

Interview with Chilean Revolutionaries

Reprinted below are portions of an interview with the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile from the September 1968 issue of Unidad Revolucionaria of Valparaiso Chile. The article was translated by W.R. from the Chilean journal Causa M-L, Sept.-Oct., 1968. A number of the points raised by the Chilean comrades requires serious further reflection.

Question:

The Revolutionary Communist Party is clandestine. For this reason we know little about its origins and development and its perspectives for success as well. Would you like to tell me the reasons for its secrecy and something about its history and its future?

I shall begin by responding to your first point in which you refer to our clandestineness. We have established the necessity of taking power through a revolution, that is to say, to overturn the reactionary sectors by violence. Of course, the legal and open existence of a Party that persists seriously in bring about the revolution—with all its militants, activities and organisms, in view of police repression—is inconceivable. Nevertheless, there is a more profound reason for the underground character of our Party than the mere protection of our militants and activities. We are secret and illegal because we want to destroy the legal bourgeois injustice and reactionary power. Our clandestineness is also a means to guarantee that our Party can faithfully represent the independent interests of the proletariat. To operate within bourgeois legality means either to make concessions to the dominant class or to deliver ourselves bound hand and foot into the hands of reactionary repression. This does not mean that we have fallen into the infantilism of not utilizing wherever possible this bourgeois legality when we can do so without compromising our revolutionary independence or risking the security of our Party. Nor does it mean that we consider clandestineness and illegality as ends in themselves which should be maintained under all circumstances. In those places in the country where through struggle we successfully impose revolutionary power, a series of Party activities can manifest themselves in public form, under the protection of the masses.

Moreover, the secrecy of our militants, of the nuclei of our Party and their internal activities does not mean that we hide our plans from the masses. On the contrary, revolutionary means of security are favorable to the possibility of doing political work among the masses over a relatively prolonged time and in

a relatively secure manner. The masses themselves look with justifiable distrust on those who talk of crushing the reactionary forces while at the same time participating publicly in reactionary institutions and not taking measures to safeguard their independence and protect themselves from repressive forces. To the masses, this seems to be either proof of immaturity or naivete or that they are revolutionaries only from the mouth up and that they are really doing nothing to destroy the regime of the exploiters. It is reasonable that the masses distrust such "revolutionaries" and refuse to associate with them or trust them.

Therefore, clandestineness properly understood, far from separating the Party from the masses and transforming itself into a conspiratorial sect, helps to establish solid and secure ties of revolutionary leadership with the masses. For this reason one must never lose sight of the fact that a revolutionary Party does not hide itself exclusively or fundamentally to preserve its own forces but to fight better. For this reason we must actively encourage the struggle of the masses, understanding clearly that armed struggle for power cannot be accomplished by militants alone but by the masses led by the Party.

With respect to our history I can tell you that the Revolutionary Communist Party was born of a union of the Spartacists and the Union of Rebellious Communists (an anti-revisionist organization from the North) with numerous cadres and middle leaders of the proletarian masses of our country. To these were also added a series of middle leaders and militants from the traditional "leftist" parties who were aware of the betrayal of their leaders. The process of the regrouping of Marxist-Leninists began in 1963. Beginning from this date, the process of creating the Revolutionary Communist Party lasted three years. The initial movement began to divest itself of diverse opportunist elements included in the beginning; it began to establish ties with the workers and the peasants; it initiated the elaboration of a revolutionary program; it started to work in secrecy and to act in accordance with a plan and not in an improvised fashion. This first stage of what can be called the prehistory of

the Revolutionary Communist Party ended with a National Congress held in May of 1966. Attending this Congress were more than fifty delegates representing numerous Regional Committees already constituted throughout Chile. Present also were delegates from the Marxist-Leninist parties of Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, Brazil and Argentina. At this Congress agreement was reached to name the new party the "Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile." A program and statutes, and other political documents were adopted and a Central Committee elected.

