

**MARXISM-LENINISM:
INTERNATIONAL
TEACHING
FOR COMMUNISTS
IN ALL
COUNTRIES**

Pravda May 12, 1964

NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY PUBLISHING HOUSE



137

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



MARXISM-LENINISM:
INTERNATIONAL TEACHING
FOR COMMUNISTS
IN ALL COUNTRIES

Solidarity in Communist Movement Rests on Ideological Unity

What Chinese Leaders are Trying to Impose upon Communist Movement Under Guise of Marxism-Leninism

Political Purpose of Chinese Leadership's Theoretical Concepts

NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY PUBLISHING HOUSE

MOSCOW, U.S.S.R.

6d.

SOLIDARITY IN COMMUNIST MOVEMENT RESTS ON IDEOLOGICAL UNITY

The world-historic mission of the working class can be discharged only if the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist Parties pool their efforts internationally. Hence the tremendous importance attaching to the task of achieving cohesion in the world communist movement.

This task is especially important today, because never before have the Communists borne such a great responsibility for the destinies of peace, socialism and progress, for the destinies of mankind.

How can this unity be achieved, a unity which presupposes not only verbal declaration of solidarity, but also united, concerted action, constant mutual assistance, and the organic blend of the national and international tasks of each revolutionary detachment? The Communists have always regarded ideological unity based on Marxism-Leninism as a main pillar of their international solidarity. This unity expresses the community of purpose and agreement on the fundamental means and basic tactical principles of the struggle for these aims by all the revolutionary detachments of the international working class.

Even the Comintern, with its Rules, that were obligatory for all Parties, could unite Communists in different

countries only by relying on their ideological unity. The importance of the struggle for ideological unity is all the greater today, not only because in our days such an organization as the Comintern no longer exists, and the forms of contacts between the Parties have changed. Of far greater importance are the changes that have resulted from the growth of the communist movement and all revolutionary forces.

Communist Parties exist today in most countries of the world, and their concrete tasks and the conditions under which they are waging their struggle are becoming increasingly diverse. This, naturally, gives rise to a great variety of forms of struggle and tactical methods, and also to different approach to one or another common issue.

The international communist movement was also confronted with a new historical situation owing to the fact that the arise of the world socialist system, the collapse of colonialist empires, the mounting class struggle of the proletariat, and the upsurge of the popular democratic movements had awakened once passively-minded sections of society to active political life. The revolutionary dynamic character of the epoch brought vast sections of the petty bourgeoisie in Asia, Africa and Latin America into the whirlpool of political developments. They joined in the world revolutionary movement and this is the greatest gain of social progress. At the same time, the drawing of new sections of society, including the petty bourgeoisie, into these vigorous, epoch-making efforts, has broadened the channels of non-proletarian influence on the revolutionary detachments. Hence the increased importance attaching to the struggle the Communist Parties are waging for the true ideological, theoretical and political line of all revolutionary forces, and, above all, for ideological unity among the Communists themselves.

Without this struggle, without ideological unity, communism would cease to be a world movement, becoming but an amorphous conglomerate of Parties incapable of joint action.

It is quite clear that there are no relations of hierarchy, domination, and subordination in the world communist movement which consists of independent Parties enjoying

equal rights, nor can there be any relations of that nature. Hence it follows that the only form of unity can and must be a *voluntary alliance of like-minded people*, which would guarantee equal rights and independence of each Party and at the same time ensure the cohesion, unity and co-ordination of action and voluntary discipline, in pursuing the general line of the world communist movement.

An alliance of this kind can be achieved only on such an ideological and theoretical platform which, on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the present epoch, provides the correct answers to the vital questions of today and takes into account the new phenomena and processes of reality. This is the platform of creative Marxism. There is absolutely beyond doubt that to be loyal to Marxism-Leninism means upholding the basic principles and propositions of the revolutionary theory of the working class and fighting against every attempt to revise it — whether made from the “right” or from the “left”. It is also obvious that fidelity to Marxism-Leninism calls for a creative application and development of this teaching in accordance with the changing historical conditions.

At the same time the creative development of theory itself must necessarily be a collective concern of all the Marxist-Leninist Parties. Not that the entire multi-million strong army of Communists is for some reason experiencing today a lack of talented theoreticians and, consequently, we “for want of anything better” have decided to cope with theory “together”. Quite a few talented theoreticians are to be found among present-day Communists as well. They are to be found in many Parties. However, the very ways of developing Marxism have changed—not “for want” of talented people, but because of the wealth of forms, conditions and experience of struggle that we have. Today theory can be developed only when all the Parties, the entire movement co-operates—and not so much by “armchair” reasoning as rather by practical activity, in the process of the struggle itself against imperialism, for socialism and communism.

