

MARXIST-LENINISTS, UNITE!

Resolution of the Brussels Federal Committee of
the Belgian Communist Party (August 15, 1963)

A Reply to the "Open Letter" of the
C.C., C.P.S.U. of July 14, 1963

50 pages 18.5 × 13 cm.

Published by

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

Pai Wan Chuang, Peking (37), China

Distributed by

GUOZI SHUDIAN

China Publications Centre

P.O. Box 399, Peking, China

Jacques Grippa

"THEORY" AND PRACTICE OF THE MODERN REVISIONISTS

A SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE HIGHER PARTY SCHOOL
OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST
PARTY OF CHINA

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

Jacques Grippa

“THEORY” AND PRACTICE OF
THE MODERN REVISIONISTS

A SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE HIGHER PARTY SCHOOL
OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF CHINA, JUNE 10, 1964

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1965

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This speech of Jacques Grippa, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium, was made during his visit in China in 1964. The present English translation has been made from the French text published in Supplement No. 26 to the June 26, 1964 issue of *La Voix du Peuple*, organ of the Communist Party of Belgium.

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

REVISIONIST BETRAYAL	1
UNITY OF MARXIST-LENINISTS	2
ESSENCE OF MODERN REVISIONISM	3
CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE IMPERIALIST CAMP AND THE SOCIALIST CAMP	6
CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE OPPRESSED NATIONS AND IMPERIALISM	7
CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE PROLETARIAT AND THE BOURGEOISIE	11
BOURGEOIS NATIONALIZATION	15
BOURGEOIS DICTATORSHIP AND MODERN REVISIONISM	17
INTERNAL CONTRADICTIONS OF REVISIONISM	22
IMMEDIATE DEMANDS AND SOCIALIST REVOLUTION	24
REVISIONISM AGAINST PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP	26
CONTRADICTIONS AMONG IMPERIALISTS, AMONG MONOPOLISTS	28
THE STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE	30
REVISIONISTS AND U.S. IMPERIALISM	32
THE REVISIONISTS PRACTISE NUCLEAR BLACKMAIL AND OPPOSE THE EFFECTIVE STRUGGLE TO PREVENT WORLD WAR	34
THE REVISIONISTS' HATEFUL ATTACKS ON MARXIST- LENINISTS AND THE PEOPLES	37
REVISIONISM IN BELGIUM	38
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM REBUILDS ITSELF ON THE BASIS OF MARXISM-LENINISM	45
MARXIST-LENINISTS, UNITE!	49

Comrades:

Permit me to convey to you the fraternal greetings of the Communists of Belgium and express their admiration for the outstanding firmness of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party in the struggle for socialist construction in your country, in the struggle to carry the socialist revolution to the end, in the struggle to oppose imperialist aggression and the export of counter-revolution, and to avert a world war,

— their admiration for the exemplary resoluteness of the Chinese Communist Party in carrying out an active policy of proletarian internationalism, in exposing modern revisionism, the main danger in the present-day international communist movement,

— their admiration for the Chinese Communist Party for its skilled application of Marxism-Leninism under the concrete conditions of our times.

The Communists of Belgium highly appreciate the ideological aid which the Chinese Communist Party has given to the Marxist-Leninists of all countries, to the international communist movement.

REVISIONIST BETRAYAL

The international situation is excellent for the revolutionary forces. The general crisis of capitalism is deepening but at the same time, the aggressiveness of imperial-

ism, its evil deeds, its crimes and its manifold plots are also on the increase.

In these circumstances, the revisionists are acting as auxiliaries of imperialism.

They are stepping up their manoeuvres to divide the socialist camp, to split the international communist movement and the Communist Parties.

They want to smother the revolutionary movement for national liberation.

They try to disarm the working class in the capitalist countries, and drag them into the quagmire of neo-reformism.

They want to hold back the proletariat from fulfilling its historic mission of overthrowing the capitalist social order and carrying through the socialist revolution.

They try to smash proletarian internationalism. They especially want to place the working class in capitalist countries in opposition to the revolutionary struggle for liberation of the oppressed peoples and nations and make them collaborate with imperialism, first of all, with U.S. imperialism, the main bulwark of colonialism of today.

This is how they have slid down the slippery slope of class collaboration into racism!

The speed of their degeneration reflects the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism.

UNITY OF MARXIST-LENINISTS

But the Marxist-Leninists of all continents have strengthened their ideological unity and their ability to combat imperialism and its agents. They are united like the fingers of a hand.

Our presence here, at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, is itself evidence of this, modest evidence, it is true, but significant, nevertheless.

The talks which we have had with several comrades of the leadership of your Party have enabled us to make a very deep examination of the various aspects of our common struggle. These talks have been of great use to us and very instructive. They have shown the complete identity of our views.

ESSENCE OF MODERN REVISIONISM

It is impossible to carry on an effective struggle against imperialism without denouncing and defeating reformism and revisionist neo-reformism.

Lenin once pointed out that revisionism is "vague, indistinct, and imperceptible". We are familiar with the nebulous and confused talk of the revisionists, their high-sounding phrases devoid of sense, their distortion of facts, their lies and their slanders against us. But we must uncover the content of their "theory" and practice.

The essence of modern revisionism is the same as that of reformism and classical revisionism: that is, it is the theory and practice of class collaboration.

One of its characteristic aspects, an important one in its present-day manifestations, is to be seen in the domestic and foreign policies of the revisionist Khrushchov group.

To Khrushchov, everything must be arranged around a monstrous edifice based on class collaboration. One of the mainstays of this edifice is big-power chauvinism in

regard to the socialist countries and the revolutionary peoples and classes the world over. The other mainstay is "all-round co-operation" with U.S. imperialism, the biggest international exploiter and principal force of aggression and war.

And the keystone of that edifice is nuclear blackmail.

Like all political conceptions based on the doctrine of class collaboration, modern revisionism opposes the historical development of human society. Therefore, it must deny the facts and objective reality.

While dialectical materialism is, for us Marxist-Leninists, our world outlook and our method of study and cognition, the revisionists use subjective idealism and eclecticism. They practise pragmatism and are characterized by their complete changes of front.

Thus it is bad luck for those who follow the baton. By attempting at all costs to justify the pirouettes and disavowals of their ringleader, they discredit themselves in the eyes of the masses.

In 1963, the Moscow tripartite treaty concerning nuclear monopoly was glorified as a great victory for peace, but only a few weeks ago, this U.S.-British scheme was deservedly denounced.

U.S. imperialism is increasing the number of its underground tests and constantly reinforcing its nuclear arsenal.

But when China and other threatened socialist countries wish to have their own means of defence, that is a crime!

On many occasions, especially at the end of 1961, the Berlin question had to be settled at all costs in a matter of weeks. But since then, it seems there is no hurry. . . .

The Khrushchov group installed missiles in Cuba — Marxist-Leninists did not ask them to do so. Then they removed these missiles — Marxist-Leninists did not oppose that. But for the revisionists, this is a great feat and the wish to impose a violation of the sovereignty of Cuba and to change Cuba into a second Congo is a great victory!

For many years, they claimed that their ideas of "genius" in the field of agriculture would produce miracles. Today in the face of the agricultural disasters they have caused in the countries which suffered under these policies, the revisionists are commending — U.S. methods of capitalist exploitation of the countryside!