With respect to our future prospects, we believe that they are excellent. The Party's creation was not due to the caprice of a few persons but to historical necessity. The proletariat and people of Chile need a vanguard to successfully lead their revolutionary struggle for power. This necessity goes beyond the bounds of an exclusively national problem. In all countries of the world, following the perfidious betrayal of some of the leaders of the old international Communist movement, Marxist-Leninist parties are springing up, including in the countries ruled by the revisionists. It is something similar to what occurred when the major part of the leaders of the parties making up the Second Communist International corrupted and watered down Marxism. Under the inspiration of the denunciations made by Lenin against these opportunist leaders, new Marxist-Leninist communist parties came into being and created the Third International.

The terrain covered by our Party since its inception indicates to us that it is developing solidly, particularly with respect to the workers and peasants. After having captured the most advanced cadres of the masses we are now beginning to gain influence among the masses themselves and to lead some of their struggles. We have learned from initial errors and have perfected our methods of action. We are disposed to continue learning the theory and practice of revolution. We have succeeded in forming a certain number of middle cadre of an advanced ideological level endowed with great revolutionary morale. We are solidly united around a common revolutionary line which in essence is correct. For this reason, we believe that we can count on the growing support of the masses. This will be the most decisive testimony for us that we are on the correct road and that our Party is worthy of the great historical task before it: to lead the revolution in our country.

Question:

The leaders of the parties of the "left" which you fight think that because of the existence of certain democratic traditions in Chile, it is possible to bring about the revolu-

tion by peaceful means and that it is worth a try in order to avoid the bloodshed of the people. What is your opinion of this point of view?

We believe that the Chilean people are exploited by North American imperialism, the same one which has intervened several times to drown in blood the liberating struggle of other peoples of this continent. The same which massacres without pity the people of Vietnam for the purpose of colonizing and exploiting them and using their country as a military base against the people of Asia. We believe, moreover, that the latifundists and the bourgeoisie of Chile are as cruel and exploitive as those of any other capitalist nation. We are convinced that these national and foreign reactionaries will not hesitate one instant in initiating the most brutal repression in Chile and in doing away with every appearance of legality once they see their interests threatened in any manner. If this proves too shocking to their refined sensibilities, they will undoubtedly find a henchman to do it for them. They will also be able to count on the editorial writers in their newspapers who are charged with tranquilizing their "Christian and western" conscience and with convincing them that by assassinating their own people they are saving the country from chaos and horror. One must not forget that nations with a "democratic" tradition have transformed themselves into fascist dictatorships when this was in the interest of the exploiting classes.

The historical experience of the Chilean popular movement demonstrates that our exploiters and our government, so "democratic" and so "humanist", have not hesitated to violate all legality and to brutally massacre the workers each time that they have fought with great intensity to escape from their misery. As far as I know, there has never existed a government in Chile, including the present, whose hands have not been stained with the blood of the workers. If they have not yet transformed the whip, the bullet, the jail into habitual instruments of government as in other countries, it is because they do not yet find it necessary and because they are terrified at the violent reaction of the people to such a policy. As long as it is possible for them to count on the opportunists to deceive the masses, to slow down the revolutionary struggle and to divert it from its path; as long as they can intensify their exploitation without resorting to more violent repression, naturally they prefer this policy. In the final analysis, the purpose of the so-called "democracy" and "legalism" is to lend prestige to the regime and to mask the cruel exploitation on which it rests.

Nevertheless, to the extent that the masses get effective revolutionary leadership and see through the schemes of the opportunists to slow down and divert the revolution, the exploiters and their government will abandon their "legalistic" and "democratic" mask and put in place of the carrot (that is to say reformist and opportunist tricks) the whip and the bullet.