The international character of the Marxist-Leninist teaching inherently incorporates the obligatory demand for taking into account the national peculiarities and specific

features in the concrete approach of each country to the solving of the common international task. The experience accumulated by all the detachments of the communist movement is of great importance for perfecting and enriching the theoretical weapons of the working class.

Every Party—big or small—takes an active part in the common cause of creatively developing the revolutionary theory and makes its own contribution to this cause.

It is common knowledge that the CPSU has done much theoretical work to generalize the changes that have taken place in the world over the past decade. We are proud that the results of this work, as recorded in the resolutions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU and its new Programme, have been highly appraised by the fraternal Parties.

These years were extremely fruitful also as regards the theoretical work done by other Marxist-Leninist Parties.

The Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries faced many new problems in their socialist reorganization of society. As they solved these problems they developed a whole series of important Marxist propositions dealing first of all with the theory of revolution and the building of socialism in states differing in the conditions and level of economic development.

The Communist Party of China has also made its contribution to the common cause of developing the Marxist-Leninist theory. In the struggle against imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionaries and in the first stages of socialist construction, it enriched the theory and practice of the communist movement with important conclusions as to the guerilla campaign in China, the united front of the national forces in the struggle against imperialism, the ways of transforming capitalist property (redemption, mixed property, etc.), etc.

Extensive theoretical work has also been done by the Communist Parties of the leading capitalist countries—France, Italy, Britain, the USA, etc. They have developed many aspects of the Marxist-Leninist teaching as to the strategy and tactics of the class struggle of the proletariat in their application to modern conditions. The Commu-

nists of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are successfully tackling important aspects of Marxism-Leninism that are related to the problems of wedding the struggle for socialism to the national-liberation movement, establishing broad alliances with the petty and national bourgeoisie and working out methods for non-capitalist development of countries that have shaken off the colonial yoke.

Each Party contributes to the common treasure chamber of Marxism. In so doing it proceeds, first of all, from its own experience. For instance, no one would know the problems of the working class struggle in the developed capitalist countries better than the Communist Parties of those countries. The same can be said of the Parties tackling the problems of the national-liberation movement or of the building of socialism and communism. Proceeding from real life, all the Communist Parties take an active part in working out general theoretical principles that pertain to the communist movement as a whole.

This nature of the creative process of developing Marxism-Leninism cannot but be reflected in the very forms of the Parties' theoretical work. Each new word of Marxism is not uttered peremptorily from the heights of a theoretical Olympus, but is verified in practice, is discussed at international forums of Communists, and becomes the wealth of the entire movement. A case in point is the work of the two Moscow Meetings and the programmatic documents of international communism that they drafted, i. e., the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. Adopted by the entire movement, the new theses have become the guide to action for all its detachments, by virtue of the voluntarily assumed pledge to abide by them and count with the assessments recorded in joint documents.

As for the joint collective theoretical work of the Parties, Marxism-Leninism develops, as is only natural, through discussion, disputes and controversies. Everything new is always born out of disputes and struggle. It will be like that in the future as well, because the development of Marxism-Leninism with its creative contributions to theory is a process that never stops. This only makes it still more

important strictly to adhere to the standards and principles of theoretical disputes and discussions that the movement has evolved: under no circumstances to use them as a method for factional struggle and for squaring accounts with other Parties. Marxists-Leninists regard theoretical and political discussions among Communists as a means for achieving stronger unity, not as an instrument of dissension. To prevent these discussions from playing into the hands of the enemies and to make them serve our cause, they must be carried on in a friendly, dignified form, conscientiously and to the point, with the common interests of communism being put before narrow nationalist egoistical considerations.

In theoretical disputes between like-minded Communists, there must be no sectarian, fanatical intolerance of differences in views as that is characteristic only of medieval monks, not of Marxists-Leninists. The fact that the Communist Parties are working in different conditions, have arrived at different stages of the struggle and have accumulated varying experience, accounts for the many diverse shades of opinion on specific questions. This, naturally, cannot cause displeasure or alarm. Our Party has expressed its views on the score more than once, stressing the point that such differences must not cause quarrels and strife. Real Communists take first everything that unites them with their brethren in the other countries, not what divides them, as they believe that questions upon which no common view has been established today, can be agreed upon tomorrow, after time and practice have best demonstrated who was right and who was wrong.

All these norms of the ideological activities of the Communist Parties, which in recent years have won general recognition in our movement, are now being grossly violated and rejected by the Chinese leaders.

Suffice it to read the polemical material published in Peking in the past few months to see that, far from treasuring the unity of the Parties, they, on the contrary, have proclaimed constant schism, a sort of a law of normal development in the revolutionary movement.

That is exactly how the point is put in the article published in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* on Febru-

ary 4, 1964. "...In the international working-class movement," the article says, "as in anything else in the world, the process of the division of the whole is taking place." And further: "Unity, followed by struggle or even a split, then to be followed by new unity on a new basis represents the dialectics of the development of the international working-class movement." It is clear to all that this "philosophy of dissension" is summoned not so much to explain the past as to argument the present activity of the Chinese leaders with its aim of undermining the ideological and political unity of the Communists.