Back in 1960, Khrushchov signed the Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties unanimously condemning Yugoslav revisionism in the following terms:

The Communist Parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist "theories" in concentrated form. After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist programme to the Declaration of 1957; they set the L.C.Y. against the international communist movement as a whole, severed their country from the socialist camp, made it dependent on so-called "aid" from U.S. and other imperialists, and thereby exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through a heroic struggle. The Yugoslav revisionists carry on subversive work against the socialist camp and the world communist movement. Under the pretext of an extra-bloc policy

they engage in activities which prejudice the unity of all the peace-loving forces and countries. Further exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists and active struggle to safeguard the communist movement and the working-class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists, remains an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist Parties.

Since then, the Yugoslav revisionists have persisted and have gone further and further along the road of betrayal. Meanwhile Khrushchov and those who follow him are openly adopting the positions of the Tito group. They side with them and sing their praises, but those Marxist-Leninists who persist in considering as "an essential task" the "further exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists" are accused by them of violating the Statement of the 81 Parties.

CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE IMPERIALIST CAMP AND THE SOCIALIST CAMP

But let us take a closer look at the "thought" process of the modern revisionists.

For them, the fundamental contradictions of the contemporary world are reduced to one thing only: the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, and moreover this contradiction has and can have only one aspect — peaceful competition!

Furthermore, for the revisionists, this contradiction must be overcome and resolved by "all-round cooperation", thus doing away with all its class content.

This theory of class collaboration on an international scale attains the height of absurdity with the stupidly pretentious claim that the fate of humanity can be arranged by agreement between two men, "wise and reasonable, having powerful authority", namely, between the representative of U.S. imperialism, the enemy of the people of the whole world, on the one hand, and Khrushchov on the other.

CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE OPPRESSED NATIONS AND IMPERIALISM

For Marxist-Leninists, the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism is one of the fundamental contradictions of the world today. For us, the national-democratic revolutions of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which are an integral part of the world proletarian revolution, strike direct blows at imperialism and show where the principal zone of revolutionary tempests is situated today.

For us, Marxist-Leninists, a nation which oppresses another cannot itself be free.

This is why for the working class and the labouring masses in the imperialist countries, an active proletarian internationalism towards the revolutionary movements of national liberation is an incontrovertible duty, inseparable from the struggle for their own liberation.

In pretending that colonialism is practically liquidated and in wilfully feigning ignorance of the role of neo-colonialism, the modern revisionists hope to negate the

contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism.

The revisionists wish to drain this contradiction of all revolutionary content and reduce it to a gap in level of development between "advanced" and "underdeveloped" countries, a gap which can be filled by so-called material "aid" within the framework of all-round co-operation with imperialism.

The facts, however, show that underdevelopment has become worse in countries under the yoke of old and new colonialism.

The revisionists admit, at the most, the perspective of a bourgeois dictatorship for these countries, and condemn with abhorrence the necessary armed revolutionary struggles.

They try to make the working class of the highly industrialized countries an auxiliary of imperialism, shamelessly falsifying the Leninist theory on the necessity of the working class taking the lead in the national-democratic revolution so as to pursue it to the end and guide it to the path of socialism.

On the one hand, they pretend that this leading role must be filled exclusively by the working class of the highly industrialized countries.

On the other hand, as did the classical reformists, they unjustifiably affirm that they represent this proletariat — although modern revisionism and reformism are really an agency of the bourgeoisie within the ranks of the working class.

This is why they oppose any mutual support between the revolutionary movement of the working class of the

highly industrialized countries and the revolutionary movement of national liberation.

What they wish to impose is, in fact, the stifling of the whole revolutionary movement by modern revisionism and reformism.

It is not surprising under these conditions that the revisionists have cultivated colonial chauvinism, and declared that the Algerian war was an internal affair for the French. They make themselves protagonists of the "French Union" and have said, in Belgium, that "Belgium and the Congo share the same interests"!

Suslov, in his recent report, quoted Lenin to support his own revisionist theses:

. . . the mutual relations between the nations, the whole world system of states, are determined by the struggle waged by a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states, at the head of which stands Soviet Russia. If we lose sight of this we shall not be able to present correctly a single national or colonial question, even if it concerns the most remote corner of the earth. Only by adopting this point of view can the Communist Parties correctly present any political question concerning civilised or backward countries and give a reply to this question.¹

But why does Suslov hide the first part of the sentence in this report of Lenin's to the Second Congress of the Communist International (July 26, 1920):

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Report of the Commission on the National and Colonial Questions at the Second Congress of the Communist International", *Selected Works*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1946, Vol. 10, p. 240.

“The second leading idea in our theses is that in the present world situation, after the imperialist war, the mutual relations between the nations. . . .”¹

Precisely because there is this idea, which is most important and fundamental, and which Suslov wants to hide as it is a scathing denial of his revisionism.

Such behaviour is enough for us to judge of the man and the theses he defends. But let us cite Lenin:

Firstly, what is the most important, the fundamental idea contained in our theses? The distinction between oppressed nations and oppressing nations. Unlike the Second International and bourgeois democracy, we emphasise this distinction. It is particularly important in the epoch of imperialism for the proletariat and the Communist International to establish concrete economic facts and, in solving all colonial and national problems, to take as our starting point, not abstract postulates, but the phenomena of concrete reality.

The characteristic feature of imperialism is that the whole world, as we see, is at present divided into a large number of oppressed nations and an insignificant number of oppressing nations possessing colossal wealth and powerful military forces. The overwhelming majority of the population of the world, numbering more than a billion, in all probability a billion and a quarter, if we take the total population of the world at one and three-quarter billion, *i.e.*, about 70 per cent of the population of the world, belongs to the oppressed nations, which are either in a state of direct colonial dependence or belong to the outlying colonial states

¹ *Ibid.*

such as Persia, Turkey and China, or else, after being conquered by the armies of a big imperialist power, have been forced into dependence upon it by treaties. This distinction, the idea of dividing the nations into oppressing and oppressed nations, runs like a thread through all the theses, not only the first theses which appeared over my name and which were published earlier, but also through Comrade Roy's theses. The latter were written mainly from the point of view of the situation in India and among other large nationalities which are oppressed by Great Britain, and this is what makes them very important for us.¹

Lenin returned immediately after this, in his third point, to the question of the national revolutionary movement.

It is precisely the second leading idea spoken of by Lenin which shows that the revolutionary movements of national liberation are part of our epoch of world proletarian revolution.

CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE PROLETARIAT AND THE BOURGEOISIE

What is the attitude of the revisionists with regard to the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries? Or more exactly, how do they try to reconcile their theory and practice of class collaboration on an international scale with the existence of this objective contradiction?

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 239-40.

They do it by renouncing the strategic objective of proletarian revolution, of socialist revolution.

For this objective they substitute the slogans of bourgeois pacifism, of so-called structural reforms, and of bourgeois democracy.

As to the revisionist prattlings about peace, we shall see later on that these have nothing to do with the tactical objectives of a consistent struggle against imperialist aggression and for the defence of world peace.

In forsaking the tasks of the proletarian revolution, the revisionists, in fact, deny the irreconcilable nature of the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Their subjectivist assertions about peaceful transition and peaceful evolution from capitalism to socialism are part of their revision of Marxism-Leninism.

The Marxist-Leninist stand on this question is known. Naturally the working class would prefer to advance to socialism by the peaceful way; it should not let slip any opportunity of doing so. But how can one conceive such an eventuality — which is extremely improbable and of which there is up to now no example that permits a verification of this possibility — except in a situation where the working class in alliance with other labouring people has established an overwhelming superiority of forces over the bourgeoisie, including superiority in the field of arms?

This means that at the decisive moment, the working class and its vanguard, the revolutionary party, must be capable of conducting armed struggle victoriously — ideologically, politically and organizationally. Only in this circumstance is it possible to force the bourgeoisie to capitulate.

