

**IN
REFUTATION OF
MODERN
REVISIONISM**

IN
REFUTATION OF
MODERN
REVISIONISM

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1958

Publisher's Note

This is a collection of the major editorials and articles on modern revisionism that appeared in the Chinese press in May and June, 1958, and the Resolution on the Moscow Meetings of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties adopted by the Second Session of the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China on May 23, 1958.

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

RESOLUTION ON THE MOSCOW MEETINGS OF REPRESENTATIVES OF COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES	1
MODERN REVISIONISM MUST BE REPUDIATED "Renmin Ribao" (People's Daily) Editorial	14
MODERN REVISIONISM MUST BE FOUGHT TO THE END "Renmin Ribao" Editorial	22
YUGOSLAV REVISIONISM—PRODUCT OF IMPERIALIST POLICY <i>Chen Po-ta</i>	33
YUGOSLAV REVISIONISM IS JUST WHAT U.S. IMPE- RIALISM NEEDS <i>Kang Sheng</i>	50
IN REFUTATION OF MODERN REVISIONISM'S REAC- TIONARY THEORY OF THE STATE <i>Wang Chia-hsiang</i>	63
THE MORE THEY TRY TO HIDE, THE MORE THEY ARE EXPOSED "Renmin Ribao" Commentator	82

**RESOLUTION ON THE MOSCOW MEETINGS OF
REPRESENTATIVES OF COMMUNIST AND
WORKERS' PARTIES**

*Adopted on May 23, 1958,
by the Second Session of the Eighth National Congress
of the Communist Party of China*

The Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China, at its Second Session, having heard the report delivered by Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping on the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries held in Moscow from November 14 to 16, 1957, and the meeting of representatives of 64 Communist and Workers' Parties held from November 16 to 19, unanimously endorses the Declarations adopted by the two meetings and expresses satisfaction with the work of the delegation of the Communist Party of China headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung during the two meetings.

The Moscow meetings of the Communist and Workers' Parties of various countries and the two Declarations they adopted ushered in a new stage in the international communist movement of our time and were a very great inspiration to the labouring people and all forces for peace, democracy and progress throughout the world. The Communist Parties throughout the world have welcomed and given their support to the two Declarations. The Communist Party of the United States of America, after

clearing out the revisionist John Gates, has also endorsed the stand taken by these Declarations. Only the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has not only openly assumed an attitude of opposition to the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, but has also adopted an anti-Marxist-Leninist and out-and-out revisionist programme at its Seventh Congress, and set it against the Declaration of the Moscow meeting. At their Congress, in an effort to defend their anti-Marxist-Leninist and out-and-out revisionist programme, Tito and other leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia made a series of vicious attacks against the international communist movement and the socialist camp with the Soviet Union as its centre, whereas in regard to U.S. imperialism, that most ferocious enemy of the people in every part of the world, they were sycophantic and deeply grateful.

At present, the international communist movement has the important responsibility to adhere firmly to the viewpoints expressed in the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, to defend the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and oppose modern revisionism.

The Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries sums up the experience of the international communist movement in the past century, especially in the past forty years; expounds the common principles which the Communist Parties of all countries must abide by in the socialist revolution and socialist construction; puts forward the basic policy of the Communist Parties in rallying the broad masses of the people to the struggle

for the cause of peace, democracy and socialism; it lays the ideological and political foundation for solidarity among the Communist Parties and strengthens the unity of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. It is an epoch-making document which is in the nature of a programme for the international communist movement.

Analysing the current international situation, the Declaration points out that "world development is determined by the course and results of the competition between two diametrically opposed social systems," that "while socialism is on the upgrade, imperialism is heading towards decline," that the colonial system is crumbling and that "capitalist economy is bound to encounter new deep slumps and crises." It points out that the question of war or peaceful co-existence has become the basic issue in world politics, while the existence of imperialism is the source of aggressive wars. It points out that the aggressive imperialist circles of the United States have become the centre of world reaction, the most deadly enemy of the peoples. It says: "By this policy these anti-popular, aggressive imperialist forces are courting their own ruin, creating their own grave-diggers." At the same time, the Declaration points out that the forces of peace have so grown that there is a real possibility of averting wars and that at the forefront of the forces of peace is the indestructible socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. The Declaration says: "An alliance of these mighty forces can prevent war, but should the bellicose imperialist maniacs venture, regardless of anything, to unleash a war, imperialism will doom itself to destruction, for the peoples will not tolerate a system that brings them so much suffering and exacts so many sacrifices."

The Peace Manifesto adopted at the meeting of representatives of 64 Communist and Workers' Parties points out that the threat to peace and the security of the people comes from "the capitalist monopolies which have amassed unprecedented riches from the two world wars and the current arms drive." It appeals to people of good-will throughout the world: Organize and fight for peace!

The correctness of the appraisal of the international situation made in the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries is confirmed by the development of events. In the past six months, in the socialist camp, economic and cultural construction in the Soviet Union, China and many other brother countries has shown a continuous upward trend. In Asia, Africa and Latin America, there has been a fresh advance in the national liberation movement waged against the imperialists and their lackeys, and in some countries fierce struggle is going on. Meanwhile, the imperialist countries have landed in a new, grave and deep economic crisis. This began first in the United States, where capitalism is most developed, and the economic crisis of the United States is now hitting the whole capitalist world. On the issue of peace or war, the Soviet Union, Poland, the German Democratic Republic, Rumania and other brother countries have put forward a series of peace proposals. The Soviet Union has stopped the testing of nuclear weapons before others; the governments of the Korean Democratic People's Republic and of our own country jointly decided to withdraw the Chinese People's Volunteers from Korea. These facts demonstrate to the people throughout the world the determination of the countries in the socialist camp to do all in their power to

secure peace. Despite the desire for peace of the people of all countries, the aggressive bloc headed by the U.S. imperialists persists up to now in its refusal to stop nuclear tests, to end the cold war, to reduce armaments and to withdraw its troops from Korea, and it is doing all it can to delay the convening of a summit conference. The U.S. imperialists have been occupying our Taiwan. They have gone so far as to interfere openly in the internal affairs of Indonesia, aiding and abetting and supplying the rebel clique in that country with materials and now they are interfering in the internal affairs of the Lebanon. We must be awake to the fact that U.S. imperialism and the imperialist bloc headed by it are still actively threatening war, preparing for new wars, stepping up their political, economic and cultural aggression against many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, undermining the internal unity of these countries and even resorting to armed force to suppress national liberation movements. It is our task to rally the peace-loving forces of the whole world to safeguard peace and smash the war schemes of the aggressive imperialist bloc headed by the United States.

The Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries points out that in adhering to the principle of combining the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution and construction in various countries, attention must be paid to overcoming revisionism and doctrinairism. The Declaration lays stress on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism—dialectical materialism—refutes metaphysics and idealism, and holds that "the application of dialectical materialism in practical work and the education of Party functionaries

and the broad masses in Marxism-Leninism are urgent tasks of the Communist and Workers' Parties." To the question of what is the main danger now facing the international communist movement, the Declaration gives this clear-cut answer: "The main danger at present is revisionism, or, in other words, right-wing opportunism, which, as a manifestation of bourgeois ideology, paralyses the revolutionary energy of the working class and demands the preservation or restoration of capitalism." The Declaration points out: "The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source." Making a special note of the emergence of modern revisionism, the Declaration points out: "Modern revisionism seeks to smear the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, declares that it is 'outmoded' and alleges that it has lost its significance for social progress. The revisionists try to exorcize the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and the working people in general. They deny the historical necessity for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, deny the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, reject the principle of proletarian internationalism and call for rejection of the basic Leninist principles of Party organization and, above all, of democratic centralism and for transforming the Communist Party from a militant revolutionary organization into some kind of debating society."

We Chinese Communists, like the Communists of other countries, note with pleasure that since the publication of the Declaration, fresh achievements have been made by the fraternal Parties in the countries of the socialist

camp in socialist revolution and socialist construction, in ideological and political work and in unity and co-operation. New progress has also been made by the fraternal Parties in the capitalist countries in the struggle against revisionism and right-wing renegades, in the work of consolidating their own ranks, defending the Marxist-Leninist unity of the Party and increasing its militant strength, and in the work of establishing close ties with the workers, peasants and the rest of the broad masses of the labouring people.

It is clear that, to wage a joint struggle against imperialism for the common cause of the proletariat of the whole world, the unity and solidarity of the Communist Parties in all countries on the basis of Marxism-Leninism is of special importance. Brother Parties should strengthen their mutual contacts. All talk and action that go against this unity and solidarity are harmful, they must be resolutely opposed.

The truth of the judgment made in the Declaration that the main danger at present is revisionism, that is, right-wing opportunism, has also been confirmed by the facts. On a series of fundamental questions, the Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia recently approved by its Seventh Congress betrays the principles of Marxism-Leninism, sets itself against the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, and turns against the Peace Manifesto adopted by the meeting of representatives of 64 Communist and Workers' Parties, which bears the signature of the representative of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. Just as the Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has the right to adopt its programme, so the Communist

Parties of other countries have the right, as well as the obligation, to criticize and repudiate this revisionist programme in their effort to preserve the purity of Marxism-Leninism.

This programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia asserts, on the one hand, that "the swelling wave of state-capitalist tendencies in the capitalist world is the most obvious proof that mankind is indomitably moving into the era of socialism through a wide variety of different roads," and that the state apparatus in the capitalist world is "a regulator in the sphere of labour and property relationships, of social rights and social services and other social relations," which tends increasingly "to restrict the role of private capital" and "deprive the owners of private capital of certain independent functions in the economy and in the society." On the other hand, the Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia describes ownership by the whole people, that is, ownership by the state, in the socialist countries as "state capitalism," and they hold that it is directly from the foundation of this so-called "state capitalism" that "bureaucracy and bureaucratic-statist deformities" are produced. In this way the Programme smears socialism and glorifies capitalism, smears the proletarian dictatorship and glorifies the bourgeois dictatorship.

The Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia holds that "factors of socialism" are taking shape in the capitalist countries and that provided the working class "exercises incessant pressure" on the bourgeois state apparatus and strives to "win a decisive influence" in it, it will be possible to "secure the development of socialism." Here, in an attempt to sap the revolutionary energy of the working class in capitalist

countries, the Programme spreads the erroneous view that there is no need to carry out the proletarian revolution, no need to smash the capitalist state machine, no need to set up a proletarian dictatorship.

The leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia claim to be standing outside the socialist camp and the imperialist camp. In fact this is not so; they have always directed the spearhead of their attack against the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, but have not dared to touch U.S. imperialism in the least. They describe the two fundamentally different world economic-political systems, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, as a "division of the world into two antagonist military-political blocs" and do their utmost to smear the socialist camp and glorify the imperialist camp. It should be pointed out that quite a number of countries, though they are not socialist countries, have adopted the policy of neutrality which opposes war and supports peace. This is of positive significance to the maintenance of world peace; it is opposed by the aggressive imperialist forces, but has the sympathy of the peace-loving peoples of all countries. On the other hand, the so-called position outside the blocs advocated by the leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, which aims at disrupting the solidarity of the socialist countries, caters to the policy of the imperialists headed by the United States against communism, against the Soviet Union and the socialist camp. That is why it is applauded and rewarded by the U.S. imperialists.

The Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia quotes some phrases of Marxism-Leninism just to disguise itself with a cloak of Marxism-Leninism and thus make it easier to deceive others. In method of

thinking, the Programme substitutes for revolutionary materialistic dialectics a sophistry which turns the facts upside down and confuses right with wrong; politically, it substitutes the reactionary theory of the state standing above classes for the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, and reactionary bourgeois nationalism for revolutionary proletarian internationalism; in political economy, it defends monopoly capital and obscures the fundamental differences between capitalism and socialism. The Yugoslav revisionists betray the Marxist-Leninist theories concerning the class struggle of the proletariat, the proletarian revolution and the proletarian dictatorship, and thus completely forsake the Marxist-Leninist doctrine about the political party of the proletariat. In a wild attempt to undermine and disintegrate the Communist Parties of various countries, they propagate a series of absurdities which deny the leading role of the Communist Party in socialist revolution and socialist construction, attack the Communist and Workers' Parties in the socialist countries, and slander the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries as "ceasing to act as a revolutionary creative factor and motive power of social development in their respective countries."

This out-and-out revisionist programme is put forward for the purpose of splitting the international communist movement. It is propounded at the very time when the general crisis of capitalism is deepening and when the revisionist harangues of the right-wing socialists are daily losing their paralysing effect on the working class and the labouring masses. That is why the service rendered by this Programme to imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism, is tantamount to "sending it a present of firewood in cold weather."

The Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party at its Second Session considers as basically correct and necessary the criticism made in 1948 by the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties in its resolution "Concerning the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia" in regard to the fact that the Yugoslav Communist Party departed from the principles of Marxism-Leninism and took the wrong road of bourgeois nationalism, although there were defects and mistakes in the methods adopted at that time in dealing with this issue. Our Party agreed with and supported that criticism. The second resolution concerning the Yugoslav Communist Party adopted by the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties in 1949, however, was incorrect and it was later withdrawn by the Communist Parties which took part in the Information Bureau meeting. Since 1954, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union headed by Comrade N. S. Khrushchov initiated improvement of relations with Yugoslavia and has adopted a series of measures to this end. This was entirely necessary and correct. This initiative of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had the approval of all socialist countries and the Communist Parties of various countries. We also took similar steps to those of the Soviet Union and established relations between China and Yugoslavia and between the Chinese and Yugoslav Parties. Starting from the desire for unity, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and some other Communist Parties concerned made necessary self-criticism of past defects in their relations with Yugoslavia. In order to improve relations with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the Communist Parties of various countries have since then made

their best efforts, waiting patiently for the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia to return to the stand of Marxism-Leninism. But the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia have completely ignored the well-intentioned efforts of the Communist Parties of various countries; they have failed to realize their own mistakes and have not made any self-criticism. Furthermore, they have continuously attacked and slandered the socialist countries and the Communist Parties of various countries, and have gone so far as to echo the attacks of the imperialists against the socialist camp and the international communist movement. They played the inglorious role of provocateur and interventionist in the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary. Their schemes failed only because the leading comrades of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party consistently maintained a principled and correct attitude during and after suppressing the counter-revolutionary uprising. And now, when the Moscow meetings have strengthened the solidarity of the Communist Parties of various countries, they display a stubborn anti-Marxist-Leninist standpoint in their Programme and intensive hostility towards the socialist countries and the Communist Parties of various countries. There is no doubt that by this stand and conduct, the Yugoslav leaders have alienated themselves from the ranks of the international communist movement. This is in no way in the interests of the true Communists of Yugoslavia and of the Yugoslav people.

The Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party at its Second Session fully endorses the decision of the Party's Central Committee not to send a delegation, but only an observer to be present at the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of

Yugoslavia. It is the unanimous opinion of the Congress that a resolute struggle must be waged against the modern revisionism which has emerged in the international communist movement. It is the sacred duty of our Party towards the international working class to work, together with the fraternal Parties, for the complete defeat of modern revisionism politically and theoretically, and for the safeguarding of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, at its Second Session, expresses full confidence that the cause of peace, democracy and socialism will win through all obstacles to score fresh and still greater victories throughout the world.

MODERN REVISIONISM MUST BE REPUDIATED

*“Renmin Ribao” (People’s Daily) Editorial of
May 5, 1958*

Today marks the 140th anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx, founder of scientific communism. Since 1844, Marxism has been carrying on a persistent struggle against reactionary bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideas of every description and against opportunist ideas of every variety within the ranks of the international workers’ movement. Marxism has scored one victory after another in the struggle, because revolutionary practice has testified to its correctness. It was in the course of the struggle in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution that Lenin developed Marxism and carried it forward to a new stage, the stage of Leninism. Now the international workers’ movement has placed before Marxism-Leninism a new sacred task: to wage an irreconcilable struggle against modern revisionism or neo-Bernsteinism. This is a struggle between two fundamentally different lines: Marxism-Leninism versus anti-Marxism-Leninism, a great struggle involving the success or failure of the cause of the working class of the world and the cause of socialism.

The Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia which ended recently has adopted a “Draft Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia”

which is an anti-Marxist-Leninist, out-and-out revisionist programme. To sum it up briefly, the draft programme substitutes sophistry for revolutionary materialistic dialectics in method of thinking; politically, it substitutes the reactionary theory of the state standing above classes for the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, and reactionary bourgeois nationalism for revolutionary proletarian internationalism; in political economy, it defends monopoly capital and tries to obscure the fundamental differences between the capitalist and socialist systems. The draft programme openly betrays the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, sets itself against the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers’ Parties of socialist countries held in Moscow last November, and at the same time turns against the “Peace Manifesto” adopted by the meeting of representatives of 64 Communist and Workers’ Parties, endorsed by the representatives of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia themselves. The draft programme brands all the basic principles of revolutionary theory established by Marx and Engels and developed by Lenin and other great Marxists as “dogmatism,” and the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia call themselves “irreconcilable enemies of any dogmatism.”

What are the most fundamental things in the “dogmatism” which the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia have chosen to attack? They are proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. But as everybody knows without proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship there can be no socialism. The Draft Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia centres its attacks on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, besmirches the socialist state and

the socialist camp, and gilds capitalism, the imperialist state and the imperialist camp. This cannot but give rise to doubts about the "socialism" avowed by the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

Speaking like the reactionaries of all countries and the Chinese bourgeois rightists, the leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia viciously slanders proletarian dictatorship, alleging that it "leads to bureaucratism, the ideology of etatism, separation of the leading political forces from the working masses, stagnation, the deformation of socialist development, and the sharpening of internal differences and contradictions." They maliciously slander the socialist camp, alleging that it also has a policy of "positions of strength and struggle for hegemony." They describe the two fundamentally different world politico-economic systems, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, as "division of the world into two antagonistic military-political blocs." They represent themselves as standing outside the "two blocs" of socialism and imperialism, that is, standing in a so-called position beyond the blocs. They hold that the U.S.-dominated United Nations can "bring about greater and greater unification of the world," that economic cooperation of all countries of the world, including the imperialist countries, is "an integral part of the socialist road to the development of world economy." They maintain that "the swelling flow of state-capitalist tendencies in the capitalist world is the most tangible proof that mankind is irrepressibly and by the most diverse roads deeply entering into the epoch of socialism." These propositions cannot but call to mind the revisionist preachings about "evolutionary socialism," "ultra-imperialism," "organized capitalism," "the peaceful growing

of capitalism into socialism," etc. made by such right-wing socialists in the late 19th century and early 20th century, as Bernstein, Kautsky, Hilferding and their ilk, which were intended to lure the working class in the various capitalist countries to abandon revolutionary struggle for socialism and uphold bourgeois rule. Now, the preachings of the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia also contain a preposterous design against the working class and other labouring people of various countries, that is, to lure the workers and other labouring people to take the road of surrender to capitalism. In his speech delivered at Pula in November 1956, Tito, leader of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, said: "What is actually involved is whether the new trend will triumph in the Communist parties — the trend which really began in Yugoslavia." He also said: "It is a question now whether this course (the so-called Yugoslav course — editor R. R.) will be victorious or whether the Stalinist course will prevail again. Yugoslavia must not concentrate on herself, she must work in all directions." These words fully expose what their true ambition is.

It is no accident that the Draft Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has appeared at the present time. Since the Great October Socialist Revolution, the international communist movement has achieved a series of great historic victories, the socialist system has been successfully established among a population of 900 million and more, and the general crisis of capitalism has broadened out greatly, with the imperialist countries headed by the United States experiencing a new and profound cyclical economic crisis. Therefore the imperialists, led by the United States, are stepping up their sabotage against the international communist move-

ment. There are only two methods to which the bourgeoisie has resorted to undermine the workers' movement — suppression by brute force and deceit. In the present new international situation, when the revisionist harangues of the right-wing socialists are daily losing their paralysing effect on the working class and the labouring masses, the programme put forward by the Yugoslav revisionists fits in exactly with the need of the imperialists, and particularly the American imperialists.

In his speech "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People," Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "Revisionism, or rightist opportunism, is a bourgeois trend of thought which is even more dangerous than doctrinairism. The revisionists, or right opportunists, pay lip service to Marxism and also attack 'doctrinairism.' But the real target of their attack is actually the most fundamental elements of Marxism." Facts have proven that what Comrade Mao Tse-tung says here is not only directed to the situation in our country, but also fits the international situation well.

The Declaration of the meeting of the representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of socialist countries says: "The main danger at present is revisionism or, in other words, right-wing opportunism, which as a manifestation of bourgeois ideology paralyses the revolutionary energy of the working class and demands the preservation or restoration of capitalism." It further points out with special emphasis: "Modern revisionism seeks to smear the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, declares that it is 'outmoded' and alleges that it has lost its significance for social progress. The revisionists try to exorcize the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and the

working people in general. They deny the historical necessity for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, deny the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, reject the principles of proletarian internationalism, and call for rejection of the Leninist principles of party organization and, above all, of democratic centralism, and for transforming the Communist party from a militant revolutionary organization into some kind of debating society." The Declaration clearly depicts the true face of the modern revisionists. The content of the Draft Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia shows that face precisely.

It is quite obvious that the series of anti-Marxist-Leninist and out-and-out revisionist views assembled in the Draft Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia must be openly and uncompromisingly criticized and repudiated. If theoretical criticism of the revisionism of Bernstein and Kautsky and their ilk, by the Marxists of the late 19th and early 20th centuries was inevitable, then it is even more necessary for us to repudiate neo-Bernsteinism now. This is because modern revisionism is set forth as a comprehensive and systematic programme by the leading group of a party that wields state power; because modern revisionism is aimed at splitting the international communist movement and undermining the solidarity of the socialist countries, and is directly harmful to the fundamental interests of the Yugoslav people.

We consider as basically correct the criticism made in June 1948 by the Information Bureau of Communist Parties in its resolution "Concerning the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia" in regard to the mistake

of the Yugoslav Communist Party in departing from the principles of Marxism-Leninism and sinking into bourgeois nationalism; but there were defects and mistakes in the method adopted at that time by the Information Bureau in dealing with this question. The resolution concerning Yugoslavia adopted by the Information Bureau in November 1949 was incorrect and it was later withdrawn by the Communist and Workers' Parties which took part in the Information Bureau meeting. Since 1954, the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist camp have done their utmost and taken various measures to improve their relations with Yugoslavia. This was entirely correct and necessary. The Communist Parties of various countries have adopted an attitude of waiting patiently, hoping that the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia may return to the Marxist-Leninist standpoint in the interest of adherence to the road of socialism by the Yugoslav people. However, the leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has spurned the well-intentioned efforts made by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communists of other countries. Around the time of the Hungarian events, they tried to disrupt the unity of the countries in the socialist camp on the pretext of so-called "opposition to Stalinism"; during the Hungarian events, they supported the renegade Nagy clique; and, in their recent Congress, they have gone further and put forward a systematic and comprehensive revisionist programme. The leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia should think soberly: Will the League of Communists of Yugoslavia be able to maintain its solidarity with the Communist Parties of other countries by abandoning the fundamental viewpoints of Marxism-

Leninism and persisting in revisionist viewpoints? Can there be a basis for solidarity without a common Marxist-Leninist viewpoint? Will it be in the interests of the Yugoslav people to reject friendship with the countries in the socialist camp and with the Communist Parties of other countries?

We deem it absolutely necessary to distinguish between right and wrong on vital questions in the international workers' movement. As Lenin said: "A policy based on principle is the only correct policy." The world is now at a new historic turning point with the east wind prevailing over the west wind. The struggle between the Marxist line and the revisionist line is nothing but a reflection of the sharpening struggle between the rising class forces and the moribund class forces in society, a reflection of the sharpening struggle between the imperialist world and the socialist world. It is impossible for any Marxist-Leninist to escape this struggle. Historical developments will testify ever more clearly to the great significance of this struggle for the international communist movement!

MODERN REVISIONISM MUST BE FOUGHT TO THE END

"Renmin Ribao" Editorial on June 4, 1958

The Second Session of the Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, in the light of the new situation in the international communist movement, pointed out in its resolution on the Moscow meetings of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties that "at present, the international communist movement has the important responsibility to adhere firmly to the viewpoints expressed in the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, to defend the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and oppose modern revisionism." "It is the sacred duty of our Party towards the international working class to work, together with the fraternal Parties, for the complete defeat of modern revisionism politically and theoretically, and for the safeguarding of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology." Now the fight against modern revisionism, as represented by the programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, has begun, but this is only the beginning. To smash modern revisionism completely, both politically and theoretically, this fight must be carried through to the very end.

But is it not "going too far" to deal with the Yugoslav revisionists in this way? Might it not have some unfavourable effect on the international workers' movement and the struggle for peace? These are questions that have to be answered.

Some people may think that even if the Yugoslav programme is revisionist and benefits the imperialists, it is best not to say so clearly to avoid pushing the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists to the side of the imperialists. But the fact that the Yugoslav programme represents modern revisionism and helps the imperialists, particularly the U.S. imperialists, is determined not by any criticism from any quarter, but by the programme itself, which is an objective fact. When the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League was drawing up their programme, nobody accused them of being modern revisionists or prejudged that they would bring forth a document which is such an omnibus of revisionism and levels such attacks on the socialist camp and provides such a shield for U.S. imperialism. On the contrary, even when the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League refused to participate in the Moscow meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries and came out in the open against the Declaration adopted by this meeting, the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries still maintained friendly relations with the Yugoslav Communist League and did not enter into argument with it. But all this did not prevent the Yugoslav Communist League from bringing up and adopting its revisionist programme. When the Yugoslav programme patently betrays the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, what is the result other than damage to the political consciousness of the working

class and the labouring people if you do not call the programme revisionist? When the programme of the Yugoslav Communist League and the words and deeds of its leading group in fact help the U.S. imperialists, and when even imperialist journals in the United States declare in no uncertain terms that "Tito's interests, as it happens, run parallel to ours for quite a stretch ahead" and that "we are partners in the only inside job," what is the purpose other than to let Dulles and company laugh up their sleeves if you do not say they are serving the imperialists?

The fundamental Marxist-Leninist approach is to see all things for what they really are. We do not favour painting the programme of the Yugoslav Communist League and its leading group worse than they are, nor do we have the duty or right to portray them better than they are. It was from this standpoint that the *Renmin Ribao* editorial of May 5 and the resolution of the Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party (Second Session) stated and repeated that, on the one hand, the resolution concerning the Yugoslav Communist Party adopted by the Information Bureau of Communist and Workers' Parties in November 1949 was wrong and there were defects and mistakes in the methods used by the Information Bureau in June 1948 in criticizing the Yugoslav Communist Party, and it was entirely necessary and correct that since 1954 the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union headed by Comrade N. S. Khrushchov corrected these mistakes, initiated improvement of relations with Yugoslavia and adopted a whole series of measures to this end; while on the other hand, the criticism of the mistakes of the Yugoslav Communist Party made by the Information Bureau in its 1948

resolution was basically correct and necessary. It is unfortunate that the criticism which was necessary and basically correct should have been marred by defects and mistakes in the methods employed; this should be taken as a lesson. But despite an inconsistency between form and content, Marxist-Leninists must of course distinguish between right and wrong on their merits and above all take content into account. The question now is that after the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Communist Parties concerned took positive steps to eliminate all the defects and mistakes, the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League is trying to take advantage of the 1949 mistake and the mistakes in methods employed in 1948 to repudiate completely all that was correct in the 1948 criticism and long after the Communist Parties of all countries had stopped mentioning the 1948 resolution, they launched unbridled attacks on this resolution at the League's Congress. As it is, we cannot help but take another look at what was said after all in the 1948 resolution.