Peking does not recognize creative collective work in the field of theory, though it makes a big fuss about the "equality" and "independence" of different Parties. Refusing to reckon with the general conclusions of the world communist movement, posing as supreme arbiters on questions of theory and politics, and "excommunicating" one fraternal Party after another from Marxism, the Chinese leaders have quite openly appropriated some special rights in the field of Marxist-Leninist theory.

However, the communist movement does not believe in "prophets" and "oracles" who think and decide for others—as Stalin attempted to do in his time. As far as the CPSU is concerned, it has made its stand with regard to this issue crystal-clear.

The wealth of experience accumulated by the CPSU, and the services it has rendered to the communist movement, gave rise to a tradition where our Party was given a special, leading position—a point that was recorded in the general documents of the communist movement. The Central Committee of our Party took the initiative to end this tradition, even in spite of protest made by a number of other Parties, among which most active, strange as it may sound today, was the Communist Party of China, which demanded that the respective wordings be introduced in the general documents of the Communist Parties. The real reason for this position of the CPC leaders is now quite clear. Apparently, the Chinese leaders sought already at that time to establish the "office" of captain of the communist movement, with the aim of usurping it in time.

Our Party has resolutely opposed violations of equality in relations in the socialist camp and the communist movement, that were typical of the time of the personality cult and have killed the very idea of one or another Party enjoying "hegemony" in the communist movement. The Chinese leaders, on the other hand, are obviously eager to revive the idea, usurping the right to solve all by themselves theoretical and political problems that pertain to the entire movement.

Indeed, what other explanation can be found for the hullabaloo raised in China over the "ideas of Mao Tse-tung" as being the apex of Marxist thought for all the peoples, for the entire movement? Peking went so far as to claim that theoretical generalization of the historic tasks of our day had been completely assumed by Mao Tse-tung alone, that our age itself was the "age of Mao Tse-tung."

Such utterances are not only pervaded with adulation of a leader that is unworthy of Communists. They also clearly attempt to assert the "monopoly" of Chinese theoreticians in Marxism-Leninism. In contrast to the great teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the Chinese leaders seek to impose on the communist movement as its ideological banner the so-called "Sinofied" Marxism.

(Pravda, May 10, 1964)

WHAT CHINESE LEADERS ARE TRYING TO IMPOSE UPON COMMUNIST MOVEMENT UNDER GUISE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

In their theoretical speculations, the Chinese leaders are revising the Marxist-Leninist teaching, distorting the views of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and repudiating one of the most important principles of Marxism-Leninism—the creative attitude to theory. Peking denies the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory, the new appraisals and conclusions drawn by the fraternal Parties in their jointly adopted documents.

Indeed, in what have the CPC leaders seen the "revisionist sinning" of the Marxist-Leninist Parties? As they themselves explain, in the fact that these Parties have adopted the "course of so-called peaceful co-existence", "peaceful competition", "peaceful transition", "the state of the whole people" and "the Party of the whole people". Hardly is any need to say that the general line of the communist movement is by no means reduced to the above-mentioned propositions. This is generally known. Characteristic in this respect is something entirely different, notably the very range of propositions selected for attack.

At stake are different things—the principles of the foreign policy of the socialist states and the character of

the state in the period of the transition from socialism to communism, the roads of the socialist revolution and the social character of the Party after the complete victory of socialism. There is however one common aspect to all these diverse questions—in every case the points at issue are theoretical problems, in the elaboration of which the Communist Parties, in accordance with the demands of the epoch, have introduced particularly many new elements, over the past few years.

It is against this that the CPC leaders have directed their offensive first and foremost. They appraise all the propositions of creative Marxism advanced by the present generation of Marxists-Leninists from the point of whether they conform or not to what was written 100, 50 or 30 years ago. This approach is matched by their method of criticism, which completely ignores objective reality and boils down to the calling of individual quotations from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin referring to another epoch and another historical situation. The Chinese theoreticians, judging by their own pronouncements, imagine that Marxism-Leninism is a set of hard-and-fast rules, principles and slogans valid for all time, which Communists have to strictly abide by like churchmen the Old and the New Testaments.

Such an approach to theory was organically alien to Marx, Engels and Lenin. The founders of Marxism-Leninism saw their theoretical task not in remaining loyal to the letter of books written earlier, but in being loyal to the spirit of the scientific world outlook of the working class, in carefully analyzing changing reality, in generalizing the new experience gained in the struggle, and in creatively accomplishing the tasks that each new epoch puts on the agenda.

Modern Marxists take the same approach to the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin. In their eyes, Marxism-Leninism is not only the collected works of the classics, and not only truths expressed by authorities decades ago but also achievements of modern Marxist thought, which have stood the test of practice. That is the kind of Marxism we uphold.

