

505-208

**LENINISM
AND
MODERN REVISIONISM**



FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

**LENINISM
AND
MODERN REVISIONISM**

"Hongqi" Editorial, No. 1, 1963

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1963

列宁主义和现代修正主义

*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1963年1月第一版（二）

编号：（英）3050—477

00022

3-E-541P

Printed in the People's Republic of China

Leninism, the fundamental revolutionary principles of Marxism expounded by the great Lenin, which represents a new stage in the development of Marxism, is being assailed, distorted and adulterated by the modern revisionists more viciously than ever before.

The essential thing about Leninism is the fact that it has carried the teachings of Marx and Engels further, providing a scientific analysis of capitalism's sharpening contradictions in its development to the stage of imperialism, and further enriching the Marxist theory and tactics on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. The Great October Revolution achieved victory under the direct leadership of Lenin. Carrying on the cause of the October Revolution, the Chinese people and the people of many other countries have also won a series of victories. These are victories for Marxism, victories for Leninism.

Lenin once said that "this doctrine [of Marx] had to fight at every step in its course".¹ Similarly, Leninism developed in the course of struggle against the revisionism of the Second International. Every new confirmation and victory of Leninism has unavoidably been accompanied by "one battle after another against political stupidity, vulgarity, opportunism, etc."²

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism", *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1950, Vol. I, Part 1, p. 87.

² V. I. Lenin, "Letter to Inessa Armand", *Against Revisionism*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1959, p. 351.

The old-line revisionists of the Second International often used what they called "new data on economic development" to confuse the masses and cut the revolutionary soul out of Marxism, and yet they falsely displayed the colours of "Marxism". History is repeating itself under different circumstances and in different forms. The modern revisionists, falsely displaying the colours of "Leninism" and talking glibly about being "faithful to Lenin", are actually repeating the same process of using certain "new data" on historical development to confuse people, undermine the revolutionary teachings of Leninism and assail the essentials of Leninism, i.e., Lenin's teachings on imperialism and his theory and tactics on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship.

Like the revisionism-opportunism of the Second International, modern revisionism is trying hard to cover up the contradictions of capitalism and imperialism and to deny that imperialism is moribund, decaying capitalism whose days are numbered. It has gone so far as to describe modern imperialism as "peaceful" and "democratic" "supra-imperialism". The modern revisionists represented by the Tito group of Yugoslavia have especially tried to make the imperialist monopoly-capitalist state machine look attractive. They describe the so-called policy of nationalization, state-monopoly capitalism and state economic intervention in the imperialist countries and capitalist countries in general in such terms as "the growth of socialist factors", "the realization of planned economy", "the beginning of the process of socialist transformation", and so on. They prate about "gradual change", "the integration of revolution and reform", "entering deeply into the socialist era", and so on. But they never have a single word to say

about the need, in the transition from capitalism to socialism, to make a revolution that will smash the bourgeois state machine and to replace bourgeois dictatorship with proletarian dictatorship. It is well known that the fundamental Marxist standpoint which Lenin took great pains to expound was precisely that of the revolution to smash the bourgeois state machine and the replacement of bourgeois dictatorship by proletarian dictatorship. For without such a revolution, all talk about socialist transformation will be meaningless, and state-monopoly capitalism will remain capitalism and nothing else. Lenin had well said that the existence and growth of monopoly capitalism, including state-monopoly capitalism, can only demonstrate the maturing of the material prerequisites for socialism and the impending approach and inevitability of the socialist revolution, but cannot in any way serve "as an argument in favour of tolerating the repudiation of such a revolution and the efforts to make capitalism look more attractive, an occupation in which all the reformists are engaged".¹

Herein lies a fundamental difference in the appraisal of our epoch. When Marxist-Leninists say that "the main content of our epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism which was begun by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia",² they base themselves on the viewpoint of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, and on the fundamental experience of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 270.

² Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries, held in Moscow, November 14 to 16, 1957.

Great October Socialist Revolution. But the modern revisionists, shunning this viewpoint like the plague, distort the experience of the October Revolution and avoid referring to the road of the October Revolution as the common road leading to the emancipation of mankind. As a matter of fact, they regard our epoch as one of "capitalism growing into socialism peacefully".

