

70472-013

# RED FLAG

WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (M.-L.)

Volume I, Number 1

January-February 1966

### CONTENTS

CONGRATULATORY TELEGRAM OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY U.S.A. (M.-L.) TO COMMEMORATE THE SIXTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.....Page 4

DECLARATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY U.S.A. (M.-L.).....Page 5

LENIN AND STALIN ON THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION.....Page 11

FULLY EXPOSE THE KHRUSHCHEV REVISIONISTS' TWO-FACED ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE VIETNAMESE PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE.....Page 19

MALAYAN PEOPLE'S EXPERIENCE REFUTES REVISIONIST FALLACIES.....Page 27

PEACE OR VIOLENCE?.....Page 34

The RED FLAG is published bi-monthly by the Communist Party of the United States of America (M.-L.). The articles appearing in the RED FLAG represent the views of the Party.

The RED FLAG is distributed by the Workers' International Book Store, 1313 E. Firestone Blvd., Los Angeles, California, 90001, U.S.A. Rates: single copy \$1.00; subscription - surface \$6.00/year, airmail \$12.00/year - anywhere in the world.

The Editorial Board of the RED FLAG encourages all Marxist-Leninists to send their manuscripts, comments, and correspondence to:

RED FLAG  
c/o WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL BOOK STORE  
1313 E. Firestone Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California, 90001  
U.S.A.

CONGRATULATORY TELEGRAM OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY U.S.A. (M.-L.)  
TO COMMEMORATE THE SIXTEENTH ANNIVERSARY  
OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) has sent a telegram to Liu Shao-chi, Chairman of the People's Republic of China, and to Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council, congratulating the people of China on the sixteenth anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China - China's National Day, October 1, 1965

The Telegram reads:

"The C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) warmly greets the People's Republic of China on its 16th anniversary.

"Under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party the heroic Chinese people have proven that a revolutionary people cannot be defeated."

The telegram is signed on behalf of the Central Committee of the C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) by its Chairman, W.H. Sherman.

DECLARATION OF THE  
COMMUNIST PARTY USA (Marxist-Leninist)

The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) is the vanguard of the working class of the United States of America, the highest form of its class organization. The aim of the Party is to carry forward the historical traditions and contributions of the Communist Party in the United States.

BRIEF HISTORICAL NOTES

HISTORY OF MARXISM-LENINISM IN  
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The historical struggle of the American working class was carried forward by the formation of the Communist Party U.S.A. in 1919 with the adherence and acceptance of the Party in the Third International. With less than several hundred members and under the direct attack of U.S. imperialism, the Party waged an unceasing struggle against the capitalist system. After years of struggle, the Party in 1927 was forced to deal with the ~~process~~ of Trotskyism within the ranks of the Party and it waged a fierce struggle against those representatives of bourgeois ideology within the ranks of the Party.

The C.P.U.S.A. heroically led the working class in struggle and consistently fought for the rights of the national minorities and the right of self-determination of all oppressed peoples. In 1935 at the Seventh World Congress, certain leaders of the Party attempted to pursue an incorrect line on the national-colonial question.

This point represented the initial phase in the development of a revisionist tendency within the Party which came to be developed under Browder and finally in 1944 proceeded to liquidate the Communist Party in the U.S.A. to appease the bourgeoisie. In 1945, the Communist Party U.S.A. was reconstituted in name only. The period from 1945 to 1956 saw the full implementation of a revisionist theory and practice within the Party. Under this situation, it degenerated into a social-democratic Party defaulting in its historical role as that of the vanguard Party of the working class. In 1956, the Party's conversion into a Party of the liberal bourgeoisie was all but complete. Under the centrist leadership of William Z. Foster, the conciliators of revisionism within the Party fought to secure a false "unity" with the open revisionists. By 1958 the conciliators along with the revisionist faction felt secure enough to expel the Marxist-Leninists from the Party.

In 1958, Marxist-Leninists who had been expelled and others still in the Party joined together to form the Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party in the U.S.A. (P.O.C.) and began to wage an untiring struggle against the opportunism of the C.P.U.S.A. which had by this time sunk ever deeper into the mire of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

The theory of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the question of whether to make revolution or not to make revolution has always been the dividing line between Marxist-Leninists and revisionists. The 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. made clear that there existed two different lines within the international communist movement on this question of principle. At the 22nd Congress, the revisionist line of "peaceful coexistence," "peaceful competition", and "peaceful transition" was put forth by certain fraternal Parties. As a result of the 22nd Congress, modern revisionism fully exposed its ugly features. The consequence was the further exposure of the C.P.U.S.A. and its class collaborationist policies in the service of the bourgeoisie.

Since the C.P.U.S.A. could then play only a limited role in the furthering of the bourgeoisie's interests, it became incumbent upon the bourgeoisie in 1952 in league with Trotskyites and revisionists to create their own "Marxist-Leninist" organization. Since 1952, there has occurred an intensification of the class struggle and the national struggle within the United States. This struggle revealed itself within the existing Marxist-Leninist groups. With the reaching of a higher plane in the struggle represented by the developments of August, 1965, the revisionist elements of the leadership of the Provisional Organizing Committee (P.O.C.) abdicated the leadership of the class and capitulated to the bourgeoisie. At this time all Marxist-Leninists must move decisively to carry forth the historic role assigned to the vanguard Party of the proletariat.

---

### THE HISTORIC TASK OF THE C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.)

Representatives of the U.S. working-class met during the weekend of September 4-5, 1965 at Los Angeles, California, to attend the Founding Conference of the Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist). These representatives were from the Workers Organizing Committee (M.L.) and the Marxist-Leninists from the Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party in the United States.

The Communist Party of the United States has been reconstituted to carry forward the struggle for emancipation of the working class of the United States and fulfill its international proletarian obligations to fight for national liberation, peace, and socialism.

The C.P.U.S.A. (M-L) adheres to the Marxist-Leninist world outlook of dialectical and historical materialism, and opposes the world outlook of idealism and metaphysics. Marxism-Leninism is not a dogma, but a guide to action. It demands that in striving to build socialism and communism we should proceed from reality, apply the principles of Marxism-Leninism in a flexible and creative way for the solution of various problems arising out of the struggle, and thus continuously develop the theory of Marxism-Leninism. Consequently, the Party in its activities upholds the principle of integration, the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the actual struggle of the working-class.

### THE C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) UPHOLDS THE PRINCIPLES OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The C.P.U.S.A. (M-L) adheres to the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement of the Eighty-one Communist and Workers' Parties which are summarized as follows:

Workers of all countries unite; workers of the world unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations; oppose imperialism and reaction in all countries; strive for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism; consolidate and expand the socialist camp; bring the world revolution step by step to complete victory; and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the exploitation of man by man.

The C.P.U.S.A. (M-L) further recognizes the fundamental class contradictions which exist in the contemporary world. Marxist-Leninists hold that they are:

The contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp; the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries; the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism; and the contradiction among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

- The C.P.U.S.A. (M-L) calls for unity of the international communist movement based on Marxist-Leninist theory and practice.
- The C.P.U.S.A. (M-L) holds that modern revisionism is the main danger to the international communist and workers movement. The C.P.U.S.A. (M-L) condemns the schismatic activities of the modern revisionists in their vain attempt to split the international communist movement. Modern revisionism is the new social prop of imperialism. It is the advance guard of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement. In the United States, revisionism expresses itself in opportunism and complete capitulation to the bourgeoisie, Trotskyism manifests itself in different ways on different questions and often wears the mask of "ultra-leftism," but its essence is the opposition to revolution, repudiation of revolution--a variety of revisionism.
- The C.P.U.S.A. (M-L) must wage an untiring struggle against modern revisionism and Trotskyism, for without a struggle against Trotskyism and modern revisionism any struggle against imperialism is but an idle phrase. The Party must prevent and resist corrosion by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ways of thinking and styles of work and guard against and defeat any rightist or "leftist" opportunist deviation inside the Party.

#### THE NATIONAL-COLONIAL QUESTION: A CLASS QUESTION

Our country is a multi-national state. The Anglo-American nation oppress the Negro and Puerto Rican nations as direct colonies. Within the Anglo-American nation, the American Indians, the American Negroes, the Mexican Americans and the Puerto Ricans, are all oppressed national-minorities. In the final analysis, a national struggle is a question is a question of class struggle.

The fight for freedom by the people of the colonial and semi-colonial world is the most striking feature of our time. The impact of the revolutionary upsurge of the colonial people's national liberation movements which are sweeping Asia, Africa and Latin America is being felt within the United States. U.S. imperialism is the most vicious enemy of the people of the world, the number one exploiter and oppressor, the world gendarme, the source of war in modern times.

The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) pledges to fight for immediate independence for the nation of Puerto Rico, for the liberation and right to self-determination of the Negro nation in the South, for equal rights for all the national minorities which is an integral part of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, democracy, peace, and socialism.

The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) pledges itself to fight for the creation of a broad anti-imperialist united front encompassing all patriotic forces willing to struggle and fight for the right of self-determination of the Negro nation and for the independence of Puerto Rico.

The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) pledges its firm support for the national liberation forces opposing U.S. imperialism in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) opposes all tendencies to great nation chauvinism and nationalism, both of which hamper the unity of the nationalities, and firmly upholds proletarian internationalism. Special attention must be paid to the prevention and correction of tendencies of great-nation chauvinism on the part

of Party members.

The C.P.U.S.A. (M-L) must work untiringly to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat which is the guarantee for the socialist cause in the United States of America.

The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) pledges to carry forward and lead the struggle against racial discrimination, for equal rights and for socialism.

The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) opposes all forms of racial discrimination. Basically, the Negro people struggle for civil rights is in reality a struggle for equal rights which must of necessity become an anti-imperialist struggle to be successful. The fact that it has not more fully manifested its anti-imperialist nature can be attributed to the quisling leadership which has been fostered by the reactionary ruling clique of the United States. Integration and non-violence are the deceptive ploys utilized by the ruling class through its quislings to divert this struggle into reformist channels under the complete hegemony of the bourgeoisie.

### C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) OPPOSES THE RISE OF FASCISM IN THE U.S.A.

The balance of forces between the imperialist camp and the socialist camp has changed since World War II. This has led to the general decline of U.S. monopoly capital. The forces of national liberation aided by the socialist camp are in the ascendancy. Fascism is developing in the U.S. as the direct result of U. S. monopoly capital being threatened and deprived of its sources of raw material and spheres of influence. The loss of these colonies and semi-colonies coupled with the contradiction among other imperialist powers means the loss of U. S. monopoly capital super-profits, and serves to deepen further the general crisis of U.S. imperialism.

Fascism is the open terroristic dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital. Using the facade of "democracy" and under the guise of "law and order", the bourgeoisie is increasing its attacks on the most oppressed and most exploited section of the American working class. U.S. imperialism employs both legal and extra-legal means of suppression, which lays bare the true nature of so-called "democracy" and "freedom" in the United States and reveals the inner link between the reactionary policies pursued by the U.S. Government at home and its policies of aggression abroad.

Racism has one primary source: U.S. imperialism. Racism emanates from the reactionary policies pursued by U.S. monopoly capital. The basis for its eradication can only be the destruction of U.S. imperialism. Another aspect of the rise of fascism in the United States today is the conversion of trade unions into open labor fronts of U.S. monopoly capital. The C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) approaches the trade union question based on a united front from below, with the rank and file. We seek to unite with the most exploited and oppressed sections of the class. It is essential that the broadest possible united front against fascism be formed with all democratic forces in alliance with the working class.

### REVOLUTIONARY THEORY MUST BE PUT INTO PRACTICE

The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) puts into practice all that it advocates through the activity of the Party organizations and membership among the masses and through the conscientious efforts made by the people under its guidance. For this reason it is necessary to constantly develop the tradition of following the mass line in Party work. Whether the Party is able to give correct leadership depends on whether or not the Party will, through analysis

and syntheses, systematically summarize the experience and opinions of the masses, turn the resulting ideas into the policy of the Party and as a result of the Party's propaganda and organizational work among the masses, transform it into the views and actions of the masses themselves, testing the correctness of Party policy, and supplementing and correcting it in the course of mass activity. It is the duty of the Party leadership to ensure that in the endless repetition of this process of "coming from the masses and going back to the masses," the Party members' level of understanding and that of the masses of the people are continually raised and the cause of the Party and the people is constantly advanced. The Party and its members must, therefore, maintain close and extensive ties with the workers, farmers, intellectuals and other patriots, and strive constantly to make such ties ever stronger and more widespread. Every Party member must understand that the interests of the Party and those of the people are one, and responsibility to the Party and responsibility to the people are identical. Every Party member must wholeheartedly serve the people, constantly consult them, pay heed to their opinions, concern himself with their well-being and strive to help realize their wishes. The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) has been reconstituted firmly on a Marxist-Leninist basis. The historic task before us is the building of the Party so that it may lead the working class in the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist construction in the U.S.A.

#### ORGANIZATIONAL PRINCIPLES OF C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.)

The organizational principle of the Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) is democratic centralism, which means centralism on the basis of democracy and democracy under centralized leadership. The Party must take effective measures to promote inner-Party democracy, encourage the initiative and creative ability of all Party members and of all local and primary Party organizations and strengthen the lively contact between the higher and lower Party organizations. Only in this way can the Party effectively extend and strengthen its ties with the masses of the people, give correct leadership and adapt itself flexibly to various concrete conditions and local characteristics. And only in this way can Party life be invigorated and the centralism and unity of the Party be consolidated and its discipline be voluntarily, not mechanically observed.

Democratic centralism demands that every Party organization should strictly abide by the principle of collective leadership coupled with individual responsibility and that every Party member and Party organization should be subject to Party supervision from above and from below.