Can one visualize the scientific theory of the working class today without the Declaration and Statement, without

the conclusions drawn by the Parties in their programmatic documents, without the truths that have emerged from the revolutionary battles of the past few years? The subtraction of all this from Marxism would infinitely impoverish it, deprive it of that very thing which bears the imprint of the epoch and which is particularly important for the struggle of the working people. Our generation of Marxists-Leninists would be unworthy of their brilliant teachers, were they not to do their duty towards the working class in the field of theory.

This is precisely the premise the Marxist-Leninist Parties proceeded from in working out the general line for the present stage.

The Chinese leaders have met at dagger-point the scientific generalization of the new phenomena of reality, and the great creative work done by the Communist Parties, to implement the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Having accused the fraternal Parties of "revisionism", they, contrary to the general line of the communist movement argued in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement, have put forward their own "proposals with regard to the general line" in their letter of June 14, 1963. It is noteworthy that, in the interpretation of the Chinese leaders, only the most general principles of the Declaration and Statement, such as "the union of the proletarians of all countries", "the struggle against imperialism and the reactionary forces", "the gradual attainment of full victory in the world proletarian revolution", etc., are associated with the general line. "This is, in our opinion", the letter pointed out, "the general line of the international communist movement at the present stage".

One may well ask the Peking theoreticians: Where does the present enter the picture here? Although all the theses that they have advanced are important, they have to do with every epoch and call for concretization at each specific stage in history, namely how to bring about a union of the proletarians of all countries at the present stage, how to wage a most effective struggle against the imperialists in the given conditions, and how to struggle for the complete victory of the world proletarian revolution nowadays.

The Marxist-Leninist Parties deemed it their main task to answer these concrete questions. Their answers constitute the political line of the communist movement, its strategy and tactics. But under the cover of general declarations repeating universally known truths, the Chinese leaders, reject every new thing that has been added to revolutionary theory by the collective experience of the fraternal Parties. Meanwhile the new evaluations and conclusions are more than just "pure" theory. They are a guide to action, a generalization of the new forms of the struggle of the working-class movement, an argumentation of the new methods for waging an onslaught against the positions of imperialism. Negation of the new conclusions not only reveals theoretical stagnation but also leads to idle talk and inactivity in policy, to rejection of the use of the new powerful levers that exist for the revolutionary transformation of the world.

For the first time in the history of our movement has the Communist Party of the Soviet Union been faced with the task of all-out communist construction. Naturally, the Party had to answer a number of new questions put forward by this stage, in particular, those pertaining to the historical destinies of the state and the Party on the approaches to communism. The Chinese leaders, who even did not bother to analyze the essence of the problems touched upon, hastened to anathematize the new theses advanced by our Party.

After the war the Communist Parties of the developed capitalist countries found themselves confronted with new conditions for the struggle, conditions, which were brought to life by the aggravation of general crisis of the capitalist system, by the defeats it had sustained in the peaceful competition with socialism, by the growth of state-monopoly trends, by the upsurge of the working class and democratic movements. It is only natural that these Parties paid particular attention to evolving new tactical lines in order to make more effective use of the new possibilities to defend the interests of the working people, to fight the monopolies, to bring the masses nearer to the socialist revolution.

Again the Chinese leadership preferred to close its eyes on the problems posed by life,—which is particularly evident from the article published in *Hungchi* and *Jenmin-jihpao* on March 31, this year. They preferred to cling dogmatically to quotations true of a different epoch and different conditions taken out of context and presented in a distorted light.

Nor did they wish to see the new tasks that had come to face the national-liberation movement and the peoples that had won political independence—the tasks of struggling for economic independence, overcoming century-old backwardness, of embarking on non-capitalist development. The Chinese leaders keep on reiterating that these peoples have, as before, to follow only the one road, of further armed struggle, though the Chinese leaders themselves fail to explain against whom this struggle should be waged today in such countries as Algeria, Mali, Ghana, and Burma among others.

Many general problems, among them the problem of war and peace, have today risen up in a new light before the world communist movement. Again the Chinese leadership preferred to resort to old quotations, in posing as the "champion" of Marxism-Leninism, and launched an attack against the concerted stand of the fraternal Parties.

The CPC leaders try to cover up their break with Marxism-Leninism by referencing to the history of the communist movement; they draw parallels between the struggle Lenin and the Bolsheviks waged against the opportunists of the Second International, and their own splitting activities in the world communist movement. But again the Chinese leaders are treading on thin ice.

Indeed, what was it in the Second International's activities that Lenin so ruthlessly fought? Along what basic lines did the ideological and political struggle proceed between the Communists and Social-reformists?