Just see for yourself! This resolution criticized the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party for having "pursued an incorrect line which represents a departure from Marxism-Leninism," and declared that "the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia have taken a stand unworthy of Communists, and have begun to identify the foreign policy of the Soviet Union with the foreign policy of the imperialist powers, behaving towards the Soviet Union in the same manner as they behave to the bourgeois states"; that "the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia are departing from the positions of the working class and are breaking with the Marxist theory of classes and class struggle"; and that "the leadership of the

Communist Party of Yugoslavia is revising the Marxist-Leninist teachings about the Party." Are not these the facts? Has not the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League by its own deeds over the past ten years provided additional evidence as to the correctness of this resolution? On such a serious question, can they prove themselves right by repeating "any expectation in any quarter that we shall renounce our principled stands both in international and in internal matters, is only a loss of time"? It can be seen from this that it does not help the Yugoslav revisionists to attack the Communist Parties of various countries by using the 1948 resolution of the Information Bureau; it cannot prevail over the criticism against the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League, but can only overwhelm the leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists themselves.

Up to the present, the Yugoslav revisionists have not yet made any serious reply to the criticisms expressed by the Communist Parties of various countries, nor can they do so. One of their favourite weapons is to describe this criticism as "interference in internal affairs." This, of course, in no sense represents a serious attitude. For Marxist-Leninists to fight the anti-Marxist-Leninist trend of revisionism is not only unavoidable but a matter of duty. Waging this ideological struggle has nothing to do with whether the countries concerned are large or small, or with whether the Parties concerned are in power or not. Even where Marxist-Leninists are still a small group under the oppression of reactionary rulers, nobody can deprive them of their right to carry on such ideological struggle. Nor has such ideological struggle any relation whatsoever to interference in the internal affairs of other countries, by force or by underhand means, or to so-called

big-nation chauvinism and hegemony. To employ such allegations in order to shift the ground of the argument, and to resort to sophistry and slander is ludicrous. And it is doubly so for the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League to hurl charges of so-called interference in internal affairs. Is it not the Yugoslav Communist League which, in its programme, started talking at length about the internal policies of all the socialist countries (which are also "binding" on them alone) and pinned a series of malicious labels on them? Since the Yugoslav Communist League maintains that "Yugoslavia must not concentrate on herself," why should other countries concentrate on themselves alone? Why should the smaller socialist states neighbouring on Yugoslavia, such as Albania and Hungary, find that even their right to concentrate on themselves is infringed upon by Yugoslavia? What curious logic! Some people behave as if they could, like the magistrate in the Chinese saying, set houses on fire while forbidding ordinary folk to light lamps. But a rebuff brings immediate whines about "unequal positions". . . . Enough of this!

The Yugoslav revisionists have yet another miserable weapon — they say the sort of things they are doing have been going on for a long time, why should they be criticized for them now? True enough, the revisionist standpoint of the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League has long been there, and that in fact was the basis of the 1948 resolution of the Information Bureau. However, at that time the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League had not yet systematized its revisionist views. Nor did it, after the socialist countries resumed relations with Yugoslavia, state them as systematically as it has now done. From 1954 to the time preced-

ing the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the Communist Parties of various countries on many occasions, publicly or in other ways, argued with the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League. As is generally known, these arguments reached a climax after the 1956 counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary. Although the arguments failed to change its stand, the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League repeatedly expressed the desire to end the argument and to maintain and even improve friendly relations with the socialist countries and the Communist Parties of the various countries. In November 1957, though it did not participate in the Moscow meeting of the Communist Parties of the socialist countries, the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League joined in the meeting of the 64 Communist and Workers' Parties and in the Peace Manifesto. All this for a time made the Communist Parties of various countries rather hopeful. But the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League once more broke faith and returned evil for good. Unilaterally it scrapped the agreements between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia reached in the talks held in 1955, 1956 and 1957 on expanding and strengthening co-operation between Yugoslavia and the socialist countries. Unilaterally it forsook the stand taken on matters regarding principles in the international situation expressed in the Peace Manifesto, and put forward an out-and-out revisionist programme. Prior to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the Communist Parties of some countries gave comradesly advice to the Yugoslav League of Communists and suggested that the analysis of the international situation contained in the draft programme, which

obviously ran counter to Marxism-Leninism, be deleted. The Yugoslav League of Communists turned a deaf ear to the basic points in this advice. So far from heeding this advice, at their Congress they concentrated their attacks on the Soviet Union which had given them generous fraternal aid and on the socialist countries and the Communist Parties in various countries; but they fawned on and servilely thanked U.S. imperialism, the most ferocious enemy of the people all over the world. So it was only when their prolonged efforts, characterized by patience and magnanimity, proved fruitless, that the Communist Parties of various countries gave this shameful band of renegades the counter-blows it deserves. Now the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League blames others for not adopting a comradesly attitude to it and for failing to keep promises. Whom is it trying to fool? What serious-minded person can bear with such fooling?

Nowadays the most urgent task facing the people of the world is the defence of peace. Will the fight against the Yugoslav revisionists hamper the people's cause of defending peace? *The New York Times* editorial of June 1 helpfully provides us with an answer. It said: "Unexpected and now unforeseeable developments may produce situations in the months ahead in which other Communist-ruled nations might request our aid and in which it would be desirable for us to grant such request. . . . Certainly the news from Belgrade and Moscow in recent days suggests that the flexibility shown in the past in regard to American aid to Yugoslavia was wise from the point of view of our own interests." Those who do not see the danger of Yugoslav revisionism should give careful attention to this. The United States expects the Yugoslav ex-

ample to encourage new Nagys hidden in the Communist Parties of the socialist countries, expects that these new Nagys may perhaps bring about "unexpected and now unforeseeable developments" "in the months ahead" and may seize political power and ask for U.S. aid as Yugoslavia has been doing. Although this is an illusion of the U.S. imperialists, it is not difficult to see from it the part played by Yugoslav revisionism in the U.S. imperialists' plans for subversion and the significance of the fight against Yugoslav revisionism for the cause of defending peace. At the same time, it is not difficult to see the difference between Yugoslav revisionism and neutralism in general: ordinary neutral countries cannot serve the purpose of subversion which the United States requires, but often themselves become the target of U.S. subversion. The fight against Yugoslav revisionism is not only to draw a clear-cut line between Marxism-Leninism and anti-Marxism-Leninism, to let all supporters of socialism recognize the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League for what it is, and so serve to consolidate the core of the peace forces — the socialist camp and the international workers' movement. It is also to let all supporters of peace recognize the imperialists, particularly the U.S. imperialists, for what they are and see clearly where the danger of war lies. Naturally this is even more obviously in the interests of peace.

But to draw a dividing line does not mean breaking off diplomatic relations. The leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League complains that to criticize its servility to U.S. imperialism is to force it to sever diplomatic relations with the United States. This is simply deliberate and dishonest confusion of two different things. Similarly it is bluffing people by saying that the criticism

of Yugoslav revisionism by the Communist Parties of the socialist countries means a repetition of the history between 1948 and 1954 and a menace to the diplomatic relations between these countries and Yugoslavia. But this will frighten nobody. The post-1948 history will not be repeated. If the true face of the Yugoslav revisionists is recognized, their sabotage of the socialist camp and the international workers' movement can be stopped more easily. To return to the pre-1954 situation is not right. At any rate, the working people of Yugoslavia hope to take the socialist road and be friendly with the peoples of the socialist countries. Since the socialist countries can maintain diplomatic relations with capitalist countries, why cannot they maintain such relations with Yugoslavia? However, since the Yugoslav leaders themselves do not want fraternal relations with the socialist countries, it is only natural that relations between Yugoslavia and the socialist countries are levelled down to ordinary diplomatic relations, and there is no need for the Yugoslav leaders or anyone else to make a fuss about it. The programme of the Yugoslav Communist League in many places shows that Yugoslavia supports peace. Although this does not show that the programme is Marxist, yet so long as Yugoslavia is willing to do so, we believe the socialist countries will continue to co-operate with it on the question of safeguarding peace, just as they can co-operate on this question with some capitalist countries and certain political forces of the bourgeoisie. In fighting against the opportunists, Lenin once quoted this saying of Marx: "If you must unite, Marx wrote to the party leaders, then enter into agreements to satisfy the practical aims of the movement, but do not allow any bargaining over principles, do not make

'concessions' in questions of theory." This teaching of Marx and Lenin is our guide to action. We hold that modern revisionism must be fought to the end and there can be no room for concession here. But in the future it will still be possible for the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia and the socialist countries, or the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the Communist Parties of various countries, to "enter into agreements." Whether this "entering into agreements" will really take place and what kind of "agreements" will be entered into depends primarily on the future attitude of the leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

YUGOSLAV REVISIONISM — PRODUCT OF IMPERIALIST POLICY

Chen Po-ta

The struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties of all countries against the revisionism of the Yugoslav leading group headed by Tito is a big event in current international affairs. The Tito group provoked it. The programme which it put forward unleashed an attack all along the line against Marxism-Leninism and the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, in the belief that in this way it could weaken the positions of Marxism-Leninism and cause a split in the international communist movement. Marxist-Leninists had no choice but to accept the challenge and have already begun to show the challengers that they are knocking their heads against a brick wall. Contrary to the expectations of the Tito group, the Communist Parties of all countries have shown great solidarity in this struggle.

It is imperative that we examine this problem in the international political and economic setting as a whole and thus expose the very essence of the revisionism of the Tito group.

This article appeared in the June 1 issue of *Hongqi* (The Red Flag), fortnightly theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

The revisionism of the Tito group is in no way accidental; it is a product of the contemporary international class struggle, a product of the policy of the contemporary imperialists, in particular the U.S. imperialists, the fiercest enemy of the people throughout the world.

The revisionism of the period of the Second International, represented by Bernstein, also reflected the policy of the bourgeoisie — the imperialists. But the modern revisionism or neo-revisionism represented by Tito differs from Bernstein's in its function. Bernstein revisionism appeared at the close of the 19th century, when imperialism was still a complete system holding sway the world over, when there was as yet no state under proletarian dictatorship. But what era are we living in today? The great era of successful proletarian revolutions among a population of over 900 million and of socialism established as a new world system, the era in which the colonial system has already disintegrated or is in process of disintegration, and the imperialist system is tottering; it is the great era, as Comrade Mao Tse-tung has put it, of "the east wind prevailing over the west wind." In this new era, the struggle between the socialist and the capitalist systems, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in all lands, has become a fierce, life-and-death struggle. This is what inevitably stamps modern revisionism, that is, neo-revisionism, and gives it new features.

Marx and Engels in their time repeatedly pointed out that the British bourgeoisie used a small part of its superprofits to maintain a group of aristocrats of labour. In a letter to Marx, Engels once referred to "those very worst English trade unions which allow themselves to be led by men sold to, or at least paid by the middle class." It

is well known that Lenin — in the course of the relentless battle he waged against revisionism, opportunism, reformism, social chauvinism and social imperialism — time and again referred to this view of Marx and Engels and added new evidence to substantiate it. Lenin said: "Objectively the opportunists are a section of the petty bourgeoisie and of certain strata of the working class who have been bribed out of imperialist superprofits and converted into watchdogs of capitalism and corrupters of the labour movement."

How does the situation stand today? Since the working class has seized state power in many countries, the imperialists have found that it is not sufficient to buy over traitors to the working class within their own countries. Besides continuing the policy of bribery in their own countries, the imperialists, with the U.S. imperialists in the lead, are at the same time doing their best to find in some socialist countries bourgeois nationalist elements and unstable persons and buy them over and make them tools to undermine the proletarian dictatorship, the socialist system, the international communist movement and the unity of the socialist countries. That being the case the U.S. imperialists have picked on the leading group of Yugoslavia, and carried out a policy of buying it off at a high price.

According to figures published in the newspapers and periodicals of the United States and Yugoslavia, between 1945 and 1957 the United States extended over U.S.\$1,700 million in economic aid to the leading group of Yugoslavia; of which over \$1,000 million were given after 1949. In addition, according to Associated Press reports, the United States gave Yugoslavia more than \$1,000 million in military aid from 1950 to 1957. This is apart from

an estimated \$300 million of economic aid received by Yugoslavia from other capitalist countries. So all in all, the aid given to the leading group of Yugoslavia by the whole capitalist world headed by the United States amounted to about \$3,000 million.

In his report to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Tito disclosed that U.S. aid made up 4 per cent of Yugoslavia's national income. It can be estimated from this figure that U.S. aid accounts for a very large proportion of Yugoslavia's national budget, probably amounting to about 20 per cent.

The stark fact is that the Yugoslav leading group headed by Tito not only lives on its own people but on a large amount of U.S. aid. At the same time, the so-called "American way of life" of which the U.S. imperialists boast of so loudly has also been imported into Yugoslav society by means of U.S. aid, with the purpose of corrupting the Yugoslav people.

A report published in *The Washington Post and Times Herald* of June 6, 1957 says, "Instalment-plan buying of American-style electrical gadgets is changing the Yugoslavs from Communists to capitalists, says Pittsburgh's G.O.P. Congressman James F. Fulton, heretofore bitter foe of United States policy toward Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. He has just returned from Tito-land. . . . He said: 'The May Day parade had a real American look, American tanks, American equipment. There's tremendous American influence . . . among the people, Americans are the most popular of all nationalities.'"

