

548

“More on the Historical Experience of Proletarian Dictatorship”

*Published by
The Communist Party,
16 King Street, London, W.C.2,
and printed by
Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.),
Beechwood Rise, Watford, Herts.
CP/X/4/1/57*

An article prepared by the editorial department of the *People's Daily* (Peking) on the basis of a discussion at an enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. The article was published on December 29, 1956.



**“More on the
Historical
Experience of
Proletarian
Dictatorship”**



“MORE ON THE HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE OF PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP”

In April 1956, we discussed the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in connection with the question of Stalin. Since then, a further train of events in the international communist movement has caused concern to the people of our country. The publication in Chinese newspapers of Comrade Tito's speech of November 11, and the comments on that speech by various Communist Parties, have led people again to raise many questions which call for an answer. In the present article we shall centre our discussion on the following problems:

First: An appraisal of the fundamental course taken by the Soviet Union in its revolution and construction;

Second: An appraisal of Stalin's merits and faults;

Third: The struggle against doctrinairism and revisionism; and

Fourth: The international solidarity of the proletariat of all countries.

In examining modern international questions, we must proceed first of all from the most fundamental fact, the antagonism between the imperialist bloc of aggression and the popular forces in the world. The Chinese peoples, who have suffered enough from imperialist aggression, can never forget that imperialism has always opposed the liberation of all peoples and the independence of all oppressed nations, that it has always regarded the communist movement, which stands most resolutely for the people's interests, as a thorn in its flesh. Since the birth of the first socialist state, the Soviet Union, imperialism has tried by every means to wreck it. Following the establishment of a whole group of socialist states, the hostility of the imperialist camp to the socialist camp, and its flagrant acts of sabotage against the latter, have become a still more pronounced feature of world politics. The leader of the imperialist camp, the United States, has been especially vicious and shameless in its inter-

ference in the domestic affairs of socialist countries; for many years it has been obstructing China's liberation of its own territory Taiwan, and for many years it has openly adopted as its official policy the subversion of the East European countries

The activities of the imperialists in the Hungarian affair of October 1956 marked the gravest attack launched by them against the socialist camp since the war of aggression they carried on in Korea. Just as the resolution of the provisional central committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party pointed out, the Hungarian affair was the result of various causes, both internal and external, and one-sided explanation is incorrect; and among the causes international imperialism "played the main and decisive part". Following the defeat of their plot for a counter-revolutionary come-back in Hungary, the imperialist powers headed by the United States have manoeuvred the United Nations into adopting resolutions directed against the Soviet Union and interfering in Hungary's internal affairs. At the same time, they stirred up a hysterical anti-communist wave throughout the Western world. Although United States imperialism takes advantage of the fiasco of the Anglo-French war of aggression against Egypt in order to grab British and French interests in the Middle East and North Africa in every way possible, it pledges itself to eliminate its "misunderstandings" with Britain and France and to seek "closer and more intimate understanding" with them to repair their united front against communism, against the Asian and African peoples and against the peace-loving people of the world. To oppose communism, the people and peace, the imperialist countries should unite—this is the gist of Dulles' statement at the N.A.T.O. Council meeting on the so-called "need for a philosophy for living and acting at this critical point in world history". Somewhat intoxicated by his own illusions, Dulles asserted: "The Soviet communist structure is in a deteriorating condition (!) with the power of the rulers disintegrating (!) . . . Facing this situation, the free nations must maintain moral pressures which are helping to undermine the Soviet-Chinese communist system and maintain military strength and resolution". He called on the N.A.T.O. countries "to disrupt the powerful Soviet despotism (!) based upon militaristic (!) and atheistic concepts". He also expressed the view that "a change of character of that (communist) world now seems to be within the realm of possibility".

We have always considered our enemies our best teachers, and now Dulles is letting us have another lesson. He may slander us a thousand times and curse us ten thousand times, there is nothing new in this at all. But when Dulles, putting the matter on a "philosophic" plane, urges the imperialist countries to place their contradictions with communism above all other contradictions, to bend all their efforts towards bringing about "a change of character of that (communist) world" and towards "undermining" and "disrupting"

the socialist system headed by the Soviet Union—this is a lesson that is extremely helpful to us though such efforts will certainly come to naught. Although we have consistently held and still hold that the socialist and capitalist countries should co-exist in peace and carry out peaceful competition, the imperialists are bent on destroying us. We must therefore never forget the stern struggle with the enemy, i.e. the class struggle on a world scale.

There are before us two types of contradiction which are different in nature. The first type consists of contradictions between our enemy and ourselves (contradictions between the camp of imperialism and that of socialism, contradictions between imperialism and the people and oppressed nations of the whole world, contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the imperialist countries etc.) This is the fundamental type of contradiction, based on the clash of interests between antagonistic classes. The second type consists of contradictions within the ranks of the people (contradictions between different sections of the people, between comrades within the Communist Party, or, in socialist countries, contradictions between the government and the people, contradictions between socialist countries, contradictions between Communist Parties etc.). This type of contradiction is not basic; it is not the result of a fundamental clash of interests between classes, but of conflicts between right and wrong opinions or of a partial contradiction of interests. It is a type of contradiction whose solution must, first and foremost, be subordinated to the overall interests of the struggle against the enemy. Contradictions among the people themselves can and ought to be resolved, proceeding from the desire for solidarity under new conditions. Of course, real life is complicated. Sometimes, it is possible that classes whose interests are in fundamental conflict unite to cope with their main common enemy. On the other hand, under specific conditions, a certain contradiction among the people may be gradually transformed into an antagonistic contradiction when one side to it gradually goes over to the enemy. Finally, the nature of such a contradiction is completely changed: it no longer belongs to the category of contradictions among the people themselves but becomes a component part of the contradiction between ourselves and the enemy. Such a phenomenon did come about in the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Communist Party of China. In a word, anyone who adopts the standpoint of the people should not equate the contradictions among the people with the contradictions between the enemy and ourselves, or confuse these two types of contradictions, let alone place the contradictions among the people above the contradictions between the enemy and ourselves. Those who deny the class struggle and do not distinguish between the enemy and ourselves are definitely not communists or Marxist-Leninists.

We think it necessary to settle this question of fundamental standpoint first, before proceeding to the questions to be discussed. Otherwise, we are bound to lose our bearings, and will be unable to explain correctly international events.

I

The attacks by the imperialists on the international communist movement have long been concentrated mainly on the Soviet Union. Recent controversies in the international communist movement, for the most part, have also had to do with one's appraisal of the Soviet Union. Therefore, the problem of correctly assessing the fundamental course taken by the Soviet Union in its revolution and construction is an important one which Marxist-Leninists must solve.