Lenin formulated the law of the uneven economic and political development of imperialism and drew up the major conclusion as to the possibility of a break in the imperialist chain in one country. Adopting doctrinaire, dogmatic positions, the leaders of the Second International accused Lenin

of departing from Marxism. They tried to use antiquated quotations against Lenin.

Lenin and the Bolshevik Party led the people to socialism after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The thesis as to the possibility of achieving a complete victory of socialism in one country, has become the historic gain of revolutionary thought. These conclusions of Lenin's were also dogmatically and persistently opposed by the leaders of the Second International.

Lenin's analysis of imperialism and of its contradictions, his plan for the building of socialism and all his tremendous contribution to the treasury of Marxist thought, was viewed by the leaders of the Second International as an encroachment on Marxism. Actually, it was exactly the struggle against the fossilization of theory, for a creative Marxism constantly enriched by revolutionary practice, that lay at the pivot of the bitterest ideological battles which Lenin waged against Bernstein, Kautsky and other leaders of the Second International.

Hence, if one is, indeed, to look for an analogy between the present struggle that the Chinese leadership has engaged in within the ranks of the communist movement, and Lenin's struggle against the "orthodoxists" of the Second International, we shall see that this analogy is not at all favourable for the CPC leaders. They resemble Lenin by no means. On the contrary they are aping the spiritual fathers on the Right-wing Socialists of today. Because like these men, they, too, are through the necrosis of Marxism regressing to its distortion, to attempts to substitute for it home-baked "theories" that undermine the development of the revolutionary process.

A closer examination of the theoretical concepts advocated by the Chinese leaders, a thoughtful analysis of their ideological evolution of late will compel the conclusion that the path the Chinese leadership is following is one of flagrant distortion of Marxism-Leninism and revision of its bedrock principles.

The revisionist essence of the positions adopted by the Chinese leaders leaps into particularly bold relief in their re-estimation of that vital point of Marxist-Leninist theory,

notably, the issue of the historic mission of the proletariat and its place in the world-wide emancipatory process.

The CPC leaders are, in effect, discarding the Marxist-Leninist thesis as to the world-historic role that the working class plays in the revolutionary transformation of the world, a thesis that has stood the acid test of decades of class struggle. Though the Chinese leaders are attacking this paramount conclusion of the revolutionary theory from different quarters, they are doing this with the one and only aim of proving that hegemony in the world revolutionary process is shifting, or has, already shifted, from the working class to the social strata comprising the mass at the foundation of the national-liberation movement, namely, the peasantry, the radical intelligentsia and the national bourgeoisie. Now Marxists-Leninists greatly value the revolutionary potentiality of the peasantry. It was the peasantry, who after they started making history, became the staunchest ally of the international working-class movement in its struggle against imperialism. However, the Chinese leaders are not talking of this obvious fact, but are preaching a regrouping of revolutionary forces, which dispenses with the vanguard role of the international working class.

This is precisely the purpose of Peking's "concept" alleging that the zone of the national-liberation movement, upon which the destinies of the world socialist revolution now wholly depend presumably, has become the No. 1 knot of all world contradictions. The Chinese would-be theoreticians are trying to borrow Lenin's authority to back up this point. But actually they are going against Lenin's ideas. Because when Lenin spoke of the great significance of the national-liberation movement, far from opposing it to the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, he, on the contrary argued, the unbreakable alliance between these two forces, placing particular emphasis on the role and importance of the working-class movement in all revolutionary processes.

But what are the men in Peking doing? They are peddling the claim that today the peasantry has supposedly become the most consistent revolutionary force. While, as for the

world working class, in the opinion of the theoreticians acting as apologists for the Chinese leadership, it has been "infected" with social-reformism and has thus relinquished its revolutionary birth-right.

Now though such talk may flatter the egos of certain immature, nationalistically-minded, petty-bourgeois politicians, what can it have in common with Marxism-Leninism?

The Peking leaders are shouting out from the house-tops not only about the "special" role which the national liberation plays in the world proletarian revolution. At the same time they are trying high and low to minimize the revolutionary role of the world working class and its offspring, the socialist system.

Such is the big idea behind all the talk about it being impermissible to attach decisive significance to the competition between world socialism and world capitalism as such an attitude is allegedly nothing but "revisionism". Such also is the big idea behind the charges of "social reformism" proffered against the Communist Parties of the developed capitalist countries. The Chinese leaders actually discount the working-class movement in these countries and refuse to recognize its revolutionary force, its revolutionary potentialities.

A rather odd picture that: to see people denying the revolutionary potentialities and world historic mission of the working class donning the togas of sole defenders of the revolutionary theory of that class!

Just how far the new-fangled "orthodoxists" go in their revision of Marxism is shown by the fact that the Chinese leaders are not stopping short of distorting the ultimate goal of the revolutionary struggle of the working class, its socialist ideal.