The opportunists and the other reactionaries (when it suits them) are accustomed to pose as "humanists" and to speak of non-violence and of the necessity to avoid a civil war in order to "save lives." The truth is, nevertheless, that although the reactionaries and their government are not assassinating, imprisoning, or torturing every day, they are submitting the people to the daily torture of their misery and are killing them by exploitation. They are assassinating them by hunger, cold and disease which are the products of misery and ignorance, etc. Exploitation in itself signifies the constant exercise of a cruel violence against the exploited sectors. Historically this demonstrated that revolutions, although they cost some lives through the fault of the reactionaries, save many more lives of workers annihilated prematurely because of the misery and wickedness that are the characteristic of the exploiting regime. They prevent something else which is often worse than death itself: a life of insecurity, of poverty, of material and moral suffering, a veritable hell on earth through which the exploited masses must pass.

Furthermore, a violent confrontation between exploiters and exploited is inevitable at some future date if things continue as they are now. Even the statistics of the bourgeoisie show how despite the struggle of the masses to wring out some concessions from the exploiters and from the reformist demagogues, the standard of living continues to go down year after year. This progressive and acumulative misery will inevitably lead to a spontaneous rebellion of the masses, even if there is no revolutionary leadership. In this case the shedding of blood will be much worse (and without positive results) than if there were a revolution made with full awareness and with adequate leadership, since the reactionaries are not disposed to accept the rebellion of the masses without repressing them. The correct thing to do, therefore, is not to prolong the suffering of the people by inducing them to desperate actions; is not to sow illusions in reformism, in elections or any other fraudulent "solution", but to prepare the people now for that revolutionary struggle necessary for power and to initiate it as soon as it can be done so with success. It is clear that the exploited, in resorting to the use of violence to liberate themselves, are doing no more than responding to a violence which is

exercised against them daily by the exploiters; they are only confronting repressive apparatus especially designed to repress the people and to keep the reactionaries in power. We believe, therefore, that rebellion is justified, both on moral and on practical grounds.

Question:

Why do you so severely criticize the parties of the Chilean left who call themselves Marxist, such as the Communist Party of Chile and the Socialist Party? Do you not think that this criticism damages the unity of the popular forces against imperialism and the national reactionaries?

Above all I want to make clear that in our critique we make a clear distinction between the leaders and the bases of these parties. We believe that within these bases there are many honest and well-intentioned militants, even though presently confused by the directions of their leaders. The leaders of these parties make use of the prestige of the names "Communist" and "Socialist" to mask their opportunist activities among the masses, but they are neither. The truth is that if we observe their opinions and actions (it is impossible to judge the degree of subjective awareness they have of the reactionary role they play) we can conclude that such parties are not destined to serve the people and their revolutionary cause but to act in such a way that their leaders can use the people to obtain advantages from the bourgeoisie.

Leaders of this type, for example, deceive the people and their own militants by spreading the monstrous lie that it is possible to bring about the "revolution" by changing the man who governs or the composition of parliament. They delude the masses and their militants with an imagined "peaceful road" or "ballot box" to power which can only come about in fantasy. They encourage the people to participate in an electoral farce every six years, sowing the false hope that by obtaining more votes than the reactionaries, the latter will give up state power and stop exploiting the people. This is a betrayal of the exploited masses.

The worst is that the exploiting classes do not grant this right to play with them during election time without charge. They do it on the basis of an agreement with these "left-wing" leaders to put the brakes on the class struggle and to prevent it from developing to the point of endangering the bourgeois regime. In the opposite case, as they have done in all countries where the class struggle has intensified, the bourgeoisie will cancel the elections and begin to apply their dictatorship in a brutal and open

manner. The "peaceful road" and the "ballot box" therefore, are essentially ways to slow down the struggle of the revolutionary masses, transforming it into a "struggle" of opinions expressed through votes and election propaganda. Lenin said with reference to the opportunist position described: "Every concession to the idea of the peaceful capitulation of the capitalists to the will of the majority of the exploited and of a peaceful and reformist transition to socialism, in addition to being a gross stupidity, is equivalent to a bare-faced betrayal of the workers, to prettifying capitalist wage slavery and to hiding the truth."