On May 2, 1958, Reuter's correspondent sent a long report from Belgrade in which he said that the Yugoslav press ten years ago was "just as dull and doctrinaire as *Pravda*." But "nowadays, it often tries to be as racy as

the American tabloids." "Marxist eyebrows are often raised by 'cheesecake' photographs and the American-angled features which regularly appear in the Yugoslav newspapers." "The Yugoslav reader is offered a liberal spread of 'human stories,' including frank and often gory details of crime and disaster." All this shows that some leading Yugoslav newspapers have been turned into instruments of publicity for the "American way of life."

Man's social being determines his consciousness. It is precisely the import of large quantities of U.S. aid and the "American way of life" that has wrought a change in the consciousness of the Yugoslav leading group, caused revisionist ideology to grow up in its midst, and determined its internal and external policies which are directed against the Soviet Union, against communism, against the socialist camp and against socialism in its own country.

What are the main points in the revisionism and the domestic and foreign policies of the leading group in Yugoslavia headed by Tito, as expressed in the programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia?

1. With regard to the over-all political struggle in the world, the Tito group sets forth views which are diametrically opposed to those in the Declaration of the Moscow meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries. It denies that the most fundamental feature of the present world situation is the counterposing of two different social, political and economic world systems and of the two camps arising from these two different systems. It rejects the point made in the Declaration that "in our epoch world development is determined by the course and results of the competition between two diametrically opposed social systems." It completely confuses the differences between the two

fundamentally different social systems — socialism and capitalism — and describes these two fundamentally different world economic-political systems, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, as “the division of the world into antagonistic military-political blocs,” and it holds that “the division of the world into antagonistic military-political blocs also led to the economic division of the world . . . and thus obstructs the process of the integration of the world and impedes the social progress of mankind.” According to the sophistry of the Tito group, the world, or the world economy, was originally united under the system of capitalism — imperialism; as though the capitalist countries had never split into blocs contending for world supremacy, arising from the interests of monopoly capital in its drive for superprofits; as though monopoly capital had never engaged in life-and-death global wars for the re-division of the world. The Tito group does not in any way believe that the way out for humanity lies in the ultimate replacement of the capitalist system by the socialist system. Its proposal is for the United Nations, which is dominated by U.S. imperialism, to “encourage and promote comprehensive cooperation and closer connections between peoples, in short, to assist efforts towards achieving a fuller unity of the world.”

What kind of “unity” is the so-called “unity of the world” that is to be promoted through the U.S.-dominated United Nations? Isn’t this unity which the Tito group hankers after a unity in which U.S. imperialism seeks to dominate the world?

2. The Tito group declares that it does not belong to the camp of socialism. It brags about a so-called position of “standing above blocs.”

What is it all about, after all? The facts have shown: (1) that its purpose in staying outside the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and outside the ranks of the international proletariat is nothing less than substituting reactionary bourgeois nationalism for revolutionary proletarian internationalism; and (2) that its so-called position of “standing above blocs” is nothing but an adaptation to the requirements of the imperialist bloc.

3. On the question of war or peace, Marxists have always held that the root cause of modern wars is monopoly capitalism, i.e., imperialism, and that the socialist countries and the Communist Parties of all countries are the core of the forces defending world peace. But the Tito group directs the spearhead of its attack against the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and acts as an apologist for the war policy of the imperialist camp. Tito himself has declared: “Owing to Stalin’s inflexible and uncalled for threatening foreign policy, seeing that they would be unable to accomplish their aims by diplomatic means, the big Western powers decided they would be able to do so by displaying force. This was the basic reason for the formation of the Atlantic Pact, for the creation of a military bloc. . . .” (Tito’s report to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.) Apparently the Tito group is trying to lead up to such an absurd, ultra-reactionary conclusion as this: that the danger of war arises not from the imperialist system and the imperialist camp headed by the United States but from the socialist system and the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union.

4. As scientifically analysed by Lenin, imperialism is the last stage of capitalism and, with it, mankind has entered the era of proletarian revolution. Since the Octo-

ber Revolution, the proletarian revolution has triumphed in a number of countries. But imperialism is not yet finally down and out. The era of proletarian revolution is not yet over. Yet according to the Tito group, the world today has already passed beyond the age of imperialism and proletarian revolution, because "the capitalist system in its classical form is increasingly becoming a thing of the past" and socialism is coming into being in the capitalist countries. The Tito group keeps harping on the word "age" in the following manner: "Mankind is indomitably moving into the age of socialism through a wide variety of different roads, into the age in which socialism and socialist relations increasingly become the content and method of everyday life of all mankind"; "the age in which mankind is living today is already, more than anything else, the age of the introduction, forming and strengthening of new social, political and cultural forms based on socialist economic relationships." From this it comes to the conclusion that "socialist thinking is no longer primarily concerned with questions relating to the overthrow of the old, capitalist system." In other words, the problem of destroying the capitalist system in various countries of the world no longer exists, the theory of proletarian revolution is "outmoded," and it has become nothing but a figment of the thinking of so-called "dogmatists."

5. According to Lenin, monopoly capitalism "introduces everywhere the striving for domination, not for freedom. The result is reaction all along the line, whatever the political system, and an extreme intensification of existing antagonisms in this domain also." But according to the Tito group, monopoly capital is peacefully growing into socialism in the capitalist countries through

the forms of state capitalism, and state capitalism in these countries is in fact "socialism." In the capitalist countries, it says, "the state increasingly controls the activities of capital, partially restricting the right of private management of capitalist property and depriving the owners of private capital of certain independent functions in the economy and in society." "In certain fields of activity the top monopoly circles are steadily losing their former completely independent role, while some functions of the monopolies are increasingly being transferred upon the state." "The state assumes an important role in the economy." "The role of the state as that of a regulator in the sphere of labour and property relationships, of social rights and social services and other social relations also grows."

So runs the extraordinary argument of the Tito group: the state apparatus of monopoly capital does not serve monopoly capital; it stands above classes and is fulfilling the task of expropriating monopoly capital.

6. Thus, the Tito group maintains that the working class in the capitalist countries can "make the state apparatus serve the society" without having to smash the bourgeois state apparatus. The task of the working class in the capitalist countries is thus confined to "winning decisive influence in state power and gradually — in keeping with its political strength — securing development of socialism."

7. Since the Tito group glorifies bourgeois dictatorship in every way, it is no wonder that it exerts itself to smear proletarian dictatorship. Speaking like all reactionaries, it alleges that proletarian dictatorship must inevitably lead to "bureaucracy" and "bureaucratic statism."

8. Marxists maintain that there are two forms of socialist ownership, i.e., ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, and that ownership by the whole people is the higher form of socialist ownership. But the Tito group describes ownership by the whole people, i.e., state ownership, in the socialist countries as "state capitalism" and "the last echo of old social relations." Socialist economy, it says, comprises only two kinds of ownership — "collective ownership" and "personal ownership." By "collective ownership" it means allowing the direct producers to "make decisions pertaining to the creation and the total distribution of products." The group further alleges that "private land holding" is "a component part of large-scale socialist agricultural production," and that small proprietors also represent "a component part of the socio-economic forces of socialism."

In short, the Tito group describes state capitalism in the capitalist countries as "socialism," and the ownership by the whole people in the socialist countries as "state capitalism." It is for the former but against the latter. "Socialism" of the Tito brand puts the collective above the whole people, and the individual, in turn, above the collective. Its slogan is "socialism cannot subordinate man's personal happiness to any kind of 'higher aims.'" Its logic is that individual interests may stand above the collective interests and the interests of the whole people but should not be subordinated to them, and that, certainly, collective interests may stand above the interests of the whole people and should not be subordinated to the latter.

9. The "socialism" of the Tito brand is so queer a thing that to all intents and purposes it is the "socialism" of the bourgeoisie, the kind of "socialism" that is toler-

able to the imperialists. It is fundamentally different from socialism as defined by Marxism-Leninism and practised in the socialist countries. No wonder the Tito group categorically repudiates the common laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction, sets itself against the common ideology and concerted action of the international proletariat and the international communist movement, and maliciously slanders this common ideology and concerted action as "ideological monopoly" and "political hegemony."

10. Proceeding from the above-mentioned views, the Tito group is hostile to all Communist Parties. It declares: "The conception that Communist Parties have a monopoly over every aspect of the movement of society towards socialism and that socialism can only find its representatives in them and move forward through them—is theoretically wrong and practically, very harmful." It also asserts: "Some of the Communist Parties cease to act as the revolutionary creative factor and motive power of social development in their respective countries."

The Tito group has great contempt for the Communist Party of the United States. But history will ultimately prove that though the U.S. Communist Party, which adheres to the truth, is now small, it is a really vital living force and has a great future; on the other hand, though the Tito group now rules Yugoslavia, who can guarantee that it will not trip over its own revisionism?

11. The Tito group holds that "the development of the international workers' movement during the last few decades did not advance in step with the social events and the development of material conditions"; and that "during the last few years of the Stalin period, the workers' move-

ment in the world . . . not only stagnated but even retrogressed."

The Tito group seems blind to the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the success of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, the great victories gained in the war against fascism in which the Soviet Union played the chief role, the existence of the new socialist countries, the growth of the workers' movements in the capitalist countries, and the great Chinese revolution and the People's Republic of China.

12. The Tito group is of the opinion that "Marxist thought in the course of the last few decades has not kept in step with the advance of contemporary society." As the editorial of the *Renmin Ribao* (People's Daily), May 5, 1958 pointed out, the Tito group brands the basic principles of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory as "dogmatism," and calls itself "irreconcilable enemies of dogmatism"; this being so, how can it possibly understand whether Marxism has developed or not? As it does not see the great world events that have come about under the leadership of the Communist Parties since the October Revolution, and utters such reactionary twaddle about "humanity," "personality of man," "free personality," "truth about man as a social being," and "man's spiritual constitution," on the pretext of opposing so-called "dogmatism" and "pragmatic revision," how can this group possibly have a common language with Marxism-Leninism?

These twelve points do not exhaust the revisionist views and the domestic and foreign policies of the Tito group. But they suffice to show how the revisionism of the Tito group serves the interests of the imperialists, particularly the U.S. imperialists.

In his report to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Tito called Djilas a revisionist. "By orders from outside and for Judas' silver," Tito said, "these traitors wrote slanderous pamphlets against the socialism and reality in Yugoslavia." However, as pointed out correctly by an article in the West German *Tagesspiegel* of April 22, 1958: "Here is harsh mockery. For the basic ideas of this programme were drafted by no other than Djilas himself who is today behind prison bars." Of course, there is a difference between Djilas and the Tito group. It is that while Djilas does not bother to don the cloak of Marxism-Leninism, the Tito group still uses Marxism-Leninism as a disguise. But has it ever occurred to Tito that the content of the programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is actually another edition of Djilas' *New Class*? Tito might well hold up Djilas as a mirror to see his own reflection.

After the war against fascism, the people of Yugoslavia embarked on the road to socialism. But under the dominating influence of the policies of the Tito group, Yugoslavia has not yet carried out a serious, thorough-going struggle between the capitalist and the socialist roads on the economic, political and ideological fronts, and has not solved the question of which road shall win in the country. In the villages of Yugoslavia, individual economy still accounts for more than 90 per cent of the rural economy, and this preserves a seedbed for the return of capitalism.

The question in Yugoslavia is not solely that of ownership. For the people of Yugoslavia, a more serious question is that the dollar policy of U.S. imperialism is exerting influence on the leading group of Yugoslavia and

thereby causing confusion among the Yugoslav people as to the road to socialism.

As can be seen from the material quoted above, the dollar policy of U.S. imperialism towards Yugoslavia began in 1945. Even before 1948, the Tito group already began to forsake the road of proletarian internationalism and foster reactionary bourgeois nationalism. This was bound up with the dollar policy of U.S. imperialism and was a product of it in Yugoslavia. But to this very day, a good many of the Yugoslav people, and of the members of the Yugoslav League of Communists, still do not realize this.

Although the programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists declares that "personal ownership" and "private land holding" are also "socialism," it is understandable that the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists does not necessarily hope to discard immediately the forms of public ownership that came into being in the previous course of the revolution, and it is impossible for them to do so. For if it does, it will not only meet with resistance from the Yugoslav working class and other politically conscious working people, but also lose its political stock-in-trade for deceiving its countrymen and befuddling world opinion, and so eventually lose its political capital for bargaining with U.S. imperialism.

There is an acute contradiction between the degenerate policy of the Tito group and the desire of the Yugoslav people and loyal Communists inside the Yugoslav League of Communists to take the socialist road. This is why, to maintain its rule, the Tito group is willing to preserve certain forms of public ownership. Moreover, as long as the Tito group remains hostile to the international com-

munist movement and to the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, the U.S. imperialists may agree to the preservation of certain forms of public ownership in Yugoslavia and assume an attitude of "non-intervention." Consider, for instance, what *U.S. News & World Report* wrote in its issue of November 9, 1956: "In urging independent — but not necessarily capitalistic — governments in countries that are now Soviet satellites (the imperialists always talk this nonsense, referring to all the socialist countries other than the Soviet Union as 'satellites' — *Author*) the Eisenhower Administration is continuing its support of Titoism." Discussing Yugoslavia's function at a press conference on August 6, 1957, John Foster Dulles had this to say: "It is possible to have a communist regime without being dominated by what we call 'international communism' or a Soviet-type brand of communism."

As Marxists see it, there is nothing strange in certain forms of public ownership being tolerated in a particular society which is governed by an exploiting class, so long as they do not harm, and may even help, the fundamental interests of that exploiting class. In feudal society, for instance, it is quite common for certain village communes, or certain forms of public ownership or autonomy to be preserved. In capitalist society, a joint stock company may be considered a kind of capitalist form of "public ownership" and some workers may even hold shares in it. Yet, as we all know, that does not prevent the capitalists from drawing their maximum profits; on the contrary, it adds to the capitalists' assurance of maximum profits. After the October Revolution, the counter-revolutionaries at one time hoped to make use of the organizational form of Soviets — what they called "Soviets without Communists." When collective farming was brought about in

the Soviet Union, some counter-revolutionaries at one time similarly wanted to make use of the form of collective farms — what they called “collective farms without Communists.” On this point, Stalin rightly said: “Everything depends upon the content that is put into this form.” All organizational forms, political or economic, remain mere organizational forms. The question is who runs them, who leads.