The pronouncements of the CPC leaders and their political activities give us a notion of the type of society they are striving for—a society which though passed off as a paragon of socialism, actually contradicts the basic principles of Marxist-Leninist theory and the proletarian character of socialism.

The men in Peking do not think a high level of industrial development an inalienable feature of socialism. Improvement of the living standards of the working people

is declared unnecessary, even dangerous, as it allegedly entails "bourgeois degeneration". The principles of socialist democracy are constantly neglected in both theory and practice. The very notion of socialist democracy is, in effect, absent in the wordy materials Peking publishes. But then the Chinese leaders fetishize violence in every way and cultivate the personality cult which is alien to the very nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. They are carrying out the "militarization" of every aspect of life and look upon the masses as a "blank sheet of paper" (as Mao Tse-tung put it) on which the leader may "write" what he wills.

The Chinese leaders' idea of socialism is most unusual—they visualize it as a society devoid of a developed industry, democracy and respect for the rights of the individual, a society perpetuating the poverty and privations of the working masses. But is it really this type of "socialism" that Marxist-Leninist theory offers? Is it really this type of socialism that millions of working people all over the world are fighting for? Not for nothing do the CPC leaders throw mud at the banner of humanism the Marxist-Leninist Parties are holding on high. They have no use for it, for they no longer visualize socialism as a society created for the working man, in the name of his happiness.

The socialist revolution, Lenin pointed out, replaces private ownership of the means of production by public ownership and introduces the planned organization of social production to ensure well-being and the all-round development of all the members of society. Socialism is built in the name of the people, for their good.

No matter what the Chinese leaders may say, no matter how they may extol themselves, the real facts refute their claims to the role of law-givers in Marxism. These facts convincingly testify to something that is quite the opposite: the Chinese-style version of Marxism-Leninism which underlies the ideological and theoretical platforms of the Chinese leadership, is nothing but betrayal of the basic principles of the international revolutionary theory espoused

by Communists in all countries, betrayal of the great teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

(Pravda, May 11, 1964)

POLITICAL PURPOSE OF CHINESE LEADERSHIP'S THEORETICAL CONCEPTS

In an analysis of the concepts of so-called "Sinofied Marxism", the first thing that strikes the eye is the contradictory character, the state of being at sixes and sevens, the rather fanciful tangle of dyed-in-the-wool dogmatism and out-and-out revisionism, the utter inconsistency with which views are expressed, and finally—this being the main point—the yawning gap between the revolutionary bombast phrases and the actual doings of the CPC leadership.

At first they announced the "great leap" and told the whole world of the sensational plans they were making to produce iron and steel and coal, in the endeavour to tackle in one swoop all the tasks of building up a modern industry. But, after a smashing fiasco, they proclaimed farming the "basis of economy".

At first they considered the people's commune a ready "staircase to paradise", a form of achieving a direct transition to communism, totally oblivious of the fact that the appropriate material facilities and productive forces were first necessary to effect such a transition. Then they started peddling the claim that one could not talk of building communism in general, until the complete demise of imperialism.

The constant swing-around in positions, the ideological and political scurrying to and fro of the Chinese leadership, distinctly reveal the petty-bourgeois nature of their outlook. Presented in bold relief in the utterances of the Peking ideologists is lack of principles elevated to the status of a principle, a preparedness to put forward, take up the cudgels for, and subscribe to, any thesis, provided it accords with the political directives of the CPC leadership. The entire development of the polemics in the communist movement has shown that the Chinese leaders are, in fact, not preoccupied in the slightest with questions of Marxist-Leninist theory or with an endeavour to find the truth by honestly comparing positions and putting them to the test of practical activity. They have allocated to the polemics dealing with problems of theory the merely **subsidiary role** of camouflaging and vindicating their own particular political aims, the role of a tool in the struggle for these aims.

So what is the political trend of the CPC leadership's theoretical concepts?

It is crystal-clear today that the main purpose of their claim of being the only true modern Marxists-Leninists is to assert their own hegemony in the communist movement and in the entire liberation movement.

The Chinese leaders are attempting to produce the impression that they started the polemics in the communist movement and launched a political drive against the fraternal Parties only because they are concerned most for the interests of the revolution and are the most relentless, staunchest fighters against imperialism.

But whom can these claims deceive?

Here as elsewhere, we must go by what is done, not by what is said. What the Chinese leaders are doing shows that in their person we are dealing not with "impatient" revolutionaries or inordinately ardent fighters against imperialism. It is that by raising a hue and cry around the "defence" of the dictatorship of the proletariat, they are "defending" it from the CPSU, that Party which first established and developed the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Chinese leaders, in effect, arrive at the very same

political position adopted by the leaders of the Second International who flatly denied the Marxist-Leninist theory of proletarian dictatorship. While the Peking leaders simply are fond of showing up own inventions and views that they slanderously attribute to the fraternal Parties, they are least of all concerned with the successes of the world socialist revolution and the anti-imperialist struggle. They do more than objectively disrupt and weaken the anti-imperialist revolutionary front in the face of the class enemy. Their subjective intentions, the aims they are setting themselves, are also arousing increasingly serious doubts.