This Marxist truth about capitalism teaches us that every exploitive regime consists of a dictatorship of the exploiters over the exploited, a dictatorship which they maintain with violence. There is no other way, nor has there been any other way throughout history, to escape from this exploitation except through revolutionary violence which breaks up the repressive machinery keeping the exploiters in power. Anyone who deceives the people by making them believe that without a revolutionary struggle it is possible to take state power and who puts brakes on the popular struggles in order to obtain from the exploiters the right to take part in elections is a traitor of the people, an agent of the bourgeoisie, whom it is necessary to unmask and with whom it is necessary to break.

Some maintain that by denouncing the deception of these opportunist leaders before their bases and before the people, we are dividing the forces of the "left" and doing harm to the struggle against imperialism and the national reactionaries. We think just the opposite. It is true that we urge breaking with these renegade leaders. Nevertheless, this is not a rupture between workers but a rupture between them and the agents of the bourgeoisie who have infiltrated their ranks. As long as the popular masses are "united" and led by these opportunists, they will be united in turn with their class enemies and led by them. Only a break with this handful of opportunist leaders can make way for a real revolutionary unity of the masses, an indispensable condition for effectively combating the reactionaries and making the revolution.

Whoever does not understand the necessity to break ideologically, politically and organizationally with these agents of the bourgeoisie or only wants to compete peacefully with them for influence with the masses, without unmasking them as enemies, makes a profound mistake. This attitude shows that basically they continue to believe that such leaders are mistaken men of good faith and that their opportunist positions constitute a legitimate and acceptable tendency within the revolutionary movement. This stand on opportunism is also revisionist.

It means throwing by the board some of the most essential principles of Marxism-Leninism as, for example, that which states that power is won through the class struggle and revolutionary violence; that which holds that it does not suffice to patch up the capitalist regime but to destroy it; that which holds the necessity of setting up the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc. No true Marxist can accept as a "tendency" belonging within the revolutionary ranks anyone who has subverted and betrayed the essence of Marxism.

Lenin, in reference to the opportunists who are as near like those in our country as two peas in a pod, said they "were better servants of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeoisie themselves" and that without their influence within the ranks of the workers, the bourgeoisie could not maintain themselves in power. For this reason, at the same time, he called for "an implacable struggle against the opportunist current and not only a struggle which must be carried out on the ideological plane but one which attempts to cut out the monstrous excrescence from the workers parties. The representatives of these policies, alien to the proletariat, must be expelled from the organizations. It's necessary to break totally with them." "These people," Lenin concludes, "will not die physically or politically, but the workers must and will break with them and toss them into the ditch together with the other lackeys of the bourgeoisie. The working class will use the example of the opportunists' corruption to educate a new generation, or to be more exact, a new proletarian army capable of carrying the banner of the insurrection."

Only those who slyly participate in the reactionary game; or those who basically underestimate the decisive and indispensable role which the popular masses must play in the revolution; or those who underestimate the importance of ideology in conducting the revolutionary struggle; or those who continue to think that the revolution will be made by a group of heroes on the margin of the masses fulfilling a purely military function will belittle the obligation of every Marxist to combat the influence of the opportunists among the masses.

Our Party believes that these opportunist leaders, while they do not constitute the principal danger, are nevertheless serious and cunning enemies of our people. It is for this reason that we fight them on all levels. The fact that they have working masses that follow them, far from being a reason to refrain from attacking them, is precisely the reason that we unmask and denounce them.

Question:

As is well known, you have differences with the Cuban leaders. Could you tell me just what these differences are?

First of all I should say that our Party values very highly all the anti-imperialist stands which the Cuban people have taken since the fall of Batista. We believe that in Cuba important advances were made by the expropriation of businesses controlled by Yankee monopolies, of land owners and of certain bourgeois sectors. We believe that the challenge given to Yankee imperialism by the men of the "Sierra Maestra" when they audaciously seized power after the fall of Batista was a great stimulus to the struggle of the Latin American peoples.