As Comrade Mao Tse-tung said in his speech “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People,” the revisionists, too, pay lip service to Marxism-Leninism. It is said that, in Yugoslavia, the Tito group permits people to hang up portraits of Marx and Lenin. This point needs to be seen from the same angle. What the Tito group is doing is to preserve a certain amount of Marxist phraseology while getting rid of its revolutionary content. In countries where the working class movement has a Marxist tradition behind it, revisionists and opportunists may accept a part of Marxist theory, and even the theory of the class struggle, where this accords with the interests of the bourgeoisie. Lenin said: “Those who recognize only the class struggle are not yet Marxists; they may be found to have gone no further than the boundaries of bourgeois reasoning and bourgeois politics. To limit Marxism to the theory of the class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to something which is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. A Marxist is one who extends the acceptance of the class struggle to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” But the Tito group has gone much further than those opportunists who accept the class struggle. It has even repudiated the class struggle, in order to fit in with the needs of the U.S. imperialists.

The leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia declares that under no circumstances will it abandon its revisionist stand, that any attempt to get it to change its position is illusory and will be of no avail. It also declares that it will not stop its contention, that is to say, it will continue to challenge Marxism-Leninism. It can be seen therefore that it is impossible to cease this struggle. Is this struggle good for Marxism-Leninism? Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said that under specific conditions “bad things can be turned into good things.” Things always develop dialectically. The programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is a concentrated expression of modern revisionism. It will serve as an example in reverse to educate the Yugoslav people and the Communists of the world and enable people to distinguish still more clearly between Marxism-Leninism and anti-Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism has always grown and developed by combating opportunism of every description. So long as Marxist-Leninists wage clear-cut, uncompromising struggle against modern revisionism, the international communist movement is bound to benefit.

YUGOSLAV REVISIONISM IS JUST WHAT U.S. IMPERIALISM NEEDS

Kang Sheng

The attack on the Soviet Union and the international communist movement launched by the leading group of the League of Yugoslav Communists by means of the League's revisionist programme and its Seventh Congress has been rebuffed, rightly and seriously, by the Communist and Workers' Parties of various countries. Now an important struggle to safeguard the purity of Marxism-Leninism is unfolding. This struggle is of immense importance to the international communist movement and the just cause of safeguarding world peace.

To date, the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League has not given any valid answers to the criticisms made by the Communist Parties of various countries; nor can it do so. Its so-called answers are mere sophistry. For example, it describes its odious action in serving the U.S. imperialists as an effort "to seek joint elements of the line of peace and international co-operation," and even claims this action coincides with the aims of Soviet foreign policy. It arbitrarily links two essentially different things: Yugoslavia's economic dependence on the United States and the Soviet Union's

This article appeared in *Renmin Ribao* on June 14.

proposal to expand trade with the U.S. At the same time, it dismisses the serious and justified criticisms made by Marxist-Leninist parties of various countries as "interference in internal affairs" and "unprincipled attacks," "detrimental to world peace." But the facts speak louder than lies. Any objective observer can see that the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists by its policy of serving the U.S. imperialists — planners of a new war — under the mask of socialism is playing a role particularly damaging to the just cause of defending world peace. Precisely for this reason, the U.S. imperialists, who are hostile to the socialist camp and to peace, lavish praise on Yugoslavia.

Yugoslav revisionism has not arisen accidentally. Since the Second World War, socialism has grown into a new world system. To save capitalism from still deeper general crisis the U.S. imperialists have been searching for a new tool from within the socialist countries, to add to the old revisionism — social democracy. They thought it would be ideal to find a "socialist" country with a Marxist-Leninist signboard, which can split the camp of socialism from within. John Foster Dulles has long been highly confident that the policy of the leading group in Yugoslavia fits the needs of the United States. Referring to Yugoslavia at a press conference on August 6 last year, he said: "It is possible to have a communist regime without being dominated by what we call 'international communism' or a Soviet-type brand of communism." What this remark of Dulles means is: 1. The new tool needed by the U.S. imperialists should be one that they do not consider as "international communism," that is, it should have the "communist" label yet be against international communism. 2. This new tool must

not be a "Soviet-type brand of communism," that is, it should discard the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, depart from the trail blazed by the October Revolution and set itself against the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. 3. This new tool should be a "regime" controlled by a "communism" which embodies the foregoing two characteristics. This is particularly important, because only those revisionists who are in power in what was for a time a socialist country can effectively serve the imperialists today when socialism has become a world system. To Dulles, the ideal tool must fit these "specifications" and Yugoslav revisionism is just the thing.

U.S. Big Business has spared no small investment in building up its Yugoslav revisionist tool. According to Senator Knowland, the U.S. has given Tito's government aid amounting to 1,500 million dollars (Associated Press Washington dispatch, March 20, 1958). It is well known that the Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists, which runs to about 150,000 words, did not dare even once to use the term "U.S. imperialism," as though this were a "royal taboo." The same is true of the pronouncements of the leading members of the Yugoslav Communist League. Take, for example, Tito's version of the U.S. plot of aggression against Syria last year. He said in his report at the Seventh National Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists: "The pressure exercised against Syria last year led to the speeding up of the unification of Egypt with Syria. . . ." And regarding the U.S. aggression in Indonesia, he said: "Similar developments took place in Indonesia. The young united republic of the peoples of Indonesia has through intrigues and interference in its internal affairs

on the part of Western circles become the battlefield of civil war." In short, it seems that there is no such thing in the world as U.S. imperialism. The question arises: If a self-styled Marxist-Leninist party in analysing the current world situation does not even dare to point to the existence of U.S. imperialism, what does this indicate other than U.S. dollar influence?

A great many statesmen and political commentators in many capitalist countries that stand for peace and neutrality, such as India, Indonesia and the United Arab Republic, it should be pointed out, do not call themselves Marxist-Leninists, yet they dare to condemn the policy of aggression of U.S. imperialism.

The leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League goes to great lengths to deny that its Programme fits the needs of the imperialists, particularly the U.S. imperialists. But the facts speak louder than eloquent words. A brief review of some of the historical events in the past few years clearly shows the ugly face of the Yugoslav revisionists and how they play the game of the U.S. imperialists.

Firstly, during the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary, the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists played the role of instigator and interventionist. It openly called the counter-revolutionary uprising a revolution and supported it. It gave encouragement and support to the "Workers' Councils" which were in the hands of the counter-revolutionaries and engaged in activities hostile to the worker-peasant revolutionary government. It maintained close ties with the renegade Nagy group, openly sheltered Nagy and other counter-revolutionaries and made the Yugoslav Embassy in Hungary a haven for these counter-revolutionaries. Only

because the leading comrades of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, during and after the suppression of the uprising, maintained a consistently principled, correct stand did its scheming come to nothing and it was compelled to give ostensible support to the Hungarian Government headed by Comrade Janos Kadar. But to this very day, the attitude of the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists on this question still harmonizes with that of the imperialists, particularly the U.S. imperialists. Time and again, the U.S. imperialists have tried to drag the so-called "Hungarian question" on to the agenda of the United Nations, in the vain hope of making a breach in Hungary by means of the United Nations, which is under their control. And Tito too, in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, said that "Yugoslavia exerted efforts in the U.N. for a settlement of this question." Is this not enough to show that the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League advocates precisely what the U.S. imperialists need?

Secondly, in the speech he made at Pula in November 1956, Tito joined in the anti-Soviet, anti-communist campaign launched by the imperialists taking advantage of the Hungarian events. In that speech he attacked almost all the socialist countries and the Communist Parties of many countries, and proclaimed that Yugoslavia would work in various ways for the victory in the Communist and Workers' Parties of various countries of "the trend" which "began in Yugoslavia," so as to defeat the so-called "Stalinist course." In the Yugoslav press, they also attacked the leadership of many Communist and Workers' Parties and encouraged the revisionist elements to carry out splitting activities. The U.S. imperialists were highly appreciative

of these activities. Walter Lippmann, mouthpiece of the U.S. bourgeoisie, stated at the time that it was in the "true interest" of the U.S. to make what he called "Titoism" "prevail" in the socialist countries (*Washington Post*, October 30, 1956). At secret talks among leaders of the U.S. Senate, James P. Richards also expressed the view that "it is to the advantage of our country, as well as the entire free world, to encourage Tito and other communist dissenters like him." (*New York Post*, December 31, 1956.) We would like to ask the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist League: Since the U.S. imperialists describe your "ism" as in their true interests, does this not mean that your "ism" suits their needs? You say this kind of talk by the Americans does not count; if so, why do you never regard it as an "insult" and repudiate it?

Thirdly, in November 1957, the leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists, betraying the agreement reached at the Soviet-Yugoslav talks in Rumania, refused to take part in the Moscow Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries or to sign the Declaration of that meeting. They announced that this was because the Moscow Declaration "contains certain attitudes and appraisals which are contrary to the standpoint of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and which it considers to be incorrect." For this action, they immediately earned the praise of the U.S. imperialists. An *Agence France Presse* report of November 22, 1957, said: "There were clear signs that the Yugoslav attitude caused great interest in the State Department. The prevailing impression in Washington was that Yugoslav President Marshal Josip Broz Tito had once again insisted on demonstrating his independence from the communist bloc." On December 8, 1957 Tito received James W.

Riddleberger, U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia. *The New York Times* wrote on the following day that Tito "did mention Yugoslavia's refusal to sign the Declaration as further proof of her continued independence." This was immediately followed by a huge U.S. loan to Yugoslavia and the signing of an agreement for the supply of 62.5 million dollars worth of American surplus farm produce to Yugoslavia.

On the refusal of the League to attend the Moscow Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries and to sign the Declaration of that meeting, there is an article by Immanuel Birnbaum, a bourgeois commentator who has quite a few contacts with the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists. The article appeared in the first number of *The Problems of Communism* this year, a magazine published by the U.S. Information Agency and expressed many views that are well worth noting. Using the statements of the leading group of the League as its basis, the article analysed the true reasons behind the refusal to attend the Moscow Meeting and sign its Declaration. The writer said: "Belgrade could not agree to the two basic theses put forward in the Declaration, namely that the entire blame for the continuation of international tension rests on the shoulders of the West, and that the only way to prevent a world catastrophe is for all countries under communist rule to stand solidly united in support of the Moscow policy and leadership." Judging by the Draft Programme of the League and the speeches made by the leaders of the League at its Seventh Congress, this appraisal by Birnbaum is true to the facts. The article added: "It is important that, at a time when Moscow is seeking once more to tighten its reins over

the other segments of the communist world, at least one country professing to be a disciple of Lenin refuses to submit." The persistence of the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists in its "independence from the communist bloc" is just what the U.S. imperialists need; the two "basic theses" opposed by the leading group of the League are exactly what the U.S. imperialists have resolutely opposed. Does not this standpoint of the leading group of the League fit the needs of the U.S. imperialists exactly?

Fourthly, the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists issued its out-and-out revisionist programme in opposition to the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting at a time when the east wind prevails over the west wind and the United States is experiencing an acute economic crisis. At the Seventh Congress of the League, it went out of its way to defend and curry favour with the U.S. imperialists, and to unscrupulously attack the socialist camp; and on a series of questions, it issued most absurd statements, counter to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism but suited to the needs of U.S. imperialism. This is true of its analysis of the present international situation, and its statements on the question of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, the question of the leading role of the Communist Party and the so-called question of "opposing dogmatism."

For example, Eisenhower defamed the Soviet Union as being a "strongly armed imperialistic dictatorship" (1957 State of the Union message); and the Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists also attacked the Soviet Union as being a "hegemony." Dulles attacked the foreign policies of the Soviet Union and the camp of socialism as a "major threat" to the entire world (Octo-

ber 1957 issue of the U.S. *Foreign Affairs* quarterly); and in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, Tito similarly slandered them as proceeding from a "power policy" and "big power principles." Tito went so far as to allege that it was "owing to Stalin's inflexible and uncalled for threatening foreign policy" that the U.S. had engaged in arms expansion and war preparations, established military blocs and manoeuvred to conclude the North Atlantic Treaty. Eisenhower and Dulles have been attacking the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements all the time; the Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists also openly opposes these agreements.

Again, the imperialists have always tried deliberately to confuse the fundamental differences between the two systems of socialism and capitalism in order to benumb the revolutionary consciousness of the working class. Eisenhower said that since the government in a capitalist country "controls" part of the "economic life" of the bourgeoisie, "such things can, of course, in the long run lead to communism, but we have had this same kind of thing inherent in our form of government for many years." (Reply to the correspondent of the *New York Herald Tribune* at a press conference on June 5, 1957.) The Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists also stresses so-called "factors of socialism" in the capitalist countries, saying that in this type of country "the specific forms of state capitalist relations may either be the ultimate effort made by capitalism to survive, or the first step towards socialism, or may, at the same time, be both the one and the other."

Again, the imperialists hold the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular hatred. In a speech delivered at

the annual luncheon of the Associated Press on April 22, 1957, Dulles reviled proletarian dictatorship as "despotism," alleging that "those who are subject to it in vast majority, hate the system and yearn for a free society"; the Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists also attacks the state of proletarian dictatorship as so-called "bureaucracy," "bureaucratic statism," and "monopolists," alleging that it "strives to transform the state apparatus into the master of society instead of being its servant and executive agent," stresses so-called "antagonisms" between the socialist state and the masses, and trumpets a crudely distorted theory of "the withering away of the state" in order to undermine proletarian dictatorship in the countries of the camp of socialism.