Democracy within the Party must not be divorced from centralism. The Party is a united militant organization, welded together by a discipline which is obligatory on all its members. Without discipline it would be impossible for the Party to lead the people in making the proletarian revolution and overcoming all the powerful enemies of the people and build socialism and communism. As the highest form of class organization the Party must strive to play a correct role as the leader and core in every aspect of the country's life and must combat any tendency to departmentalism, which reduces the Party's role and weakens its unity. Solidarity and unity are the very life of the Party, the source of its strength. It is the sacred duty of every Party member to pay constant attention to the safeguarding of the solidarity of the Party and the consolidation of its unity. Within the Party no action which violates the Party's political line or organizational principles is permissible, nor is it permissible to carry on activities aimed at splitting the Party

or factional activities, to act independently of the Party, or to place the individual above the collective body of the Party.

No political party member can be free from shortcomings and mistakes in work. The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) and its members must constantly practice criticism and self-criticism to expose and eliminate their shortcomings and mistakes so as to educate themselves and the people.

In view of the fact that the Party strives to play the leading role in the life of the working class, it is all the more necessary that it should make stringent demands on every Party organization and member and promote criticism and self-criticism; and in particular, it should encourage and support criticism from below, inside the Party as well as criticism of the Party by the masses of the people, and should prohibit any suppression of criticism.

In the case of Party members who have committed mistakes, the Party should, in the spirit of "curing the illness to save the patient", allow them to remain in the ranks and receive education and help them to correct their mistakes, provided such mistakes can be corrected within the Party and the erring Party member himself is prepared to correct his mistakes. As for those who persist in their mistakes and carry on activities detrimental to the Party, it is essential to wage a determined struggle against them, even to the point of expelling them from the Party.

The Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) requires all its members to place the Party's interests above their personal interests, to be diligent and unpretentious, to study and work hard, to unite the broad masses of the people, and to overcome all difficulties in order to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and build a modern socialist state, and on this basis to advance towards the achievement of the loftiest ideal of mankind - Communism.

#### CALL FOR THE FIRST NATIONAL PARTY CONGRESS

The Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) declares that one year from the date of September 5, 1965, the First National Congress will be called at which time all Marxist-Leninists in the United States will be invited to unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMUNIST PARTY USA  
(MARXIST-LENINIST).

---

WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!



# LENIN AND STALIN ON THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION

## INTRODUCTION

The question of the right of nations to self-determination is one of prime importance, especially today in the "heartland" of U.S. imperialism. Historically, this question has always separated the Marxist-Leninists from the social chauvinists masquerading as socialists and communists. This question comes to the fore in the United States today in relation to the Negro nation in the South. The revisionists and the social-chauvinists either deny the existence of the Negro nation or go to the other extreme of calling for the "formation" of a Negro nation or of Negro nations under imperialism - tailing the bourgeois nationalists. On the other hand, the Marxist-Leninists, led by the Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist), fight for the right of self-determination for the Negro nation under socialism.

It is with this question in mind that we are reprinting selected excerpts from the writing of V.I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin on the question of the right of nations to self-determination, delineating the correct approach to this question; Here, the basic question of proletarian internationalism is posed as a living reality concerning the relation of the struggle of the workers of the oppressor nation to the struggle of the workers in the oppressed nation in a multi-national state, such as is the case in the U.S.

It is only on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism that the struggle of the workers has been advanced towards socialism. This struggle is advancing throughout the world. Today with U.S. imperialism on the retreat throughout the world, and with the advance of the anti-imperialist forces, led by the Marxist-Leninist forces, these same principles of proletarian internationalism, as advanced by Lenin and Stalin, are more valid than ever before.

It is these principles of proletarian internationalism that must be understood and mastered. The fight against imperialism and its creation, revisionism, can best be conducted by the correct application of proletarian internationalism to the struggle in the U.S. - a multi-national state - and exposing the social-chauvinism of the revisionists who whitewash the national oppression by U.S. imperialism of its colonies and semi-colonies. The rights of all oppressed nations must be fought for as part of the anti-imperialist struggle and as part of the class struggle in the U.S. - especially in regard to the Negro nation. It is only through the struggle against imperialism and for socialism that we can advance the cause of the proletariat and to expose the class traitors and the class enemies of the working class, and finally to lead the working class in revolution.

The following contributions by Lenin and Stalin serve as beacons of light showing the correct path to pursue in the revolutionary struggle for socialism and communism, relating to the question of proletarian internationalism and the right of nations to self-determination.

J. V. Stalin (National and Colonial Question, page 137-139)

1. Even as early as the last century the development of capitalism betrayed a tendency to internationalize the means of production and exchange, to eliminate national aloofness, to bring peoples into closer economic relations, and gradually to merge vast territories into a single connected whole. The further development of capitalism, the development of the world market, the perfection of the great rail and sea routes, the export of capital, and so on, still further accentuated this tendency and bound all kinds of peoples by the ties

of international division of labor and universal interdependence. Inasmuch as this process was a reflection of a colossal development of productive forces, inasmuch as it helped to destroy national isolation and the contradiction between the interests of the various peoples, it was and is a progressive process, for it is creating the material conditions for a future world socialist economic system.

2. But this tendency developed in specific forms which were completely at variance with its intrinsic historical significance. The interdependence of peoples and the economic amalgamation of territories arose in the course of the development of capitalism not as a result of the collaboration of peoples enjoying equal status, but by means of the subjection of certain peoples by others, by means of the oppression and exploitation of less developed peoples by more developed peoples. Colonial plunder and annexations, national oppression and inequality, imperialist violence and arbitrary rule, colonial slavery and national subjection, and, finally, the struggle among the "civilized" nations for mastery over the "uncivilized" peoples - such were the forms in which the process of economic amalgamation of peoples took place. For this reason we find that, side by side with the tendency to amalgamation, a struggle for the emancipation of the oppressed colonies and dependent nationalities from the imperialist yoke. Inasmuch as the latter tendency implied a revolt of the oppressed masses against imperialist forms of amalgamation, inasmuch as it demanded the amalgamation of peoples on the basis of collaboration and voluntary union, it was and is a progressive tendency, for it is creating the psychological conditions for the future world socialist economic system.

3. The conflict between these two principal tendencies, expressed in forms that are natural to capitalism, fills the history of the multi-national bourgeois states during the last half-century. The fact that the contradiction between these two tendencies is irreconcilable within the framework of capitalist development was the basic reason for the intrinsic insolvency and the organic instability of the bourgeois colonial states. Inevitable conflicts within such states and inevitable wars between such states; disintegration of the old colonial states and the formation of new ones; a new drive for colonies and again the disintegration of multi-national states, leading to a new re-arrangement of the political map of the world - such are the results of this fundamental contradiction. The disintegration of the old Russia, of Austria-Hungary and of Turkey on the one hand, and the history of such colony-owning states as Great Britain and the old Germany on the other; and, lastly, the "great" imperialist war and the growth of the revolutionary movement among the colonial and non-sovereign peoples - all these and similar facts clearly point to the instability and insolidity of the multi-national bourgeois states.

Thus the irreconcilable contradiction between the process of economic amalgamation of the peoples and the imperialist methods of accomplishing this amalgamation was the cause of the inability, helplessness and impotence of the bourgeoisie in finding a correct approach to the solution of the national problem.

4. Our Party took these circumstances into consideration when it made the basis of its policy in the national question the right of nations to self-determination, the right of peoples to lead an independent political existence. From the first days of its existence, at its very first congress (in 1898), when the contradictions of capitalism in connection with the national question had not become

fully and clearly defined, the Party recognized this inalienable right of nations. In subsequent years it steadfastly endorsed its national program in specific decisions and resolutions of its congresses and conferences down to the October Revolution. The imperialist war and the mighty revolutionary movement which arose in connection with it in the colonies only provided new corroboration of the correctness of the decisions adopted by the Party on the national question. These decisions consist of a) the vigorous repudiation of all and every form of compulsion in relation to the nationalities; b) the recognition of the equal and sovereign right of the peoples to determine their own destinies; c) the recognition of the thesis that a durable amalgamation of peoples can be accomplished only on a basis of collaboration and voluntary consent; d) the proclamation of the truth that such an amalgamation is possible only as a result of the overthrow of the power of capital.

#### V. I. Lenin (The Right of Nations to Self-determination)

p.77 The right of nations to self-determination means only the right to independence in a political sense, the right to free, political secession from the oppressing nation. Concretely, this political, democratic demand implies complete freedom to carry on agitation in favor of secession, and freedom to settle the question of secession by means of a referendum of the nation that desires to secede. Consequently, this demand is by no means identical with the demand for secession, for partition, for the formation of small states. It is merely the logical expression of the struggle against national oppression in every form. The more closely the democratic system of state approximates to complete freedom of secession, the rarer and weaker will the striving for secession be in practice; for the advantages of large states, both from the point of view of economic progress and from the point of view of the interests of the masses, are beyond doubt, and these advantages increase with the growth of capitalism. The recognition of self-determination is not the same as making federation a principle. One may be a determined opponent of this principle and a partisan of democratic centralism and yet prefer federation to national inequality as the only path towards complete democratic centralism. It was precisely from this point of view that Marx, although a centralist, preferred even the federation of Ireland with England to the forcible subjection of Ireland to the English.

The aim of socialism is not only to abolish the present division of mankind into small states and all national isolation; not only to bring the nations closer to each other, but also to merge them. And in order to achieve this aim, we must, on the one hand, explain to the masses the reactionary nature of the ideas of Renner and O. Bauer concerning so-called "cultural national autonomy" and, on the other hand, demand the liberation of the oppressed nations, not only in general, nebulous phrases, not in empty declamations, not by "postponing" the question until socialism is established, but in a clearly and precisely formulated political program which shall particularly take into account the hypocrisy and cowardice of the Socialists in the oppressing nations. Just as mankind can achieve the abolition of classes only by passing through the transition period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, so mankind can achieve the inevitable merging of nations only by passing through the transition period of complete liberation of all the oppressed nations, i. e., their freedom to secede.

p.65 The Socialists cannot reach their great aim without fighting against every form of national oppression. They must therefore unequivocally demand that the Social-Democrats of the oppressing countries

(of the so-called "great" nations in particular) should recognize and defend the right of the oppressed nations to self-determination in the political sense of the word, i.e., the right of political separation. A Socialist of a great nation or a nation possessing colonies who does not defend this right is a chauvinist.

To defend this right does in no way encourage the formation of small states, but on the contrary it leads to a freer, more fearless and therefore wider and more universal formation of larger governments and unions of governments - a phenomenon more advantageous for the masses and more in accord with economic development.

On the other hand, the Socialists of the oppressed nations must unequivocally fight for complete unity of the workers of both the oppressed and the oppressor nationalities (which also means organizational unity). The idea of a lawful separation between one nationality and the other (the so-called "national cultural autonomy" of Bauer and Renner) is a reactionary idea.

Imperialism is the period of an increasing oppression of the nations of the whole world by a handful of "great" nations; the struggle for a Socialist international revolution against imperialism is therefore impossible without the recognition of the right of nations to self-determination. "No people oppressing other peoples can be free" (Marx and Engels). No proletariat reconciling itself to the least violation by "its" nation of the rights of other nations can be Socialist.

p.108-109 The way to the one goal - to complete equality, to the closest intimacy and the subsequent amalgamation of all nations - obviously proceeds here by different concrete routes; in the same way, let us say, as the route to a point in the middle of a given page lies towards the left from one edge and towards the right from the opposite edge. If a Social-Democrat belonging to a great, oppressing, annexing nation, when advocating the amalgamation of nations in general, were to forget even for one moment that "his" Nicholas II, "his" Wilhelm, George, Poincare, etc. also stands for amalgamation with small nations (by means of annexations) - Nicholas II being for "amalgamation" with Belgium, etc. - such a Social-Democrat would be a ridiculous doctrinaire in theory and an abettor of imperialism in practice.

The weight of emphasis in the internationalist education of the workers of the oppressing countries must necessarily consist in advocating and getting them to demand freedom of secession for oppressed countries. Without this there can be no internationalism. It is our right and duty to treat every Social-Democrat of an oppressing nation who fails to conduct such propaganda as an imperialist and a scoundrel. This is an absolute demand, even if the chance of secession was possible and "feasible" - only one in a thousand before the introduction of socialism.

It is our duty to educate the workers to be "indifferent" to national distinctions. Nobody will dispute that. But not to be indifferent in the spirit of the annexationists. A member of an oppressing nation must be "indifferent" to whether small nations belong to his state or to a neighboring state or to themselves, according to where their sympathies lie; if he is not "indifferent" in this way he is not a Social-Democrat. To be an internationalist Social-Democrat one must not think only of one's own nation, but must place the interests of all nations, their general liberty and equality, above one's own nation. In "theory" every one agrees with this, but in practice an annexationist indifference is displayed. Herein lies the root of the evil.

On the contrary, a Social-Democrat belonging to a small nation must place the weight of his agitation on the second word in our general formula: "voluntary amalgamation" of nations. He may, without violating his duties as an internationalist, be in favor either of the political independence of his nation or of its inclusion in neighboring state X, Y, Z, etc. But in all cases he must fight against small-nation narrow-mind-

edness, insularity and aloofness, he must fight for the recognition of the whole and the general, and for the subordination of the interests of the particular to the interests of the general.

People who have not gone thoroughly into the question think that there is a "contradiction" in Social-Democrats of oppressing nations insisting on "freedom of secession" while Social-Democrats of oppressed nations insist on "freedom of amalgamation". However, a little reflection will show that there is not, nor can there be, any other road leading from the given situation to internationalism and the amalgamation of nations, that there is not, nor can there be, any other road leading to this goal.

p.77-78 As against this philistine, opportunist utopia, the program of Social-Democracy must point out that under imperialism the division of nations into oppressing and oppressed ones is a fundamental, most important and inevitable fact.