This can be “forgotten” only by those people who wish to “ignore” the fact that in the state the bourgeoisie has at its disposal an armed force of repression which it is quite ready to use.

To say, as the revisionists do, that it is only necessary in practice to consider the possibility of peaceful transition — only mentioning the other possibility for form’s sake — means renouncing the proletarian revolution, whether peaceful or not.

The revisionists have gone even further: they condemn violent revolution under the pretext that envisaging the possibility of violent revolution would endanger peaceful transition. This is to deliver the working class, bound hand and foot, disarmed ideologically, politically and organizationally, to bourgeois domination.

Moreover, in these circumstances, the revisionists have gone to the lengths of participating in counter-revolutionary repression on the side of the bourgeoisie. Noske and Scheideman, the counter-revolutionary renegades of the social-democratic leadership, have shown before them where reformism can lead.

The possibility of peaceful transition to socialism which Lenin considered rare, is described by the revisionists as being the actual rule. What can this assertion be based on?

In the capitalist countries, every year workers are shot down during strikes and peaceful demonstrations which cannot in the least endanger the state power and privileges of the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie has constantly strengthened the repressive arsenal of its state, its police and armed forces.

How can one imagine that capitalism will voluntarily renounce the use of these forces?

In short, here again under the influence of the bourgeoisie, the revisionists have capitulated before the pressure of capital, of imperialism, before its threats and blackmail.

They thus renounce all revolutionary perspectives at the very moment when the bourgeoisie is reinforcing its state apparatus in order to cope with the mounting difficulties and the increasing contradictions besetting the capitalist world, contradictions which will inevitably develop to their climax, to a revolutionary situation.

Can one find a better proof of the absurdity of the position of the revisionists and their capitulationism than their application of so-called peaceful transition to fascist Spain where they preach the policy of "national reconciliation"?

Now more than ever before we should remember the following behest of Lenin:

The necessity of systematically imbuing the masses with *this* and precisely this view of violent revolution lies at the root of *all* the teachings of Marx and Engels. The betrayal of their teaching by the now predominant social-chauvinist and Kautskyite trends is expressed in striking relief by the neglect of *such* propaganda and agitation by both these trends.¹

We always say — and it was said at the Second Congress — that revolution demands sacrifices. Some comrades in their propaganda argue in the following way: We are prepared to make a revolution, but it must not be too severe. If I am not mistaken, this thesis was uttered by Comrade Shmeral in his speech

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Selected Works*. FLPH, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 220.

at the congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. . . . At all events, I must say that if Shmeral did say that, he was wrong. Several comrades who spoke after Shmeral at this congress said, "Yes, we shall go with Shmeral because in this way we shall avoid civil war." If these reports are true, I must say that such agitation is not Communistic and not revolutionary. . . .¹

BOURGEOIS NATIONALIZATION

The modern revisionists have purely and simply picked up again the so-called theory of structural reform from the obscurantist ideological outfit of social democracy.

The outline of this theory is well known. Peaceful evolution from capitalism to socialism will be realized by the so-called peaceful conquest of political power, achieved through a parliamentary majority, along with a so-called conquest of economic power by nationalization.

With regard to the first point, this is a negation of the class character of the bourgeois state and its ornament, parliament, a negation of the necessity of destroying the bourgeois state machinery and, in consequence, a negation of the necessity of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Concerning the second point, this denies the fact that the character of nationalization — bourgeois or socialist — is entirely decided by the nature of the state.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Tactics of the R.C.P. (B.)", Report Delivered at the Third Congress of the Communist International, July 5, 1921, *Selected Works*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1946, Vol. 9, p. 235.

Socialist nationalization is the product of the socialist revolution; it is carried out under the conditions created by the state power of the working class and its allies and under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Socialist nationalization realizes the expropriation of the expropriators; by it, the means of production become the property of the whole people.

Nationalization within the framework of the capitalist system will always be bourgeois nationalization, that is, the further strengthening of state-monopoly capitalism, the further fusion of capitalism and the state into a single mechanism for intensified exploitation and oppression.

The examples provided by Britain, Italy, France, Germany and the Netherlands clearly demonstrate the true content and significance of bourgeois nationalization.

Lenin pointed out:

... state-monopolistic capitalism is a complete *material* preparation for Socialism, the *threshold* of Socialism, a rung in the ladder of history between which and the rung called Socialism *there are no intermediate rungs*.¹

In other words, the strengthening of state-monopoly capitalism, bringing as it does the socialization of production to the highest point that the capitalist system can reach, creates more favourable *objective* conditions for the socialist revolution. But it by no means marks any stage on the road of the transformation of capitalist society into a socialist society.

Lenin long ago trenchantly exposed the deceptive nature of this assertion. He said:

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It", *Selected Works*, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 158.

... the erroneous bourgeois reformist assertion that monopoly capitalism or state-monopoly capitalism is *no longer* capitalism, but can already be termed "state Socialism," or something of that sort, is most widespread. . . .¹

That is to say, we must use the development of state-monopoly capitalism to demonstrate the necessity of the socialist revolution and not to negate this necessity, or to celebrate the so-called progress of capitalism, as the reformists or the revisionist neo-reformists do.

The spreading of confusion between bourgeois nationalization and socialist nationalization by the reformists and neo-reformists leads to the discrediting of the latter and therefore of socialism itself. They try to make the masses accept bourgeois nationalization and the strengthening of state-monopoly capitalism as a transformation of capitalist society into socialist society and so turn the working class and the mass of working people away from the indispensable task of smashing the bourgeois state machine and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat as the first fundamental act of the socialist revolution.

BOURGEOIS DICTATORSHIP AND MODERN REVISIONISM

The modern revisionists wish to confine the struggles of the working class within the limits of bourgeois democracy and the legality of the bourgeois state. This leads

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Selected Works*, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 269.

to and amounts to smashing the struggles of the working class, even including those for their immediate rights in day-to-day life.

The Italian revisionists restrict their activities within the limits of the constitution of the bourgeois republic.

In the document prepared for their 21st congress, the Dutch revisionists set themselves the following objective:

To win a parliamentary majority for a government of the workers' movement, so as to implement the main points of the programmes of the Dutch Communist Party, and of the Labour Party (the social democratic party) and the Pacifist Socialist Party.

In this respect, there are the questions of the peaceful transition to socialism, the role of parliamentary democracy in achieving this aim and using the possibilities provided by the constitution to achieve greater democracy and the nationalization of the monopolies.

The revisionists have promoted the Dutch monarchical constitution into a means of peaceful transition to socialism. Here is a lovely example of parliamentary and monarchical cretinism!

And in fact, the immediate programme of the Dutch revisionists is no better than that of a class-collaborating union, and includes among other things the "inspiring" prospect of demanding a second television network with parliamentary control over publicity.

In France, the revisionist leaders demand:

A national assembly elected by universal and proportional suffrage, whose main task is to enact laws and control the government; and the formation of a strong and stable government which is responsible to

the national assembly and whose role is to rule the country while carrying out the programme desired by the majority of the people.

The revisionist leaders can add any qualification they like — genuine, real, pure — to the word "democracy", but what they are referring to is still bourgeois democracy. When they demand the formation of a "strong and stable government", what they demand is a strong and stable *bourgeois* government!