Our criticism of the position and attitude of the Cuban leaders, whom we consider mistaken and opportunist, derives from our desire to see the Cuban revolution under the direction of the proletariat. Our criticism has as its modest intent to persuade the heroic Cuban people to line up on the side of Marxism-Leninism and to break their ties with revisionism.

We make our critique public—which constitutes an additional proof of our independence and internationalist spirit—precisely because

of the influence which Cuba has in Latin America and particularly on the course of the revolutionary struggle in our country. We make it with the full realization that initially it might not be well received by many people who are emotionally linked with the Cuban leaders and their achievements.

One of the reasons for which we have criticized the Cuban leaders is for having tried to maintain a supposed "neutrality" with respect to the public denunciation made by Marxist-Leninists of the whole world against the contemporary revisionists led by the Soviet leaders. It seems to us that this struggle is unavoidable and obligatory for Marxists. None of the great historic leaders of the proletarian revolution neglected the duty of denouncing the opportunists in their day. Moreover, Lenin maintained that you cannot have a consistent anti-imperialist line without at the same time combatting the opportunists. To silence the condemnation of the opportunists means to make oneself an accomplice in the betrayal of the popular masses by these agents of the bourgeoisie.

The worst is that the Cuban leaders have not only neglected to criticize the principles of the revisionists but that, in addition, they have joined with the revisionists in a series of actions of great importance, thus contributing to these opportunistic policies. And so in 1964, two years after the beginning of the public struggle against the revisionists, they met in Havana with the leaders of the "Communist" parties; Fidel himself signed a joint statement with Khrushchev, the greatest renegade of our epoch, in which he declared himself in accord

with the details of Khrushchev's international policy. Then the Tricontinental Conference took place to which the revisionists of the Continent were invited but from which all Marxist-Leninist organizations of Latin America were excluded. Later on, OLAS was pushed in a series of Latin American countries and since it was under the control of revisionists, its role has of necessity been counter-revolutionary. Finally, Fidel ended up supporting the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia thereby shocking even his most staunch supporters.

It is true that the Castroites have made certain criticisms of the revisionists. But since these have not been principled denunciations of the reactionary essence of Soviet policies and have not led them to break with these opportunists, the Cuban leaders have in fact become supporters of the Soviet revisionists. They have become this because one criticizes without breaking only with those persons whom one believes to be honestly mistaken and for that reason capable of changing. With respect to the rupture of the Marxist-Leninists with the revisionists, they have maintained a frankly hostile attitude toward the Marxist-Leninists. They have gone so far as to prevent the free circulation of Marxist-Leninist views in Cuba. Finally, no one has ever heard any self-criticism with respect to this alliance with the revisionists or any indication of any open proposal to rectify this conduct.

Some persons, while recognizing these bunglings of the Cuban leaders, try to excuse their behavior by alluding to an alleged "necessity" which Cuba has of economic or military support from the USSR. Nevertheless, whoever tries to "defend" them in this manner shows them up to be even more remiss in their position. This interpretation of their behavior supposes nothing less than that these leaders are fully aware of

the betrayal of the Soviet leaders, whom they basically condemn, but whom, for the sake of certain favors rendered, they refrain from criticizing or shunning. With this "defense" they are in reality presenting them as being responsible for a betrayal of the principles and the interests of the world revolution, in return for conveniences of an economic and military type. If this is not opportunism, we do not know what is. They are presented, moreover, as committing the gross error of believing that the conquests of the Cuban people can be defended by allying themselves with renegades and counter-revolutionaries. Anyone who knows revisionism is aware that it is not possible to count on anyone who is bent on the restoration of capitalism in his own country to defend the interests of any people anywhere else in the world; on anyone who is conspiring with imperialism to divide up the world; on anyone who

is putting the brakes on revolution throughout the world for the sake of this collaboration with imperialism; and on anyone who, with the invasion of Czechoslovakia, displays its real imperialist spirit.