The proletariat of the oppressing nations cannot confine itself to the general hackneyed phrases against annexations and for the equal rights of nations in general, that may be repeated by any pacifist bourgeois. The proletariat cannot evade the question that is particularly "unpleasant" for the imperialist bourgeoisie, namely, the question of the frontiers of a state that is based on national oppression. The proletariat cannot but fight against the forcible retention of the oppressed nations within the boundaries of a given state, and this is exactly what the struggle for the right of self-determination means. The proletariat must demand the right of political secession for the colonies and for the nations that "its own" nation oppresses. Unless it does this, proletarian internationalism will remain a meaningless phrase; mutual confidence and class solidarity between the workers of the oppressing and oppressed nations will be impossible; the hypocrisy of the reformist and Kautskyan advocates of self-determination who maintain silence about the nations which are oppressed by "their" nation and forcibly retained within "their" state will remain unexposed.

The Socialists of the oppressed nations, on the other hand, must particularly fight for and maintain complete, absolute unity (also organizational) between the workers of the oppressed nation and the workers of the oppressor nation. Without such unity it will be impossible to maintain an independent proletarian policy and class solidarity with the proletariat of other countries in the face of all the subterfuge, treachery, and trickery of the bourgeoisie; for the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations always converts the slogan of national liberation into a means for deceiving the workers; in internal politics it utilizes these slogans as a means for concluding reactionary agreements with the bourgeoisie of the ruling nation (for instance, the Poles in Austria and Russia, who entered into pacts with reaction in order to oppress the Jews and the Ukrainians); in the realm of foreign politics it strives to enter into pacts with one of the rival imperialist powers for the purpose of achieving its own predatory aims (the policies of the small states in the Balkans, etc.).

The fact that the struggle for national liberation against one imperialist power may, under certain circumstances, be utilized by another "great" power in its equally imperialist interests should have no more weight in inducing Social-Democracy to renounce its recognition of the right of nations to self-determination than the numerous cases of the bourgeoisie utilizing republican slogans for the purpose of political deception and financial robbery, for example, in the Latin countries, have had in inducing them to renounce republicanism.

J.V. Stalin (Marxism and the National Question)

p.33-34 The right of self-determination means that only the nation

itself has the right to determine its destiny, that no one has the right forcibly to interfere in the life of the nation, to destroy its schools and other institutions, to violate its habits and customs, to repress its language, or curtail its rights.

This, of course, does not mean that Social-Democracy will support every custom and institution of a nation. While combatting the coercion of any nation, it will only uphold the right of the nation to determine its own destiny; at the same time agitating against the noxious customs and institutions of that nation in order to enable the toiling strata of the nation to emancipate themselves from them.

The right of self-determination means that a nation may arrange its life in the way it wishes. It has the right to arrange its life in the basis of autonomy. It has the right to enter into federal relations with other nations. It has the right to complete secession. Nations are sovereign, and all nations are equal.

This, of course, does not mean that Social-Democracy will support every demand of a nation. A nation has the right even to return to the old order of things; but this does not mean that Social-Democracy will subscribe to such a decision if taken by any institution of the said nation. The obligations of Social-Democracy, which defends the interests of the proletariat, and the rights of a nation, which consists of various classes, are two different things.

In fighting for the right of nations to self-determination, the aim of Social-Democracy is to put an end to the policy of national oppression, to render it impossible, and thereby to remove the grounds of strife between nations, to take the edge off that strife and reduce it to a minimum.

This is what essentially distinguishes the policy of the class-conscious proletariat from the policy of the bourgeoisie, which attempts to aggravate and fan the national struggle and to prolong and sharpen the national movement.

And that is why the class-conscious proletariat cannot rally under the "national" flag of the bourgeoisie.

p.36 A nation has the right freely to determine its own destiny. It has the right to arrange its life as it sees fit, without, of course, trampling on the rights of other nations. That is beyond dispute.

But how exactly should it arrange its own life, what forms should its future constitution take, if the interests of the majority of the nation and, above all, of the proletariat are to be borne in mind?

A nation has the right to arrange its life on autonomous lines. It even has the right to secede. But this does not mean that it should do so under all circumstances, that autonomy, or separation, will everywhere and always be advantageous for a nation, i.e., for its majority, i.e., for the toiling strata.

p.37 But what solution would be most compatible with the interests of the toiling masses? Autonomy, federation, or separation?

All these are problems the solution of which will depend on the concrete historical conditions in which the given nation finds itself.

J.V. Stalin (Foundations of Leninism)

p.77-79 Formerly, the principle of self-determination of nations was usually misinterpreted, and not infrequently it was narrowed down to the right of nations to autonomy. Certain leaders of the Second International even went so far as to represent the right to self-determination as meaning the right to cultural autonomy, i.e., the right of oppressed nations to have their own cultural institutions, leaving all political power in the hands of the ruling nation. As a consequence the idea of self-determination stood in danger of becoming transformed from an instru-

ent for combatting annexations into an instrument for justifying them. Now we can say that this confusion has been cleared up. Leninism broadened the conception of self-determination and interpreted it as the right of the oppressed peoples of the dependent countries and colonies to complete secession, as the right of nations to independent existence as states. This precluded the possibility of justifying annexations by interpreting the right of self-determination as to mean the right to autonomy. Thus the principle of self-determination itself was transformed from an instrument for deceiving the masses, which it undoubtedly was in the hands of the social-chauvinists during the imperialist war, into an instrument for exposing all and sundry imperialist aspirations and chauvinist machinations, into an instrument for the political education of the masses in the spirit of internationalism.

Formerly, the question of the oppressed nations was usually regarded as purely a juridical question. Solemn proclamations regarding "national equality," innumerable declarations about the "equality of nations" - that was the fare of the parties of the Second International which glossed over the fact that "equality of nations" under imperialism, where one group of nations (a minority) lives by exploiting another group of nations, is sheer mockery of the oppressed nations. Now we can say that this bourgeois-juridical point of view on the national question has been exposed. Leninism brought the national problem down from the lofty heights of high-sounding declarations to solid ground, and declared that pronouncements about "equality of nations" which are not backed up the direct support of the proletarian parties for the liberation struggle of the oppressed nations are meaningless and false. In this way the question of the oppressed nations became a question of supporting, of rendering real and continuous assistance to the oppressed nations in their struggle against imperialism for real equality of nations, for their independent existence as states.

Formerly, the national problem was regarded from a reformist point of view, as an independent problem having no connection with the general problems of the rule of capital, of the overthrow of imperialism, of the proletarian revolution. It was tacitly assumed that the victory of the proletariat in Europe was possible without a direct alliance with the liberation movement in the colonies, that the national-colonial problem could be solved on the quiet, "of its own accord," off the high road of the proletarian revolution, without a revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Now we can say that this anti-revolutionary point of view has been exposed. Leninism has proved, and the imperialist war and the revolution in Russia have confirmed, that the national problem can be solved only in connection with and on the basis of the proletarian revolution, and that the road to victory of the revolution in the West lies through the revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism. The national problem is a part of the general problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

p. 82-83 In solving the national problem Leninism proceeds from the following theses:

(a) The world is divided into two camps: the camp of a handful of civilized nations, which possess financial capital and exploit the vast majority of the population of the globe; and the camp of the oppressed and exploited peoples in the colonies and dependent countries, who comprise that majority.

(b) The colonies and the dependent countries, oppressed and exploited by finance capital, constitute a very large reserve and a very important source of strength for imperialism.

(c) The revolutionary struggle of the oppressed peoples in the dependent and colonial countries against imperialism is the only road that leads to their emancipation from oppression and exploitation.

(d) The most important colonial and dependent countries have already taken the path of the national liberation movement, which cannot but lead to the crisis of world capitalism.

(e) The interests of the proletarian movement in the developed countries and of the national liberation movement in the colonies call for the amalgamation of these two forms of the revolutionary movement into a common front against the common enemy, against imperialism.

(f) The victory of the working class in the developed countries and the liberation of the oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism are impossible without the formation and the consolidation of a common revolutionary front.

(g) The formation of a common revolutionary front is impossible unless the proletariat of the oppressor nations renders direct and determined support to the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples against the imperialism of its "own country," for "no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations" (Marx).

(h) This support implies the advocacy, defense and carrying out of the slogan of the right of nations to secession, to independent existence as states.

(i) Unless this slogan is carried out, the union and collaboration of nations within a single world economic system, which is the material basis for the victory of socialism, cannot be brought about.

(j) This union can only be voluntary, and can arise only on the basis of mutual confidence and fraternal relations among nations.

\*

\*

\*



FULLY EXPOSE  
THE KHRUSHCHOV REVISIONISTS'  
TWO-FACED ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE VIETNAMESE  
PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE

Article in Zeri I Popullit

The Khrushchov revisionists have lately launched a big propaganda campaign to depict themselves as firm supporters of the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people. They shout to those who want to listen to them that they are true anti-imperialists, that they never go back on their word, and heaven knows, they even go on to say that no one can predict what they will do if the imperialists disregard their "threats." If one doesn't know what kind of people the Khrushchov revisionists are, if one judges them by their words and not by their deeds, such demagoguery might fool someone. But this is out of the question now. Viet Nam's liberation struggle, the firm stand of its heroic people, their determination to strive for final victory over the aggressors at any cost—all this has driven the U.S. imperialists and the Khrushchov revisionists to their wit's end.

The attitude one takes towards Viet Nam has become a very important question of principle, a prime issue, a touchstone by which to distinguish friends from enemies, revolutionaries from counter-revolutionaries, to test who are really fighting for socialism and who are traitors and renegades, to judge which acts are in the interests of the powerful liberation movements and who are against these movements. By their opportunist and capitulationist line, by their perfidious stand and deeds with regard to the Vietnamese people and the highest interests of socialism and peace, the Khrushchov revisionists have long ago stood on the other side of the barricade. It is now clear that the new leaders of the Soviet Union are prepared to sacrifice the supreme interests and the life and the blood of the Vietnamese people in the name of rapprochement and co-operation with the United States. In all cases, —Viet Nam is no exception,—so long as their bargaining can be directed in one way or another into the channel of Khrushchovian peaceful coexistence or Soviet-American collaboration, they will shamelessly bow to imperialist pressure.

Khrushchov's capitulation in the Cuba affair is still fresh in our memory. Without the slightest pang of conscience or sense of shame, Khrushchov hailed this capitulation as a triumph of his peaceful coexistence and as a model of a sensible solution of conflicts with the imperialists. The position of the Soviet revisionist leaders shows that similar things are now happening in regard to Viet Nam: The Khrushchov revisionists have tried their utmost to compel the Vietnamese people to accept the "peace" proposed by Johnson. Pretending to be sincere friends of the Vietnamese people, they at the same time plot with the enemies of the Vietnamese people in order to save American imperialism from impending and inevitable defeat. As in the past, they try their best to keep American political and military prestige intact and to preserve the present international status quo so that imperialism can continue its rule over various peoples and regions in the world. They particularly try to avert a U.S. military defeat in Viet Nam, since such defeat would reduce to ashes all myths about super powers, the decisive force of modern weaponry, the impossibility of victory for national liberation struggle in the atomic age, and finally about Khrushchovian peaceful coexistence with imperialism—the foundation on which rest all the opportunist illusions of the modern revisionist-capitulationist policies. This the perfidious and capitulationist line itself is the result of the further ideological and political degeneration of Khrushchovian revisionism, the result of fear of, and servile submission to, imperialism —

the common trait of all opportunists and renegades. It is however hidden behind false revolutionary phraseology, high-sounding words, hypocrisy and cynicism.

But as everyone sees, the imperialists have paid little attention to and to be exact, are not at all worried about the anti-imperialist uproar of the Soviet revisionists on the question of Viet Nam. Johnson has made almost daily speeches and held numerous conferences to justify his aggressive policy in Viet Nam and to attack those who do not agree with his policies. He now smiles, now threatens, now shows prudence, now shows rudeness, to impress the hesitant and convince the intransigent. However among the torrent of words mouthed by the American president and his colleagues, and in the entire U.S. press at that, one fails to detect even the slightest uneasiness over the "curses" and "menace" from the Khrushchovian revisionists. Nor over the Soviet supply of arms to Viet Nam, although the U.S. president and the American press did raise a howl over the discovery of a single Chinese-made rifle in south Viet Nam. How can one explain the fact that the U.S. imperialists remain undisturbed amidst this disturbing situation? Logic and numerous facts have shown that all the moves by Soviet leaders with regard to Viet Nam, both in the diplomatic and propaganda fields, were done prior to agreement with the United States.

Even before the arrival in Viet Nam of the Soviet delegation led by Kosygin, the new Soviet leaders had made obvious gestures to show that their visit was not directed against the United States, but against the Chinese People's Republic and against the unity and solidarity of the socialist countries in Asia. In their formal talks before their departure, the Soviet leaders made it quite clear to the Americans, and also to others, that their Asian trip was linked with their splitting plans to sabotage the socialist camp and international communist movement. From the very day they took over the Soviet Party and government leadership from Khrushchov, the new leaders hastened to assure the United States of their everlasting friendship, which they themselves admit, will remain the basis of their foreign policy. This friendship of the Soviet leaders is unconditional and without reservation, so that at the beginning the Vietnamese question was not listed among the problems which they claimed concerned them.

The Americans began their air raids against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam at a time Kosygin was in Hanoi. At that time, some of the uninformed believed that these were carried out as threats against the Soviet Union and that they would incite the Soviet leaders to adopt a firmer stand apropos the anti-imperialist struggle of the Vietnamese people for liberation. However, in order to avoid any misunderstanding and misinterpretation, the White House solemnly declared that the bombings in no way affected Soviet-American co-operation... Today, it has become clear that the aggravation and escalation of the war in Viet Nam is not only the result of a bellicose and aggressive U.S. imperialist policy, but also of the policy of unprincipled compromise, capitulation and perfidious treason of the Khrushchov revisionists. The Soviet leaders are continuing their neglect of the world-acclaimed heroic struggle of the south Vietnamese people. Like Khrushchov, they consider this struggle a "dangerous hotbed for war," that its sparks must be extinguished at all cost so as to avoid its spreading and causing the "outbreak of world war." Johnson often talks about this "hotbed of war" and the need to extinguish the conflagration to avoid world war. He has proposed "unconditional discussions," whereas the revisionists are demanding a "peaceful political solution." Undoubtedly, these stands are complementary; they are not "concerned" with

avoiding a confrontation of the atomic powers. There was no such confrontation whether in questions of procedure at the United Nations, or in such substantive questions as U.S. intervention in Cuba, Viet Nam or the Dominican Republic. As a matter of fact, this attitude of capitulation by the cowards and opportunists means to give the American imperialists a free hand in south Viet Nam, so that they can maintain their colonial rule there forever and later extend this rule to the whole of Southeast Asia. Recently the U.S. imperialists have been stepping up the sending of troops to south Viet Nam and their air raids against the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. At the same time, they are clamoring and threatening to extend their aggression to the north. No doubt, all these grave moves reflect their desperate situation as a result of the military and political defeats they have suffered in Viet Nam.