The Marxist theory of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat is a scientific summing-up of the experience of the working class movement. However, with the exception of the Paris Commune which lasted only 72 days, Marx and Engels did not live to see for themselves the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat for which they had striven throughout their lives. In 1917, led by Lenin and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Russian proletariat carried the proletarian revolution to victory and established the dictatorship of the proletariat; it then successfully built up a socialist society. From this time on, the theory and ideals of scientific socialism became a living reality. And so, the Russian October Revolution of 1917 ushered in a new era, not only in the history of the communist movement but also in the history of mankind.

The Soviet Union has achieved tremendous successes in the 39 years since the revolution. Having eliminated the system of exploitation, the Soviet Union put an end to anarchy, crisis and unemployment in its economic life. Soviet economy and culture have advanced at a pace beyond the reach of capitalist countries. Soviet industrial output in 1956 is 30 times what it was in 1913, the peak year before the revolution. A country which before the revolution was industrially backward and had a high rate of illiteracy has now become the world's second greatest industrial power, possessing scientific and technical forces which are advanced by any standards, and a highly developed socialist culture. The working people of the Soviet Union, who were oppressed before the revolution, have become masters of their own country and society; they have displayed great enthusiasm and creativeness in revolutionary struggle and in construction, and a fundamental change has taken place in their material and cultural life. While before the October revolution, Russia was a prison of nations, after the October revolution these nations achieved equality in the Soviet Union and developed rapidly into advanced socialist nations.

The development of the Soviet Union has not been plain sailing. From 1918 to 1920, the country was attacked by 14 capitalist powers. In its early years, the Soviet Union went through such severe ordeals as civil war, famine, economic difficulties, and factional splitting activities within the Party. In a decisive period of the second world war, before the Western countries opened the second front, the Soviet Union, single-handed, met and defeated the attacks of millions of troops of Hitler and his partners. These stern trials failed to crush the Soviet Union or stop its progress.

The existence of the Soviet Union has shaken imperialist rule to its very foundations and brought unbounded hope, confidence and courage to all revolutionary movements of the workers and liberation movements of the oppressed nations. The working people of all countries have helped the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union has also helped them. It has carried out a foreign policy that guards world peace, recognises the equality of all nations, and opposes imperialist aggression. The Soviet Union was the main force in defeating fascist aggression throughout the world. The heroic armies of the Soviet Union liberated the East European countries, part of Central Europe, North-East China and the northern part of Korea in co-operation with the popular forces of these countries. The Soviet Union has established friendly relations with the People's Democracies, aided them in economic construction and, together with them, formed a mighty bulwark of world peace—the camp of socialism. The Soviet Union has also given powerful support to the independence movements of the oppressed nations, to the peace movement of the people of the world and to the many peaceable new states in Asia and Africa established since the second world war.

These are incontrovertible facts that people have known for a long time. Why is it necessary then to bring them up again? It is because, while the enemies of communism have naturally always denied all this, certain communists at the present time, in examining Soviet experience, often focus their attention on the secondary aspects of the matter and neglect the main aspects.

There are different aspects to Soviet experience in revolution and construction as far as its international significance is concerned. Of the successful experience of the Soviet Union, one part is fundamental and of universal significance at the present stage of human history. This is the most important and fundamental phase of Soviet experience. The other part is not of universal significance. In addition, the Soviet Union also had its mistakes and failures. No country can ever avoid them entirely, though they may vary in form and degree. And it was even more difficult for the Soviet Union to avoid them, because it was the first socialist country and had no successful experience of others to go by. Such mistakes and failures, however,

provide extremely useful lessons for all communists. That is why all Soviet experience, including certain mistakes and failures, deserves careful study while the fundamental part of the successful Soviet experience is of particular importance. The very fact of the advance of the Soviet Union is proof that the fundamental experience of the Soviet Union in revolution and construction is a great accomplishment, the first plan of victory of Marxism-Leninism in the history of mankind.

What is the fundamental experience of the Soviet Union in revolution and construction? In our opinion, the following, at the very least, should be considered fundamental:

One. The advanced members of the proletariat organise themselves into a Communist Party which takes Marxism-Leninism as its guide to action, builds itself up along the lines of democratic centralism, establishes close links with the masses, strives to become the core of the labouring masses and educates its party members and the masses of people in Marxism-Leninism.

Two. The proletariat, under the leadership of the Communist Party rallying all the labouring people, takes political power from the bourgeoisie by means of revolutionary struggle.

Three. After the victory of the revolution, the proletariat, under the leadership of the Communist Party, rallying the broad mass of the people on the basis of a worker-peasant alliance, establishes a dictatorship of the proletariat over the landlord and capitalist classes, crushes the resistance of the counter-revolutionaries, and carries out the nationalisation of industry and the step-by-step collectivisation of agriculture, thereby eliminating the system of exploitation, private ownership of the means of production and classes.

Four. The state, led by the proletariat and the Communist Party, leads the people in the planned development of socialist economy and culture, and on this basis gradually raises the people's living standards and actively prepares and works for the transition to communist society.

Five. The state, led by the proletariat and the Communist Party, resolutely opposes imperialist aggression, recognises the equality of all nations and defends world peace; firmly adheres to the principles of proletarian internationalism, strives to win the help of the labouring people of all countries, and at the same time strives to help them and all oppressed nations.

What we commonly refer to as the path of the October revolution means precisely these basic things, leaving aside the specific form it took at that particular time and place. These basic things are all universal truths of Marxism-Leninism which are generally applicable.

In the course of revolution and construction in different countries there are, besides aspects common to all, aspects which are different. In this sense, each country has its own specific path of development.

We shall discuss this question further on. But as far as basic theory is concerned, the path of the October revolution reflects the general laws of revolution and construction at a particular stage in the long course of the development of human society. It is not only the road for the proletariat of the Soviet Union, but also the road which the proletariat of all countries must travel to gain victory. Precisely for this reason the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China stated in its political report to the Party's Eighth National Congress: "Despite the fact that the revolution in our country has many characteristics of its own, Chinese communists regard the cause for which they work as a continuation of the great October revolution".

In the present international situation, it is of particularly great significance to defend this Marxist-Leninist path opened by the October revolution. When the imperialists proclaim that they want to bring about "a change of character of the communist world", it is precisely this revolutionary path which they want to change. For decades, the views put forward by all the revisionists to revise Marxism-Leninism, and the right-opportunist ideas which they spread, have been aimed precisely at evading this road, the road which the proletariat must take for its liberation. It is the task of all communists to unite the proletariat and the masses of the people to beat back resolutely the savage onslaught of the imperialists against the socialist world, and to march forward resolutely along the path blazed by the October revolution.

II

People ask: Since the basic path of the Soviet Union in revolution and construction was correct, how did Stalin's mistakes happen?