Again, the imperialists, in order to suppress the workers' movement in their own countries, often smear the Communist Parties in these countries as being "under the domination of a single power, international communism, acting under the direction of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" (Dulles' statement at the Ministerial Council of the Bagdad Pact on January 27, 1958). And in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, Tito also slandered the Marxist parties in various countries as conducting "dependent policies" and being "accustomed to receiving and implementing directives coming from outside." The Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists even tries to induce the workers in the U.S. and some other capitalist countries to renounce the Communist Parties. It alleges that "it is most probable that — in the countries where classical political parties of the working class are practically non-existent, as in the United States, for example—the working people organized in trade unions"

can strengthen "its leading role in the system of government."

Again, the imperialists often attack Marxism-Leninism by making use of so-called "opposition to dogmatism," twaddling that "international communism has become beset with doctrinaire difficulties" and the label communism as "unimaginative" (Dulles' address at annual luncheon of the Associated Press on April 22, 1957) and the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists also does all it can to defame fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism as "dogmas." Preposterously asserting that "Marxist thought in the course of the last few decades has not kept in step with the advance of contemporary society," and that some people "attempt to turn it into a static collection of stale dogmas and abstract truths." The leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists, moreover, style themselves as "uncompromising towards all kinds of dogmatism" and persistently advocate that "the roads leading to socialism differ" in an attempt to negate the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism and the general laws of achieving victories in revolution and construction by the Communist Parties in all countries.

Even more absurd is the fact that Tito showered praise and eulogy on the United States at the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, although all the ferocity of the U.S. imperialists has been exposed in its true colours. According to him, U.S. relations with Yugoslavia are based on "mutual respect, co-operation on an equal basis and non-interference in internal affairs. If there were certain attempts that were not in line with these principles, they usually came from individuals or groups and not from the U.S. Government." In tones of profound gratitude, Tito praised U.S. aid as having helped

Yugoslavia surmount colossal difficulties. It is indeed a "creative exploit," unparalleled in history, that people who style themselves Communists and revolutionaries should, at their Party Congress, pay tribute to the U.S. imperialists—the most ferocious enemy of the people throughout the world. This is presumably the "creative contribution" which the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists often boast they have made to the international communist cause!

The U.S. imperialists have warmly applauded the Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists and its Seventh Congress, C. Burke Elbrick, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, said at a hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate that Tito was "doing a pretty good job." Viewing the recent activities of the Yugoslav Communist League the imperialist press of the United States went into raptures. "The incident illustrates once more Yugoslavia's unique value as an independent centre of attraction in the communist world," said the editorial of the *Christian Science Monitor* on April 24, 1958. "His (Tito's) latest outburst cannot fail to have an upsetting effect on Soviet foreign policy. The West stands to profit from all this," said the U.S. *Newsweek* on May 5, 1958.

The Yugoslav revisionists are very annoyed to hear others say that they are serving the U.S. imperialists. Of course, they will be welcomed if they really come round to a revolutionary standpoint against U.S. imperialism. But they have no intention whatever of changing their stand, though they accuse people who are telling the truth of having "abused" and "insulted" them. Yugoslav papers have recently repeated what Tito said at the Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists showing

stubborn adherence to the revisionist standpoint, that "any expectation in any quarter that we shall renounce our principled stands both in international and in internal matters, is only a loss of time." The modern revisionists have curried favour with the U.S. imperialists by this kind of reactionary stubbornness.

The struggle against modern revisionism has just begun. It is essential that the banner we raise in this serious struggle stands out clearly. We stand firmly on principle and shall carry the struggle to the end. The leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists shall not be allowed to impair the great cause of Marxism-Leninism.

IN REFUTATION OF MODERN REVISIONISM'S REACTIONARY THEORY OF THE STATE

Wang Chia-hsiang

The *Renmin Ribao* editorial "Modern Revisionism Must Be Repudiated" pointed out that one of the fundamental points in modern revisionism, as typified by the programme put forward by the leading group in Yugoslavia, is its substitution of the reactionary theory of the state standing above classes for the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state.

The imperialists have always sought to cover up the nature of the state as a class dictatorship in order to wreck the revolutionary working-class movement. They describe the state under bourgeois dictatorship as "standing above classes," "belonging to the whole people" and "democratic," and slander the state under proletarian dictatorship as "totalitarian" and undermining democracy. Now that socialism and imperialism stand out in sharp contrast, with socialism in the ascendant like the sun rising and imperialism in murky decline, the working people under capitalist rule are turning towards socialism increasingly, the imperialists' lies are more than ever losing their power to deceive and the anti-communist nonsense of the Social Democrats is proving

This article appeared in the June 16 issue of *Hongqi* (Red Flag).

more and more incapable of helping the imperialists. It is at such a time that the Yugoslav revisionists, donning the cloak of Marxism-Leninism, have come forward to serve imperialism, particularly U. S. imperialism, by peddling the bourgeois theory of the state standing above classes, so as to repay U. S. imperialism for its reward of large sums of American dollars.

State power in an imperialist country is a means of serving the handful of monopoly capitalists and exercising dictatorship over the overwhelming majority of the people. Yet the Yugoslav revisionists are at great pains to conceal the dictatorship character of the imperialist state power. They say that in the capitalist world "the state increasingly controls the activities of capital" and "restricts the role of private capital," that "the role of the state as that of a regulator also grows" (Draft Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia) and that "the state is no longer the apparatus of a certain class in capitalist society; it no longer reflects or upholds the special interests of that class" ("Has Capitalism Changed?" by R. I., October 1956 issue of the Yugoslav magazine *The Truth About Us*). Glorifying imperialist state power in such a fashion, are they not toeing the line of the imperialists?

The outstanding feature of our age is the transition from capitalism to socialism. Through revolution in one form or another, the working class must smash the bourgeois state apparatus, set up the proletarian state apparatus and replace bourgeois dictatorship by proletarian dictatorship. Marxist-Leninists, therefore, have always held that seizure of state power is the crucial question in the proletarian revolution. Using sophistry, the Yugoslav revisionists insist that state capitalism in the

capitalist countries is a "factor of socialism," that socialism is taking form within the capitalist system, and that the bourgeois state apparatus is also changing in this direction. Consequently, there is no need for the working class to carry out proletarian revolution, to smash the bourgeois state apparatus or to set up its own state apparatus. They claim that by "exercising incessant pressure" on the bourgeois state apparatus and working to "exert a decisive influence" in it, the working class will be able to "secure the development of socialism." They are spreading this nonsense about "peaceful evolution" from capitalism to socialism in order to create ideological confusion within the ranks of the revolutionary working-class movement, to paralyse, corrode and sap the revolutionary will-power of the working class and Communist Parties in the capitalist countries, and to prevent proletarian revolution. This being so, what trace of Marxism-Leninism do they show, what markings other than those of an accomplice of the imperialists?

Since the Great October Revolution, one-third of mankind has smashed the bourgeois state apparatus and established their own states of proletarian dictatorship. The proletarian dictatorship in these countries is fundamentally different in nature from dictatorship by all exploiting classes. It is the dictatorship of the exploited class, the dictatorship of the many over the few, dictatorship for the building of socialist society free from exploitation of man by man. It is the most progressive, and also the last, dictatorship in human history which is undertaking the greatest and most difficult historic task of eliminating classes, and it is forging ahead in conditions of most complex struggle, along the most tortuous

road ever known in human history. With a history of only forty years, it is impossible for the dictatorship of the proletariat to avoid making some partial mistake or another, in the course of its advance. Whatever the mistakes, since proletarian dictatorship is the system of the people themselves, it will learn from mistakes and correct them by itself. But the Yugoslav revisionists, following the imperialist reactionaries, venomously attack the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. They call the state system of the socialist countries "bureaucracy and bureaucratic statism." They fiercely attack the Communist Parties in the socialist countries for holding the leading position and exercising the leading role in the life of the state and slander direct leadership and supervision by the Communist Parties in these countries over the work of the state as giving rise to "the growth of bureaucracy in the Party" and "statism." A mere glance shows that the weapons used by the Yugoslav revisionists against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries come from the arsenals of the imperialists. It is just because they brandish these antiquated weapons in the name of "Communists," with the status of a "socialist country," and under the cloak of Marxism-Leninism, that they win special approval and plaudits from the U.S. imperialists.

All the classical writings of Marxism-Leninism show that socialist state power is the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e. the proletariat organizing itself as the ruling class. After seizing power, the proletariat must exercise dictatorship through its own state apparatus over the vanquished exploiting classes, carry on the class struggle in the new conditions and solve the problem of whether the socialist road or the capitalist road will win out, so

as to eliminate classes. But the Yugoslav revisionists maintain that socialist state power should not be an instrument of force, should not exercise dictatorship over the class enemy and should not conduct struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads. At the same time, they make no little fuss about the so-called question of democracy, attacking the socialist countries under the pretext of promoting "democracy." Tito has manufactured the pretext that "we are always emphatically against regarding the proletarian dictatorship as mere force," as though there were only dictatorship and no democracy in the socialist countries. Since the class enemy still exists in the period of transition, and there are antagonistic contradictions between them and the proletariat, contradictions between the enemy and ourselves, dictatorship must be exercised if such contradictions are to be resolved. As to democracy, all democracy is merely a form of class rule. Democracy that is divorced from proletarian dictatorship can never be democracy under the socialist system. In essence, bourgeois democracy is dictatorship by the few over the great majority, the working people, while proletarian dictatorship means democracy for the great majority, the working people. Either the enemy wipes us out or vice versa; either bourgeois democracy or proletarian democracy. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a unity of dictatorship and democracy. Comrade Mao Tse-tung once said: "Democracy for the people and dictatorship over the reactionaries, when combined, constitute the people's democratic dictatorship" (*On People's Democratic Dictatorship*); "dictatorship does not apply in the ranks of the people. The people cannot possibly exercise dictatorship over themselves; nor should one section of them

oppress another section"; "under the people's democratic dictatorship, two different methods—dictatorial and democratic—should be used to resolve the two kinds of contradiction of different nature—those between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people." (*On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*) By opposing democracy to dictatorship while chattering about abstract democracy, denying the necessity of dictatorship over the class enemy, the necessity of struggle between the socialist and the capitalist roads, the Yugoslav revisionists are simply trying to create confusion within the socialist countries in co-ordination with the subversive activities conducted against these countries by the imperialist countries.

Under the pretext that Stalin had made individual mistakes on the question of proletarian dictatorship, the Yugoslav revisionists exultantly exaggerated these mistakes to attack the proletarian dictatorship in the socialist countries. It never occurs to them that in doing so they are simply showing their revisionist colours. True, Stalin once made the appraisal that, as a rule, class struggle in the transitional period "grows increasingly acute," and this appraisal interpreted as continuous expansion of the class struggle, can bring detrimental results to the socialist cause. But this does not mean that to correct this mistake one must deny the class struggle in the transitional period, the struggle to decide whether socialism or capitalism will win. The facts show that the class struggle to decide which will win out continues not only throughout the initial stage of the proletarian dictatorship, when capitalist ownership is being eliminated and socialist ownership established, but also, on the political and ideological fronts, after the question of owner-

ship has been completely solved. In the struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism, there are contradictions between the enemy and ourselves and contradictions among the people. Sometimes, of course, the class struggle in the transitional period is tense and at other times relaxed, marked by ups and downs. At one stage, the situation may tend for a while to relaxation after the proletariat wins a round in battle and the class enemy is forced to retreat. But the class enemy is never resigned to extinction and will, in given conditions, launch fresh attacks on socialism. These ups and downs in the class struggle will repeat themselves many times over a period. Nevertheless, with the advance of the socialist revolution and socialist construction, the general trend is towards the gradual weakening of the class struggle till it dies out. The Yugoslav revisionists deny this objective law and spread the slander that the socialist countries aggravate the social contradictions by means of the power of the state. What interpretation can be placed on this other than that they are helping the imperialists and opposing proletarian dictatorship and the elimination of classes?

The Yugoslav revisionists particularly attack as the source of all evils, the democratic centralism practised in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. They deceitfully drag in the experience of the "Paris Commune" and distort the lessons drawn from it by Karl Marx as being the elimination of centralism. This is an insult to Marx and to the French proletariat who raised the banner of the Paris Commune. As Lenin said, "there is no departure whatever from centralism" in Marx's summing up of the experience of the Paris Commune. (Lenin: *The State and Revolution*) In the socialist coun-

tries it is democracy, i.e. democratic centralism, not dictatorship, that is practised among the people. Among the people, democracy and centralism, decentralization and centralization of power — these are unities of opposites. Democracy means democracy under centralized guidance, not extreme democratization; centralism means centralism based on democracy, not absolute centralization. Decentralization means apportionment of power under unified leadership, not anarchy; centralization means concentration of power on the basis of bringing into play the activity and initiative of the lower organizations and the rank and file, not absolute centralization which restricts and hampers this activity and initiative. It is wrong to emphasize one aspect to the denial of the other. True, over-centralization or over-decentralization may occur in the course of socialist construction owing to lack of experience. But this is only a question of how democratic centralism is applied, not an inevitable result of proletarian dictatorship. In slandering centralism in the proletarian states, the Yugoslav revisionists merely reveal their ulterior motives in attacking the socialist countries. As to the so-called “social self-government,” which they assert to be an absolute boon, it is enough to quote what Engels said: “It is absurd to speak of the principle of authority as being absolutely evil, and of the principle of autonomy as being absolutely good.” (Engels: *On Authority*) And, as Engels pointed out, whoever sticks to this absurd concept is actually serving the reactionaries.

