imperialist democratic revolution leading to socialism, people's war and military strategy generally, philosophy (where he made important contributions on the analysis of contradictions, which is the essence of dialectics, and on the theory of knowledge and its links with practice and the mass line), revolutionizing the superstructure and continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, as well as in the struggle against revisionism on the practical and theoretical fronts. It is therefore nothing less than the question of whether to uphold Marxism-Leninism itself. Mao's theoretical and practical leadership represent a quantitative and qualitative development of Marxism-Leninism on many fronts and the theoretical concentration of the historical experience of the proletarian revolution over the last several decades.

We are still living in the era of Leninism, of imperialism and the proletarian revolution; at the same time we affirm that Mao Tsetung Thought is a new stage in the development of Marxism-Leninism. Without upholding and building on Mao's contributions it is not possible to defeat revisionism, imperialism and reaction in general.

Closely linked to the above is the need to vigorously oppose the new revisionist rulers in China who have overthrown the dictatorship of the proletariat and are restoring capitalism. They have utterly capitulated to imperialism, and have demanded that others follow suit, at the present time under the signboard of their reactionary "strategic theory of the three worlds" which they have fraudulently tried to pass off to the ignorant as the work of Mao himself.

The Soviet revisionists and those revisionist parties historically linked to them remain bitter enemies of the international proletariat. In recent years the Soviet revisionists have adopted a more militant posture vis à vis the Western imperialist powers. This is consistent with their own requirements as a great imperialist power heading up a rival imperialist bloc. They have on several occasions intervened directly by military means or made use of the Vietnamese and Cuban revisionists who are part of their bloc, to seek to expand their imperialist domination. This is often masked as "internationalism". In some cases revisionist parties historically tied to the USSR have prompted such counterrevolutionary lines as "peaceful roads" and "historic compromise" with the bourgeoisie; in other cases these revisionist parties prepare military coups and armed actions divorced from the masses. The role and nature of the revisionist parties today must be further analyzed and studied, both in par-

ticular cases and in general, but in any event it is completely clear that they stand as bitter enemies of the proletarian revolution and must be unmasked and defeated as a crucial part of developing the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and mobilizing the masses in revolutionary struggle.

The Albanian Party of Labor and its leadership have fallen completely into the revisionist swamp. Shortly after the counter-revolutionary coup in China the PLA attracted a number of genuine revolutionaries because they opposed some of the more hideous features of the Hua-Teng clique in China, especially regarding international line. Very quickly, however, they outdid even Hua and Teng in the virulence of their attack on Mao and Mao Tsetung Thought. The PLA leaders have adopted classic Trotskyite positions on a number of questions, including the nature of the revolution in semi-feudal, semi-colonial countries, e.g. excluding people's war as a form of revolutionary struggle. More significantly their position grows daily closer to the made-in-Moscow revisionist line on a number of cardinal questions and world events, as already shown by their stand on Vietnam's invasion of Cambodia, the workers' upheaval in Poland, and their attacks on Mao, which are similar to the Soviets' attacks.

The influence of Trotskyism has been strengthened by revisionism in general and has been especially strengthened recently by the coming to power of the revisionists in China and by the revisionist stands of the PLA. The organizations and Parties which endorse this communique are calling for the struggle against revisionism to be linked to the struggle against the positions of the Trotskyites, which are left in form but deeply rightist in essence, and are especially calling for opposition to the following points: their "purist", "workerist" line of negating the alliance with the peasantry or other non-proletarian forces, negating in particular the policy of a united front against the reactionary classes in power; the negation of the possibility of seizing power and embarking on the socialist transition period in a single country; and their economist conception of the mass struggles and with regard to the way in which they see the transition to communism as consisting basically of a development of the productive forces.

The signatory organizations and Parties underline the increased danger posed by social democracy which holds power in a number of countries and which continues to serve as a Trojan horse for the interests of the Western imperialists. In addition to its usual conciliatory tactics, in some countries social democracy is attempting to form or influence armed groups in order to play a role in a situation of changing conditions. Marxist-Leninists must steadfastly combat their influence among the masses and must denounce all their tactics.