Lenin clearly gave us ideological weapons in exposing the treachery which makes social democracy a social bulwark of the bourgeoisie. He said:

. . . finance capital, in its striving towards expansion, will "freely" buy and bribe the freest, most democratic and republican government and the elected officials of any country, however "independent" it may be. The domination of finance capital, as of capital in general, cannot be abolished by *any* kind of reforms in the realm of political democracy. . . . The domination of finance capital, however, does not in the least destroy the significance of political democracy as the freer, wider and more distinct *form* of class oppression and class struggle. . . .¹

The socialist revolution may begin in the very near future. In that event the proletariat will be faced with the immediate task of capturing power, of expropriating the banks and of introducing other dictatorial measures. In such a situation, the bourgeoisie and

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Selected Works*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1944, Vol. 5, pp. 268-69.

particularly the intellectuals like the Fabians and the Kautskyists will strive to disrupt and to hinder the revolution, to restrict it to limited democratic aims . . .¹

Generally speaking, political democracy is only one of the possible *forms* (although, theoretically, the normal form of “pure” capitalism) of the superstructure that rises *over* capitalism. Facts have proved that both capitalism and imperialism develop under *all* political forms, and subordinate *all of them* to their rules. . . .²

The learned Mr. Kautsky has “forgotten” — accidentally forgotten, probably . . . a “trifle”; namely, that the ruling party in a bourgeois democracy extends the protection of the minority only to another *bourgeois* party, while on all *serious, profound and fundamental* issues the proletariat gets martial law or pogroms, instead of the “protection of the minority.” *The more highly developed a democracy is, the more imminent are pogroms or civil war in connection with any profound political divergence which is dangerous to the bourgeoisie. . . .*

Take the bourgeois parliament. Can it be that learned Kautsky has never heard that the *more highly* democracy is developed, the *more* the bourgeois parliaments are subjected by the stock exchange and the bankers? This does not mean that we must not make use of bourgeois parliaments. . . . But it does mean that only a liberal can forget the *historical limitations and condi-*

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 277.

² V. I. Lenin, “The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up”, *Collected Works*, International Publishers, New York, 1942, Vol. XIX, p. 273.

tional character of bourgeois parliamentarism as Kautsky does. Even in the most democratic bourgeois state the oppressed masses at every step encounter the crying contradiction between the *formal* equality proclaimed by the “democracy” of the capitalists and the thousands of *real* limitations and subterfuges which turn the proletarians into *wage slaves*. It is precisely this contradiction that is opening the eyes of the masses to the rottenness, mendacity and hypocrisy of capitalism. It is this contradiction that the agitators and propagandists of Socialism are constantly exposing to the masses, *in order to prepare* them for revolution! And now that the era of revolutions *has begun*, Kautsky turns his back upon it and begins to extol the charms of *moribund* bourgeois democracy.

. . . The toiling masses are *barred* from participation in bourgeois parliaments (which *never decide* important questions under bourgeois democracy; they are decided by the stock exchange and the banks) by thousands of obstacles, and the workers know and feel, see and realize perfectly well that the bourgeois parliaments are institutions *alien* to them, *instruments for the oppression* of the proletarians by the bourgeoisie, institutions of a hostile class, of the exploiting minority.¹

In our era, the era of the victorious proletarian revolution and of transition from capitalism to socialism, capitalism is using and will use two tactics: on the one hand, “pure”, “genuine” and “real democracy”; on the other,

¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky”, *Selected Works*, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 51-54.

repression and counter-revolutionary terror pushed to their most bloody form — fascism.

It is behind the smokescreen of this “pure democracy” that the bourgeoisie organizes its terrorist groups and prepares for bloody repressions.

INTERNAL CONTRADICTIONS OF REVISIONISM

Here, you will ask: Is there any difference at all between the modern revisionists and the social democrats? The revisionists have in fact fundamentally passed over to the positions of the reformists.

As the general crisis of capitalism deepens, the social basis of reformism is shrinking.

On the other hand, the sharpening of the class struggle has increasingly exposed the true colours of reformism. The workers have seen for themselves that reformism has brought them nothing but frustration and betrayal. That is why ever more important sections of them are turning away from social democratic reformism.

The modern revisionists camouflaged as Communists are trying to win the sympathy of these workers for whom the name of Communist Party means a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary, vanguard party.

It is precisely here that there lies the grave danger of the working class in Western Europe being dragged into a neo-reformism while believing that they have found the revolutionary road.

That is why it is all the more urgent for the working people of the vanguard to hold high the banner of Marxism-Leninism and foil these tricks which so effectively serve the plans of the bourgeoisie.

In Western Europe, the revisionist leaders are openly working in the direction of seeking unity with social democracy, including organizational unity, on the basis of reformist positions.

But the realization of this unity is not necessarily a simple process.

In reality, although modern revisionism, like classical reformism, implies class collaboration, there is still the problem of what the form of collaboration should be and with which bourgeoisie it should collaborate.

During World War I, the social democrat reformists took their stand on the side of the bourgeoisie of their own countries. As a result, there were complete contradictions between the various reformist parties of the Second International.

Between World War I and World War II, some reformist leaders became collaborators of foreign imperialist finance capital, while others were still zealously serving the bourgeoisie of their own countries.

For instance, before 1940 Henri De Man, President of the Workers' Party of Belgium, was a real representative of the interests of German imperialism, while Paul Henri Spaak was, at this time, the representative of British imperialism. Today the self-same Spaak, former Secretary-General of NATO, has become a creature of U.S. imperialism.

Nowadays, the pro-U.S. tendency predominates in the social democratic leadership in Western Europe.

Contradictions among the imperialists still exist and are becoming more acute. In spite of the fact that the policy of the Khrushchov clique actually consists in collaborating with U.S. imperialism, contradictions also exist, and with all the more reason, between the Soviet

Union and the capitalist countries including the United States.

The changes in relations between the revisionist and reformist leaders should also be studied in the light of these facts.

Likewise, we can also note a deepening of contradictions between the revisionist leaders of various countries.

For instance, those revisionist leaders who follow the baton of Khrushchov and are completely subordinated to him are opposed to a certain extent to those revisionist leaders who, though taking the same neo-reformist position, are more inclined to collaborate directly with this or that bourgeoisie.

While furthering the development of the adverse current of revisionism, its ringleader Khrushchov has at the same time created the conditions for the growth of centrifugal tendencies in the relations between those parties which are under revisionist leadership. This is the reason for differences of view in the positions of various revisionist parties, especially those in Western Europe.

IMMEDIATE DEMANDS AND SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

The road followed by revisionism also leads it to betray the working class and labouring masses in their struggles for their immediate demands and against the encroachments of capital.

Marxist-Leninists must stand, and do stand, in the van of the day-to-day struggle of the working class for their immediate economic demands, in their struggle to defend threatened democratic freedoms, in "the general meth-

odical and revolutionary struggle for democracy" and in their actions to prevent world war.

This combination of struggles signifies for us the preparation and ripening of the subjective factors of revolution. That is to say, the consciousness and organization of the proletariat are to be raised in the course of these struggles to the highest level so that it can fulfil its historic mission of socialist revolution.

And that includes the strengthening of the vanguard party, the Communist Party, theoretically, politically and organizationally, and the strengthening of its ties with the masses.

In this sense, day-to-day struggles — the working out of their objectives and means of action — must be subordinated to realization of strategic aims and the final goal.

For the revisionist neo-reformists (as for the classical reformists), "the movement is everything, the final aim is nothing". In their eyes, the pursuit of successive limited and immediate objectives, the realization of reforms within the framework of the capitalist system supposedly means evolution from capitalism to socialism.

But in wishing in this way to limit proletarian action within the laws, regulations and orders of bourgeois democracy, that is to say, the bourgeois dictatorship, the content of the "movement" itself is changed, becoming qualitatively different. It thus becomes an appendix to the policy of the bourgeoisie, a tool of class collaboration and a means of patching up the capitalist system; it takes a hand in the attempt to save the capitalist system.