Recent developments have shown the Peking leaders to be slanderously assailing the Communist Party of the Soviet Union bitterest of all. It is now perfectly clear that the Chinese leaders have spearheaded their ideological attack not against imperialism and colonialism, but against the world communist movement, primarily the CPSU.

Peking propaganda has accused our Party of every single mortal sin. Moreover, it is not only all the norms of relations between fraternal Parties that are being trampled underfoot. Even elementary common sense is being defied. The writers of the Peking articles are looking for simpletons who would believe them when they allege that the CPSU leadership is "co-ordinating its actions with imperialism", seeking co-operation with the United States "to dominate the world", and is "regarding American imperialism its most loyal friend", when they allege that the CPSU leadership has "...given the capitalist forces a free reign in the Soviet Union".

Such ways of conducting "theoretical" polemics will hardly bring the Chinese leaders any laurels.

But in the case in question we are interested not in the moral side, but in the political aspect of the matter. It is perfectly obvious that such base slander can pursue the one and only purpose of discrediting and defaming the CPSU, which the Peking splitters view the main obstacle to the accomplishment of their hegemonistic plans.

Their attempts, by hook or by crook, to dominate this movement, in total defiance of the real interests of the

international revolutionary movement, and to subordinate it to its own egoistic interests have brought the Chinese leaders into conflict with the Marxist-Leninist Parties, the real vanguard of the revolutionary forces. The hegemonistic plans of the CPC leaders have come up against an insurmountable barrier. The overwhelming majority of Communist Parties have emphatically condemned this course.

Checked, the Chinese leaders are seeking other methods to achieve their hegemonistic ends. They are now staking their all on splitting the communist movement, and establishing under their own aegis a special international bloc that would stand in opposition to the world communist movement.

Never, probably, in the entire history of the working-class movement have such cynical attempts been made to hide in talk about defending the purity of the great ideas of Marx and Lenin, aims so alien to its ideals.

The auxiliary role the theoretical juggling of the Peking splitters plays in the furtherance of political ends, is distinctly revealed also in their approach to problems of the national-liberation movement. Again pseudo-revolutionary slogans and pseudo-theoretical postulates are needed merely to conceal narrow nationalist political aims.

The claim the Peking theoreticians make that the "hub" of all present-day contradictions has shifted to the "zone of the three A's"—Asia, Africa and Latin America—pursues quite definite political aims. Speculating with this proposition the Chinese splitters are trying to win the sympathy of the peoples of the young national states, usurp the leadership of the national-liberation movement and place it in opposition to the socialist countries and the international proletariat.

When considerations of a nationalistic policy demand it, the Chinese leaders, without batting an eyelid, cast to all four winds both their revolutionary phrase-mongering and theoretical concepts. For instance, they did not stop at a frontier conflict with India, a state pursuing an alliance-free policy, accusing it of aggression and of collaboration with US imperialism, and at once, without pausing for respite, began to tout their friendship with Pakistan, a state

that is a member of the aggressive imperialist SEATO and CENTO blocs.

Absolutely clear, in the light of the Chinese leadership's latest practical moves on the world scene, is the real political purpose of their theory about the so-called "intermediary zone" between the socialist countries and the United States, which is summoned to argument the Chinese leadership's line of extending co-operation with such imperialist countries as France, Japan, West Germany and Britain.

Our Party has no intentions of giving the Chinese leaders tit for tat when they try to qualify improving Soviet relations with the capitalist states as "collusion with the imperialists" and "a departure from the class struggle." The CPSU views improving economic and other relations between the socialist and capitalist states as something that is quite normal, as the practical embodiment of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The entire point, however, is that the CPR is establishing closer contacts with a number of imperialist powers not along the lines of a general policy of peaceful co-existence but in conditions when China is co-operating less and less with the socialist countries, in conditions when the Chinese leaders are isolating themselves from the socialist camp, in conditions of the ideological and political war that the Peking splitters have declared on the communist movement. In a situation like that, instead of taking advantage of the contradictions between the imperialists to promote the interests of socialism, the CPC leadership is itself becoming a pawn in the political game and manoeuvres that the imperialist powers engage in to weaken the communist movement and the positions of socialism.

So what is the net result?

An analysis of Peking's theoretical concepts and—the main thing—the drawing of a comparison between these concepts and the doings of the Chinese leaders leaves not the slightest doubt that this is an artificially constructed platform devised specially to serve definite political purposes. Peking's theoretical concepts are called upon to "argue" and "justify" the great-power nationalistic

policy of the Chinese leadership, to promote their claims to hegemony, to split the world-liberation movement, and to bring under the aegis of Peking definite circles both inside and outside the communist movement.