We discussed this question in our article published in April last year ["On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat"—Ed.] but as a result of recent events in Eastern Europe and other related developments, the question of correctly understanding and dealing with Stalin's mistakes has become a matter of importance affecting developments within the Communist Parties of many countries, unity between Communist Parties, and the common struggle of the Communist forces of the world against imperialism. So it is necessary to further expound our views on this question.

Stalin made a great contribution to the progress of the Soviet Union and to the development of the international communist movement. In "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" we wrote:

"After Lenin's death Stalin, as the chief leader of the Party and the state, creatively applied and developed Marxism-Leninism. In the struggle to defend the legacy of Leninism against its enemies—the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and other agents of the bourgeoisie—Stalin expressed the will and wishes of the people and proved himself to be an outstanding Marxist-Leninist fighter. The reason why Stalin won

the support of the Soviet people and played an important role in history was primarily because he, together with the other leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, defended Lenin's line on the industrialisation of the Soviet state and the collectivisation of agriculture. By pursuing this line, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union brought about the triumph of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and created the conditions for the victory of the Soviet Union in the war against Hitler; these victories of the Soviet people served the interests of the working class of the world and all progressive mankind. It was therefore also quite natural for the name of Stalin to be greatly honoured throughout the world".

But Stalin made some serious mistakes in regard to the domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet Union. His arbitrary method of work impaired to a certain extent the principle of democratic centralism both in the life of the Party and in the state system of the Soviet Union, and disrupted part of the socialist legal system. Because in many fields of work Stalin estranged himself from the masses to a serious extent, and made personal, arbitrary decisions concerning many important policies, it was inevitable that he should have made grave mistakes. These mistakes stood out most conspicuously in the suppression of counter-revolution and in relations with certain foreign countries. In suppressing counter-revolutionaries, Stalin, on the one hand, punished many counter-revolutionaries whom it was necessary to punish and, in the main, accomplished the tasks on this front; but, on the other hand, he wronged many local communists and honest citizens, and this caused serious losses. On the whole, in relations with brother countries and parties, Stalin took an internationalist stand and helped the struggle of other peoples and the growth of the socialist camp; but in tackling certain concrete questions, he showed a tendency towards great-nation chauvinism and himself lacked a spirit of equality, let alone educating the mass of cadres to be modest. Sometimes he even intervened mistakenly, with many grave consequences, in the internal affairs of certain brother countries and parties.

How are these serious mistakes of Stalin's to be explained? What is the connection between these mistakes and the socialist system of the Soviet Union?

The science of Marxist-Leninist dialectics teaches us that all types of relations of production, as well as the superstructures built up on their basis, have their own course of emergence, development, and extinction. When the old relations of production no longer basically correspond to the productive forces, the latter having reached a certain stage of development, and when the old superstructure no longer fundamentally corresponds to the economic basis, the latter having reached a certain stage of development, then changes of a fundamental nature must inevitably occur; whoever tries to resist such changes is discarded by history. This law is applicable through

different forms to all types of society. That is to say, it also applies to the socialist society of today and the communist society of tomorrow.

Were Stalin's mistakes due to the fact that the socialist economic and political system of the Soviet Union had become outmoded and no longer suited the needs of the development of the Soviet Union? Certainly no. Soviet socialist society is still young; it is not even 40 years old. The fact that the Soviet Union has made rapid progress economically proves that its economic system is, in the main, suited to the development of its productive forces; and that its political system is also, in the main, suited to the needs of its economic basis. Stalin's mistakes did not originate in the socialist system; it therefore follows that it is not necessary to "correct" the socialist system in order to correct these mistakes. The bourgeoisie of the West has not a leg to stand on to use Stalin's errors to prove that the socialist system is a "mistake". Nor are others convincing who trace Stalin's mistakes to the administration of economic affairs by the socialist state power, and assert that once the government takes charge of economic affairs it is bound to become a "bureaucratic machine" hindering the development of the socialist forces. No one can deny the tremendous upsurge of Soviet economy, the result precisely of the planned administration of economic affairs by the state of the working people, while the main mistakes committed by Stalin had very little to do with shortcomings of the state organs administering economic affairs.

But even where the basic system corresponds to the need, there are still certain contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic basis. These contradictions find expression in defects in certain links of the economic and political systems. Though it is not necessary to effect fundamental changes in order to solve these contradictions, readjustments must be made in good time.

Can we guarantee that mistakes will not happen once we have a basic system which corresponds to the need and have adjusted ordinary contradictions in the system (to use the language of dialectics, contradictions at the stage of "quantitative change")? The matter is not that simple. Systems are of decisive importance, but systems themselves are not all-powerful. No system, however excellent, can guard against the serious mistakes in our work. Once we have the right system, the main question is whether we can make the right use of it; whether we have the right policies and right methods and style of work. Without all these, even under a good system it will still be possible for people to commit serious mistakes and to use a good state apparatus to do evil things.

To solve the problems mentioned above, we must rely on the accumulation of experience and the use of practice; we cannot expect results overnight. What is more, with conditions constantly changing,

new problems arise as old ones are solved, and there is no solution which holds good for all time. Viewed from this angle, it is not surprising to find that even in socialist countries which have been established on a firm basis there are still defects in certain links of their relations of production and superstructure, and deviations of one kind or another in the policies and methods and style of work of the Party and the state.

In the socialist countries, the task of the Communist Party and the state is, by relying on the strength of the masses and the collective, to make timely re-adjustments in the various links of the economic and political systems, and to discover and correct mistakes in their work in good time. Naturally, it is not possible for the views of the leading personnel of the Communist Party and the state to conform *completely* to reality. Isolated, local and temporary mistakes in their work are therefore unavoidable. But so long as the principles of the dialectical materialist science of Marxism-Leninism are strictly observed and efforts are made to develop them, so long as the system of democratic centralism of the Party and the state is thoroughly observed, and so long as we rely on the masses, persistent and serious mistakes affecting the whole country can be avoided.