These are the cries of a mortally wounded beast who can do nothing else. American imperialism, by these actions, seek an escape from an untenable situation. These are dual tactics: on the one hand, they intensify the aggression against both north and south Viet Nam; and internationalize the war against Viet Nam by sending to south Viet Nam regular puppet troops such as those from south Korea, Australia and New Zealand; on the other hand, through frauds perpetrated by their allies Britain, the Tito clique and the Indian reactionaries, they try to impose the American "peaceful solution" on others.

Thus, American imperialism is holding out its hand to the Soviet and Tito revisionists and demanding that they exert pressure on the question of negotiations "in the name of peace and international security." In this connection, some political observers link Tito's visit to the Soviet Union with the opportunist and capitulationist attitude adopted by the Soviet leadership with regard to the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people. The Yugoslav president arrived in Moscow after the visit by the Indian Prime Minister, who together with Tito were the initiators of the so-called proposal of the 17-non-aligned countries for "peaceful negotiations in Viet Nam." During Shastri's visit to Moscow, the Soviet leaders highly praised his "peaceful" initiatives on the Vietnamese question, although these initiatives are only a copy of the deceptive proposals raised by Johnson in his Baltimore speech.

Shastri said in Moscow: "all efforts must be made to have all the parties concerned sit down around the conference table." He also appealed for an end to air raids against north Viet Nam so as to "create a favorable climate for a peaceful solution."

Of course such state ments could be hailed by the White House, as they are echoes of its own words. But why are they applauded by the Soviet leaders who had wanted Shastri to "make a new and precious contribution to the Vietnamese situation"? Tito would not have acted and Shastri would not have made the statements he made in Moscow without the approval and blessing of the Soviet leaders.

The tricks played by the Khrushchov revisionists on this question are not so complicated. Fearful of openly approving the deceptive manoeuvres of Johnson for "unconditional discussions" at present, they are encouraging the Indian reactionaries and the Tito clique to demand negotiations in the name of the "Asian peoples", "the non-aligned countries" and the "third world." The Soviet leaders cannot support the American proposal as they had hoped without facing the great danger of notoriety. While hiding themselves behind others, the Khrushchov revisionists now try their best to exert pressure for negotiations. In this way they are helping the U.S. imperialist policy of aggression against Viet Nam and striking at the heroic Vietnamese people from behind.

Like the modern revisionists, the American imperialists also instigate

The British Government to make such "peaceful" proposals. Wilson, who is a staunch ally and supporter of American aggression against the Vietnamese people, sought to exploit the Commonwealth Conference, in which a number of Asian and African heads of states took part, to persuade Viet Nam to accept Johnson's "unconditional discussions." It is clear that the United States is following a policy which consists of bombs and demagoguery in order to break the militant spirit of the Vietnamese people. The Soviet leaders' opportunist and pro-American attitude is revealed once more in their reply to the "delegation on the Vietnamese question" organized by Wilson at the request of the Americans, and formed by the government: heads of Britain, Ghana, Nigeria and Trinidad-Tobago. They declared: "the Soviet Union is not authorized by any person to carry out negotiations for a Vietnamese settlement."

This position of compromise by the Soviet government was considered by the West as a great encouragement, because it did not reject outright in principle the diabolical and despicable manoeuvre by Wilson—it did not oppose the manoeuvre but, on the contrary, put pressure on the Vietnamese people. In short, they were saying that if others want it, we are ready but what can we do if they do not listen to us? U.S. air raids against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, the arrival of more American troops in south Viet Nam, their direct participation in the fighting and the dispatch of military units of America's allies—all these are factors used by the Khrushchov revisionists as a means of pressure to force the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam to accept the American solution of the Vietnamese problem. The Soviet revisionists consider the American manoeuvres to suspend air raids or to stop sending troops of U.S. allies to south Viet Nam as manifestations of good will and concessions, as a favorable condition toward the solution of the Vietnamese problem through "peaceful negotiations."

This revisionist logic can only justify aggression and legalize the situation in the interest of the American imperialists. All these plots jointly worked out by the imperialists and the revisionists have as their purpose the making of another Varziza in Viet Nam. The Khrushchov revisionists have at their disposal the experience of the Tito revisionists who by their hostile activities, sabotaged and liquidated the victory of the liberation struggle of the Greek people.

The olive branch which Johnson holds out and on which the Khrushchov revisionists shower their smiles is no less dangerous than the weapons which the United States brandishes in Viet Nam. These are two aspects of the same American aggressive policy towards the Vietnamese people, two methods which U.S. imperialism uses in vain to bring the Vietnamese people to their knees. The so-called "peaceful" method supported by the Khrushchov revisionists actually means helping the American imperialists directly in the military field so as to ensure its domination of Viet Nam by force of arms. However, the Vietnamese people have answered the devilish manoeuvres of U.S. imperialism with blows on the battlefield and in the diplomatic area. The Vietnamese people rejected with disdain the advice of Tito and Shastri; they also completely exposed Wilson's fraud.

These facts show that the war in Viet Nam has become a real political deal for the Khrushchov revisionists who try to reap political profit from the Vietnamese war situation. They see an opportunity to put forth Khrushchov's hackneyed and exposed slogans for "unity," "cessation of polemics," and so forth. They seek to use the Vietnamese situation as a move in their demagogic game of vulgar political speculation to pass themselves off as fighters for the unity of the international communist movement, as anti-imperialists, and as defenders of national liberation movements.

Above all, they seek to exploit the situation to gain a little political capital which they hope will help them from being further exposed still more as the agents and close collaborators of imperialism. It is for this reason that the Khrushchov revisionists have no wish for an end to the American aggression against Viet Nam. On the contrary they are interested in seeing that this aggression lasts as long as possible. They need it to win more time and do more plotting. What they intend to do is to collect their forces so that when the time comes they can strike still more fiercely at Marxism-Leninism and the socialist camp, propagate revisionism and stifle revolution. They hope that the longer the war in Viet Nam lasts, the worse the situation becomes, and the greater the possibility to soften the correct and principled polemics which Marxists-Leninists are carrying out against them. It is from this aspect that we must look at their demagogic appeal for "united action" to give so-called help to Viet Nam.

Of course, the Khrushchov revisionists very rarely think of the blood shed by the Vietnamese people. Any means is justified so long as it helps them to achieve their infamous aim. The "unity of action" about which the revisionists make such a great fuss is nothing but a scandalous and shameless mockery of the sincere desire of the peoples to strengthen the unity and cohesion of all revolutionary forces against imperialist aggression and particularly against U.S. aggression in Viet Nam. At first glance the revisionists appear to be making some concessions, but actually they only seek to weaken the will of the Marxist-Leninists in their struggle against modern revisionism, to distract people's attention to their further exposure and to draw closer to and collaborate quietly with imperialism. This is the essence of their publicized "unity" and their "aid" to the Vietnamese people. The Soviet leaders, for instance, often demand that the United States stop bombing the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, but the stopping of the bombing can never be the result of the pity of the imperialists or the generosity of the revisionists in the mediation; nor can it become the price of negotiations as the revisionists and other allies of the U.S. have wished. The U.S. imperialists can use any weapon and any tactic of war in Viet Nam, but no matter what they do, they can never hope to annihilate the Vietnamese people. Without the slightest doubt, they will be driven out of Viet Nam and peace will be restored to that country, not as a result of the stopping of bombings or a change in tactics, but only when there is not a single American firearm and not a single American soldier left in Viet Nam.

The aim of the Khrushchov revisionists and the imperialists is if their droll trick does sell with the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, they could then divide the Vietnamese people's anti-imperialist struggle into two parts, the south and the north, and deal with them separately. But this demagogic manoeuvre is doomed to failure. U.S. imperialism has launched an aggression against the entire Vietnamese people whose fatherland is one and indivisible and so is their struggle against foreign aggression and for freedom and independence. The advices of the revisionists are viper's poison; they aim to destroy the fighting unity of the Vietnamese people and serve the U.S. imperialists.

The present position of the Soviet leaders with regard to Viet Nam is simply one of contradictory and hypocritical bluff, masked by a subtle demagogy and lowest subterfuges. As men with a double face, on the one side they try to create illusions by pretending to oppose imperialism in order to lure those who lend them an ear, and on the other side they help imperialism to carry out its policy of aggression. Although they have already been largely unmasked, the Soviet leaders still hope that their demagogic propaganda on the question of Viet Nam and their hypocritic slogans on "unity-of action" and "aid" will rally an echo and con-

tribute to the adoption of a "sensible" and "differentiating" attitude towards them. But where can such an erroneous judgement of these renegades from Marxism-Leninism lead to? Let us cite some facts:

Nikita Khrushchov and his accomplices used to attack Titoism and regard it as an agent of U.S. imperialism who was restoring capitalism in Yugoslavia, and so on. Later they began to soften their polemic with Titoism until they completely stopped it under the pretext that the Titoites had "undergone a change" and had declared themselves against imperialism. Then in the next stage they began to assert that in their relations with Yugoslavia it is necessary to stress first what is there to unite us instead of what separates us. Later they declared that there existed some differences between them but that our views were identical or close to each other on main questions. Finally, Tito was accorded with grand reception in Moscow as an "eminent guide of the international communist movement."

At present the Soviet leaders wish very much that the genuine revolutionaries would believe in their anti-imperialist demagogic propaganda and their hypocrisy, that is, they support the Vietnamese people's struggle and they hope to profit by the opportunity to come close to the true revolutionaries and to correct their mistakes. But neither Tito nor the Khrushchov revisionists can embark on a right path. Their flatteries are like a spider's web catching its victims. Whoever entertains the illusion that the Khrushchov revisionists can correct themselves, whoever accepts their stratagem, whether he likes it or not, will sooner or later find himself in the same position. In dealing with the Tito clique Khrushchov and his successors who actually intend to "correct" Tito's mistakes have themselves become Titoites.

Now what is the difference between the Tito clique and the revisionists leaders? None, except that the former is an old and open agent of U.S. imperialism while the latter are new traitors and renegades of Marxism-Leninism and the socialist camp. Indeed it would be very contradictory and quite senseless should one regard Tito as an agent of U.S. imperialism and the Khrushchov revisionists as just deceived and misled ones who under given conditions can be expected to correct their mistakes.

The anti-imperialist struggle of the Vietnamese people against imperialism is advancing steadily towards total and final victory. There is now no force which can prevent the Vietnamese people from liberating their fatherland and reunifying the whole country. It will be a great victory for all revolutionary people of the world and a destructive blow to the U.S. imperialists' global strategy of intimidation and terror as well as to Khrushchov's "peaceful co-existence". This is why both the U.S. imperialists and the Khrushchov revisionists are making every effort to see to it that the people of Viet Nam do not win. For they know very well that such victory will mean the end of their strategy and tactics of peace. This is precisely the outcome which President Johnson had in mind when he recently appealed to the Soviet leaders "to unite with the United States to establish a stable peace in the world." New York Times, which usually reflects the U.S. government's views has commented on their common interests and objectives in Vietnam. This is what it writes in its editorial on June 15:

"Moscow and Washington have a powerful common stake in a negotiated peace in Vietnam. The problem is to convert that joint interest into concerted action to end the war."

The U.S. imperialists are now openly and publicly demanding the collusion of the Khrushchov revisionists in their aggression in Viet Nam because they reckon that all the roads of the revisionist policy of capitulation lead to Washington, lead to the strengthening of revisionist-imperialist criminal co-operation against the peoples of the world,

socialism and peace. They see and understand very well that the gesture of aid made to Viet Nam by the Khrushchov revisionists is completely deceptive, purely for certain propaganda purpose and nothing harmful. It is not accidental that Johnson always smiles to the Soviet leaders and makes successive propositions with a view to strengthening friendship between them. Johnson knows that the Soviet leaders have done what they can because they are in a blind alley and not because they are fond of the Vietnamese people. The few weapons delivered to Viet Nam by the Khrushchov revisionists, from the viewpoint of material, are of very little importance to the outcome of the war going on there. But is more important for the revisionists is that it helps them to embellish their demagogic campaign of "unity of action against imperialism", "cessation of polemics", "unity of the communist movement", etc.

It will be a great misfortune if some people should be taken in by such demagogy and should fall into the trap set by the revisionists. In Viet Nam the actions being taken by the imperialists and revisionists are co-ordinated and harmonized: one party uses armed force from the outside while the other works from inside to split, to exert pressure and to propagate capitulationism. The leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union regularly exchange information on their military and political actions in Viet Nam. All the Khrushchov revisionists' plans and intentions are known to the United States. The so-called aid is dispatched to Vietnam only after the list has been sent to the Americans.

The co-ordination of common activities is particularly shown in the pressure applied by both parties to lead to "peaceful discussions", the last trump-card to extricate U.S. imperialism from the blind alley it finds itself in Viet Nam.

