

The Modern Revisionists on the way to degenerating into Social-Democrats and to fusing with Social-Democracy

Reproduced from Zëri i Popullit dated April 7, 1964. Published in [The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism](#), Naim Frashëri Publishing House, Tirana, Albania, 1972.

Every day that passes by brings new facts to light testifying that the modern revisionists, N. Khrushchev's group and their followers, have completely deviated and have turned into enemies of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism, of socialism and of the revolutionary and liberation movement of the working class and the peoples under bondage, enemies of the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. They have joined in a "holy alliance" with the American imperialists and the reactionaries of different countries, with all the anti-communist forces against peoples and socialism. They have turned the blade of all their daggers against Marxism-Leninism, against all fraternal parties and revolutionary communists loyal to it, against the anti-imperialist, liberation and revolutionary movement of the peoples. All their utterances about "loyalty" to Marxism-Leninism, to the cause of socialism, to the revolution and proletarian internationalism are sheer bluff and demagoguery from head to foot.

In order to carry through their anti-Marxist, anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary line, they stand in need of allies. And where could they find better allies than among the revisionist elements in the various parties and among the Titoite clique in Yugoslavia? Therefore, N. Khrushchev and his group succeeded, through 'putsches' and plots, deceiving some and compromising others, under the guise of fighting "the cult of the individual" in bringing to power and placing at the head of certain communist and workers' parties revisionist elements of their choice while, on the other hand, they rehabilitated Tito's renegade clique and joined up with them completely. Thus, the united revisionist front came into being. This was the first step.

In addition to this, the modern revisionists have never given up efforts to find other allies too. And who could these be? It is very natural for them to turn to—and they could not help turn to—their "brothers", fellow traitors—the right-wing social-democrat leaders. For revisionism and social-democracy of today are two manifestations of the same ideology—bourgeois ideology. Social-democracy is the manifestation of bourgeois ideology in the workers movement, while revisionism is the manifestation of bourgeois ideology in the communist movement.

This is the common ideological basis that draws the revisionists closer to and united with the social-democrats and creates the premises for their complete fusion not only ideologically and politically but also organizationally. Therefore, it is altogether natural and logical that the attempts of the revisionists to cause the degeneration of the communist parties they direct, into social democratic parties, that their tendency to fuse in with the social-democracy, is being made so very clear nowadays.

The trend to get closer and to join with social-democrats, the whole treacherous line of action of the modern revisionists, have their beginnings at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This trend was re-emphasized at the 21st and 22nd Congresses and was sanctioned in the new program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Speaking of this line of approach to and union with social-democracy at the 22nd Congress, N. Khrushchev said: "This is not a tactical temporary slogan but the general line of the communist movement dictated by the basic interests of the working class". N. Khrushchev has also said: "If we are to speak of the role and position of the non-communist parties, we should stress, above all, that in the present situation, in order to achieve the socialist transformation of society, collaboration of the communist party with the other parties is not only possible but indispensable". (N. Khrushchev's reply to the editor of the Australian newspaper Herald, John Waters, published in Pravda June 25, 1958).

The line of approach to and union with social-democrats began to be put into effect immediately after the 20th Congress. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union addressed letters to the social-democratic parties of Western Europe calling for unity. Beginning with 1956 the Soviet Union was visited by a number of social-democratic leaders and by whole delegations of social-democratic parties who came into contact and carried on talks with N. Khrushchev's group.

The campaign for unity with social-democrats has become more intensive especially in recent times. A proof of this lies in the last year's visits to Moscow of such leaders of social-democracy as P.H. Spaak, secretary-general of the Belgian Socialist Party, Harold Wilson, the present chairman of the English Labour Party and Guy Mollet, secretary-general of the French Socialist Party, who conducted talks with N. Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders. In connection with these talks, in an interview with foreign journalists in Moscow Guy Mollet said that he had discussed with Khrushchev "a number of questions comprising all theoretical and doctrinarian problems of a general nature and which characterize the relations between social-democratic and communist parties". While in an interview granted to the newspaper "Unita" (February 22, 1964) Guy Mollet stated that "The talks which the delegation of SFIO conducted with the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and in particular with Nikita Khrushchev, gave us sure satisfaction in many points."