The reason why some of the mistakes made by Stalin during the latter years of his life became serious, nationwide and persistent, and were not corrected in time, was precisely that in certain fields and to a certain degree he became isolated from the masses and the collective and violated the principle of democratic centralism of the Party and the state. The reason for such a partial infraction of democratic centralism lay in certain social and historical conditions: the Party lacked experience in leading the state; the new system was not sufficiently consolidated to be able to resist every encroachment of the influence of the old era (consolidation of a new system and the dying away of the old influences do not operate in a straightforward fashion but often assume the form of an undulating movement at turning points in history); there was the constricting effect which acute internal and external struggle had on certain aspects of development of democracy etc. Nevertheless, these objective conditions alone would not have been enough to transform the possibility of making mistakes into their actual commission, Lenin, working under conditions which were much more complicated and difficult than those encountered by Stalin, did not make the mistakes that Stalin made. Here, the decisive factor is the ideological conditions. A series of victories and the eulogies he received in the latter years of his life turned his head. He deviated partly, but grossly, from the dialectical materialist way of thinking and fell into subjectivism. He began to put blind faith in personal wisdom and authority; he would not investigate and study the complicated conditions seriously or listen carefully to the opinions of his comrades and the voice of the masses. As a result, some of the

policies and measures he adopted were often at variance with objective reality. He often stubbornly persisted in carrying out these mistaken measures over a long period and was unable to correct his mistakes in time.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has taken measures to correct Stalin's mistakes and eliminate their consequences. These measures are beginning to bear fruit. The Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union showed great determination and courage in doing away with blind faith in Stalin, in exposing the gravity of Stalin's mistakes and in eliminating their effects. Marxist-Leninists throughout the world, and all those who sympathise with the communist cause, support the efforts of the C.P.S.U. to correct mistakes, and hope that the efforts of the Soviet comrades will meet with complete success. It is obvious that since Stalin's mistakes were not of short duration, their thorough correction cannot be achieved overnight, but demands fairly protracted efforts and thorough-going ideological education. We believe that the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has already overcome countless difficulties, will triumph over its difficulties and achieve its purpose.

It is not to be expected, of course, that this effort of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to correct mistakes would get any support from the bourgeoisie and the right-wing social-democrats of the West. Eager to take advantage of the opportunity to erase what was correct in Stalin's work as well as the immense achievements of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist camp up to now, and to create confusion and division in the communist ranks, the Western bourgeoisie and right-wing social-democrats have deliberately labelled the correction of Stalin's mistakes "de-Stalinisation" and described it as a struggle waged by "anti-Stalinist elements" against "Stalinist elements". Their vicious intent is evident enough. Unfortunately, similar views of this kind have also gained ground among some communists. We consider it extremely harmful for communists to hold such views.

As is well known, although Stalin committed some grave mistakes in his later years, his was nevertheless the life of a great Marxist-Leninist revolutionary. In his youth, Stalin fought against the Tsarist system and for the spread of Marxist-Leninism. After, he joined the central leading organ of the Party; he took part in the struggle to pave the way for the revolution of 1917. After the October revolution, he fought to defend its fruits. In the nearly 30 years after Lenin's death, he worked to build socialism, defend the socialist fatherland and advance the world communist movement. All in all, Stalin always stood at the head of historical developments and guided the struggle; he was an implacable foe of imperialism. His tragedy lies in the fact that, at the very time when he was doing things which were mistaken, he believed they were necessary for the defence of the interests of the working people against encroachments by the enemy. Stalin's mis-

takes did harm to the Soviet Union, which could have been avoided. None the less, the socialist Soviet Union made tremendous progress during the period of Stalin's leadership. This undeniable fact not only testifies to the strength of the socialist system but also shows that Stalin was after all a staunch communist. Therefore, in summing up Stalin's thoughts and activities, we must consider both his positive and negative sides, both his achievements and his mistakes. As long as we examine the matter in an all-round way, even if people must speak of "Stalinism", it could only mean, in the first place, Communism and Marxism-Leninism, which is the main aspect; and secondarily, it contains certain extremely serious mistakes which go against Marxism-Leninism and must be thoroughly corrected. Even though at times it is necessary to stress these mistakes in order to correct them, it is also necessary to set them in their proper place so as to make a correct appraisal and avoid misleading people. In our opinion Stalin's mistakes take second place to his achievements.

Only by adopting an objective and analytical attitude can we correctly appraise Stalin and all those comrades who made similar mistakes under his influence, and correctly deal with their mistakes. Since these mistakes were made by communists in the course of their work, what is involved is a question of right versus wrong within communist ranks, but not an issue of ourselves versus the enemy in the class struggle. We need therefore to adopt a comradely attitude towards these people and should not treat them as enemies. We should defend what is correct in their work while criticising their mistakes and should not blankly denounce everything they did. Their mistakes have a social and historical background and can be attributed especially to their ideology and understanding. In just the same way, such mistakes may also occur in the work of other comrades. That is why, having recognised the mistakes and undertaken their correction, it is necessary that we regard them as grave lessons, as an asset that can be used for heightening the political consciousness of all communists, thus preventing the recurrence of such mistakes and advancing the cause of communism. If, on the contrary, one takes a completely negative attitude to those comrades who made mistakes, treats them with hostility and discriminates against them by labelling them this and that kind of element, it will not help them to learn the lesson they should learn. Moreover, since this means confusing the two entirely different types of contradiction—that of right versus wrong within our own ranks and that of ourselves versus the enemy—it will only help the enemy in his attack on the communist ranks and attempts at disintegrating the communist position.

The attitude taken by Comrade Tito and other leading comrades of the Yugoslav League of Communists towards Stalin's mistakes and other related questions, as their recent views indicate, cannot be regarded by us as well-balanced or objective. It is understandable that

the Yugoslav comrades bear a particular resentment against Stalin's mistakes. In the past, they made worthy efforts to stick to socialism under difficult conditions. Their experiments in the democratic management of economic enterprises and other socialist organisations have also attracted attention. The Chinese people welcome the reconciliation between the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on the one hand, and Yugoslavia on the other, as well as the establishment and development of friendly relations between China and Yugoslavia. Like the Yugoslav people, the Chinese people hope that Yugoslavia will become ever more prosperous and powerful as it advances to socialism. We also agree with some of the points in Comrade Tito's speech, for instance, his condemnation of the Hungarian counter-revolutionaries, his support for the Worker-Peasant Revolutionary Government of Hungary, his condemnation of Britain, France and Israel for their aggression against Egypt and his condemnation of the French Socialist Party for adopting a policy of aggression. But we are amazed that, in his speech, he attacked almost all the socialist countries and many of the communist parties. Comrade Tito made assertions about "those hard-bitten Stalinist elements who in various parties have managed still to maintain themselves in their posts and who would again wish to consolidate their rule and impose those Stalinist tendencies upon their people, and even others." Therefore, he declared, "together with the Polish comrades we shall have to fight such tendencies which crop up in various other parties, whether in the Eastern countries or in the West." We have not come across any statement put forward by leading comrades of the Polish United Workers' Party, saying that it was necessary to adopt such a hostile attitude towards brother parties. We feel it necessary to say in connection with these views of Comrade Tito's that he took up a wrong attitude when he set up so-called "Stalinism", "Stalinist elements" etc. as objects of attack and maintained that the question now was whether the course "begun in Yugoslavia" or the so-called "Stalinist course" would win out. This can only lead to a split in the communist movement.