Lately the Khrushchov revisionists and other modern revisionists have collaborated with imperialism and world reactionaries to prevent the holding of the Second Afro-Asian Conference at Algiers on various pretexts and by taking advantage of the events in Algeria. But it is clear that the main reason for their systematic sabotage lies in the fact that from this great tribune U.S. imperialist aggression will be forcefully unmasked and the just cause of the people of Viet Nam will be defended with determination. This does not suit the U.S. imperialists nor the Khrushchov revisionists and the Titoites.

All these facts show that the Khrushchov revisionists are playing the dirtiest tricks in Viet Nam known in modern history. Through the deceptive ruse of "anti-imperialism" hypocritical gestures of solidarity and empty promises of aid, they seek to neutralize and paralyze the militant and revolutionary spirit of the Vietnamese people, to exploit the situation in Viet Nam and Indo-China in order to create a field of intrigue and plots against the People's Republic of China and the liberation movements in Asia and set dangerous traps against the Marxist-Leninist parties, all revolutionary forces resolutely defending the just cause of the people of Viet Nam, and against socialism and peace.

These attempts of the Khrushchov revisionists, however, have so far failed and will continue to fail. The world's people have come to see more and more that they have become accomplices of U.S. imperialism in aggression against the Vietnamese people and that their political degeneration is more and more deepening.

In spite of all this, the revisionists still hold onto their line. It is therefore the sacred duty of all Communist Parties, Marxist-Leninists and all revolutionary forces of the world to expose and fight to the end the Khrushchov revisionists' demagogic propaganda and all kinds of hoax. This will also be great help to the Vietnamese people and a concrete contribution to the successful conclusion of their just struggle.

Time has proved that whether in the realm of ideology or on the anti-imperialist front, there can be no collaboration or contact with the dangerous agencies of the revisionists. It is also true with the struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression in Viet Nam where there can be no collaboration or unity of action with the Khrushchov revisionists, the supporters and allies of imperialism.

Under the present conditions all Communists and revolutionaries are duty bound to continuously raise their vigilance and reinforce their resolute struggle in order to foil once and for all the diabolical manoeuvres of the imperialists and revisionists. The heroic people of Viet Nam have themselves chosen the road to victory and they are highly vigilant against the designs of the imperialists and the intrigues of the revisionists. The fight will be long and difficult but it will be crowned with success. With the people of Vietnam are the people of the socialist countries and the people of the world; with them are the international working class, all revolutionaries and millions of anti-imperialist fighters; with them are justice and the future. This is a powerful fighting solidarity and a great support for the people of Viet Nam which the imperialists and revisionists can never destroy. The people of Viet Nam will triumph over the imperialists' arms and ruses; their heroic struggle will also crush the criminal schemes and plots of the revisionists.

\*

\*

\*



MALAYAN PEOPLE'S EXPERIENCE REFUTES  
REVISIONIST FALLACIES

Sixteenth Anniversary of the Malayan People's  
Armed Struggle

This month (June), the patriotic anti-colonialist sections of the Malayan population proudly commemorate the 16th anniversary of the Malayan people's armed struggle against British imperialism. Since the day, sixteen years ago, when the armed forces of British imperialism viciously and treacherously slaughtered the heroes and heroines of the Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army who had helped Britain defeat Japanese Fascism, many attempts have been made to cloud the whole origin and issue of the Malayan people's struggle for national liberation.

British officialdom has conspired with unprincipled "historians", ignorant hack-writers, and traitors to the Revolutionary cause to misrepresent the National Liberation movement of the Malayan people, led by the Communist Party of Malaya, as a "terrorist" organization, an agency of "foreign subversive elements", etc.

Unfortunately for these perverters of truth and history, the Malayan people's valiant struggle throughout these years is an indelible record of truth; and anyone who is not afraid of truth can see for himself who the terrorists and the liars are. What is even more important, the impartial observer can see for himself that the imperialists and their agents in Malaya are doomed. Anyone who is unable to arrive at this conclusion from the evidence of the past sixteen years must be uncommonly obtuse.

The decision of the Malayan people's patriotic forces, led by the Communist Party, to meet the armed onslaught of the imperialists with armed struggle was eminently correct. Violence must be met with violence. That is the first law of survival and of scientific Revolution. Furthermore, certain evils can only be eradicated by violence, and the biggest evil in human history--imperialism and colonialism--is removable only by sustained violence. In the entire history of the world, there has never been, nor will there ever be, an example of a nation, a people or a group within the sphere of imperialism-colonialism achieving liberation without some form of armed struggle (i.e., violence). There are, of course, any number of fake and half-baked "liberated" and "independent" countries or groupings which have come into being by the grace of imperial conferment of so-called "freedom". If the Malayan people had wanted this sort of "liberation" and "independence", they could have had it long ago. The "offer" was actually made to them, not once, but many times during the past twenty years; but they have treated such "offer" with contempt--true as they are, and will always be, to the cause of anti-imperialism in Malaya and throughout the world.

Those who questioned the wisdom of armed struggle when the vital decision was made sixteen years ago, were soon to find out their mistake; for, the more they yielded to imperialist violence and trickery, the more they suffered. This, on the converse side, is also the first law of survival and the first law of scientific Revolution.

The patriotic forces of the Malayan people, led by the Communist Party, correctly judged the situation and the issue; and by taking the historic decision to counter imperialist violence with the people's violence, saved Malaya from being completely decimated and subjugated, and contributed vitally to the weakening of imperialism in Asia and the world as a whole.

The survival of the Malayan people as a nation today and the bright future awaiting them would have been out of the question had the correct decision to resist imperialist violence with people's violence not been taken in time and persistently implemented to this day.

Since Western colonization began in the 15th century, an average of two organized wars of suppression every year has been recorded throughout the past 500 years or so. This does not take into account the so-called process of "pacification" which has accompanied every single act and phase of medieval, post-medieval and modern imperialist oppression. Imperialism as a concept, is inseparable from violence. Imperialism in motion (i.e., from its very inception to its very end) is the very embodiment of violence. Hence, whether in the atomic age or in the age of bows and arrows, the subjugation of other peoples' territories and rights has been successfully carried out only by the use of maximum physical pressure on the victims; that is to say, only by the use of the highest organized armed forces of the oppressing power.

It is also a fact that whether in the atomic age or in the age of bows and arrows, governance and violence have always been integral in the day-to-day schemes of the oppressing power. This is true in respect of the oppressors' "governing" of their "own" toiling masses; but it is doubly true in respect of the oppressors' dealings with the peoples on whom they have clamped the shackles of colonialism. From this, it is clear that even after the initial act of armed violent conquest and suppression of a people by the invading power, there is no such thing as a "period of peace" for the conquered, suppressed and exploited people in a colony. The mere absence of military action, however prolonged after the initial period of conquest, belies the true nature of imperialist exploitation and suppression in a colony.

Those who have studied imperialism-colonialism at first hand, better still, suffered and struggled as colonial victims, will readily understand that the end of the initial military campaign of conquest by the imperialist power merely marks the beginning of a long-drawn-out, punishing phase of violent "pacification"--what British officialese calls "maintenance of law and order". How hideously true this is can be seen from the fact that in every colony, the number of violent deaths through "pacification" and "maintenance of law and order" suffered by the oppressed peoples far exceeds even the number of those killed in the initial period of military conquest.

Finally, in the period of so-called "patronage" and "peaceful evolution", when the "rule of law" of the oppressing power is "established", the number of deaths from sheer exploitation, impoverishment and disease exceeds even the total for the initial period of military conquest and the period of "pacification". This is true of Malaya. It is true of every colony, past and present. Thus, the claim that there ever was or ever could be such a thing as a "peaceful" advent or maintenance of colonialism stands exposed as a myth concocted by the oppressors themselves or their agents to fool their existing and would-be victims, and to stifle any twinges of public conscience.

The Malayan people, like all normal, patriotic and freedom-loving peoples, have never advocated, much less practised violence for the sake of violence. They ardently cherish peace; and were in fact, preparing for a peaceful assumption of power after their magnificent and selfless sacrifices in the resistance against the Fascist occupiers when they were violently and treacherously stabbed in the back by their wartime "allies" (the British Government). The Malayan people, too, had to learn afresh that imperialism never changes its nature, and that "Pax Britannica"--like the "peace" of all imperialist powers--is the "peace" of slavery, national obliteration and of death.

Those who love to philosophise on the ethics of violence should bear in mind that there is no such thing as a prerogative of violence. How could such "philosophers" seriously argue that the power with the biggest battleships and bombers could violently impose its will on others while the latter, by virtue of some divine proscription, might not use violence in self-defence? If such "philosophers" could not sustain their argument in the face of irrefutable facts, what ultimately is their aim in disseminating their one-sided "ethics"? In the final analysis, theirs is the "logic" and the "ethics" of the pirate, the plunderer, the murderer, the rank hypocrite! They are saying, in effect: "Hold on a minute, chaps! When I slit your throat, it's alright; but when you try to kick me in the teeth, it's all wrong, unethical, terroristic!"

Those whose hearts and aspirations are unsullied have never had any misgivings about defending the armed struggle of the oppressed colonial peoples. Their intellect and their emotions are untroubled by hidden reservations that have been nurtured, like some secret vice, on the drug of special pleading. Imperialists and their apologists provide classic examples of duality of standards and elaborate duplicity. It is indeed an education to watch and hear an imperialist at church praying for "peace" on a Sunday and going out to shoot somebody's son or daughter on a Monday. This has happened and is happening everyday in Malaya, as no doubt, it has happened and is happening everyday in every place where imperialism still has a foothold.

From their own experience, Malayan patriots know that such state of things cannot be argued or coaxed out of existence. Like the process of creation itself, the final, physical destruction of the penultimate state of things must take place before the basis of the new can be laid.

The Western powers who comprise the overwhelming majority of the forces of the old order (i.e., capitalism-imperialism-colonialism), know this only too well. Their ruling class itself went through a similar, inevitable, violent overthrow of the penultimate state of things----feudal society----before it could usher in and establish its hegemony, the hegemony of the capitalist ruling class.

As early as the date of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the elemental warning of the beginning of the end of the capitalist-imperialist order had been flashed throughout the world. In 1949, the victory of the Chinese people's Liberation movement, followed by an accumulating avalanche of victories of oppressed peoples in many parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America, brought the capitalist-imperialist order to its final stage of disintegration.

This fact is so overwhelming that even the imperialists themselves openly admit it. When, a few years ago, the then Prime Minister of Britain, Harold Macmillan, spoke of the "wind of change" in the colonies, he was, in fact, echoing with fear and gloom the imperialists' acknowledgment of this fact. And try as his Government did to forestall or divert this "wind of change" into some safe channels in the interests of imperialism, the Liberation movements of the oppressed peoples went on from victory to victory.

Thus, according both to the laws of history and to the subjective admission of the imperialists themselves, the violent leap of the oppressed peoples towards freedom had, in our era, become inevitable, general, completely unimpeachable morally and ethically, and assuredly invincible.

In making the decision to embark on this road of struggle and re-creation, the patriots of Malaya, led by the Communist Party, not only have no cause for regrets, but have every cause for joy at being ranged on the side of the completely just and invincible forces of history. In this knowledge, they will traverse this road with renewed vigour and press on until the glorious goal is reached.

#### THE MODERN REVISIONIST ENCROACHMENT

It would be idle to pretend that the Liberation movement in Malaya has not been infected by the outbreak of modern revisionism that has caused so much trouble in the international Communist movement.

Yes, Malaya has its quota of modern revisionism. Our garden too is infected by the prevailing disease. Malaysians need not be ashamed in admitting this. Admission is the first token of resolve to carry out self-change; and this is eminently healthy, just as it is vitally necessary.

It should not surprise anyone that the Liberation movement in Malaya too is not immune to modern revisionism. After all, Malaya is a colony; and, as has been shown with such tragic clarity in the oldest and most respected citadel of Marxist-Leninist Revolution--the Soviet Union--no place under the sun is immune to the disease.

Even after the whole world has been cleared of imperialists, the mind of man cannot be said to be completely resistant to petty-bourgeois revision. Of course, as more countries and peoples become liberated from the clutches of imperialism, the material basis for the survival of the remnants of petty-bourgeois ideology and for the revival of retrogressive values and practices diminish. But unless the process of Revolutionary education and self-change is carried out as part of the process of struggle for liberation, consolidation and Socialist re-creation, two things could happen: (1) Some elements among the older generation could lapse into old habits of thinking and practice; (2) Some elements among the younger generation (none of whom have experienced the hard school of Revolutionary thinking, living and struggle) could create a new variant of social kink, that is, as it were, generic to the new society.

How could Malaya, which is still a colony, be free from a disease that has penetrated far more powerful citadels? After all, modern revisionism--like its historical antecedent, classic reformism--is part of the imperialist armoury.

It is well known that the imperialists do not rely on armed force alone to suppress, confuse and divide the oppressed peoples. They also rely a good deal on psychological warfare--at which British imperialism is particularly adept. Part of the "secret weapons" used by the imperialists in their psychological warfare consists of pseudo-revolutionary, pseudo-Marxist-Leninist, pseudo-anti-colonialist ideas. These are far more dangerous than atom bombs because they are usually well-camouflaged in Revolutionary and even "Marxist-Leninist" and "Communist" colours and are disseminated by people who are members of important Communist and Workers' Parties and even Socialist Governments.

It is at first sight alarming that, on the very eve of the final victory of the anti-imperialist forces of the world against the doomed forces of capitalism-imperialism, the very threshold of the Socialist and anti-imperialist camp should be hit by a most virulent epidemic generated by the ideological germs let loose by the imperialists' psychological warfare department. Yet, on further consideration, this contradiction is not at all strange or alarming, although it is admittedly serious.

It is precisely because imperialism is conscious of its impending doom that it has flung into battle its last, secret and most dangerous weapon. Throughout the history of the working class and anti-imperialist movement, the secret and most dangerous weapon of the capitalist-imperialist ruling class has always been the weapon of ideological confusion, distortion and revisionism. General Templer, former commander of the British imperialist forces fighting against the Liberation Army of Malaya, used this very weapon and well earned his bread and butter from his imperial masters when he ordered his troops to combine killing with "winning the hearts and minds" of the people. The British colonial authorities used a similar weapon when they recruited renegades from the Communist Parties of Britain and other countries to preach the doctrines of modern revisionism among the people of Malaya. These renegades too earned their bread and butter from their imperial masters.