This is what the practice of the modern revisionists in the capitalist countries leads to.

Particularly, where struggles for immediate economic demands are concerned, one of their disarming techniques is to oppose the large-scale movements carried out by joint, inter-trade efforts, divide up the working class by trades, enterprises and workshops, and encourage the ideas of craft unionism. They also oppose valid objectives of struggle and substitute for them pseudo-demands acceptable to the bourgeoisie in order to ensure social peace. They advocate capitalist social and economic plans. They use negotiations as a weapon to deter the working class from action. They practise parliamentary cretinism.

Hence in the course of these day-to-day struggles we are duty-bound to expose the modern revisionists before the broadest masses.

REVISIONISM AGAINST PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP

The class collaboration practised by the revisionists also reveals itself in certain socialist countries when they deny that there is class struggle during the period of socialist revolution.

The "state of the whole people" signifies the liquidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the "party of the entire people" the liquidation of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the working class.

The example of Yugoslavia demonstrates the possibility of "peaceful evolution" from socialism to capitalism, and emphasizes the danger represented by revisionism which can imperil the victories of socialism.

On the other hand, to talk about building communism in one country while imperialism still exists, and when

socialism is still far from being fully realized, is not only a theoretical mistake. It is also a piece of demagogy intended to cover up the repeated failures caused by revisionism at home, as well as a camouflage designed to cover up the renunciation of the tasks of socialist revolution. This is, moreover, a diversion, an attempt to justify theoretically the development of non-socialist relations to the detriment of other countries of the socialist camp, and the putting of these countries under economic, political and military control and supervision.

Such a policy not only leads to a weakening of the socialist camp which it divides. But this revisionist policy weakens the Soviet Union itself, causing grave difficulties for it and elements of the restoration of capitalism are introduced. It is the source of Soviet agricultural disasters. It slows down the tempo of its industrial development.

* * *

The revisionists in capitalist countries have made a big issue in recent years of the miraculous results arising from the example of communism in the U.S.S.R., as if the value of this example suffices for all and for this reason all should be subordinated to the objective of the so-called "building of communism in the U.S.S.R.".

What an absurd idea! The example of the successes of the socialist revolution certainly constitutes a great help to the exploited and the oppressed in their struggles against capitalism, against imperialism, because this example encourages their militancy and strengthens their will to realize the socialist revolution too.

But the superiority of the socialist economy over the capitalist economy has long been demonstrated, and ex-

ample alone can by no means replace the revolutionary struggle itself.

What is more, in the case of the revisionists, they serve precisely as a negative example. In our country, what we have to do at the moment is precisely to explain that the difficulties now existing in the Soviet Union and certain other socialist countries are due to revisionism, and are not the fault of socialism.

Contrary to that, we can talk about the value of the example of the successes of the socialist revolution in the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, the People's Republic of Albania, and in Cuba. These successes are also victories of Marxism-Leninism.

Despite the unfortunate consequences caused by revisionism in places where it predominates, when we come to estimate the forces of the socialist camp on a world scale, we can say that they have kept on growing, thanks to the victories achieved in the socialist countries where the Communist and Workers' Parties have persisted in their Marxist-Leninist stand.

CONTRADICTIONS AMONG IMPERIALISTS, AMONG MONOPOLISTS

Now let's take up the question of contradictions among the imperialists. With the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, the contradictions among the imperialists have become increasingly acute. Marxist-Leninists cannot allow themselves to be indifferent to this. It was Lenin who said:

To carry on a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie, a war which is a hundred times

more difficult, prolonged and complicated than the most stubborn of ordinary wars between states, and to refuse beforehand to manoeuvre, to utilise the conflict of interests (even though temporary) among one's enemies, to refuse to temporize and compromise with possible (even though transitory, unstable, vacillating and conditional) allies—is not this ridiculous in the extreme?¹

He further pointed out the necessity of “thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skilfully taking advantage of every, even the smallest, ‘rift’ among the enemies, of every antagonism of interest among the bourgeoisie of the various countries and among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie within the various countries, and also . . . taking advantage of every, even the smallest, opportunity of gaining a mass ally, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who do not understand this do not understand even a particle of Marxism, or of scientific, modern Socialism *in general*. Those who have not proved by *deeds* over a fairly considerable period of time, and in fairly varied political situations, their ability to apply this truth in practice have not yet learned to assist the revolutionary class in its struggle for the emancipation of toiling humanity from the exploiters. And this applies equally to the period before and to the period after the conquest of political power by the proletariat”.²

The aggravation of contradictions among the imperialists has set before us the problem of indirect allies of the proletarian revolution. In this respect, it is also neces-

¹ V. I. Lenin, “*Left-Wing*” *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, International Publishers, New York, 1940, pp. 52-53.

² *Ibid.*, p. 53.

sary to start from the concrete analysis of concrete situations and to examine the possibilities offered in relation to the supreme and general interests of the proletarian revolution and especially, at the present time, in relation to the national-liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples and nations.

One of the principal aspects of the contradictions among the imperialists today is the contradiction between different capitalist countries and U.S. imperialism. U.S. imperialism is still pursuing its plan of world domination which includes the political, economic and military control of other capitalist countries. Under such conditions, it is inevitable that contradictions should arise and develop among them.

For this reason the West European countries have a double character. They are imperialists and exploiters to other countries, especially to peoples enslaved by old and new colonialism. On the other hand, they are exploited, mainly by U.S. imperialism.

This phenomenon is reflected with special clarity in the revenues from capital invested by the finance capital of these countries on the one hand, and on the other hand, from capital invested by foreign finance capital in these countries.

It is necessary to make use of the contradictions among the imperialists to further our international strategic aims and, tactically, with the objective of isolating U.S. imperialism, the enemy of the peoples of the whole world.

THE STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

We can note that these contradictions in certain circumstances are already taking on the aspect of struggle

for national independence and for liberation from the U.S. yoke.

So long as this opposition to U.S. imperialism is led by strata of finance capital, we can see that the results might be as follows:

— capitulation to the demands of the United States, or the arrangement of new compromises more or less favourable to these finance capital strata (in this connection, the development of class struggle on the domestic and international scales may act as one of the factors deciding them on such a stand);

— the outbreak of a conflict or war of an imperialist nature;

— the carrying out of a so-called neutral policy, with or without the formation of new political-military blocs;

— an eventual alliance with the socialist countries.

We are assuredly heading towards complex situations which may present abrupt turns and changes, in the course of which the Communist Parties will be required to display a high degree of political capability in order to be able to direct their actions correctly.

But in these circumstances, the working class of the capitalist countries can and must play a still more active role.

We consider that our course of action should be one of struggle for national independence, in the course of which the working class should endeavour to ensure its hegemony and leadership by forming the broadest possible alliances, including even alliance with certain capitalist strata whose interests are opposed to those of U.S. imperialism.

The working class should take back into its own hands the banner of national independence.

This national-independence struggle cannot imply any weakening of the class struggle within the country between labour and capital.

The Communist Parties uphold their independence on the ideological, political and organizational planes; they will continue to promote the struggle of the working class more extensively on all fronts.

Thus in Belgium we have raised the slogan of struggle for national independence and for the liberation of our country from the yoke of the United States; at the present stage, we have especially put this objective into the concrete demand of the slogan: "Quit NATO!"

REVISIONISTS AND U.S. IMPERIALISM

What is the attitude of the revisionists towards the contradictions among the imperialists?