We, on the other hand, do not have enough faith in the subtle Machiavelianism of the Cuban leaders to believe that, while understanding the basic character of revisionism, and secretly repudiating it, they nevertheless, refrain from denouncing it and only support it for convenience. We believe that, on the contrary, the Cuban leaders sincerely share a series of opportunist points of view and actions with the Soviet leaders and that they "reject" others, considering them erroneous tendencies which express legitimate discrepancies within the international communist movement. The truth is that the alleged economic dependence on the Soviet Union, if this were the real cause of their attitude, might possibly have led them to remain on the sidelines of the polemic against revisionism but not to turn them into defenders and preachers of the necessity to suspend denunciation of the revisionists. But Fidel himself has defined the criticism and denunciation of the revisionists as "Byzantine discussion," or, in other words, useless; as "divisionism" and the "apple of discord" between Communists. It is difficult for us to believe that simply because of external pressure alone a man like Fidel would go so far as to protect the revisionists. If to this we add the alliance with the opportunists in a series of affairs of importance, it is even more difficult to suppose that it is a question of an imposed position. With respect to whether he shares opportunist points of view and attitudes with the revisionists with complete knowledge of their reactionary character or solely because of error and political immaturity, we prefer not to make any hasty judgment. We believe that the future development of events together with a frank and open critique on the part of revolutionaries of every opportunist attitude or scheme will contribute to the elucidation of this problem.

To the above differences with the Cuban leaders, we can add the one which we have with respect to the form of armed struggle which they have planned for Latin America. It appears to us that the guerrilla *foco*, devised by the petty bourgeoisie, is a mistaken way to liberate the masses from their exploitation or to "bring them over" to the revolutionary struggle. We believe that not only has this line failed in practice, but that it is also anti-Marxist. It is this because it puts the military aspect above the political, and, for this reason, does not rest on the basic truth that the great exploited masses must liberate themselves. Moreover, as a struggle isolated from the masses, it is condemned to failure. And what is

more, in the hypothetical case in which one utilizing this type of armed struggle might be able somehow to seize power, this does not mean that it is a question of a revolution in which the exploited masses, led by the proletariat, consciously fight for power and directly assume the control of this power. It seems to us that the real conquest of power on the part of the proletariat, which cannot in good faith be turned over to other sectors who will do it for them, is a necessary premise for the establishment of an authentic socialist system. What is decisive are the social classes which take control of that State and manage socialist property for the benefit of the people. One must not forget that the bourgeoisie itself in the capitalist countries have also transformed a series of enterprises into state businesses without their becoming collectivist or socialist institutions.

Before concluding, we would like to reiterate that our criticism of the Cuban leaders is done with faith in the development of the Cuban revolution and we will resolutely defend the achievements of the Cuban people against any imperialist aggression or revisionist treason.

Question:

You have been called "Pekingists." What does this mean? Do you plan to pattern the Chilean Revolution after the Chinese or do you follow a line dictated by Peking?

If by "Pekingism" you mean fidelity to the principles of Marxism Leninism and the revolutionary interests of the peoples of the world, obviously, we are Pekingists. If by "Pekingist" you mean the repudiation of the renegades who have betrayed Marxism and have transformed themselves into exploiters and "social-imperialists," then we are Pekingists. If by "Pekingism" you mean the rejection of collaboration and alliance with Yankee imperialism which the Soviet leaders practice and the resolve to struggle with no holds barred against imperialism as the Chinese do, then we are Pekingists. We are Pekingists if you mean by that the rejection of all the fraudulent theories to slow down the world revolution that were spread by Khrushchev and his successors such as: the "peaceful road" to power, "peaceful coexistence" with imperialism, the invention of a "non-capitalist road" to achieve socialism, etc.