Marxism-Leninism has always attached importance to the struggle for democracy. In countries where the bourgeois-democratic revolution has not yet been accomplished, the proletariat must mobilize the masses, make every effort to lead the bourgeois-democratic revolution and fight for its victory. In countries where bourgeois democracy exists, the proletariat should utilize the democratic rights already won to fight for more democratic rights in order to educate, arouse and organize the masses to fight the bourgeois system of exploitation and violence. After the seizure of power, the proletariat should solidify and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and at the same time give effect to widespread democracy under highly centralized guidance. In other words, it must enforce dictatorship over the enemy and practise people's democracy within the ranks of the people in order to ensure the successful building of socialism and communism. Democracy invariably has a class character. Marxist-Leninists have always treated the problem of democracy in its historical context and have never talked about "democracy in the abstract" or "democracy in general".

Lenin emphasized that under capitalism, the proletariat can retain its independence only if it makes its struggle for democracy serve its over-all objective

of proletarian dictatorship.¹ He went on to point out that the replacement of bourgeois dictatorship by proletarian dictatorship means an extension of democracy which is of world-wide historic significance; it means a change from bogus democracy to genuine democracy; and it means to deprive the exploiting few of democratic rights and enable the working people, the overwhelming majority, to enjoy democracy. To think that the dictatorship of the proletariat implies the rejection of democracy is a degenerate "liberal and false assertion" which loses sight of the class struggle.² Like the old-line revisionists, the modern revisionists use every kind of pretext to obliterate the class character of democracy and the difference between bourgeois and proletarian democracy. In championing "democracy in general" or "democracy of the whole people", they are actually making a fetish of bourgeois democracy, i.e., of bourgeois dictatorship. Proceeding from this viewpoint, they do their utmost to confound revolution with reform and to limit and confine all their work to the scope permitted by bourgeois dictatorship. Lenin long ago repudiated this extremely wrong point of view. He said:

It would be sheer nonsense to think that the most profound revolution in human history — one which for the first time transferred power from the exploiting minority to the exploited majority — could be performed within the old framework of bourgeois, par-

¹ Cf. V. I. Lenin, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, 1943, Vol. V, p. 273.

² Cf. V. I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Moscow, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 40, 48-57.

liamentary democracy, without drastic changes, without the creation of new forms of democracy and new institutions conforming to the new conditions for applying democracy, etc.¹

This proposition of Lenin's has proved correct in relation to the October Revolution and also completely correct in relation to the victories subsequently won by a number of countries in their socialist revolution. Yet what the modern revisionists persist in is exactly the absurd theory Lenin had refuted. Under socialism, the modern revisionists, again on the pretext of "democracy in general", deny the class character of democracy and strive to achieve their objective of gradually eliminating the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to facilitate the gradual restoration of capitalism in a certain form.

On the question of the fight for world peace and peaceful coexistence, too, the modern revisionists have vulgarized Leninism in the extreme and have completely adulterated it.

Ever since the first socialist state in the world made its appearance, all Marxist-Leninists, from Lenin onward, have considered it a major task for socialist countries to work for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems and to oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war. The Communist Party of China headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung has always held that disputes between nations should be settled by peaceful means and not by force. This Chinese Communist Party view is not only constantly reiterated in our

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Theses on Bourgeois Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship Presented to the First Congress of the Communist International", *Against Revisionism*, Moscow, p. 494.

statements but is firmly expressed in our policies and actions. All the world knows that the People's Republic of China was an initiator of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and has steadfastly put them into practice. All the attempts of the imperialists, reactionaries and modern revisionists to obliterate these facts are vain.