At times, they regard imperialism as a monolithic bloc, and denounce as a crime the efforts of Marxist-Leninists to utilize these contradictions and seek for the broadest possible alliances. At other times, they denounce French imperialism as the principal danger, and go so far as to consider France's recognition of the People's Republic of China as an act that is to the advantage of a war policy.

At still other times, the revisionists rant that the dangers of West German revanchist militarism and of the so-called Bonn-Paris axis are the greatest dangers. Actually, however, they are opposing these dangers to the policies of U.S. imperialism — which they present as being "wise and reasonable, and full of concern to preserve peace". For the revisionists, subjection to U.S. imperialism, its control and its presence itself (including

military occupation) are all a kind of "guarantee" against the danger of West German revanchist militarism.

In every case, the revisionists' position has one and only one meaning: that they accept, desire, and even demand the leadership, the hegemony of the United States.

Under these circumstances, how can one not expose their attitude which has led them to set themselves against the national independence of their own country, and made them the collaborators and accomplices of U.S. imperialism?

Is it not significant that in the draft of the theses of the last congress of the Belgian revisionists, U.S. imperialism was not even once denounced?

And in the draft resolution of the 17th Congress of the French Communist Party (May 1964), did they not achieve a tour de force by not once using the expression "U.S. imperialism" in talking about either Cuba or south Viet Nam?

During his latest visit to France, Khrushchov spared no effort in heaping compliments and expressions of regard on de Gaulle. But today when de Gaulle — and he most certainly represents French finance capital — opposes U.S. imperialism to a certain degree, the revisionists are embarrassed about it.

As for the West German revanchists, who was it that put them back on their feet, who was it that armed them? It was precisely U.S. imperialism. Without its alliance and support they would not have been able to give themselves the arrogant airs they are assuming today.

How was it that German imperialism was able to set up bases in Holland, Belgium and France? That was the result of its joining the aggressive pact of NATO, an instrument of U.S. imperialism.

Atomic weapons are stored in West Germany because U.S. imperialism has decided that they should be. German generals find themselves in the highest posts of command in NATO. At this moment, West German militarism is comporting itself as the loyal ally of U.S. imperialism. It is its principal bridgehead in Europe, and an important instrument in its world policy.

We say that, at present, there actually exists a Washington-Bonn axis, a condominium of the United States and the German Federal Republic, under the former's direction, over NATO.

Of course, internal contradictions also exist in such an alliance, and one cannot predict the future development of such contradictions. But the fact is: U.S. imperialism is now supporting West German militarism, and, the latter, on its part, is leaning on U.S. imperialism in preparing its revanchist plans. To pretend to oppose West German revanchist militarism while approving of U.S. imperialism, as the revisionists are doing, is nothing but a hoax.

THE REVISIONISTS PRACTISE NUCLEAR BLACKMAIL AND OPPOSE THE EFFECTIVE STRUGGLE TO PREVENT WORLD WAR

Lenin said, "One of the forms of deception of the working class is pacifism and the abstract preaching of peace. . . ."¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Conference of the Sections of the R.S.D.L.P. Abroad", *Selected Works*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1944, Vol. 5, p. 135.

The revisionists are using this deception in an attempt to divert the working class, the peoples and oppressed nations from their struggle against exploitation and oppression. They want to "outlaw" struggles, revolutions and liberation wars.

But their so-called pacifism also tends to divert the peoples from effective struggle against imperialist aggression and to avert world war.

The revisionist leaders are multiplying their acts of kindness towards imperialism. But imperialism is not in the least grateful; it despises them, and shows a growing arrogance towards them.

The capitulation of the revisionist leaders before U.S. imperialism, and their collaboration with it, can only encourage its aggressiveness and further increase the threats against the Soviet Union itself.

Let us take for example the Moscow tripartite treaty which has been condemned not only by Marxist-Leninists but by all awakened working people.

All of us know the contents of the Moscow treaty which is a copy of the 1962 Anglo-U.S. proposal.

The Moscow treaty means the continued manufacture and stockpiling of strategic nuclear weapons by U.S. imperialism, augmenting its destructive potential, and the aggravating of the danger of a thermonuclear world war.

It gives the green light to U.S. imperialism to concentrate its military efforts on the improvement and accumulation of tactical nuclear weapons — the chosen arms of U.S. imperialism to implement its policy of blackmail and aggression against the national-liberation movements. The Moscow treaty encourages a real dissemination of imperialist nuclear weapons through the increase in the number of U.S. military bases and submarines

equipped with Polaris missiles and through the multilateral nuclear force which puts these engines of imperialist aggression at the disposal of the allies of the United States, including the West German revanchists.

At the same time, the Moscow treaty also signifies the intensification of the campaign against the peoples who refuse to bow before the dictates of the imperialists supported by the revisionists.

The possession of atomic weapons by socialist China would strengthen the world forces of peace and serve as a factor for peace. But the U.S. imperialists supported by the revisionists have presented this eventuality as a danger to peace. The Moscow treaty is one of the most dangerous hoaxes known to the peoples. It ominously reminds one of the Munich Agreement of 1938.

The revisionists, instead of denouncing imperialism which is aggressive by nature, consider China, Korea, Viet Nam, Albania and Cuba, which refuse to sign the Moscow treaty, as warmongers.

The revisionists' abandonment of the objective of totally banning and destroying nuclear weapons signifies their opposition to this demand of the peoples. And this fact shows up their duplicity.

Nuclear threats and blackmail form a part of the so-called "strategy of peace" of U.S. imperialism. But nuclear threats and blackmail also form an integral part of the theory and policy of revisionism.

With the exposure of this blackmail their whole theory of class collaboration collapses.

At a recent session of the United Nations, the Soviet delegate even put forward a so-called "plan of general disarmament" which enables U.S. imperialism to retain possession of nuclear weapons in the final phase. This

is the project of the so-called "nuclear umbrella". It is a reproduction of an old American proposition, and thus serves as a legalization of the "Pax Americana" and the plan for world domination by U.S. imperialism which relies precisely on a monopoly of nuclear power and which has the support of the revisionist Khrushchov group.

The revisionists give us a demonstration of the spurious character of their slogan of "a world without war and without arms" while imperialism still exists.

Facts have confirmed the correctness of the Leninist thesis on "the impossibility of eliminating wars without eliminating classes and creating Socialism".¹

THE REVISIONISTS' HATEFUL ATTACKS ON MARXIST-LENINISTS AND THE PEOPLES

The revisionist leaders who call compliance with imperialism "peaceful coexistence" harbour a rancorous hatred for revolutionaries.

The Belgian Communists and other vanguard workers were deeply angered when they were informed about the way the Khrushchov group has made serious attacks — particularly vicious in the economic field — on those socialist countries where the Communist and Workers' Parties are holding high the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

They share your pride and joy when they see that these odious manoeuvres of the revisionists have failed

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and War", *Collected Works*, International Publishers, New York, 1930, Vol. XVIII, p. 219.

and that these difficulties have now been successfully surmounted by applying the principle of self-reliance.

There is no need here to dwell on how all the awakened working people abhor and oppose the Khrushchov revisionists' supplying of arms to the reactionary Indian bourgeoisie to help it in its aggression against socialist China.

* * *

Comrades, to put it in one sentence: **modern revisionism is totally reactionary and counter-revolutionary both in theory and practice.**

REVISIONISM IN BELGIUM

The theory and practice of revisionism have become familiar to us during the course of our struggle in Belgium.

Let us recall briefly that during the past few years a revisionist leading group has been operating as an organized faction within the Belgian Communist Party. This group seeks to make the Party degenerate, and has carried out systematic revisionist activities.

This group has manoeuvred cunningly to expand its positions in the leading organs, and has violated and renounced the decisions of the Party Congresses.