The Yugoslav revisionists are particularly energetic in attacking the management of economic affairs by the socialist state. According to them, if the proletarian state authority manages the national economy, the state be-

comes a means of hamstringing the development of socialism. This is extraordinary logic. Has there ever existed a state that does not manage economic affairs? So long as the state exists it must manage economic affairs in one way or another. The queerest part of the logic is this — when the Yugoslav revisionists talk about the tightening of economic control exercised by the state authority in the imperialist countries they see nothing wrong in this. On the contrary, they spare no words to eulogize and glorify this as a “factor of socialism.” Yet when they come to the economic control exercised by the state authority in the socialist countries, they roundly condemn it and smear it as “the source of bureaucracy and bureaucratic statism.” Is this not revealing as to the reactionary nature of the Yugoslav revisionists’ attack on state management of the economy in the socialist countries? In the classical works of Marxism-Leninism it is pointed out, time and again, that the proletarian state, as the representative of society, must organize the socialist economy. Why must the proletarian state manage the economy? The reasons are: 1 — to wage the struggle between the two roads to secure the triumph of the socialist road over the capitalist road; 2 — to carry through the class line and the class policies of the proletariat in all economic work; and 3 — taking the interests of the whole country and all the people into consideration, to ensure the planned, proportionate development of the socialist national economy in accordance with the objective laws of socialist economic development. Precisely as a result of planned state management of the national economy, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have made tremendous achievements in their economic construction. It goes without

saying that in the state management of the economy there should be a proper division of function and coordination between the central and local authorities. Unified control and planning by the central authorities must be correctly linked with the activity and initiative of the local authorities and the masses. But whatever the way in which the central and local authorities divide their work of economic management, and however the working people play their part in this management, this is a question of concrete forms of economic management. It is not a question of whether to abolish the proletarian state's function of economic management. What meaning can there be in the Yugoslav revisionists' talk about abolishing the economic function of the proletarian state? Apart from its trickery to mislead people, it simply means undermining and abolishing the economic foundations of the proletarian state, i.e. socialist ownership by the whole people; doing away with planned economy; throwing overboard the proletarian class line and class policy of socialist economic development; abolishing the unified leadership and supervision which the proletariat exercises over the socialist economy through the Communist Party and the state apparatus; restoring capitalist methods of administration and management; and preserving and restoring freedom for the bourgeoisie to facilitate its comeback.

In repudiating the Yugoslav revisionist theory of the state it is necessary to touch on the contradictions within socialist society. Some of our comrades at one time held that in socialist society there were no contradictions between the relations of production and productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic base; and so they denied the existence of contradictions among the

people in socialist society, or contradictions between the people's government as the apparatus of the state power and the masses. This was a metaphysical viewpoint. If this viewpoint guides national construction in the socialist countries, it is impossible to overcome these contradictions in good time, to make the socialist relations of production conform better to the growth of the productive forces and the socialist state structure conform better to the development of the economic base; and it becomes impossible to further develop the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state in the light of the rich experience gathered from practice. But the Yugoslav revisionists regard the contradictions within socialist society as primarily those between the state power and the working people; they then allege that these contradictions are antagonistic and maintain that the existence of the state is the source of these antagonistic contradictions. In fact, contrary to the Yugoslav revisionist nonsense, the antagonistic contradictions which exist in the socialist countries are those between the masses of the people led by the proletariat and their class enemies who oppose socialism. It is not that proletarian dictatorship breeds antagonistic contradictions, but that proletarian dictatorship is necessary to resolve them. To attack the socialist countries, the Yugoslav revisionists mix up contradictions among the people in the socialist countries with contradictions between ourselves and the enemy; they also mix up contradictions in the socialist system with those in the capitalist social system. Comrade Mao Tse-tung, in his essay *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, creatively developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state. He pointed out that the internal contradictions in the socialist system of society are

fundamentally different from those in the capitalist system of society. In socialist society, contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic base, are non-antagonistic. The people's government representing the people's interests and the masses of the people are united as one. By contrast, irreconcilable and antagonistic class contradictions exist between a government of the exploiting class and the people. The contradictions between the people's government and the masses are those within the ranks of the people; underlying them is the basic identity of the interests of the people; and therefore they are non-antagonistic. They can be overcome and resolved by the socialist system itself. By magnifying them and labelling them antagonistic contradictions, the Yugoslav revisionists serve no purpose other than to besmirch proletarian dictatorship.

For the purpose of attacking the socialist countries, the Yugoslav revisionists, on grounds of their own fabrication, describe the socialist state system as the source of "bureaucracy" and maintain that as long as the socialist state system exists, bureaucracy will "continue to manifest itself as a tendency." Everyone knows that bureaucracy is a product of the state apparatus of exploiting class rule. The bureaucracy that exists in the Party and state organizations in a socialist country is a hang-over from the old society rather than a product of the socialist system or of the Communist Party. Such bureaucracy is totally incompatible with the political party of the working class and with the socialist state system. The history of proletarian dictatorship proves that only the socialist state system can effectively overcome bureaucracy; because only it can bring into full

play the initiative and activity of the masses, and only when this is done can there be elimination of bureaucracy, a product of the influence of the old society. In other words, the conquest of bureaucracy demands reliance on the masses and resolute struggle against the influence of bourgeois ideology. This struggle needs on the one hand leadership from above to help the government functionaries carry out continuous ideological remoulding, to correct their erroneous ways of thinking and doing things and to improve their methods of work; on the other hand, the struggle requires mobilization of the masses from the bottom up, the raising of their cultural level and political consciousness, the application of effective mass supervision over the state organs, and leading the masses to fight against bureaucracy. Our country's experience also gives proof of this point. In the nation-wide rectification campaign, we have found the method suited to the conditions of our country, during which we mobilize the masses fully to practise criticism and self-criticism, according to the "unity — criticism — unity" formula, by encouraging a full and frank airing of views, great debates and the posting of *tatsepao*.* As a result, the democratic life of our socialist society has achieved a mighty leap forward. Here we may well ask: Dare the Yugoslav revisionists practise democracy on so broad a scale?

The Yugoslav revisionists also attack the leading role of the Communist Parties in the socialist countries. They deny that the Communist Party is the highest form of organization of the working class and, on the pretext of opposing "a fusion of the organizations of Communists

* Opinions and criticisms written in bold Chinese characters on large sheets of paper, publicly posted for all to see. — Ed.

with the state apparatus," insist that it is not right for the Party to exercise direct leadership and supervision over the state. They maintain that the inevitable outcome of "an ever closer merging of the Party and state apparatus" is the "growth of bureaucracy" in the Party. Lenin's doctrine on Party building stresses that the Communist Party is the highest form of organization of the working class and only the political party of the working class, that is, the Communist Party, can give political leadership to the proletariat and, through the proletariat, unite all the working masses to carry out proletarian dictatorship; "without this the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible." (Lenin: *Preliminary Draft of the Resolution of the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party on the Syndicalist and Anarchist Deviation in Our Party*) This truth has been borne out by practice in the socialist states. The primary lesson taught by the history of proletarian dictatorship is that the proletarian cause of revolution and construction cannot advance a step without a Communist Party that takes Marxism-Leninism as its guide to action, builds itself on the principle of democratic centralism, establishes close ties with the masses, strives to become the very heart of the working people and educates its members and the masses of the people in Marxism-Leninism. In the course of socialist revolution and socialist construction, the Party must play the leading role, as regards both the general line and policy of building socialism and the line and policy for the socialist state; there must therefore be no separation between the Party and the government. It would be absolutely wrong to separate the Party from the government and thus leave the government outside the leadership of the Communist Party. Of course, the

Party and the government must do their work in different ways; the Party does not have to take on the routine work of the government organizations. But in all circumstances, the fundamental guarantee that the countries of our socialist camp will unite the people to vanquish the enemy is the strengthening of leadership by the Communist Party in the cause of socialism and over the organs of the state. The Yugoslav revisionists flagrantly reject Lenin's doctrine on Party building and do their utmost to attack the Communist Parties of the socialist countries; yet they still call themselves communists to parade before and deceive people. What impudence!

Externally, the leading group in Yugoslavia follows a foreign policy of praising the United States and slandering the Soviet Union which suits the needs of the imperialists; internally, it follows a policy of dispensing with the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads, undermining the economic foundations of socialism and allowing capitalist relations and the American way of life to overrun the country freely. These are clear indications of the degeneration and betrayal on the part of the leading group in Yugoslavia. In this way, an irreconcilable contradiction arises between this leading group and the Yugoslav people. The leading group in Yugoslavia has neither the desire nor the courage to take down their signboard of "socialists" and "communists" altogether; for if they did, they would encounter strong opposition from the Yugoslav people, their usefulness as saboteurs of the socialist camp would come to an end and they would no longer receive rewards from the U.S. imperialists. This is why they go on, as the Chinese saying puts it, selling dog's meat under a sheep's head,

trying to get rewards from the imperialists while endeavouring to hoodwink the people at home and smooth away their discontent, and cover up their degeneration and betrayal. This is also why they have patched up many Marxist phrases into their hocus-pocus theory of the "withering away of the state."

This out-and-out revisionist theory of the withering away of the state argues that it is necessary for the role of the state under proletarian dictatorship to wither away in all fields of social life; but in actual fact, it aims to "wither away" the function of the socialist state in the exercise of dictatorship over the class enemy, the system of democratic centralism among the people, the role of the state in managing the socialist economy, and the leading role of the Communist Party in the state. In short, what they hope to wither away is socialism and communism. In their opinion, if the socialist countries fail to do this, it means "pragmatic revision" in the theory of the withering away of the state, and will give rise to "manifestations of bureaucratic-statist tendencies" and "fetter the development of social and economic factors." But, if the socialist countries really do as they suggest, it will simply facilitate the imperialist sabotage and subversive activities against the socialist countries, it will simply lead to a repetition of the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary and the restoration of capitalism. This indeed is the real motive behind the efforts by the modern revisionists of Yugoslavia to sell abroad the theory of the "withering away of the state."

It is reasonable to ask how this out-and-out anti-Marxist-Leninist theory of the "withering away of the state" is applied inside Yugoslavia. There, the main apparatus of the state — the police, the law courts, the

armed forces and the other punitive organs — so far from being weakened and withered away, are being greatly strengthened. As the Yugoslav leading group wants to maintain and consolidate its dictatorial rule, it is using the state apparatus to oppress those in opposition. Last year, more than thirty thousand Yugoslav workers (constituting 4.3 per cent of all the workers in the country) were victimized and expelled for criticizing the leadership. Reuter reported recently that mass arrests are being made in Yugoslavia of people opposed to the reactionary policies of the leading group. At the same time, the leading group is trying to deceive the people with such stuff as "social self-government" and "workers' self-government," falsely claiming that the state is in the course of "withering away." In fact, its perverted measures have driven the socialist cause of the Yugoslav people to the dangerous brink of "withering away." For home consumption, the modern revisionists' theory of the "withering away of the state" is nothing but a fig-leaf to cover up their degeneration and betrayal.

We Chinese Communists, like other Marxists throughout the world, genuinely advocate the theory of the withering away of the state. Basing himself on Marxist-Leninist theory, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said that the conditions for the withering away of the state are, internally, the elimination of classes and class influence and, externally, the elimination of the imperialist system. As the internal class struggle grows gradually weaker until it finally dies out, the suppressive function of the state will naturally diminish and move in the direction of withering away. This is a long-term, natural course of development. At the same time, the external conditions should not be overlooked; moreover,

external and internal conditions act on each other. Lenin said: "The economic basis for the complete withering away of the state is such a high stage of development of communism that the antithesis between mental and physical labour disappears when there, consequently, disappears one of the principal sources of modern social inequality — a source, moreover, which cannot on any account be removed immediately by the mere conversion of the means of production into public property, by the mere expropriation of the capitalists." (Lenin: *The State and Revolution*) Therefore, the duration of the process during which the state withers away "depends upon the rapidity of development of the higher phase of communism." (*Ibid.*) There is nothing in common between the Marxist-Leninist theory of the withering away of the state and the reactionary fallacy of the Yugoslav revisionists concerning the withering away of the state.

While harping on their so-called theory of the "withering away of the state," the Yugoslav revisionists centre their attack on Stalin by means of every venomous invective at their disposal. They vilify Stalin for making a "pragmatic revision" in the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state and turning the Marxist-Leninist theory of the withering away of the state into the thesis that the state "does not wither away, but keeps strengthening in all fields of social life." The rich experience of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Communist Party in proletarian dictatorship and in building the socialist state is of world significance. Stalin was entirely correct in setting forth the functions of the state in regard to suppression, economic management and the education of the small producers, and also in saying that the withering

away of the state will begin with the natural and gradual withering away of the function of suppression, while the economic function will go on as a social function. As the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party has pointed out, he was mistaken on some particular aspects of the question of the state, yet Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist, a staunch, indomitable fighter in the struggles against the enemy. The modern revisionists of Yugoslavia, who have become traitors to the working class, are utterly incapable of making a fair and just appraisal of Stalin. They make the calumny that a so-called "rule of one man" was practised in the Soviet Union. To this we may answer in Lenin's words: "To contrast, in general, dictatorship of the masses to dictatorship of the leaders is ridiculously absurd and stupid. What is particularly curious is that actually, new leaders are put forth (under cover of the slogan: 'Down with the leaders!') who talk unnatural stuff and nonsense." (Lenin: *"Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder*) The new leader that the Yugoslav revisionists want to put forth is no other than a new Bernstein who has betrayed Marxism-Leninism and capitulated to U.S. imperialism.

From what has been said above, it is clear that the fallacies of the Yugoslav revisionists concerning the nature of the bourgeois state, the transition from capitalism to socialism, the nature and functions of the socialist state and the "withering away" of the state are out-and-out reactionary. We must resolutely smash this revisionism in order to defend the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state.