Comrade Tito correctly pointed out that "viewing the current development in Hungary from the perspective—socialism or counter-revolution—we must defend Kadar's present government, we must help it." But help to and defence of the Hungarian Government can hardly be said to be the sense of the long speech on the Hungarian question made before the National Assembly of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia by Comrade Kardelj, Vice-President of the Federal Executive Council of Yugoslavia. In the interpretation of the Hungarian incident he gave in his speech, Comrade Kardelj not only made no distinction whatsoever between ourselves and the enemy, but he told the Hungarian comrades that "a thorough change is necessary in the [Hungarian—Ed.] political system". He also called on them to

turn over state power wholly to the Budapest and other Regional Workers' Councils, "no matter what the Workers' Councils have become", and he declared that they "need not waste their efforts on trying to restore the Communist Party". "The reason," he said, "was because to the masses the party was the personification of bureaucratic depotism." Such is the blueprint of the "anti-Stalinist course" which Comrade Kardelj designed for brother countries. The comrades in Hungary rejected this proposal of Comrade Kardelj. They dissolved the Budapest and other Regional Workers' Councils which were being controlled by counter-revolutionaries and persisted in building up the Socialist Workers' Party. We consider that the Hungarian comrades are entirely right to act in this way, because otherwise Hungary's future would belong not to socialism but to counter-revolution.

Clearly, the Yugoslav comrades are going too far. Even if some part of their criticism of brother parties is reasonable, the basic stand and method they adopt infringe the principles of comradely discussion. We have no wish to interfere in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia, but the matters mentioned above are by no means internal. In order to consolidate unity of the international communist ranks and avoid creating conditions which the enemy can use to cause confusion and division in our own ranks, we cannot but offer our brotherly advice to the Yugoslav comrades.

III

One of the grave consequences of Stalin's mistakes was the growth of doctrinairism. While criticising Stalin's mistakes, the Communist Parties of various countries have waged a struggle against doctrinairism. This struggle is entirely necessary. But by adopting a negative attitude towards everything connected with Stalin, and by putting up the erroneous slogan of "de-Stalinisation", some communists have helped to foster a revisionist trend against Marxism-Leninism. This revisionist trend is undoubtedly of help to the imperialist attack against the communist movement, and the imperialists are in fact making active use of it. While resolutely opposing doctrinairism, we must at the same time resolutely oppose revisionism.

Marxism-Leninism holds that there are common, basic laws in the development of human society, but each state and nation has features different from those of others. Thus all nations pass through the class struggle, and will eventually arrive at communism, by roads that are the same in essence but different in their specific forms. The cause of the proletariat in a given country will triumph only if the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism is properly applied in the light of its special national features. And so long as this is done, the proletariat will accumulate new experience, thus making its contribution to the cause of other nations and to the general treasury of Marxism-Leninism. Doctrinaires do not understand that the universal truth

of Marxism-Leninism manifests itself concretely and becomes operative in real life only through the medium of specific national characteristics. They are not willing to make a careful study of the social and historical features of their own country and nation or to apply in a practical way the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism in the light of these features. Consequently they cannot lead the proletarian cause to victory.

Since Marxism-Leninism is the scientific summing up of the experience of the working class movement of various countries, it follows that it must attach importance to the question of applying the experience of advanced countries. Lenin wrote in his book *What Is To Be Done?*: "The social-democratic movement is in its very essence an international movement. This means not only that we must combat national chauvinism, but also that a movement that is starting in a young country can be successful only if it implements the experience of other countries." What Lenin meant here was that the Russian working class movement, which was just beginning, must utilise the experience of the working-class movement in Western Europe. His view applies, likewise, to the use of Soviet experience by younger socialist countries.

But there must be a proper method of learning. All the experience of the Soviet Union, including its fundamental experience, is bound up with definite national characteristics, and no other country should copy it mechanically. Moreover, as has been pointed out above, part of Soviet experience is that derived from mistakes and failures. For those who know how best to learn from others this whole body of experience, both of success and failure, is an invaluable asset, because it can help them avoid roundabout ways in their progress and reduce their losses. On the other hand, indiscriminate and mechanical copying of experience that has been successful in the Soviet Union—let alone that which was unsuccessful there—may lead to failures in another country. Lenin wrote in the passage immediately following the one quoted above: "And in order to implement this experience, it is not enough merely to be acquainted with it, or simply to transcribe the latest resolutions. What it requires is the ability to treat this experience critically and to test it independently. Anybody who realises how enormously the modern working-class movement has grown and branched out will understand what a reserve of theoretical forces and political (as well as revolutionary) experience is required to fulfil this task." Obviously, in countries where the proletariat has gained power, the problem is many times more complex than that referred to by Lenin here.

Between 1931 and 1934 in the history of the Communist Party of China there were doctrinaires who refused to recognise China's specific characteristics, mechanically copied certain experience of the Russian revolution, and caused serious reverses to the revolutionary

forces of our country. These reverses were a profound lesson to our Party. In the period between the Tsunyi conference of 1935 and the Party's Seventh National Congress held in 1945, our Party thoroughly liquidated this extremely harmful doctrinaire line, united all the members, including those who had made mistakes, developed the people's forces and thus won victory for the revolution. If this had not been done, victory would have been impossible. It is only because we discarded the doctrinaire line that it has become possible for our party to make fewer mistakes in learning from the experience of the Soviet Union and other brother countries. It is because of this too that we are able to understand fully how necessary and arduous it is for our Polish and Hungarian comrades to correct today the doctrinaire errors of the past.

Errors of doctrinaireism, whenever and wherever they occur, must be set right. We shall continue our efforts to correct and prevent such errors in our work. But opposition to doctrinaireism has nothing in common with tolerance of revisionism. Marxism-Leninism recognises that the communist movements of various countries necessarily have their own national characteristics. But this does not mean that they do not share certain basic features in common, or that they can depart from the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism. In the present anti-doctrinaire tide, there are people in our country and abroad who, on the pretext of opposing the mechanical copying of Soviet experience, try to deny the international significance of the fundamental experience of the Soviet Union and, on the plea of creatively developing Marxism-Leninism, try to deny the significance of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism.

Because Stalin and the former leaders in some socialist countries committed the serious mistake of violating socialist democracy, some waverers in communist ranks, on the pretext of developing socialist democracy, attempt to weaken or renounce the dictatorship of the proletariat, the democratic centralism of the socialist state, and the leading role of the Party.

There cannot be any doubt that in a proletarian dictatorship the dictatorship over the counter-revolutionary forces must be closely combined with the broadest scope of people's, that is socialist, democracy. The reason why the dictatorship of the proletariat is powerful, why it is capable of defeating powerful enemies at home and abroad, to assume the great historic task of achieving socialism, is that it is a dictatorship of the working people over the exploiters—a dictatorship of the majority over the minority—and gives the broad masses of the working people a democracy which is unattainable under any bourgeois democracy. Failure to forge close links with the mass of the working people and to gain their enthusiastic support makes it impossible to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, or at any rate impossible to consolidate it. The more acute the class struggle becomes, the more

necessary it is for the proletariat to rely, most resolutely and completely, on the broad masses of the people and to bring into full play their revolutionary enthusiasm to defeat the counter-revolutionary forces. The experience of the stirring and seething mass struggles in the Soviet Union during the October revolution and the ensuing civil war proved this truth to the full. It is from Soviet experience in that period that the "mass line" our Party so often talks about was derived.