The disgraceful attitude of this group during the counter-revolutionary attempt in Hungary was the signal announcing their later betrayals.

The *Drapeau Rouge* of November 2, 1956, carried this on its front page: "Nagy proclaims the neutrality of Hungary and denounces the Warsaw Treaty. He appeals to the United Nations."

In this article, *Drapeau Rouge* reported without comment "retreat of the Soviet troops, the massacre of 130 militant Communists hung by their feet from trees and brutally beaten to death".

In this same issue of the paper, the Political Bureau, dominated by the revisionists, expressed its "appreciation for the moderate attitude of the Soviet Union". (This was at the time when Khrushchov was withdrawing the troops from Hungary.) The Political Bureau regarded this attitude as "a manifestation of a great force in the service of an international detente".

Speaking of the government of the traitor Nagy, the Political Bureau asserted that it embodied "the first successes won by the efforts of the Hungarian Workers' Party and the organizations representing the working class and Hungarian socialist democracy grouped around their government".

The Political Bureau also hoped that "the Hungarian tragedy was approaching its denouement", an ending that in those circumstances would have been the victory of the counter-revolution.

The "Belgian Peace Committee", at the head of which one finds the same revisionist leaders who now defend the Moscow tripartite treaty, published a communique, also carried by *Drapeau Rouge* without any comment, which "deplores the bloodshed and regrets the intervention of Soviet troops in the internal affairs of the Republic of Hungary".

This communique, which was given the approval of the revisionist leaders, added: "These incidents prove that military treaties authorizing the stationing of foreign troops in any country are a danger to peace."

Since these events, there has not been any self-criticism by the revisionist Political Bureau.

In 1957, the Political Bureau showed its interest in the programme of the Yugoslav revisionists.

But later, these chameleons pretended to approve the 1957 Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, just as later they pretended to approve the 1960 Statement of the 81 Parties. But in each case this was done only in order that they could continue their undermining activities.

The 13th Party Congress held in Liege in 1960 ended its session in ambiguity. However, the Political Bureau was obliged to give way on some of the assessments and formulations originally put forward in its theses. Notably the proposition about "advancing to socialism along the parliamentary road" was deleted from the theses by the congress.

But from that time on, the true colours of the revisionist Political Bureau have been completely exposed. There has not been a single event which does not reflect the struggle between the two lines.

The revisionist leading group has betrayed all and renounced all. **It has betrayed the struggle for immediate demands.** During the great strike of December 1960-January 1961, the revisionist Political Bureau was opposed to advancing the struggle to a higher stage. It claimed that the proposal to march on Brussels and lay down tools, agreed upon by hundreds of thousands of workers, was ultra-Left.

But on the contrary, it advocated the "holding of consultations and talks with the representatives of the majority". It disassociated itself from the strikers who fell victims to provocation by the gendarmes at the

Guillemins Railway Station in Liege. It even held a press conference for this purpose!

It wanted to split the strikers' front, especially in Brussels.

In the face of a new upsurge of workers' demands in 1961, the revisionist Political Bureau, instead of calling for action, appealed for a "national labour conference", a meeting organized by the government with representatives of the capitalists and the leaders of the reformist and Christian trade unions.

A member of the revisionist Political Bureau wrote at the time:

It is clear, in fact, that none of these urgent problems with which we are concerned, can be properly solved except in the course of negotiations in as calm an atmosphere as possible. . . . All these problems are so complicated that no answer can be found through a simple collision between the capitalists and the workers. This is exactly why the reactionaries hope for such a collision.

The revisionists also want to take the road of social planning. In giving free rein to their dreams of class collaboration, they cherish the illusion of being able to plan and programme the relations between the antagonistic classes in capitalist society and bring about harmony between them.

One revisionist lyrically declared, "Nearly everyone (including a good number of anti-Communists) could be said to be creating communism unwittingly."

In the past few months, during the struggle for wage increases and so on, the main concern of the revisionists has been to restrain the workers' struggle, to formulate

objectives which divert the people's attention, and oppose the general programme of demands which our Party is successfully popularizing.

The revisionists have betrayed the struggle against the anti-strike laws.

On September 1, 1962, Ministers Gilson and Vermeyleen put forward several repressive, anti-labour bills.

However, all that the main ringleaders of the revisionists could find to say about this in January 1963 was that it was "a manoeuvre aimed at heading off the formulation of workers' new demands".

The revisionists go so far as to consider the demand for the "resignation of Gilson" as an anti-Party slogan!

The revisionists support the Lefevre-Spaak government, instrument of the most reactionary stratum of finance capital and lackey of U.S. imperialism, instead of criticizing it.

The Belgian revisionists have betrayed the struggle to prevent world war.

Together with their like in other countries, they frantically support the Moscow tripartite treaty.

Now they condemn the demand for a reduction of 10,000 million in military expenditure. They have presented Kennedy as "the king piece in the struggle for peace" and called for the "strengthening of Kennedy's position".

The Belgian revisionist group is of the opinion that it is not a question at present of withdrawing from NATO but of assuring U.S. leadership of this organization.

In international policy the Political Bureau's stand is to give active support to Spaak who has become a confidant of Khrushchov.

But in mass demonstrations, especially the "Youth's Anti-Atomic March" on March 15 and the "Day for Peace" activities of May 8, the revisionist and reformist leaders working in collusion were unable to prevent the majority of demonstrators from accepting our slogans for a consistent struggle to prevent world war: "For the total banning and destruction of nuclear arms!" and "Quit NATO!"

The Belgian revisionists have betrayed proletarian internationalism.

They have betrayed the revolutionary national-liberation struggle of the Congolese people.

After tolerating Belgium's military intervention, they advocated U.N. intervention in the Congo.

This intervention resulted in the deaths of Lumumba and his comrades-in-arms. It opened the doors of the Congo to U.S. imperialism, and subjected the Congolese people to greater sufferings, massacres and misery.

The revisionists spread criminal illusions in Belgium and in the Congo. They proposed that Gizenga should abandon the liberated areas in the northeastern part of the Congo so as to play the parliamentary game in Leopoldville. Since then, Gizenga has been confined to an unhealthy island, and no one knows whether he is still alive today!

Here let me hail the new development in the Congolese liberation struggle!

Gone are the days when capitalism and imperialism could pin their hopes on throttling the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples by bloody suppression.

The Congolese people and their revolutionary leaders have drawn the lessons from their earlier setbacks.

The Congolese people have taken up arms to drive out the U.S. neo-colonialists, who directly intervened under

the cover of the U.N., and the Belgian colonialists, and the Kasavubu-Adoula-Mobutu clique, which is in the service of imperialism.

The successes already won in this struggle herald new victories!

* * *

During the Caribbean events, in October-November 1962, the Belgian revisionists were scared stiff by the nuclear blackmail and completely opposed giving active support to socialist Cuba.

They have surpassed the worst reactionaries in their campaign of calumny against the People's Republic of China.

They ranged themselves unconditionally on the side of the reactionary Indian bourgeoisie, accomplice of U.S. imperialism, when it launched its aggression against socialist China.

They even went so far as to declare that the resolutions of solidarity with Cuba and socialist China passed by the Federal Bureau of Brussels on November 6, 1962, were anti-Party.

The Belgian revisionists have violated and betrayed every revolutionary principle in the 1960 Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties.

They have rejected the revolutionary essence of the Party. They have even done this in the new "Party Constitution" they have adopted. Their congress theses are a systematic self-exposure of modern revisionism.

Today their greatest concern is to be admitted to "Socialist Common Action", an organization completely under the control of the right-wing leaders of the Belgian

Socialist Party and which progressive workers call "Common Inaction".