**THE MORE THEY TRY TO HIDE, THE MORE
THEY ARE EXPOSED**

— ON TITO'S SPEECH OF JUNE 15 —

“Renmin Ribao” Commentator

Tito delivered a speech on June 15 at Labin. Aside from new slanders against the Communist Parties of various countries, this speech provided no answer whatever to the serious criticisms and repudiations of Yugoslav revisionism they have made. Tito was completely silent on such basic questions as: On what grounds did the League of Communists of Yugoslavia betray the Peace Manifesto it signed, and put forward entirely contrary viewpoints about the international situation in its programme? What made it necessary for the League of Communists of Yugoslavia to defame in its programme and at its Congress the socialist system and glorify the capitalist system, to attack the Soviet Union, the socialist countries and the Communist Parties of various countries, to attack the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam Agreements while defending and lauding U.S. imperialism, the common enemy of all the peoples of the world? When the socialist countries were exerting every effort to improve their rela-

This commentary appeared in *Renmin Ribao* on June 26, 1958. In addition to the commentary, the same issue of *Renmin Ribao* published the full text of Tito's Labin speech of June 15.

tions with Yugoslavia (in fact such efforts continued right up to the eve of the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav Communist League, and the Hungarian-Yugoslav talks, for instance, were held in March 1958), why was the Yugoslav Communist League so keen on repaying good with evil?

No doubt there are reasons for this. But it is difficult to state them. So the only explanation Tito could offer to the Yugoslav people was that the Communist Parties of other countries oppose the programme of the Yugoslav Communist League not because it is an out-and-out revisionist and anti-Marxist-Leninist programme, but because of certain schemes organized long ago, because the Yugoslav Communist League refused to participate in the meeting of the Communist Parties of twelve countries and in the socialist camp, and because, getting to the root of the problem, it is “against division of the world into camps.” In this way, it seemed as if all arguments of principle concerning their revisionist programme could be written off at one stroke.

This is precisely the characteristic tactic of all opportunists.

But this method of Tito's, to evade the point at issue, has not been successful. The principle at issue still cannot be avoided and to cover the matter up by “stuffing the ears while stealing a bell” only makes it more obvious. The Yugoslav Communist League refused to participate in the meeting of Communist Parties of twelve nations, but dressing this up as an explanation doesn't help Tito in any way. Why should Tito tear up the agreement he endorsed at the Bucharest talks? Why doesn't Tito say a word about this question which was put to him by Comrade Khrushchov in Sofia? Of course it is sheer nonsense for Tito to allege that Yugoslav refusal to par-

participate in the socialist camp is the main reason why the Communist Parties of various countries are struggling against revisionism. Non-participation in the socialist camp does not make it necessary to give revisionism wide publicity and to launch an all-out attack against the socialist countries. In any case it is curious that a country calling itself a socialist state should refuse to line up with the socialist countries, to stand explicitly on the anti-imperialist side, should place the imperialist countries and the socialist countries on the same footing and keep the same distance from each and maintain the same "co-operation" with them. What pretext on earth can they find to justify themselves?

"We are against division of the world into camps."

"In the present tense international situation it is more useful to pursue a constructive peaceful policy, together with other peace-loving countries which also do not belong to any bloc, rather than to enter the camp and thereby aggravate even more the already tense situation in the world."

"We consider that relations of co-operation must be established with all countries, and not limit ourselves to two camps, which will clash and because of which war might one day break out."

What a typical voice of a traitor! How similar the statement "against division of the world into camps. . ." sounds to the statement "against division of society into classes" repentantly made by deserters from the Communist Party who have surrendered to the enemy! Since a number of imperialist countries and a number of socialist countries exist in the world at the same time, the existence of camps is inevitable. Even the nations striving for independence, such as those in North Africa and

the Near East, have formed ties of association in one way or another on certain basis. This historic inevitability does not change in accordance with the subjective desire of Tito or any other person. It is true that the imperialist countries cannot possibly unite as one, but this does not mean that all the socialist countries, which are struggling for the common interests and ideals of the international proletariat, should fail to rally together closely. The socialist camp and the imperialist camp are diametrically opposed in nature and cannot be mentioned in the same breath. The comradely solidarity that exists among the socialist countries is not possible between capitalist countries, and this is precisely one of the important factors that make the victory of socialism inevitable. The countries in the socialist camp have insisted throughout on the dissolution of all military blocs and on peaceful co-existence with all capitalist countries. But why is it necessary to break our own unity in order to disband the military blocs and bring about co-existence? Isn't the truth exactly contrary to this? According to Tito's logic, participation of the socialist countries in the socialist camp will aggravate world tension while non-participation of the socialist countries in the socialist camp will ease the world situation. According to that logic, the more countries in which socialism is victorious, the more inevitable war becomes. And in order to bring about a thorough easing of the world situation and to avert war, it is of course necessary for all socialist countries to refrain from participating in the socialist camp and to disband that camp. Before World War II, however, there was certainly no socialist camp. Why then did Hitler Germany launch an aggressive war against the Soviet Union? Was this "owing to Stalin's inflexible and uncalled

for threatening foreign policy" which made the Hitlerites "unable to accomplish their aims by diplomatic means"? Wasn't Yugoslavia invaded by Hitler in April 1941 when it had not even put up the signboard of socialism? Tito has completely ignored these basic facts and alleges that in order to obtain peace, we must keep away from any association opposed by the imperialists. In this, Tito not only lacks the slightest semblance of a communist but also lacks the slightest semblance of a nationalist revolutionary opposed to imperialism.

The argument Tito spreads that if the socialist countries rally together this will create tension and war danger, translated into simple language, actually means this: Working people, oppressed people, revolutionaries, socialists, you must never split the world into camps, never "limit" yourselves to camps! You should establish "relations of co-operation" with all political forces (never mind what forces)! This will be to your great benefit. This, according to the programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists, is the Yugoslav-type "policy of active co-existence." It is "an expression of the powerful development of the productive forces which has brought about the actual inter-connection of the whole world, the close inter-dependence of the economies of different countries. This policy expresses the objective needs of the contemporary world for the broadest economic co-operation as well as for comprehensive cultural, scientific and other co-operation. The policy of active co-existence, accordingly, also creates the necessary pre-conditions for the integration of the world economy. And one of the goals of socialism must be the economic unity of the world." This is all very nice. But if you are ignorant of the present state of affairs and don't break up your unity, the situa-

tion will become tense. And, what is supremely important is that once conflict breaks out (which is unavoidable if the camps are retained!) you cannot hope to keep out of the trouble!

We do not intend to discuss here the stand of various types of neutralists. Many peaceful, neutral countries, far from having engaged in sabotage against the socialist countries, have, on the contrary, formed good relations with them. They can, therefore, have full confidence in the friendship of the socialist countries in their struggle to safeguard peace, resist aggression and develop their own national economies. In contrast to the neutralists in general, the Tito elements, having put out the signboard of Marxism-Leninism and a socialist country, mix in the ranks of the international proletariat to corrode, disintegrate and subvert. This has forced us to show them up firmly in their true colours. Some people say: "Why is it necessary to drive Tito to the side of the imperialists?" But the present facts show that Tito persists in his revisionist, pro-imperialist stand not because he has been driven to do so. Moreover, it appears that in any event he will not give up his neutralist or socialist signboard and go directly over to the side of imperialism without pretences, because he "knows" how to hold on to his bargaining position. Therefore, no good to the cause of socialism will come from worrying about his going over to the West and so relaxing the efforts to expose him. Similarly, to be afraid to "embitter" imperialism and thus not to rally the forces of peace and not to expose the machinations of the warmongers will do no good to the cause of peace.

Now, to return to the question of peace: We have at all times taken the view that peace must be defended

resolutely and that it can be defended. But this can be achieved only if all the forces of peace unite and wage a staunch struggle against the machinations of the war-plotters. Here the question is not only that war must be firmly opposed. It should also be made clear that the people really have the strength to overcome the threat of war. The people should be called on to prepare, should the war maniacs force war on them, to use their united strength to wipe out all aggressors, and eradicate imperialism, which breeds war. Without this determination, it would be impossible to prevent war and the people would be thrown into panic and dismay should the aggressors venture to unleash war. But what is the road that Tito and his followers have indicated to the peoples of various countries? To try to make people "clear the snow away only from their own doorsteps," as the Chinese saying goes, they threaten them with the danger of war; they call for the dissolution of the unity of all the forces of socialism, of all the anti-imperialist and anti-war forces; they call on the peoples to co-operate with the U.S. and all other imperialists, in order to bring about "the integration of the world" and build up "socialism"! Any objective observer can readily see that the stand of the Tito elements cannot safeguard world peace, nor offer any support to the struggle of Korea and Viet-nam, or of Egypt, Syria, Indonesia, Algeria and the Lebanon, against aggression.

In his efforts to confuse right and wrong still further, Tito has gone so far as to mix up arbitrarily his own surrender policy with the peace policy of the Soviet Union. He even compares U.S. aid to Yugoslavia with the relief given by the U.S. to the famine in the Soviet Union in 1921. What was the situation in 1921? Even under the

extremely difficult conditions at that time, the Soviet Government waged a firm struggle against the U.S. relief administration, headed by Hoover, which had obvious political designs, and prevented U.S. relief activities from getting out of the control of the Soviet Government. At that time, Lenin described the extreme ferocity of the imperialists who took advantage of the famine in the Soviet Union to carry out anti-Soviet activities, in these words: "I don't know whether the devil is more terrible than modern imperialism." Precisely because the Soviet Union, adopting a revolutionary proletarian attitude towards the imperialist states, never entertained any illusion of relying on the imperialist states, the imperialists have all along regarded the Soviet Union as a thorn in their side. The imperialists have done everything possible to oppose and disrupt the Soviet Union and have stubbornly rejected the various proposals put forward by the Soviet Union to relax international tension. But what is the attitude of Tito and his ilk to U.S. aid? Tito openly eulogizes U.S. wheat and dollars, and takes pride in the fact that he "knows" how to depend for ever on U.S. aid to "safeguard independence" and "build socialism." Similarly, the U.S. imperialists also take pride in the fact that they "know" how to disrupt the cause of socialism with their aid to Yugoslavia. Tito said: "The Americans do not give us assistance so that socialism might triumph in Yugoslavia." But the question is not so simple. Eisenhower made it very clear on the 18th of this month that he would "give any kind of aid to Soviet bloc countries which would contribute to the weakening of the bloc's solidarity." Have the Americans fulfilled their aims then? Evidently, whether it was during the uprising of the counter-revolutionary Nagy group in

Hungary in 1956, or in the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists and the programme it adopted, or in the so-called protest made by Yugoslavia following the recent verdict on the counter-revolutionary Nagy group in Hungary, the Tito elements acted as the anti-Soviet and anti-communist vanguard for the imperialist reactionaries. Nonetheless, Tito still persists in stating that he has never set himself against the Soviet Union, that he has never supported imperialism, and, what is more, that his policy is the same as the policy of the Soviet Union. To use Tito's own words, this is "the height of cynicism"!

In his speech Tito frantically attacked the Chinese Communist Party. For us, this is merely a cause for pride. The ancient Chinese poet Chu Yuan expressed it well: "How can the square exactly fit the circle? With views opposed, who can live in harmony?" The struggle of Marxist-Leninists against the revisionists is unavoidable and it is the praise of revisionists or imperialists that is to be dreaded. The criticism that the Chinese Communists made of the Yugoslav revisionists has obviously hit them where it hurts. Since they could find no way to stir up nationalist hatred among the people on pretexts deriving from past Sino-Yugoslav relations, they were compelled to cook up some particularly preposterous — and therefore particularly clumsy — lies in their fight. Tito said that we criticized them because we were bothered by their "peaceable policy, policy of peace, policy of co-existence," because we were opposed to the relaxation of world tension and thus occupied "the same platform as the most reactionary warmongering elements in the West." But one may ask: If we, rather than Tito, are standing on the side of the warmongers, how is it

that the most reactionary warmongers in the West, such as Dulles, are in no way "bothered" about Tito's "peaceable policy, policy of peace, policy of co-existence" and have even rewarded it handsomely? Tito said further that we oppose revisionism because we have encountered internal difficulties and are in need of some sort of loan. This is really a good example of "talking about one's own trade at the outset of a conversation," as the Chinese saying goes! A dwarf kneeling in a muddy pond can try as desperately as possible to spit at a giant on a high mountain, but he will find his saliva falling back on his own face. Those few utterances of Tito's provide a superb sketch of the very features of the Tito elements.

Tito's painstakingly prepared speech consists of so many lies that they are too numerous to be refuted. He said that we had not made public any of their materials. This is perhaps the most stupid of these lies. We do not consider it necessary for the socialist press to publish long-winded tirades by revisionists, but still facts are facts. In 1956, we published the full texts of Tito's notorious Pula speech and Kardelj's speech before parliament. Not long ago we published the full texts of the two draft programmes of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, and now we have printed the full text of Tito's speech delivered at Labin, while the Yugoslav press has rarely published full texts of our articles. But Tito still brags that "it is obvious that we are morally much superior to them."

Tito boasted that the Yugoslav people were one with him and issued slanders from many angles to sow dissension between the Yugoslav people and the peoples of the socialist countries. But he cannot explain why the Yugoslav state organs of force, which are supposed to

have been "withering away" for a long time, suddenly arrested a large number of true Communists recently. Of course while the imperialists can still keep a group of labour aristocrats at home and abroad, these aristocrats can still carry out their activities to a considerable extent and there are still people who pin their hopes on them. But the sun is setting in the West. Do the Tito elements and all other revisionists who look to the West have any bright future?

現代修正主義必須批判

*

外文出版社出版(北京)

1958年7月第1版

編号: (英)3050-103

PEKING REVIEW

THE WEEKLY MAGAZINE OF CHINESE
NEWS AND VIEWS IN ENGLISH

北 Gives You

京

❖ News

周

❖ Theoretical Articles

報

❖ Political, Economic and
Cultural Trends

❖ Documents and Statistics

You can get a Free Sample Copy by writing directly to:

PEKING REVIEW

Pai Wan Chuang, Peking (37)

PHOTO
REF. 111