The acute struggles in the Soviet Union then depended mainly on direct action by the mass of the people, and naturally there was little possibility for perfect democratic procedures to develop. Although after the elimination of the exploiting classes and the wiping out in the main of the counter-revolutionary forces, it was still necessary for the dictatorship of the proletariat to deal with counter-revolutionary remnants—these could not be wiped out completely so long as imperialism existed—yet its edge should have been mainly directed against the aggressive forces of foreign imperialism. In these circumstances, in the political life of the country, democratic procedures should have been gradually developed and perfected; the socialist legal system perfected; supervision by the people over the state organs strengthened; democratic methods of administering the state and managing enterprises developed; links between the state organs and the bodies administering various enterprises on the one hand, and the broad masses on the other, made closer; hindrances impairing any of these links done away with and a firmer check put on bureaucratic tendencies. After the elimination of classes, the class struggle should not continue to be stressed as being intensified, as it was done by Stalin, with the result that the healthy development of socialist democracy was hampered. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is completely right in firmly correcting Stalin's mistakes in this respect.

Socialist democracy should in no way be pitted against the dictatorship of the proletariat; nor should it be confused with bourgeois democracy. The sole aim of socialist democracy, in political, economic and cultural fields alike, is to strengthen the socialist cause of the proletariat and all the working people, to give scope to their energies for the building of socialism, and to bring their energies into full play in the fight against all anti-socialist forces. If there is a kind of democracy that can be used for anti-socialist purposes and for weakening the cause of socialism, this is certainly not socialist democracy.

Some people, however, do not see things that way. Their reaction to events in Hungary has revealed this most clearly. In the past the democratic rights and revolutionary enthusiasm of the Hungarian working people were impaired, while the counter-revolutionaries were not dealt the blow they deserved, with the result that it was fairly easy for the counter-revolutionaries, in October 1956, to take advantage of the discontent of the masses to organise an armed revolt. This

showed that, in the past, a dictatorship of the proletariat had not been really established in Hungary. When Hungary was facing its crisis, when it lay between revolution and counter-revolution, between socialism and fascism, between peace and war, how did communist intellectuals in some countries see the problem? They not only did not raise the question of realising a dictatorship of the proletariat but came out against the righteous action taken by the Soviet Union in aiding the socialist forces in Hungary. They came forward to declare that the counter-revolution in Hungary was a "revolution" and to demand that the Worker-Peasant Revolutionary Government extend "democracy" to the counter-revolutionaries. In certain socialist countries some newspapers are even to this day wantonly discrediting the revolutionary measures taken by the Hungarian communists who are fighting heroically under difficult conditions, while hardly a word has been said by them about the reactionary international campaign against communism, against the people and against peace. What is the meaning of these strange facts?

It means that those "socialists" who depart from the dictatorship of the proletariat to prate about "democracy" actually stand with the bourgeoisie in opposition to the proletariat; that they are, in effect, asking for capitalism and opposing socialism, though many among them may themselves be unaware of that fact. Lenin pointed out time and again that the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the most essential part of Marxism; that acceptance or rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat is "what constitutes the most profound difference between the Marxist and the ordinary petty (as well as big) bourgeois". Lenin asked the Hungarian proletarian regime of 1919 to use "mercilessly rigorous, swift and resolute force" to suppress the counter-revolutionaries. "Whoever has not understood this," he said, "is not a revolutionary and should be removed from the post of leader or adviser of the proletariat". So if people reject the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles regarding the dictatorship of the proletariat, if they slanderously dub these principles "Stalinism" and "doctrinairism" simply because they have perceived the mistakes committed by Stalin in the latter part of his life and those made by the former Hungarian leaders, they will be taking the path that leads to betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and away from the cause of proletarian revolution.

Those who reject the dictatorship of the proletariat also deny the need for centralism in socialist democracy and the leading role played by the proletarian party in socialist countries. To Marxist-Leninists, of course, such ideas are nothing new. Engels pointed out long ago, when struggling against the anarchists, that as long as there is concerted action in any social organisation there must be a certain degree of authority and subordination. The relation between authority and autonomy is relative and the scope of their application changes with

different stages of the development of society. Engels said that "it is absurd to speak of the principle of authority as being absolutely evil, and of the principle of autonomy as being absolutely good", and that anyone who insisted on such an absurdity was in fact "serving reaction". In the struggle against the Mensheviks, Lenin brought out most clearly the decisive significance of the organised leadership of the Party for the proletarian cause. When criticising the German Communist "left" in 1920, Lenin stressed that to deny the leading role of the Party, to deny the part played by leaders and to reject discipline, is tantamount "to completely disarming the proletariat in the interest of the bourgeoisie. It is tantamount to that petty-bourgeois diffuseness, instability, incapacity for sustained effort, unity and organised action, which, if indulged in, must inevitably destroy every proletarian revolutionary movement." Have these principles become obsolete? Are they inapplicable to the specific conditions in certain countries? Will their application lead to the repetition of Stalin's mistakes? The answer is obviously "No". These principles of Marxism-Leninism have stood the test of history in the development of the international communist movement and of the socialist countries, and not a single case that can be called an exception to them has been found so far. Stalin's mistakes did not lie in the practice of democratic centralism in state affairs, nor in putting leadership by the Party into effect; it lay precisely in the fact that, in certain fields and to a certain degree, he undermined democratic centralism and leadership by the Party. The correct practice of democratic centralism in state affairs and the proper strengthening of leadership by the Party in the socialist cause are the basic guarantees that the countries in the socialist camp will be able to unite their people, defeat their enemies, overcome their difficulties and grow vigorously. It is precisely for this reason that the imperialists and all counter-revolutionaries, bent on attacking our cause, have always demanded that we "liberalise", that they have always concentrated their forces on wrecking the leading bodies of our cause, and on destroying the Communist Party, the core of the proletariat. They have expressed great satisfaction at the current "instability" in certain socialist countries, resulting from the impairment of discipline in the Party and the state organs, and are taking advantage of this to intensify their acts of sabotage. These facts show how great is the significance of upholding the authority of democratic centralism and the leading role of the Party in the basic interests of the masses of the people. There is no doubt that the centralism in the system of democratic centralism must rest on a broad basis of democracy, and that the Party leadership must maintain close ties with the masses. Any shortcomings in this respect must be firmly criticised and overcome. But such criticism should be made only for the purpose of consolidating democratic centralism and of strengthening the leadership of the Party. It should in no circumstances bring about dis-

organisation and confusion in the ranks of the proletariat, as our enemies desire.