Such examples of the imperialists' psychological warfare are neither new nor rare. The people of Malaya have on the whole learnt, by "negative example", from the antics of the imperialists. But what the people of Malaya, particularly the patriotic elements, must learn is the lesson provided by the outbreak of modern revisionism. Unless the fight against modern revisionism is carried out as an essential part of the day-to-day struggle against imperialism and for national independence, the struggle could suffer serious retardation. All sections of the patriotic movement in Malaya must, as a first step in this period of re-assessment and nationwide self-correction, methodically expose and discard revisionist ideas in every phase of their activities.

They must beware of the cunning imperialist propaganda that the existing ideological differences concern only or mainly "Moscow and Peking"; or, they are matters which concern only Marxist-Leninists; or, such questions only concern theoreticians; etc. Imperialists spread such propaganda to disarm not only the Communist and Workers' Parties of the World, but also the broad, patriotic, anti-imperialist movements.

The disease-germs of modern revisionism hit everybody--whether Communists or monks, theoreticians or dreamers. Nor are such questions "best left to Moscow and Peking". Such attitude (again inspired by imperialists and their agents) would, if left unchecked, result in collapse of the faculty to make independent judgment and in failure to contribute to the anti-imperialist struggle at home or abroad.

#### HOW TO IDENTIFY AND COMBAT MODERN REVISIONIST IDEAS

There is no substitute for diligent and constructive study of Marxist-Leninist theory. Without a sound and daily-reinforced ideological foundation, the ability to perceive, discern, decide and act cannot but be unequal to the task in hand. Two trends--both equally harmful--in the field of theoretical studies should be combated. One is the trend of intellectual abstractionism--so common and baneful among those with a bourgeois academic background. This trend manifests itself in a kind of arrogant detachment from persons and events that are integral parts of the Revolutionary movement. A look around the Marxist-Leninist Parties that have failed, in contrast to those that have succeeded, will readily show how futile a Party led by intellectual abstractionists can become in a relatively short time.

The other trend is that of "intellectual slumming"; that is, a brand of petty-bourgeois sentimentality which says, in effect, that the working class can do no wrong and, therefore, needs no theories. People who talk and work like that should not complain when they find themselves at the head of a neo-Fascist movement comprised of a horde of the dirtiest lot of lumpen degenerates from the working class and the peasantry who ever scorned theory.

There is no place in the anti-imperialist ranks for either of the above-mentioned trends. The standard of political consciousness must be raised all the time; otherwise, new imperialist tricks, or tricks practised by the neo-colonialists and modern revisionists will succeed in causing havoc in the ranks of the patriots.

Modern revisionist tricks are not difficult to spot. It is one of the unavoidable weaknesses of the imperialists and their apologists that they can disguise their phraseology and political posture to simulate revolutionary attitudes; but, with a little probing, their true imperialist and counter-revolutionary selves can always be uncovered.

The staunch and clear-cut leadership given by the Communist Party of Malaya throughout the most arduous years of the Malayan people's Liberation struggle has been the biggest single stumbling-block to the tricks of the imperialists and their agents of various shades. Certain Malaysians who call themselves "Socialists", do not scruple to malign the C.P. of Malaya--using such mud from the imperialist barrel as: "Failure of the C.P. to give a lead"; "no influence"; "adopting wrong policies"; etc. To their eternal shame the modern revisionist leadership of certain Communist and Workers' Parties join the game of baiting the most-tested and devoted party in Malaya--hoping no doubt to creat an opening for the establishment of a revisionist leadership that would pledge Malaya to a policy of "peaceful co-operation" with the imperialists of the West.

#### ACID TEST OF "MALAYSIA"

Thanks to the correct leadership of the Communist Party of Malaya, the new phase of struggle--against the dangerous imperialist scheme, "Malaysia"--was successfully launched. Today the far-flung anti-imperialist action inside and outside Malaya, which developed directly or indirectly from the anti-"Malaysia" struggle, has become a major sector of struggle within the general anti-imperialist theatre of operations.

Many rich experiences have been gained during the anti-"Malaysia" campaign. No doubt, many of these would, by now, have provided invaluable lessons for subsequent actions.

The Anti-"Malaysia" phase of the anti-imperialist struggle has also provided an acid test for friend as well as foe.

The Liberation movement of Malaya gained many friends at home and abroad as a result of its determination to carry out the policy of confrontation against "Malaysia" to the end. At the same time, many false friends were exposed--chief among these, the modern revisionist "comrades" who tried to inject their idea of rapprochement with "Malaysia", or of "toning down" the confrontation policy.

It did not take long to discover that these "comrades", following certain outside modern revisionist trends, have virtually accepted "Malaysia" as a fait accompli, and are trying to foist their betrayal policy on their contacts. No true anti-imperialist can compromise on "Malaysia". It must be crushed, and the imperialist forces and establishments of occupation and oppression removed, before there can be any talk of ending the Anti-"Malaysia" campaign.

More than that; the present phase of the anti-"Malaysia" campaign needs to be intensified and heightened to coalesce with the general anti-U.S. imperialist struggle now reaching new heights in S.E. Asia. Since June, 1948, several new factors in the National Liberation struggle have emerged--chief of which is the desperate onslaught by the U.S. imperialists against Malaya's close neighbours in the Indo-China region. The patriots of Malaya can be proud of their record of solidarity with their brothers and sisters in neighbouring territories. However hard-pressed, the patriots of Malaya have never hesitated to render fraternal support to their fellow anti-imperialists. The development and enhancement of the spirit of nationalism side by side with the heightening of the spirit of proletarian internationalism are the direct result of the painstaking leadership of the Communist Party of Malaya--an achievement which earned for it the hatred and poisonous "rebuke" of the modern revisionist baton-wielders and their Titoite friends.

The development and enhancement of the spirit of nationalism and proletarian internationalism was also a victory over the school of parochial "revolutionaries" and "peaceful evolutionists" who, for some time, plagued certain sections of the Liberation movement. Parochialism and parliamentarian cretinism must be obliterated from the ranks of the Malayan National Liberation movement, for, they provide one of the main breeding-grounds for modern revisionism and capitulationism.

#### THE JUDGMENT OF HISTORY

Those who oppose or obstruct the Malayan people's struggle for freedom do so from two standpoints: (1) The standpoint of imperialists; and (2) The standpoint of modern revisionists. The standpoint of the former is understandable and needs no explanation. The standpoint of the modern revisionists is, however, more complex. The modern revisionists would protest and shout from the house-tops that they too are against "Malaysia"; but they oppose and try to sabotage the anti-"Malaysia" confrontation campaign because such campaign "creates tension" and "might lead to war and a general conflagration". The modern revisionists profess to support the Malayan National Liberation movement; but they openly and wantonly condemn the armed struggle of the Malayan people as a wicked waste of life and as a youthful manifestation of the desire to "die beautifully", and unashamedly build up bourgeois reformist "leaders" to head off the Malayan revolution into "safe" channels. The modern revisionists claim that they respect the sovereign rights of the oppressed peoples to self-determination; but they proceed to join in sponsoring the imperialist-infested United Nations to send "investigation" and even "supervisory" teams to Malaya and other areas of tense struggle, in an effort to use the so-called "U.N. force" to subdue the Liberation forces of the patriots. Thus, the danger of the imperialist-modern revisionist doing a "Congo" in Malaya is ever-present and must be guarded against most vigilantly.

The particular role which the Malayan patriots have been called to fulfil these past sixteen years has been arduous. History has decreed that S.E. Asia shall be one of the final graveyards of imperialism; and the patriotic peoples of the region, with many years of invaluable experience and an inexhaustible heritage to draw from, will fulfil the task of burying imperialism with a degree of determination and finality which only



## PEACE OR VIOLENCE?

(The following item is excerpted from an article published in the 9th issue of HOC TAP (Study), theoretical organ of the Viet Nam Workers Party, and reprinted in PEKING REVIEW #42, 1963.)

The fundamental question of any revolution is the question of state power. How to get state power into the hands of the working class and how to build the state power of the proletariat are the questions of primary concern to every true revolutionary fighter of the working class. That is why the method of seizing state power is one of the most important questions Communists must study and solve. This question has often been the subject of hot debate among them. The flunkies of the bourgeoisie who have wormed their way into the ranks of the working class have always advanced erroneous and reactionary arguments on this question in an attempt to sidetrack the revolution. For they are well aware that once the working class and its political party accept their arguments and the method of seizing state power recommended by them, the objective of seizing state power can never succeed.

The modern revisionists represented by the Tito group and their followers - Right opportunists in the international communist movement and the working class movement - are spreading a smokescreen about the question of the method of seizing state power and are doing all they can to distort the Marxist-Leninist principle on this matter. Modern revisionists and Right opportunists are doing their utmost to peddle pacifism and misrepresent the Marxist-Leninist theory on the role of violence in history.

### Violence - Midwife of New Social System

From the time society was divided into classes the ruling classes set up their state machinery to oppress and exploit the classes they ruled. The state is the instrument of violence used by the ruling classes to crush all resistance put up by the classes ruled by them. The rulers use troops, policemen, spies, law courts and prisons against the ruled. The exploiting classes in power, on the one hand, are always employing violence to keep down the exploited classes. On the other hand, they use their "thinkers" to spread pacifism and the theory of "non-violence" in an effort to cause the exploited to be resigned to their destiny without resorting to violence to resist the exploiting classes in power.

Those who constantly resort to violence for the suppression of the working people are, however, clamoring against the use of violence. What they oppose and attack is the violence with which the oppressed and the exploited use to resist them, while the violence which they frequently use to suppress the working people is publicized as a favour bestowed upon the working people.

Those who have swallowed the poison of bourgeois pacifism and humanitarianism oppose all kinds of violence. They make no distinction in the class character of the various kinds of violence. To them the violence used by the bourgeoisie to suppress the proletariat and the violence used by the proletariat to resist the bourgeoisie for its own emancipation are one and the same. Lenin once said: "To talk about 'violence' in general, without examining the conditions which distinguish reactionary from revolutionary violence, means being a petty bourgeois who renounces revolution, or else it means simply deceiving oneself and others by sophistry." (Lenin, SELECTED WORKS, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1937, Vol. 7, p. 175.) To the pacifists, every kind of violence is evil. They can do nothing but moan and lament over the death caused by violence. They know nothing about the law of social development. They only see the ugly side of violence and do not under-



stand that despite its ugliness it plays a revolutionary role in history. Marx once said that violence "is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one." (Engels, Anti-Duhring, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1959, p. 254.)

Today, modern revisionists and Right opportunists in the communist movement and the working-class movement keep wagging their tongues about "peace", and "humanitarianism"; they dare not mention the word "violence." For them violence is taboo. They fear the word "violence" just as a leech fears lime. The fact is that they have negated Marxist-Leninist theory on the role of violence in history. More than 80 years ago, criticizing the reactionary philosophy of Duhring, Engels wrote: "To Herr Duhring force is the absolute evil; the first act of force is to him the original sin; his whole exposition is a jeremiad on the contamination of all subsequent history consummated by this original sin; a jeremiad on the shameful perversion of all natural and social laws by this diabolical power, force. That force, however, plays also another role in history, a revolutionary role; that, in the words of Marx, it is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one, that it is the instrument with the aid of which social movement forces its way through and shatters the dead, fossilized political forms - of this there is not a word in Herr Duhring." (Engels, Anti-Duhring, P.L.P.H., Moscow, 1959, pp. 253-54.)

Communists are not Tolstoyists or the disciples of Gandhi preaching "non-violence." Nor do they spread the idea of "violence for violence sake." They are not "bellicose" and "bloodthirsty" as the reactionaries always slander them. They simply set forth a fact, that is, violence is a social phenomenon, a result of the exploitation of man by man, and a means used by the ruling, exploiting classes to maintain and extend their domination. Communists hold that the working class and other working people - victims of exploitation and domination - must resort to revolutionary violence to crush counter-revolutionary violence, so that they can win their own emancipation and society can advance according to the law of historical development. More than one hundred years ago Marx and Engels clearly stated in the Communist Manifesto: "The violent over-throw of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat." (Marx and Engels, Selected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1958, Vol.I, p. 45.) They also said: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions." (Marx and Engels, Selected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1958, Vol.I, p.65.) Communists set forth the historical role played by violence not because they are "cretans" of violence, but because it is a law governing the social development of mankind. No revolution can be successfully carried out and no development of human society is possible without grasping this law.