The special theoretical platform that the Chinese leaders have put forward bears the obvious stamp of these unsavoury aims that are inimical to the interests of the working class and the cause of communism.

To recruit followers they orient their theoretical concepts on the Left-wing adventurous elements of the liberation movement, on incorrigible doctrinaires upon whom the cleansing spirit of the 20th CPSU Congress has had no effect and who yearn for past methods of leadership characteristic of the time of the personality cult, and finally, on the chauvinistic, and even racialist, moods of strata to whom the ideals of proletarian internationalism are alien.

Hence the eclecticism of the Chinese leadership's theoretical platform. And hence too, the divorce between theory and practice, the inconsistent and contradictory character of their outlook.

It is not fortuitous, of course, for the Chinese splitters to have slithered into Left-wing opportunism. There was very much that paved the way, including the pressure of petty-bourgeois anarchy, an inadequate proletarian ideological and political schooling, certain traditions and certain peculiar historical features. However, one cannot fail to see that in the choice of a position convenient for attacking the world communist movement, the CPC leaders preferred Left-wing opportunism also because they were aware of the complete ideological insolvency of Right-wing opportunism. They believed "Leftist" pseudo-revolutionary phrasemongering a more reliable means of justifying the failures of their domestic social-economic experiments. This "Leftist" pseudo-revolutionary phrasemongering is devised also to recruit to their egoistic policy sections of the working people who rise up to revolutionary struggle on the crest of the wave of the great historical developments of today, but who have still not become ideologically and politically quite mature.

In the person of the Chinese leaders the international communist movement is faced with a particular trend that is petty bourgeois in social roots, nationalistic in political aims and Left-wing opportunistic—with a goodly dose of Trotskyism added—in ideology.

* * *

The CPC leaders, who are trying by every means to thrust on the communist movement their own erroneous views and attitudes that are leading towards a split in this movement have themselves produced a situation in which a resolute struggle against their ideological and political platform has become the way to unity. The explanation of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and of the general line of the communist movement and the exposure of theoretical distortions, demagoguery and slander comprise a vital and integral element of the task of defending creative Marxism and, consequently, of the struggle for the ideological unity of our movement.

At the same time Marxists-Leninists proceed from the premise that it is social practice, above all, that tells us which theory is right and which wrong.

The editorial of *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* carried on March 31, 1964, ends with a chapter entitled "Our Hopes". What do the Chinese leaders hope for? It appears they hope for the unconditional ideological capitulation of all who fail to share their views, for success in imposing their policy on other Parties by blackmail, slander and threats.

The Marxist-Leninist Parties have a different view as to the prospects and upshot of the differences in our movement. They are not going to compete with the Chinese leaders in blackmail, slander and yelling and are not demanding ideological capitulation.

Our confidence in ultimate restoration and consolidation of the unity of the communist movement on the principled basis of Marxism-Leninism rests elsewhere.

In the consistent pursuit of their general line, the Communist Parties are demonstrating its validity and correctness. They are demonstrating this by scoring success

after success in building socialism and communism, developing the economy and culture of the new society, improving democracy and the welfare of the working people, and enhancing the might of the world socialist system. They are demonstrating this by winning new victories in the struggle the working class and all the working people in the capitalist countries are waging against the monopolies, to achieve democracy and pave the way for the revolutionary transition to socialism. They are demonstrating this by organizing the victorious struggle of the oppressed peoples for freedom and independence and helping them to find the best paths to economic and social progress. They are demonstrating this by successfully struggling for peace and peaceful co-existence. They are demonstrating this by developing internationalist relations of solidarity, equality and comradely assistance between all detachments of the world communist and liberation movement.

Every success achieved and every victory won along this road is one more contribution to the struggle for unity in the communist movement, which includes also ideological unity, for the triumph of creative Marxism-Leninism. Social practice, the actual course of events will denude to an increasing extent the ideological poverty of the splitters, and the subjective and adventuristic character of their policy. As for all who have been deluded, because of immaturity and lack of experience, all that the Communist Parties achieve in practice in carrying forward the Leninist general line will best serve to bring them back to the correct path.

The communist movement rejects the position of the Chinese leaders, who have spearheaded their struggle not against imperialism but against the fraternal Parties, that do not subscribe to their views and fail to yield to their exhortations.

The Marxist-Leninist Parties are well aware that the main task history has placed on the Communists is to struggle against imperialism, for peace, national independence and democracy, for socialism. It is in the crucial interests of this struggle to have inviolable unity between the socialist countries, and all Communists in the world. Holding high the banner of creative Marxism-Leninism and

proletarian internationalism the world communist movement will spike the designs of the splitters and rally all revolutionary forces still more firmly together.

(Pravda, May 12, 1964)

FOR NOTES

FOR NOTES

FOR NOTES