Among those who are trying to revise Marxism-Leninism on the pretext of combating doctrinarism, there are some who simply deny that there is a demarcation line between the proletarian and the bourgeois dictatorship, between the socialist and the capitalist systems and between the socialist and the imperialist camps. According to them, it is possible for certain bourgeois countries to build socialism without going through a proletarian revolution led by the Party of the proletariat and without setting up a state led by the same, that state capitalism in those countries is socialism itself, and even human society as a whole has already been "growing into" socialism. But while these people are publicising such ideas the imperialists are mobilising all available military, diplomatic, espionage and "moral" forces, actively preparing to "undermine" and "disrupt" socialist countries which have been established for many years. The bourgeois counter-revolutionaries are of these countries, who are in hiding at home or living in exile, are still making every effort to stage a come-back. While the revisionist trend serves the interest of the imperialists, the actions of the imperialists do not benefit revisionism but point to its bankruptcy.

IV

It is one of the most urgent tasks of the proletariat of all countries in its fight against imperialist onslaughts to strengthen its international solidarity. The imperialists and reactionaries in various countries are trying in a thousand and one ways to make use of narrow nationalist sentiments and of certain national estrangements among the people to wreck this solidarity, thereby destroying the communist cause. Staunch proletarian revolutionaries firmly uphold this solidarity, which they regard as being in the common interest of the working class of all countries. Wavering enemies have taken no firm, clear-cut stand on this question.

The communist movement has been an international movement from its very inception, because the workers of various countries can throw off joint oppression by the bourgeoisie of various countries and attain their common aim only by common effort. This international solidarity of the communist movement has greatly helped the proletariat of various countries in developing their revolutionary cause.

The triumph of the Russian October revolution gave enormous impetus to the fresh advances of the international proletarian revolutionary movement. In the thirty-nine years since the October revolution, the achievements of the international communist movement have been immense, and it has become a powerful, world-wide political force. The world proletariat and all who long for emancipation place their hopes of a bright future for mankind on the victory of this movement.

During these past thirty-nine years the Soviet Union has been the centre of the international communist movement, owing to the fact that it is the first triumphant socialist country, the most powerful and experienced country in the socialist camp since its emergence, capable of giving the most significant help to other socialist countries and to peoples of various countries in the capitalist world. This is not the result of anyone's arbitrary decision, but the natural outcome of historical conditions. In the interests of the common cause of the proletariat of different countries, of joint resistance to the attack on the socialist cause by the imperialist camp headed by the United States, and of the economic and cultural upsurge common to all socialist countries, we must continue to strengthen international proletarian solidarity with the Soviet Union as its centre.

International solidarity of the Communist Parties is an entirely new type of relationship in human history. It is natural that its development cannot be free from difficulties. The Communist Parties must seek unity with each other as well as maintain their respective independence. Historical experience proves that mistakes are bound to occur if there is no proper integration of these two aspects; if one or the other is neglected. Should the Communist Parties maintain relations and equality among themselves and reach common understanding and take concerted action through genuine, and not nominal exchange of views, their unity will be strengthened. Conversely, if, in their mutual relations, one Party imposes its views upon others, or if the parties use the methods of interference in each other's internal affairs instead of comradely suggestions and criticism, their unity will be impaired.

In the socialist countries, the Communist Parties have assumed the responsibility of leadership in the affairs of the state, and relations between them often involve directly the relations between their respective countries and peoples, so the proper handling of such relations has become a problem demanding even greater care.

Marxism-Leninism has always insisted upon combining proletarian internationalism with the patriotism of the people of various countries. Each Communist Party must educate its members and the people in a spirit of internationalism; because the true national interests of all people call for friendly co-operation among nations. On the other hand, each Communist Party must represent the legitimate national interests and sentiments of its own people. Communists have always been true patriots, and they understand that it is only when they correctly represent the interests and sentiments of their nation that they really enjoy the trust and love of the broad mass of their own people, effectively educate them in internationalism and harmonise the national sentiments and interests of the people of different countries.

To strengthen the international solidarity of the socialist countries, each Communist Party must respect the national interests and sentiments of other countries. This is of especial importance for the Com-

unist Party of a larger country in its relations with that of a smaller country. To avoid any resentment on the part of the smaller country, the Party of a larger country must constantly take care to maintain an attitude of equality. As Lenin rightly said, "It is the duty of the class-conscious communist proletariat of all countries to treat the survivals of national sentiments among the countries and nationalities which have been oppressed for the longest periods with special caution and special attention."

As we have already said, Stalin displayed certain great-nation chauvinist tendencies in relations with brother parties and countries. The essence of such tendencies lies in being unmindful of the independent and equal status of the Communist Parties of various lands and that of the socialist countries within the framework of an international bond of union. There are definite historical reasons for such tendencies. The time-worn habits of big countries in their relations with small countries continue to make their influence felt in certain ways, while a series of victories achieved by a Party or a country in its revolutionary cause is apt to give rise to a certain sense of superiority.

For these reasons, systematic efforts are needed to overcome great-nation chauvinist tendencies. Great-nation chauvinism is not peculiar to any one country. For instance, country B may be small and backward compared to country A, but big and advanced compared to country C. Thus country B, while complaining of great-nation chauvinism on the part of country A, may often assume the airs of a great nation in relation to country C. What we Chinese especially must bear in mind is that China too was a big empire during the Han, Tang, Ming and Ching dynasties. Although it is true that in the hundred years after the middle of the nineteenth century, China became the victim of aggression and a semi-colony and although she is still economically and culturally backward today, nevertheless, under changed conditions, great-nation chauvinist tendencies will certainly become a serious danger if we do not take every precaution to guard against them. It should, furthermore, be pointed out that some signs of this danger have already begun to appear among some of our personnel. That was why emphasis was laid on combating the tendency of great-nation chauvinism both in the resolution of the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China and the statement of the Government of the People's Republic of China issued on 1 November 1956.

But it is not only great-nation chauvinism that hinders international proletarian unity. In the course of history, big countries have shown disrespect for small countries and even oppressed them; and small countries have distrusted big ones and even become hostile to them. Both tendencies still exist to a greater or lesser extent among the peoples and even in the ranks of the working class of various coun-

That is why, in order to strengthen the international solidarity of the proletariat, apart from the primary task of overcoming great-nation chauvinist tendencies in bigger countries, it is also necessary to overcome nationalist tendencies in smaller countries. No matter whether their country is big or small, if Communists counterpose the interests of their own country and nation to the general interest of the international proletarian movement, make this a pretext for opposing the general interests, and not seriously maintaining international proletarian solidarity in actual practice but on the contrary damaging it, they will be committing a serious mistake of violating the principles of internationalism and Marxism-Leninism.