The revolutionary cause of the proletariat does not mean ordinary reshuffle of government personnel or a mere cabinet change while the old political and economic order remains intact. The proletarian revolution must not preserve the state machinery (the existing police, gendarmes, armed forces and bureaucratic structure), mainly used to oppress the people, but must crush it and replace it with an entirely new one. This is one of the conditions marking the difference between the proletarian revolution and the bourgeois revolution. The bourgeois revolution does not smash the existing feudal state machinery but takes it over, preserves and perfects it. On the contrary, the proletarian revolution smashes the existing state machinery of the capitalist system. The proletarian revolution is a process of bitter struggle in which the bourgeoisie is overthrown, the bourgeois order is destroyed, the properties of the capitalists and landlords are confiscated and the public ownership of the various chief means of

production is realized. The working class does not simply lay hold of the existing state machinery, or transfer the militarist-bureaucratic state machinery from the hands of the bourgeoisie to its own. It must smash the bourgeois state machinery and establish a new state machinery of its own, that is, the proletarian dictatorship. Smashing the existing state machinery is "the preliminary condition for every real people's revolution." (Marx and Engels, "Marx to L. Kugelmann," Selected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1955, Vol. II, p. 463.) In a letter to L. Kugelmann in 1871, Marx considered such an action was essential for all the countries in continental Europe. In the years between 1870 and 1880, in those countries which lay outside the European continent, such as Britain and the United States, it was possible for the working class in those countries to seize state power by peaceful means, because at that time capitalism had not yet grown into monopoly capitalism and militarism and bureaucracy in Britain and the United States had not yet been developed. This was the state of affairs before the emergence of imperialism. But at the beginning of the 20th century when capitalism prevailed in all countries and developed to its highest stage, that is, imperialism, and when militarism and bureaucracy began to appear in Britain and the United States, the possibility of seizing state power by peaceful means no longer existed in these two countries. In 1917 Lenin wrote in The State and Revolution that what Marx said about this theses being limited to the continent could no longer be applied and that whether it was in Britain or the United States the smashing of the existing state machinery had become the primary condition for any genuine revolution of the people. In 1918, in his Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, Lenin regarded this question as a universal law. "The proletarian revolution," he said, "is impossible without the forcible destruction of the bourgeois state machine and the substitution for it of a new one...." (Lenin, Selected Works, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1937, Vol. 7, p. 124.) When Lenin criticized Kautsky's so-called thesis that "the transition could take place peacefully, i.e., in a democratic way," he clearly pointed out that this was an attempt to hide from the readers the fact that revolutionary violence is the fundamental sign of the concept of proletarian dictatorship, and that it was a fraud aimed at substituting peaceful revolution for violent revolution. He said: "Kautsky had to resort to all these evasions, sophisms and fraudulent falsifications in order to dissociate himself from violent revolution, and to conceal his renunciation of it, his desertion to the side of liberal labour politics, i.e., to the side of the bourgeoisie. That is the whole point." (Lenin, Selected Works, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1937, Vol. 7, p. 125.)

To renounce revolution by violence so as to reduce the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat to empty words - this is the main feature characteristic of the reformists ranging from Kautsky to the modern revisionists. The reformists call for a gradual reform of the capitalist system and the bourgeois state without overthrowing this system and smashing its state apparatus. To the reformists, reform is everything while the revolutionary struggle for seizing state power is meaningless. Subscription to reformism means the renunciation of revolution. Revolution is a change; it destroys what is most important and essential in the old order; it does not mean reconstruction of the old order cautiously, slowly and gradually, and involving the least possible damage to the old order in the process.

As the reformists see it, there is no difference between the nature of bourgeois democracy and proletarian democracy, and there is no swift advance from the capitalist system to the socialist system, and can evolve gradually into socialism in accordance with the theory of evolution. The Tito group has also preached the fallacy of the "peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism." Reformists dare not disturb

capitalism in the faintest degree; they simply seek the aid of piecemeal reforms and wash their hands of every type of illegal work in an attempt to frustrate the revolutionary preparations made by the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

Modern revisionism, like the revisionism of the early 20th century is reformism in essence. Revisionists, in the past, as at present, have made great efforts to sing the praises of the bourgeois parliamentary system. They have made a big fanfare about the entry into socialism through "parliamentary road." As a matter of fact democratic rights under the bourgeois parliamentary system are, as Marx put it, nothing more than the rights to decide once every three or six years who of the ruling classes should "represent" the people in parliament and oppress them. Lenin said: "Take any parliamentary country, from America to Switzerland, from France to England, Norway and so forth - in these countries the real business of "state" is performed behind the scenes and is carried on by the departments, chancelleries and General Staffs. Parliament itself is given up to talk for the special purpose of fooling the "common people." (Lenin, Selected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1951, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 246-47.) Lenin described bourgeois democracy as narrow, enasculated, false and deceptive democracy, the paradise of the rich, but a trap and a deceptive fraud for the exploited and the poor. In order to publicize the "parliamentary road," the modern revisionists are peddling this bourgeois "deceptive fraud" which already has been completely exposed by Lenin.

The bourgeoisie in power has never voluntarily relinquished state power to the working class. In Theses on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin pointed out that under the conditions of militarism and imperialism, "the very thought of peacefully subordinating the capitalists to the will of the majority of the exploited, of the peaceful, reformist transition to socialism, is not only extreme philistine stupidity, but also downright deception of the workers, the embellishment of capitalist wage slavery, concealment of the truth." "Only the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the confiscation of its property, the destruction of the whole of the bourgeois state apparatus from top to bottom - parliamentary, judicial, military, bureaucratic, administrative, municipal, etc., right up to the very wholesale deportation or internment of the most dangerous and stubborn exploiters - putting them under strict surveillance in order to combat inevitable attempts to resist and to restore capitalist slavery - only such measures can ensure the real subordination of the whole class of exploiters." (Lenin, Selected Works, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1946, Vol. 10, p. 164.)

The basic principle for all Communist Parties is to recognize the dictatorship of the proletariat and struggle for its realization. The process of the proletarian revolutionary movement is, in the final analysis, one of making preparations for the dictatorship of the proletariat (before the seizure of state power) and putting such dictatorship into effect (after seizing state power). The proletariat must adopt all forms of struggle, legal and illegal, inside and outside parliament, ranging from strikes, demonstrations, political general strikes up to armed uprisings, the highest form of struggle, so as to overthrow the bourgeois rule and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. The more the revolutionary movement surges forward, the more frenzied will be the repressions by the ruling bourgeoisie and the more sharp and bitter will be the class struggle. "Revolution progresses by giving rise to a strong and united counter-revolution, i.e., it compels the enemy to resort to more and more extreme measures of defence and in this way devises ever more powerful means of attack." (Lenin, Collected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1962, Vol. II, p. 172.)

In the relentless class struggle against the exploiting class in

power, the working class and other working people cannot but use arms. Marx said that "the weapon of criticism cannot, of course, take the place of criticism with weapons" and that material forces must be overthrown by material forces. Lenin pointed out that in the working-class struggle against the bourgeoisie, it was possible "at any time to substitute the criticism with weapons for the weapon of criticism." Lenin, therefore, pointed out the necessity of building up arms for the proletariat and disarming the bourgeoisie, for otherwise it would be impossible for socialism to win. In The "Disarmament" Slogan, Lenin wrote: "Our slogan must be: the arming of the proletariat for the purpose of vanquishing, expropriating and disarming the bourgeoisie." "An oppressed class which does not strive to learn to use arms, to acquire arms, deserves to be treated like slaves." (Lenin, Collected Works, International Publishers, New York, Vol. XIX, p. 354.)

Because in every class society the ruling classes possess arms, and it is a fact that the bourgeoisie in power uses them to suppress the working class. Consequently, the working class has no alternative but to take up arms to overthrow its rulers and achieve its own liberation. Lenin also said: "Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world-historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap-heap; the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but only when this condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before." (Lenin, Collected Works, International Publishers, New York, Vol. XIX, p. 355.) ...

When criticizing "the advocates of disarmament," Lenin asked: "Do the advocates of disarmament stand for a perfectly new species of unarmed revolution?" (Lenin, Collected Works, International Publishers, New York, Vol. XIX, p. 353.) Lenin also criticized Plekhanov's view that "they should not have taken to arms." In Lessons of the Moscow Uprising he said: "Nothing could be more short-sighted than Plekhanov's view, seized upon by all the opportunists, that the strike was untimely and should not have been started, and that 'they should not have taken to arms.' On the contrary, we should have taken to arms more resolutely, energetically and aggressively; we should have explained to the masses that it was impossible to confine things to the peaceful strike and that a fearless and relentless armed fight was necessary." (Lenin, Collected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1962, Vol. II, p. 173.) Lenin taught us the need to spread the idea of armed uprising to the broad masses, and he described armed uprising as a great mass struggle. He regarded recognition of armed uprising as a question of principle for the revolutionaries. "It is not enough to take sides on the question of political slogans; it is also necessary to take sides on the question of an armed uprising. Those who are opposed to it, those who do not prepare for it, must be ruthlessly dismissed from the ranks of the supporters of the revolution, sent packing to its enemies, to the traitors or cowards; for the day is approaching when the force of events and the conditions of the struggle will compel us to distinguish between enemies and friends according to this principle." (ibid., p. 176.)

Of course, Communists are very cautious about armed uprising. They regard it as an art and have never treated it lightly. It is a peculiar form of political struggle with its own specific laws. Communists start an armed uprising only when the opportunity is ripe and when subjective and objective conditions are completely ready, and once it has started they intend to carry it through to the finish.

### The Possibility of Revolution Developing Peacefully

The revolutionary class must take up arms against the ruling classes precisely because the latter use arms to protect their properties and privileges. Armed struggle and armed uprising are not the

ultimate aim of the proletariat, nor are they an aim in themselves; they are the means of achieving emancipation and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. Communists do not propose that arms be used at all times and under all circumstances. If there was a road which would involve less casualties and bloodshed, but which would lead to socialism, they would unhesitatingly take that road. When drafting the Communist Manifesto Engels raised the question whether it was possible to abolish the system of private ownership by peaceful means. He wrote: "It would be desirable if this could happen, and the Communists would certainly be the last to oppose it.... But they also see that the development of the proletariat in nearly all civilized countries has been violently suppressed, and that in this way the opponents of communism have been working toward a revolution with all their strength. If the oppressed proletariat is finally driven to revolution, then we Communists will defend the interests of the proletarians with deeds as we now defend them with words." (Engels, "Principles of Communism" Monthly Review Pamphlet Series, New York, 1952, pp. 13-14.)...

In Russia, from February to July of 1917, there appeared the possibility of seizing state power by peaceful means. This was because the tsarist autocracy had been overthrown by violence in the February revolution, there appeared the situation in which two regimes existed side by side, and the rebellion of Kornilov had been crushed by the working-class armed forces. At that time, Lenin said: "There could now be no question of resistance being offered to the Soviets if they themselves did not vacillate. No class would dare to raise a rebellion against the Soviets, and the landlords and capitalists, chastened by the experience of the Kornilov affair, would peacefully surrender power upon the ultimatum of the Soviets." (Lenin, Selected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1951, Vol. II, Part I, p. 184.) This was possible because power was still unstable and arms were in the hands of the people. "The essence of the situation was that the arms were in the hands of the people, and that no coercion was exercised over the people from without. That is what opened up and ensured a peaceful path for the development of the revolution." (Lenin, Selected Works, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1936, Vol. 6, pp. 167-68.) Lenin believed that only when the Soviet possessed all state power could the peaceful development of the revolution be ensured. He also said that if such an opportunity was lost, then there would occur "the inevitability of a bitter civil war between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat." Such a civil war would be extremely "arduous and bloody," Lenin emphasized: "The proletariat will stop at no sacrifice in order to save the revolution." Lenin believed that the road of revolution developing peacefully was a road most beneficial to the people, a road involving the least sufferings, and that Communists should make the greatest efforts to strive for it. But when the peaceful road could not be realized he unhesitatingly called on the masses to take the non-peaceful road. In mid-July 1917 Lenin said in his On Slogans: "The peaceful course of development has been rendered impossible. A non-peaceful and most painful course has begun." (Lenin, Selected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1951, Vol. II, Part I, p. 89.)

Thus, while mentioning the possibility of revolution developing peacefully Lenin never forgot to mention the possibility of a cruel and bloody civil war breaking out. On October 8, 1917, confronted with the new situation, he affirmed that "the passing of power to the Soviets now means in practice armed insurrection." (Lenin, Selected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1951, Vol. II, Part I, p. 186.) The incident that happened at that time, he said, "places the armed uprising on the order of the day." (*ibid.*, p. 189.)...

In the final stage of World War II and for a time in the postwar years, because the Soviet Red Army had wiped out the Hitlerite fascists

and smashed the fascist state machinery set up by Hitler in the various East European countries, the people's regimes led by the working class were established in these countries. With the help of the Soviet Red Army they switched to the tasks of the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat after carrying out the work of the bourgeois democratic revolution, and so there was no need for an armed uprising. What happened in Czechoslovakia in February 1948 also belongs to this category of revolutionary change. By adopting administrative measures and combining these with mass demonstrations, the Czechoslovak people's regime smashed the plot of the bourgeoisie to foment a cabinet crisis and attempt to restore capitalism, and in this way led the country directly to the road of socialism. Some people are attempting to use the February 1948 event in Czechoslovakia as an example to support their argument for "peaceful transition." But this is falsifying history because they separate the February happenings from the liquidation of German fascism by the Soviet Red Army, from the armed uprising and guerrilla warfare of the people in Slovakia in 1944 and the people's general armed uprising in Prague in May 1945. Moreover, in the February 1948 event in Czechoslovakia, the role of revolutionary violence was also embodied in the determined suppression of the bourgeois rebellion by the people's regime, which was in essence a dictatorship of the proletariat, and in the armed demonstration of the Czechoslovak people supporting the administrative measures of the communist-led government.

Since the end of World War II, the colonial system of imperialism has been in the process of disintegration. Many nations under the yoke of imperialist enslavement have today achieved national independence. In their fight for national independence, some nations have adopted the form of armed struggle, others have gone through alternate periods of armed struggle and peaceful political struggle or have combined these two forms of struggle in the same period, while still others have attained political independence without armed struggle. Some nations have been able to achieve national independence peacefully because imperialism is steadily declining and a world socialist system has come into existence and is vigorously developing, thus bringing about a change in the balance of forces on a worldwide scale, and socialism has become a strong magnet drawing the people of all nations. The national-liberation movement is gathering force like a racing storm and all the nations have awakened and are resolutely fighting for self-determination. Confronted with this situation, imperialism is forced to make its choice between two alternatives:

1. To stubbornly resist to the end and eventually be driven out of the colonies, with the result that the colonial nations which have gained complete independence will embark on the path of socialism;
2. To hand over political independence to the native bourgeoisie and in this way to retain its economic interests in the colonies and keep the former colonial nations within the orbit of capitalism.