Of course, the policy of peace pursued by the socialist countries has not nullified the various contradictions objectively existing in the world, namely, the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist countries, the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the capitalist countries, the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations, the contradictions between the imperialist powers and the contradictions between the various monopoly groups inside each imperialist country. Marxist-Leninists take the view that, whether in the past, present or future, there can be no ignoring or covering up of these contradictions, as such political philistines as the modern revisionists are trying to do, if world peace is to be secured and peaceful coexistence between the socialist countries and countries with different social systems is to be achieved. Marxist-Leninists, including the Chinese Communists, have always held that peaceful coexistence between the socialist countries and countries with different social systems can be attained, and that the world war which the imperialists are seeking to kindle can be prevented, provided the socialist countries persist in their policy of peace, provided the people's revolutionary forces in various countries and all the peace-loving countries and people of the world unite in resolute and effective struggle against the imperialist forces of aggression and war, manacle the imperialists in various ways and narrow down their sphere of opera-

tion. At the same time, Marxist-Leninists have consistently held that the strivings for peaceful coexistence between the socialist countries and countries with different social systems on the one hand, and the class struggle within the capitalist countries and the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggles of the oppressed nations on the other, are two different matters and two different kinds of problem, and that the former cannot substitute or negate the latter. The struggle waged by the oppressed people in the capitalist countries and the struggle of the oppressed nations are helpful to the strivings for world peace and for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. The attempt of the modern revisionists to restrict, weaken and even negate the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed people and oppressed nations by hypocritical appeals for "peace" and "peaceful coexistence" is in complete accord with the wishes of the imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries and is most damaging to the struggle for peace and for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems.

Just as the old-line revisionists attacked Marxism under the pretext of opposing dogmatism, so the modern revisionists use the same pretext to attack Leninism. As far back as the beginning of the 20th century, Lenin wrote that the reformists and revisionists in the working-class movement in various countries "all belong to the same family, all extol each other, learn from each other, and together come out against 'dogmatic' Marxism".¹ Has not the picture which Lenin drew sixty years ago re-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "What Is to Be Done?" *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Moscow, Vol. I, Part 1, p. 208.

appeared today in new historical conditions? The only difference is that the modern revisionists are more unscrupulous in their attacks on Marxism-Leninism. For example, some persons indulging in sheer fabrication say that the "dogmatists" want "to demonstrate the superiority of socialism and communism over capitalism by means of war". What is this but a most absurd slander levelled at Marxist-Leninists and a contemptible attempt to curry favour with imperialism and the reactionaries of various countries?

Moreover, the modern revisionists give voice to pure inventions such as that the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists, whom they label "dogmatists", "reject" certain necessary compromises. We would like to tell these modern revisionists that no serious-minded Marxist-Leninist rejects all compromises indiscriminately. In the course of our protracted revolutionary struggle, we Chinese Communists reached compromises on many occasions with our enemies, internal and external. For example, we came to a compromise with the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek clique. We also came to a compromise with the U.S. imperialists, in the struggle to aid Korea and resist U.S. aggression. For Marxist-Leninists, the question is what kind of a compromise to arrive at, the nature of the compromise, and how to bring it about. Lenin rightly said that "to reject compromises 'on principle', to reject the admissibility of compromises in general, no matter of what kind, is childishness, which it is difficult even to take seriously."¹ As Lenin also told us, a political leader who de-

¹ V. I. Lenin, " 'Left-Wing' Communism, An Infantile Disorder", *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Moscow, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 359.

sires to be useful to the revolutionary proletariat must know how to distinguish compromises that are permissible and in the interests of the people's cause from those compromises that are impermissible and are an expression of treachery. It is precisely in accordance with Lenin's teachings that we Chinese Communists distinguish between different kinds of compromise, favouring compromises which are in the interests of the people's cause and of world peace, and opposing compromises that are in the nature of treachery. It is perfectly clear that only those guilty now of adventurism, now of capitulationism, are the ones whose ideology is Trotskyism, or Trotskyism in a new guise.

In April 1946, Comrade Mao Tse-tung wrote in his article "Some Points in Appraisal of the Present International Situation" that it was possible for the socialist countries to reach agreement with the imperialist countries through peaceful negotiation and make necessary compromise on some issues, including certain important ones. Comrade Mao Tse-tung holds that "such compromise . . . can be the outcome only of resolute, effective struggles by all the democratic forces of the world against the reactionary forces of the United States, Britain and France". He then adds, "Such compromise does not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in those countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions."¹ This analysis advanced by Comrade Mao Tse-tung is scientific; it is a Marxist and Leninist analysis. The

¹ Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 87.