Stalin's mistakes aroused grave dissatisfaction among people in certain Eastern European countries. But then neither is the attitude of some people in these countries towards the Soviet Union justified. Bourgeois nationalists try their best to exaggerate the shortcomings of the Soviet Union and overlook the contributions it has made. They attempt to prevent the people from thinking how would the imperialists treat their country and their people if the Soviet Union did not exist. We Chinese communists are very glad to see that the Communist Parties of Poland and Hungary are always putting a firm check on the activities of evil elements that fabricate anti-Soviet rumours and stir up national antagonisms in relations with brother countries, and also that these parties have set to work to dispel nationalist prejudices existing among some sections of the masses and even among some of the party members. This is clearly one of the steps urgently needed to consolidate friendly relations among the socialist countries.

As we pointed out above, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has, in the main, conformed to the interests of the international proletariat, the oppressed nations and the peoples of the world. In the past thirty-nine years, the Soviet people have made tremendous efforts and heroic sacrifices in aiding the cause of the peoples of the various countries. Mistakes committed by Stalin certainly cannot detract from these historic achievements of the great Soviet people.

The Soviet Government's efforts to improve relations with Yugoslavia, its declaration of October 30 1956, and its talks with Poland in November 1956 all manifest the determination of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government to thoroughly eliminate past mistakes in foreign relations. These steps by the Soviet Union are an important contribution to the strengthening of the international solidarity of the proletariat.

Obviously, at the present moment, when the imperialists are launching frenzied attacks on the communist ranks in the various countries, it is necessary for the proletariat of all nations to strive to strengthen its solidarity. As we are faced with powerful enemies no word or deed, no matter what name it goes by, which harms the solidarity

of the international communist ranks can hope to receive any sympathy from the communists and working people of the various countries.

The strengthening of the international solidarity of the proletariat, with the Soviet Union as its core, is not only in the interests of the world proletariat but also in the interests of the independence movement of all oppressed nations, and of world peace. Through their own experience, the broad masses of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America easily understand who are their enemies and who their friends. That is why the imperialist-instigated campaign against communism, against the people and against peace has evoked so faint a response with only a handful among the more than 1,000 million people who inhabit these continents. Facts prove that the revolutionary proletariat of the Soviet Union, China, the other socialist countries and that of the imperialist countries are all staunch supporters of Egypt's struggle against aggression, and of the independence movements in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The socialist countries, the proletariat in the imperialist countries, and the countries striving for national independence—these three forces have bonds of common interest in their struggle against imperialism and their mutual support and assistance is of the greatest significance to the future of mankind and world peace. Recently the imperialist forces of aggression have again created a certain degree of tension in the international situation. But with the joint struggle of the three forces we have mentioned, plus the concerted efforts of all other peaceloving forces in the world, a new lessening of such tension can be achieved. The imperialist forces of aggression failed to gain anything from their invasion of Egypt; instead, they were dealt a telling blow. Furthermore, thanks to the help given by the Soviet troops to the Hungarian people, the imperialists were frustrated in their plan to build an outpost of war in Eastern Europe and to disrupt the solidarity of the socialist camp. Socialist countries are persisting in their efforts for peaceful co-existence with the capitalist countries, to develop diplomatic, economic and cultural relations with them, to settle international disputes through peaceful negotiations, to oppose preparations for a new world war, to expand the peace area in the world, and to broaden the scope of application of the five principles of peaceful co-existence.

All these efforts will certainly win ever more sympathy from the oppressed nations and the peaceloving peoples throughout the world. The strengthening of the international solidarity of the proletariat will make the imperialist warmongers think twice before embarking upon new adventures. Therefore, despite the fact that the imperialists are still trying to resist the efforts described above, the forces for peace will eventually triumph over the forces for war.

The international communist movement has only a history of ninety-

two years, reckoning from the establishment of the First International in 1864. Despite many ups and downs, the progress of the movement as a whole has been very rapid. During the first world war, there appeared the Soviet Union, covering one-sixth of the earth. After the second world war, there appeared the camp of socialism, which now has a third of the world's population. When the socialist states commit errors of one kind or another, our enemies are elated while some of our comrades and friends become dejected; a number of them even waver in their confidence as to the future of the communist cause. However, there is little cause for our enemies to rejoice or for our comrades and friends to feel dejected or to waver. The proletariat has begun to rule the state for the first time in history. In some countries this occurred only a few years ago, and in the oldest only a few decades ago. So it is impossible to expect that no failures should be encountered. Temporary and partial failures have occurred, are still occurring, and may occur in the future.

But any person with foresight will not feel dejected and pessimistic because of them. Failure is the mother of success. Recent temporary, partial failures have enriched the political experience of the international proletariat and will help to pave the way for great successes in the endless years to come. Compared with the history of the bourgeois revolutions in Britain and France, the failures in our cause are insignificant. The bourgeois revolution in Britain started in 1640. After vanquishing the King, this was followed by Cromwell's dictatorship. Then came the restoration of the old Royal house in 1660. It was not until 1688, when the bourgeois party staging a *coup d'état* invited to England a King who brought along with him troops and naval forces from the Netherlands, that the British bourgeois dictatorship was consolidated. During the eighty-six years from the outbreak of the French revolution in 1739 to 1875, when the Third Republic was established, the bourgeois revolution in France went through a particularly stormy period, swinging in rapid succession between progress and reaction, republicanism and monarchism, revolutionary terror and counter-revolutionary terror, civil war and foreign war, the conquest of foreign lands and capitulation to foreign states.

Although the socialist revolution faces the concerted opposition of the reactionaries throughout the world, its course as a whole is smooth and remarkably steady. This is a true reflection of the unparalleled vitality of the socialist system. Though the international communist movement has met with some setbacks recently, we have learned many helpful lessons from them. We have corrected, or are correcting, the mistakes in our own ranks which need to be rectified. When these errors are righted, we shall be stronger and more firmly united than ever before. Contrary to the expectation of our enemies, the cause of the proletariat will not be thrown back but will make ever more progress.

But the fate of imperialism is quite different. There, in the imperialist world, fundamental clashes of interest exist between imperialism and the oppressed nations, among the imperialist countries themselves, and between the government and the people of these imperialist countries. These clashes will grow more and more acute and there is no cure for them.

Of course, the new-born system of proletarian dictatorship still faces many difficulties, and has various weaknesses. But, compared with the time when the Soviet Union was struggling by itself, the situation is a good deal better. And what new births are not attended with difficulties and weaknesses? The issue is the future. However many twists and turns may await us on our forward journey, humanity will eventually reach its bright destiny—communism. There is no force that can stop it.