Many imperialist countries "wisely" chose the second alternative, and this explains why some former colonial nations have been able to achieve political independence by peaceful means. However, the various nations have a long way to go from arriving at political independence to achieving complete independence and thence going over to socialism. There are those who are trying to support their argument for the "theory" of "peaceful transition" by citing the fact that certain nations have achieved independence by peaceful means. But this is utterly wrong, because these nations remain within the orbit of capitalism after independence has been achieved, and so it cannot be said that they have realized the "peaceful transition to socialism."

So far, there is not yet a single "precedent" of peaceful transition to socialism in the world working-class history of revolutionary struggle. This "precedent" cannot be found even if one lights a torch in search of it. However, Communists have never denied the possibility

of revolution developing peacefully, which might occur at certain stages or in certain countries. It would be very good if there were such a possibility but it is extremely rare. Speaking about this possibility, Stalin, in The Foundations of Leninism, said: "Of course, in the remote future, if the proletariat is victorious in the principal capitalist countries, and if the present capitalist encirclement is replaced by a socialist encirclement, a 'peaceful' path of development is quite possible for certain capitalist countries, whose capitalists, in view of the 'unfavorable' international situation, will consider it expedient 'voluntarily' to make substantial concessions to the proletariat. But this supposition applies only to remote and possible future." (Stalin, Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1953, Vol. 6, p. 121.) It has been forty years since Stalin said this. Is that "remote future" as stated by Stalin any closer after forty years?

Today socialism has gained a great victory. The balance of world forces has changed in its favor. It has won the hearts of millions upon millions of people. The working class and other working people have acquired a high degree of political consciousness and a sharp sense of organization and discipline. The dictatorship of the proletariat has been established in many countries, capable of effectively combatting imperialist intervention in the revolutions of different countries. This makes for favorable conditions for the working class to seize power by various means of struggle. On the other hand, two-thirds of the world population still live under capitalism. Imperialism is in the process of an advanced development of militarism and bureaucracy. Every capitalist country possesses an enormous state machinery, ever ready to suppress the people's revolutionary movement with violence. In these circumstances, the possibility for the proletariat to seize power by peaceful means without launching an armed uprising remains extremely rare. Asserting that the seizure of state power by peaceful means has now become a universal possibility for the working class in most countries of the world and unduly emphasizing this possibility adds up to leaving the working class completely without adequate preparation for overcoming difficulties, defeating the exploiting classes and establishing its own dictatorship. It means disarming, intentionally or unintentionally, the working class ideologically and lulling it into a state of total unpreparedness when the exploiting classes resort to violence at the critical moment to crush the revolution.

There are people who believe that the emergence of nuclear weapons is the characteristic of our time and that this has brought about changes in the strategy and tactics of the world working class. This, they aver, makes it necessary to give "new consideration" to the Marxist-Leninist theory on the method of seizing state power. They claim that as a result of the emergence of nuclear weapons the working class must not seize power by violence but by peaceful means, for revolution by violence will lead to civil war. Because one spark may spread into a conflagration, civil war may lead to a world war which in the present era is bound to develop into a destructive nuclear war. In the circumstances, the only way left for the working class in various countries is to attain state power by peaceful means. And the peaceful means they recommend is the theory of "structural reform."

For all their destructive power, nuclear weapons cannot change the law of development of human society. They can only cause certain changes in military strategy and tactics, but never in the strategy and tactics of the working class. Not at all times will a spark develop into a conflagration. This has been proved by the Chinese civil war, by the Korean war, and by the Algerian war. The revolutions of China, Viet Nam and Cuba were all revolutions by violence and were all won after the presence of nuclear weapons. It is therefore utterly groundless to assert that the working class should not seize state power by violence following the existence of nuclear weapons.

In the face of enemies who are armed to the teeth and are prepared to stamp out revolution at any time by violence, the only way to seize state power is to resort to violence. The possibility of revolution developing peacefully can be realized only when the exploiting classes do not possess a dependable bureaucratic-militarist state machine or at a time when they have lost the will to use this machinery to suppress the revolution although it may still be in their hands. To translate the possibility of the peaceful development of revolution into reality, the working class must possess a mighty force which is equipped with a closely knit organization and leadership. That force may be a political force (mass political force), or an armed force, or a combination of political and armed forces. Therefore, in striving to make revolution through a peaceful road - the road which involves the least suffering, the working class and its party must vigorously prepare for the seizure of state power by violence. In order to be able to take the initiative against all possibilities, the working class must, on the one hand, get its forces ready to seize power by violence and, on the other hand, be prepared to strive to bring about peaceful revolution whenever and wherever the possibility arises. It is only when the working class has organized into a mighty force and firmly taken up arms that it is possible to strive for the peaceful development of the revolution.

### Viet Nam's Experience

Ever since our Party was formed it has educated its cadres, members and the masses in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. It has also educated them in Marxist-Leninist teachings on the role of violence in history. Thus, it has ideologically armed the entire Party and all the people sufficiently so that they can put up a good fight in bitter battle, wipe out the enemy and win independence and freedom for the country....

Our Party has applied Marxist-Leninist principles on the strategy and tactics of revolution to the reality of our country. On the one hand, it has stood against the defeatist and capitulationist ideas and against the "theories" advocating no-rebellion and denouncing the use of arms. On the other hand, it has opposed the idea of organizing "secret societies" for conspiracies as well as such terrorist activities as assassination of individuals. At the same time, it has waged an uncompromising struggle against reformist ideas prevailing in the working class, especially against the idea of "peaceful revolution" preached by the "Vung Hong (Red Sun) faction."\* Our Party mobilized and organized the masses and led them in waging both the lower and the higher forms of struggle in accordance with the laws of class struggle. It has educated the people in this way: Imperialism and the feudal forces dominated the people of our country by iron and blood and by counter-revolutionary violence, and if our people failed to use revolutionary violence to overthrow them there would be no hope of emancipating themselves. At the same time it has taught them that revolutionary struggle is both a science and an art, that there must be closely knit organization and leadership and that neither adventurism nor laissez-faire is allowed. It has armed the whole Party and all the people with Marxist-Leninist ideas of class struggle, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat as well as the conceptions of armed uprising. As soon as the Party was founded, the tasks of overthrowing the enemy's government and seizing state power for the workers and peasants were written into its program. In its 1930 political program,

\* "Vung Hong Dang" (Red Sun Party) also known as the "Peaceful Revolution Communist Party," or "Viet Nam Nhi Cac Dang," was an organization of some Communists in Nghien Province from 1929 to 1937. It advocated peaceful revolution and also held that following the victory of the revolution there had to be a period of the development of capitalism before going over to communism.



also pointed out that the method of seizing state power was armed uprising. "Armed rebellion is not an ordinary thing. Therefore, attention must be paid to the fact that not only the immediate revolutionary situation must be taken into account but actions must be taken on the basis of military rules. Even when the immediate revolutionary situation has not yet appeared there is also the need for fierce struggle. Such struggle, however, does not mean organizing aimless revolt or premature armed rebellion, it means mobilizing the masses for demonstrations, strikes, etc., so as to pave the way for later participation in armed rebellion."

During World War II, the Party particularly stressed the question of seizing state power by armed uprising. The resolution adopted at the seventh session of the Party's Central Committee (November 1940) provided: "The Party must be prepared to undertake the sacred missions of leading the oppressed nations in Indo-China to launch armed rebellion and achieve independence and freedom." The eighth session of the Party's Central Committee (May 1941) also pointed out that the central task for the whole Party and all the people was armed uprising. The resolution passed at this session declared: "The revolution in Indo-China will end with an armed uprising." It also put forward the task for "preparing forces at all times," so that "when the favorable moment arrives, we can, by employing the power already at our disposal, victoriously lead area uprisings one by one in order to pave the way for a large-scale general uprising."

In August 1945, when Japanese fascism collapsed, our Party led the people throughout the country in starting a timely general armed uprising and seizing state power. The August revolution in Viet Nam was a revolution by violence, by means of which the state apparatus of the colonialists and feudal forces was destroyed and a new people's state apparatus was established. In the August revolution, the expression of violence was found in the closely co-ordinated use of political and armed forces. The August revolution was the result of the prolonged revolutionary struggle in which peaceful political struggle was combined with armed struggle, and in which the peaceful political struggle of the masses was combined with the launching of local guerrilla war and the work of building bases in the rural areas. The August revolution is the direct result of the armed struggle waged by all the people, mainly the result of combining the activities of professional armed forces with semi-professional armed forces (Liberation Army, guerilla forces, militia, and self-defense corps etc.).

The August revolution in Viet Nam is different from the Russian October Revolution in that the latter was a general uprising, state power was first built in the cities and then in the countryside. The difference between Viet Nam's August revolution and the Chinese revolution is that the Chinese revolution was a prolonged armed struggle, state power was first seized in the countryside, which was used to encircle the cities and finally the cities were liberated.

The magnificent victory of the August revolution in our country was won because our Party has creatively applied Marxism-Leninism to the reality of our country and because our Party understands how to educate its members and the people in the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism and inspire them with Marxist-Leninist ideas of the role of violence in history....

The process of the long and hard struggle waged by the Vietnamese people under the leadership of our Party has proved that the only road that can be taken by the working class and other working people against the exploiting classes - who rule the people by violence - is to resort to violence to overthrow them. Of course, to make revolution by violence imposes the necessity of enduring hardship and sacrifices on the part of the broad masses of the people. But this can help shake off at an early date the long suffering and death caused by the brutal oppression and exploitation inflicted by the rulers on a countless number of people. During the general armed uprising in August 1945, only a few score of

people were killed throughout the country. On the contrary, as a result of the rule of the Japanese and French fascists, some 2 million people starved to death in the north from the end of 1944 to the first few months of 1945. History has proved that the extremely heavy losses suffered by the working people from the brutal rule of the exploiting classes cannot be matched by the losses of a revolution, however relentless it may be. The road involving the least suffering for the people is to go in for revolution to overthrow the enemy and win emancipation.

\*

Society develops in accordance with its own laws. No one can point out the road of development of society according to his subjective desire. The Communists armed with Marxism-Leninism must grasp the laws governing the development of society, work out their correct strategy and tactics in accordance with objective law, lead the working class and other working people to make revolution and win victory, thereby promoting the development of society. The working class of a country and its Party must map out the proper form of struggle in accordance with the concrete conditions of that country so as to seize state power. Whether to carry out a revolution by violence or a peaceful revolution can be decided only by the working class and its vanguard in a given country. No matter what form of struggle is adopted to seize state power, the essential conditions for the victory of a revolution are: a very powerful mass movement, and full determination of the vanguard of the working class - and it should inspire the masses of the people with the same determination - to overthrow the enemy, to defy sacrifice and hardship, to be prepared at all times to smash the state machinery of the exploiting classes so as to set up the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only by so doing can the proletariat defeat its class enemies and liberate itself.

\*

\*

\*

WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL BOOK STORE

"Revolutionary Literature From Around The World"

- I. Marxist-Leninist Literature from China, Vietnam, Albania, Korea
1. THE POLEMICS ON THE GENERAL LINE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT (China) ..... \$3.00 postpaid
  2. LENIN'S FIGHT AGAINST REVISIONISM AND OPPORTUNISM (China) ..... \$2.50 postpaid
  3. MARXIST-LENINIST IDEOLOGY WILL CERTAINLY OVERCOME REVISIONISM (Albania)..... \$2.00 postpaid
  4. OPPOSE MODERN REVISIONISM AND UPHOLD MARXISM-LENINISM AND THE UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT (Albania) ..... \$2.00 postpaid

II. Theoretical and Political Organs of Marxist-Leninist Parties - Around the World

- New Zealand - The COMMUNIST REVIEW (C.P. of N.Z.) - monthly  
                  - The PEOPLE'S VOICE (C.P. of N.Z.) - weekly
- Japan - BULLETIN: Information for Abroad (C.P. of Japan) - monthly
- U.S.A. - The RED FLAG (C.P.U.S.A. - M.-L.) - bi-monthly  
                  .....single copy \$1.00, subscription \$6.00/year  
                  - The PEOPLE'S VOICE (C.P.U.S.A. - M.-L.) - bi-weekly  
                  .....single copy \$ .25, subscription \$5.00/year

III. Other Periodic Literature

- China - PEKING REVIEW - weekly
- Vietnam - VIETNAM COURIER - fortnightly

IV. Pamphlets

1. HOLD HIGH THE REVOLUTIONARY BANNER OF NATIONAL LIBERATION (Korea) ..... \$ .35 postpaid
2. LONG LIVE THE VICTORY OF PEOPLE'S WAR by Lin Biao (China) ..... \$ .30 postpaid
3. MARXISM AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION by J.V. Stalin. \$ .35 postpaid
4. "THEORY" AND PRACTICE OF THE MODERN REVISIONISTS by Jacques Grippa (China)..... \$ .35 postpaid

CALL OR WRITE FOR FREE CATALOGS

WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL BOOK STORE

1313 E. Firestone Blvd. Los Angeles, California, 90001, U.S.A.  
Store Hours: MON.-FRI.: 1pm-8pm; SAT.: 1pm-6pm  
Telephone: Area Code 213 Call 587-1918

PEOPLE'S VOICE

THE VOICE OF ALL THE OPPRESSED AND EXPLOITED!

PEOPLE'S VOICE

AN ALL-AMERICAN COMMUNIST NEWSPAPER.

PEOPLE'S VOICE

PUBLISHED BI-WEEKLY

PEOPLE'S VOICE

NEWS, MARXIST-LENINIST ANALYSIS, TRADE UNION TOPICS

PEOPLE'S VOICE

KEEP ABREAST OF THE POLITICAL ADVANCE OF THE AMERICAN PROLETARIAT!

PEOPLE'S VOICE

PRICE: \$ 5.00 PER YEAR BY SURFACE MAIL TO ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD  
\$10.00 PER YEAR BY AIR MAIL TO ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD

PEOPLE'S VOICE

FOR INFORMATION AND SUBSCRIPTIONS,

WRITE:

PEOPLE'S VOICE  
c/o WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL BOOK STORE  
1313 E. Firestone Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California, 90001  
U.S.A.