The revisionists recommend that the left-wing workers in the Socialist Party should "remain in the ranks of their [Socialist Party] organizations" so as to demand the "faithful carrying out of the decisions of the Belgian Socialist Party's congresses". They launch the accusation of "anarchist Leftism" against those left-wing workers in the Socialist Party who do not wish to listen to them.

The revisionists desired and engineered a split.

Since December 1961 the revisionists in Belgium launched public attacks against the Albanian Party of Labour and the Chinese Communist Party.

Encouraged by the revisionist adverse current of which Khrushchov is the self-appointed head, the Belgian revisionists have stepped up their divisive measures; at the end of 1962 these took an organizational form; they have taken increasingly arbitrary measures, in violation of the Party Constitution, against those Party militants who uphold the Marxist-Leninist stand and the revolutionary principles of the Statement of the 81 Parties.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM REBUILDS ITSELF ON THE BASIS OF MARXISM-LENINISM

But the revisionists have suffered a defeat. We could not submit to this arbitrary attitude of the revisionists and make ourselves accomplices to the betrayal and liquidation of the Party.

To want to destroy Marxism-Leninism and liquidate the revolutionary Party, the vanguard of the working

class, is as vain a wish as to want to liquidate the class struggle.

In June 1963 the Brussels Federation called an extraordinary congress and re-established its unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

On December 22, 1963, the National Conference of the Belgian Communists declared that the Communist Party of Belgium would be reconstituted throughout the country on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The National Conference declared null and void the various resolutions adopted by the so-called Communist congress held at Easter, 1963, which confirmed the transformation of the organization controlled by the revisionists into a reformist party.

Subsequently, the National Conference elected the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium reconstituted on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

The Conference adopted a programme of action which has since stood the test in mass action.

Our journal, *La Voix du Peuple*, has reappeared and became a weekly on January 1 this year. We have publicized our stand through posters, meetings, pamphlets, agitational and trade journals.

Our Party already constitutes a considerable political force which has achieved successes in organizing the struggle against capital. The Communist Youth and the Communist Students have both rebuilt their national organizations on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The organization of Young Pioneers has been reactivated in two regions.

On May Day we gave proof of the vitality of our Party. A mass rally was held at Charleroi, followed by a parade through the streets of Brussels by enthusiastic and dis-

ciplined demonstrators, filled with "revolutionary spirit. This ended with another mass rally.

While the organization of the revisionists is in the process of disintegration, our Party is growing from strength to strength.

* * *

An examination of the objective situation in Belgium can be summed up as follows: the contradictions of the capitalist world are shaking Belgium, and the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism is particularly marked there.

The crisis of capitalism in Belgium is reflected in the crisis of the bourgeois parties, including the Socialist Party.

The working class of our country has more than once demonstrated its militancy.

Now it is up to us to fulfil our vanguard role.

But we must ceaselessly raise the level of the struggle of the working class, of the labouring masses.

It is also necessary to contribute actively to the international class struggle which is developing victoriously and on an ever wider scale.

The struggle of the working class and the labouring masses in our country is part of the world revolutionary struggle.

In order to determine correctly the strategy and tactics of the working class, it is necessary to base ourselves on an analysis of the concrete situation in our country and also on a correct estimate of the world political and economic situation.

The question now is to apply the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and the general line of the interna-

tional communist movement to Belgium's concrete conditions.

For the objectives of the activities of the working class and labouring masses to be valid, account must be taken of the fact that the present situation in Belgium is conditioned by its subjugation to U.S. imperialism. The Lefevre-Spaak government, as we have said before, is an instrument of the most reactionary stratum of finance capital and is the lackey of U.S. imperialism.

Our Central Committee has defined the Party's present programme of action in ten points. This programme gives the precise objectives of the struggle on all fronts and we can sum them up as follows:

- the general programme of demands of the working class;

- defence of democratic liberties with stress on the repeal of the anti-strike laws; realization of self-determination for the two peoples and of the three communities on a basis of federalism; disbandment of fascist organizations;

- the struggle to prevent world war, against imperialist aggression, against the nuclear threat and nuclear blackmail by the imperialists, for the total prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons;

- active proletarian internationalism:

- solidarity with the socialist camp as a whole and with every socialist country in particular;

- solidarity with the revolutionary movements of national liberation, and with the peoples of the Congo and Viet Nam in particular; we must keep Lenin's words firmly in mind:

The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would indeed be a mere deception if complete and close unity did not exist between the workers fighting against capital in Europe and America and the hundreds and hundreds of millions of "colonial" slaves who are oppressed by that capital.¹

- solidarity with the working people of other countries, and particularly with the peoples of Spain and Portugal who are struggling against bloody fascist dictatorships;

- the struggle for national independence, for liberation from the U.S. yoke: "Quit NATO!"

* * *

Our activity as the revolutionary vanguard party must signify that the working class, through its day-to-day struggles, must prepare to accomplish its historic task the socialist revolution.

These day-to-day struggles would be just a hoax if the Marxist-Leninist vanguard failed to make ever larger sections of the working class and the labouring masses realize the necessity of socialist revolution and the necessity of preparing for the socialist revolution.

MARXIST-LENINISTS, UNITE!

Our Party is responsible to the working class of our country and also to the whole international communist and workers' movement.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Selected Works*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1946, Vol. 10, p. 160.

Our stand in the present great debate is clear. On one side is the scientific socialist point of view and method, that is, Marxism-Leninism.

On the other side is the revision of Marxist-Leninist principles, the betrayal of the revolutionary essence of scientific socialism, that is, revisionism, capitulation to imperialism and to penetration by bourgeois ideology.

Our stand in the present debate is unequivocal: We have been, we are and will always be on the side of the revolutionary forces of Marxism-Leninism.

We are with the Marxist-Leninist fraternal Parties.

We support the Marxist-Leninist comrades who are suffering attack within those Parties controlled for the time being by revisionists.

Our action is guided by the principle: "Marxist-Leninists, unite!"

We can already say that the majority of the Communists of the world are taking a resolute Marxist-Leninist stand.

We firmly believe that even in those Parties dominated by the revisionists, most of the militants, when they find out the facts and if they are able to express their own opinions, will reject revisionism. It could not be otherwise, because when a worker becomes a Communist he does so not to betray the cause of the working class and socialist revolution, but for the triumph of the cause of the working class!

We should spare no effort to restore the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of MARXISM-LENINISM, the only basis on which unity can genuinely be achieved!

The Chinese Communist Party's proposal concerning the general line of the international communist move-

ment and the correct stand of your Party in the debate constitute an inestimable contribution in this respect.

It is futile for the revisionist leaders to aggravate and intensify their divisive manoeuvres.

We are living in the era of the victory of socialist revolution throughout the world.

The present debate within the international communist movement will certainly result in the victory of Marxism-Leninism.

The international communist movement will emerge strengthened from this debate to lead the working class and all the oppressed and exploited to final victory!

Long live the CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY and its CENTRAL COMMITTEE!

Long live Comrade MAO TSE-TUNG!

Onward to new revolutionary victories!

Onward to new victories for the revolutionary movement of national liberation!

Onward to new victories for the socialist revolution throughout the world!

Long live THE FRATERNAL UNITY OF THE MARXIST-LENINISTS OF THE WORLD!

Workers of all countries, oppressed peoples and nations, unite!

Long live MARXISM-LENINISM!

雅克·格里巴
現代修正主義者的“理論”和實踐
——在中共中央高級黨校的報告

*
外文出版社出版（北京）
1965年第一版
編號：（英）3050—1114
00039
3—E—672P