While it is not only possible but vitally necessary to take important steps now to unify genuine Marxist-Leninists on the basis of clear lines of demarcation that have emerged and in the face of the urgent tasks of the international movement, it is also necessary to carry out collective study, discussion and struggle over many important questions. This is particularly evident in relation to the necessity of developing a much fuller and

deeper understanding of the history of the international communist movement. As the Chinese Communist Party pointed out in 1963 when it was a genuine communist party, in its polemics with the Soviet revisionists, with regard to the history of the international communist (and national liberation) movement there are "many experiences and many lessons. There are experiences which people should praise and there are experiences which make people grieve. Communists and revolutionaries in all countries should ponder and seriously study these experiences of success and failure, so as to draw correct conclusions and useful lessons from them". Today, in light of further momentous experiences, positive and negative, since that time, and with the present situation and the looming possibilities in mind, this orientation assumes all the more profound significance. The need to dare to ponder and analyze more deeply and penetratingly in order to act more boldly is all the more decisive.

Before modern revisionism revealed itself openly in the USSR and various other countries, there already existed within the international communist movement different erroneous conceptions which facilitated its development.

While recognizing the undeniable contributions made by the Third International to the unity of the international proletariat, to the founding of communist parties and to their struggles; and while recognizing the tremendous role played by the October Revolution, which initiated the epoch of proletarian revolutions and opened the way for the construction of socialism in the USSR, communists must endeavor to critically sum up these experiences, making it possible to explain in the light of Marxism-Leninism the seizure of power by the bourgeoisie in that country and in other socialist nations, and also making it possible to learn from the errors and deviations which were committed and to evaluate to what extent they had bearing on the degeneration into opportunism of the majority of the international communist movement. In the face of the demoralization caused by these facts among broad sectors of the masses, and given that the bourgeois sectors are taking advantage of these facts, claiming that they prove the "failure" of Marxism, it falls on us communists to show that it is not scientific socialism which has failed, and that, on the contrary, scientific socialism makes it possible for us to grasp what objective and subjective factors gave rise to these events. Among other things, we must investigate and struggle over the experiences of the Third International and the reasons which led to its self-dissolution; the way in which the relationship between the revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie and imperialism and the policy of forming an anti-fascist united front was handled during the last world war, and also the very reasoning behind this policy; the origin of the revisionist tendencies, such as Browderism, which spread faith in the idea that it would be possible to establish a lasting peace and improve the living conditions of the masses on the basis of agreements between the USSR and the imperialist powers who were fighting against the fascist states, and of the tendencies to conciliation which these gave rise to; the

deep roots that led to the restoration of capitalism in the USSR and other socialist countries, paying particular attention to the way in which the development of the class struggle was handled and the question of how the need to consistently apply the dictatorship of the proletariat was treated in those countries, to the handling of the relationship between politics and ideology, between politics and economic and technical questions, the question of the mass line, the question of the correct handling of contradictions among the people and with the enemy on the basis of mobilizing the masses, the relationship of centralism and democracy within the party and the relationship of the party to the masses. By throwing light on these questions, while staying clear of the slander of the Trotskyites and other enemies of the revolution, we will be able to draw important lessons for the development of the revolution.

In sum, in order to achieve the unity of the Marxist-Leninists, it is essential to deepen the study so as to make an evaluation of the theoretical and practical activity of the communists during the period of the Third International, the Second World War and especially the causes of the coming to power of the revisionists in the countries in which the proletariat held power, particularly in the USSR and in China.

The undersigned Parties and organizations received and discussed a major draft text prepared jointly by the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile and the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA. They hold that, on the whole, the text is a positive contribution toward the elaboration of a correct general line for the international communist movement. With this perspective, the text should be circulated and discussed not only in the ranks of those organizations who have signed this com-

munique, but throughout the ranks of the international communist movement.

To carry out the struggle against revisionism and to aid the process of developing and struggling for a correct general line in the international communist movement, the undersigned Parties and organizations are launching an international journal. This journal can and will be a crucial weapon which can help unite, ideologically, politically and organizationally, the genuine Marxist-Leninists throughout the world.

These Parties and organizations signing this communique stress the need not only to maintain contact and carry out discussion and struggle with each other but actively to seek out and develop relations with other genuine Marxist-Leninists around the globe and carry out an ideological struggle and political work to win still broader forces of the international movement and the masses to consolidate the revolutionary position and reinforce the revolutionary struggles.

The current conjuncture in the world and in the international movement presents the revolutionary proletariat, the oppressed peoples and the Marxist-Leninists with great tasks, trials and, above all, great opportunities. Marxism-Leninism, the science of the revolutionary proletariat, has always been forged and tempered in the furnace of class struggle. Today we must rise to meet the challenges before us, race to catch up with the rapid developments of the objective conditions, reconstruct the unity of Marxist-Leninists on the basis of a correct line and summing up the experience of the past, fight for proletarian internationalism—and in so doing push ahead the advance toward communism throughout the world.

Autumn 1980



\$2.00