Within the context of the new configuration of forces which has arisen on the international plane as a result of the betrayal of certain revisionist leaders, our Party, loyal to its internationalist spirit, has united with the true revolutionaries and has resolutely broken with the renegades and false revolutionaries. Our

Party fully appreciates the decisive role which the Chinese, as well as the Albanian revolutionaries have played in re-establishing the proletarian internationalism betrayed by the present day revisionists. There can be no doubt for us that China, with its consistent Marxism-Leninist stance, is today the principal base of support for the world revolution. The struggle which they have carried on to unmask anyone who betrays Marxism and Communism is of vital importance for the development of the revolution in every part of the world. This is also true for the Chilean revolution, since the representatives of counter-revolutionary opportunism operate actively in our country. We believe also that China, through the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, has inaugurated a tremendously important and heretofore unknown chapter in the application of Marxism-Leninism. It has shown how the class struggle develops after political and economic power has been seized from the exploiters; it has demonstrated how to struggle against anyone who behaves in a bourgeois manner under socialism and attempts to bring about the return of capitalism; it has made a contribution to the understanding of how to go about developing the socialist man of the future—morally, politically and ideologically. Faced with the corruption of the so-called socialist governments led by the Soviet opportunists, China and Albania have shown the true perspective for the development of socialism, including the future of those countries which have suffered a setback as a result of the revisionists. In this manner they have prevented the people who are struggling for socialism from losing their faith in the future because of what has happened in the USSR and the other countries of Eastern Europe.

China has given to the world the thought of Mao Tse-tung, largely sabotaged and hidden by the revisionists, which constitutes a very fruitful development of Marxism-Leninism and a series of revolutionary principles of universal validity, and, by the same token, of relevance for our country as well. For these and other reasons we state that China is the most formidable bastion of anti-imperialist struggle against the present-day revisionists and all types of reactionaries and exploiters throughout the world. If to recognize and uphold these revolutionary achievements of China is what you mean by "Pekingism," then we are proud to be Pekingists.

Our solidarity with the Chinese Communists is at once freer and more profound than it is possible to imagine. It is a union that bases itself on the fact that we share with them the interests and vanguard principles of world revolution. We join with them in a common struggle against the common enemies and we, in turn,

rally around Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung, the true instruments for the struggle in any place in the world. This does not mean that we aim to duplicate the Chinese Revolution in Chile and certainly does not mean that we would apply here a line dictated directly from Peking, something which has never occurred to the Chinese Communists themselves. One of the fundamental principles contained in the thoughts of Mao Tse-tung is, precisely, that of the necessity to formulate specific laws, proper to the revolution in each country, applying Marxism-Leninism to the concrete reality of each nation and learning from revolutionary practice. Whoever correctly applies this thought, profoundly anti-dogmatic in nature, will never duplicate others' experiences, but will analyze the reality of his own country in a correct and revolutionary manner. The Chinese Revolution triumphed precisely because Mao applied Marxism-Leninism in a creative manner. In the process of developing the revolution, he formulated the specific laws of the revolutionary struggle in China and refused to apply mechanically the Soviet or any other model that was inappropriate for China. Therefore it is totally absurd to suppose that the Chinese Communists could advocate mechanically copying their revolutionary experience and much less that they have any intention of dictating from Peking a line to other parties.

Thus, anyone who attacks our unity of principles with the Chinese Communists either does not understand the character of these relations or is hypocritically disparaging Marxism-Leninism and the unity of all revolutionaries. Everything which has been described as "Pekingism" really represents only a stand consistent with Marxism-Leninism. For this reason, those who attack our unity with revolutionaries, and among them the Chinese, either do not understand the importance of this or are camouflaged servants of revisionism and the opportunists. If we were to dodge these malicious attacks of the opportunists, we would weaken our unity with the true revolutionaries and would be betraying Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. In such a case we would transform ourselves into lackeys of these intriguers in an opportunistic attempt to avoid their calumny. This we will never do, no matter how much they howl.