Chinese Communist policy in relation to international affairs has all along been formulated according to this proposition of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's.

However, the imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries and the modern revisionists always attempt to hurt us through every kind of slander. We should be aware that there has never been a revolutionary party in history which was not vilified by the enemy and his agents. The great Bolsheviks were subjected to countless enemy calumnies. "They fulminated against the Bolsheviks who were consistently described as 'sectarians, dogmatists, Blanquists, anarchists, etc.'"¹ All the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists in the world are now being subjected to attacks by the modern revisionists, and it is a matter for deep regret that Comrade Togliatti should have joined in such attacks.

The modern revisionists have made many charges against the Chinese Communist Party. Why? Is it not because we resolutely defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism? Is it not because we categorically refuse to bargain over principles and categorically refuse to make concessions as regards theory? Is it not because we stand firm against both modern revisionism and dogmatism, against both Right and "Left" opportunism, against both capitulationism and adventurism, against both unprincipled accommodation and sectarianism which alienates one from the masses, and against both great-power chauvinism and the various kinds of reactionary nationalism?

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Tactics of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party During the Election Campaign", *Collected Works*, 4th Russian ed., State Publishing House of Political Literature, Moscow, Vol. XII, p. 123.

Some people go to great lengths to attack, at every available opportunity and with shameless misrepresentation, the thesis of the Chinese Communist Party that "imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers". This thesis is derived from Lenin's scientific proposition that imperialism is moribund and decaying capitalism, from the many years of China's revolutionary experience and from the whole of the revolutionary experience in history. This thesis is in full accord with Lenin's description of imperialism as a "colossus with feet of clay", as a "bug-bear", as an "enemy who appears so strong" and as "capitalist beasts . . . absolutely incapable of doing us any harm". These people constantly boast about acting in accord with Lenin's principles. But in fact they invariably deviate from them and from the essence of Leninism, that is, from Lenin's teachings on imperialism, on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. On the question of how to appraise the nature of imperialism do they not clearly reveal themselves to be far removed from Leninism? In the final analysis, those who wildly attack the thesis that "imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers" are merely chiming in with imperialism, assiduously spreading the idea among peoples who desire revolution that the imperialist forces of aggression must not be resisted, that the imperialist system cannot be overthrown, and that revolution of any kind is undesirable and hopeless.

For many years U.S. imperialism and its partners have been using nuclear blackmail against the people of the world: "whoever defies our domination will be destroyed". All the demagogic propaganda which the modern revisionists represented by the Tito group have been conducting among the masses on the subject of nuclear

weapons is entirely in tune with U.S. imperialism's nuclear blackmail. All genuine Marxist-Leninists, including the Chinese Communists, consistently and resolutely oppose the imperialist policy of nuclear war and stand firmly for the banning and scrapping of nuclear weapons. The Government of the People's Republic of China has repeatedly proposed that a zone free of atomic weapons be established in the Asian and Pacific region embracing all the countries there, including the United States. All genuine Marxist-Leninists, including the Chinese Communists, always maintain that the people of all countries must grasp their destiny in their own hands and not be cowed by the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail. At the same time, they maintain that the socialist countries should rely on the just strength of the people and their own just policies and should in no wise engage in nuclear gambles in the international arena. The modern revisionists are obviously well aware of these correct views of the Marxist-Leninists. However, they deliberately lie to deceive the masses, alleging that the "dogmatists" hope to "push mankind to the brink of nuclear war". The modern revisionists often talk about "morality". But where is their "morality" when they tell such lies? Have they not completely lost hold of the ordinary morality of human conduct?

To distort and attack the theses and the standpoint of the genuine Marxist-Leninists, the modern revisionists have spread a series of deliberate lies for the purpose of preventing the oppressed people and oppressed nations from rising in revolution and fighting for their emancipation. In the eyes of the modern revisionists, any revolution and any action supporting revolution runs counter to the "logic of survival", now that nuclear weapons