Our Party has a clear concept of internationalism, but we understand at the same time that our principal task is to lead the revolutionary struggle of the Chilean people. This is only possible if we do so with a thorough knowledge of our own national reality. The revolutionary experience of other peoples distilled in Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung will help us only if we know how

to apply its universally valid principles to the concrete and specific conditions of our country. This is, after all, what the revolutionaries of the world expect from us: to lead the Chilean revolution to triumph.

Only the counter-revolutionists are tailers and accept a policy contrary to the interests of our people, imposed on them from outside. Such is the case of the parties and agents who apply a policy of service to imperialism and of the Chilean revisionists who attempt to impose a line dictated to them by the Soviet leaders in conformity with the latter's reac-

tionary interests.

Our Party, consistent with Marxist-Leninist principles and the interests of our revolution, from the first, that is to say, when a series of opportunist elements still occupied important positions in the government and the Party, staunchly supported the revolutionary line of Mao Tse-tung against these opportunists. It is with great satisfaction that we now see the triumph of this line in China. If the contrary had occurred, we would have broken with them and attacked them, as we have done with respect to other nations where this has occurred.

Feudalism or Capitalism?

Colombian M-L Sets Course for Socialism

On the occasion of the 5th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of Colombia (M-L), the Albanian newspaper "Zeri I Popullit" published an editorial under the title "The People's Armed Struggle in Colombia Is Successfully Led by the Communist Party (M-L)." Reprinted from an ATA dispatch, Tirana, March 28, 1969.

The Communist Party (M-L) of Colombia, the newspaper writes, was founded in March 1964, in the course of a fierce class struggle against the revisionist traitorous leaders and all opportunist and reformist trends.

Further, after dealing with the poverty and backwardness reigning in Colombia and reporting that from both the economic and the political and military viewpoints, the ruling reactionary clique of Colombia is under U.S. domination, the newspaper says that, true to the interests of the reactionary oligarchy, the regime in power defends the feudal remnants in the country by fire and sword from the ever-rising tide of struggle of the poor peasantry which is fighting for land and bread. The broad masses of the people show a growing understanding of the real nature of the regime and are waging a determined struggle against their fiercest enemies - the pro-Yankee oligarchy, and U.S. imperialism. This struggle has embraced workers, peasants, students, etc., led by the CP of Colombia (M-L). Colombian revolutionary forces are becoming ever more convinced that there is only one road to settle accounts once and for all with their enemies: the road of people's armed struggle. This conviction today permeates revolutionary forces everywhere in the world. "The world proletariat and the working people, through their life experience, are becoming ever more aware." Comrade Enver Hoxha said at the 17th conference of the Tirana party organization, "that the capitalist world and the world advocated by the social-democrats and modern revisionists, must be destroyed by means of

revolutionary violence, by the violence of arms."

At its latest congress the Communist Party (M-L) of Colombia established in its program the character of Colombian society on the basis of the historic stage of present-day economic, political, social and cultural development of the country, and reached the conclusion that "Colombia is a country with essentially capitalist relations in production basically integrated with feudal remnants, a country whose dependence on U.S. imperialism, deforms and hampers its development and that, consequently, only by means of a people's patriotic, anti-imperialist revolution, marching towards socialism, can the people and the nation be liberated from oppression and exploitation."

The party thus defined people's armed struggle as the main form of struggle. The struggle which the party is waging, life and the course of events in Colombia have rejected the pacifist theses of the modern revisionists of Gilberto Viera, who are openly collaborating with the local bourgeoisie and reaction. The Communist Party (M-L) of Colombia has condemned and is also incessantly fighting the theory of those who seek to throw themselves into revolution without being prepared for it and without a vanguard revolutionary party.

The correctness of the strategic formulations of the latest congress of the Communist Party (M-L) of Colombia, later enriched by revolutionary practice and tactics, has been tested in the crucible of the people's armed struggle in that country. More than one year has now passed since the party created the