The leaders of communist and workers parties in certain other countries are also following the line of fusing with present-day social-democracy under the dictates of "the conductor's baton". This is evident in many of their acts, in various articles and statements, in the columns of the Khrushchevian review "Problems of Peace and Socialism", in "the document of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party for the national conference of organization" appearing in the newspaper Unita dated 9-1-1964, in the draft-resolution for the 17th Congress of the French Communist Party which will be held in May this year, and so on.

In all these attempts, documents and materials of the modern revisionists regardless of the phrases they use to camouflage their designs the prevailing idea is unity and fusion with the social-democrats "on whatever basis" and "at all costs", renouncing everything that might prejudice this union, be it in the field of ideology or in that of organization.

The attempts of the modern revisionists to get close to and join up with the social-democrats are a logical consequence of their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, are a component part of their grand strategic plan of "world integration" clearly formulated by Tito in his well-known interview granted to Drew Pearson on August 7, 1962. To realize this objective the revisionists make extensive use of demagogical slogans. They try to justify their approach to and union with the imperialists and reactionaries, their approach to and union with Tito's clique in the name of "socialism", with the Roman Pontiff in the name of "humanity", with the social-democrats, in the name of "unity of the working class", in the name of "peaceful coexistence and of saving the world from a nuclear war of extermination".

Modern Revisionists Proceed Along the Treacherous Tracks of Social Democracy

The modern revisionists try to justify the approach to and union with the social-democrats under the pretext that "positive trends" are allegedly being observed especially in recent times, among the ranks of social democracy; that they have allegedly expressed themselves in favour of peace, peaceful coexistence, disarmament, that they have positively modified their attitude toward the USSR, that they have expressed themselves in favour of some kind of approach to the communists, that they have expressed some sort of willingness to meet the demands of the working class, to

preserve and strengthen democratic institutions, they have stated that they are in favour of socialist transformation of society and so forth. Thus, in order to justify their line of approach to the right-wing leaders of social-democracy, the revisionists try to create the illusion that it is not the revisionist train which is speeding its way to the social-democratic station, but the social-democratic station is coming up to meet the revisionist train!

This is no new tactic for revisionists. N. Khrushchev's traitorous group and those who follow them have used exactly this manoeuvre to justify their approach to and complete union with the Titoite clique, pretending that the Yugoslav leaders have allegedly corrected many of their errors and have adopted the line of "Marxism-Leninism". In the same way, in order to justify their treacherous line of reconciliation with and approach to the imperialists, to the American imperialists in particular, they have spread and continue to spread illusions pretending that the leaders of imperialism have now become "wise", "realistic", "peace-loving", "reasonable" and what not.

But facts go to prove that the present social-democrat leaders have changed as little in their nature and in their attitude as the Titoite clique and the imperialists. If we may speak of any kind of change of views and stands of the social-democratic leaders, the only obvious change of theirs is their ever-growing inclination to the right.

What Does Present-Day Social-Democracy Represent?

Present-day social-democracy is a direct follower of the traitorous 2nd International. It has inherited all the ideological luggage, organization and tactics of the parties of the 2nd International. The social-democrats began their betrayal by getting away from the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism, which they proclaim as out-dated and inexpedient, by renouncing the class struggle and replacing it with the "theory" of harmony and reconciliation of classes, by negating the revolution and replacing it with reforms within the capitalist order, by giving up the revolutionary way and replacing it with "peaceful", "democratic" and parliamentary method, by denying the indispensability of breaking up the old bourgeois state machinery and accepting the capitalist state as a means to cross over to socialism, by withholding their assent to the dictatorship of the proletariat and replacing it with "pure and general democracy", by departing from proletarian internationalism and going so far the other way as to plunge into positions of the national-chauvinists, to open union with the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Unmasking the betrayal of the old social-democrats Lenin wrote as far back as in his book *What is to Be Done*: "Social-democracy should be changed from a party of social revolution to a democratic party of social reforms. Bernstein has bolstered up this political demand with a whole battery of 'new' arguments and considerations harmoniously connected with one another. He denies the possibility of endorsing socialism scientifically and of proving, from the point of view of the materialist conception of history, that it is indispensable and inevitable; he denies the fact that poverty and proletarianization are on the increase and that capitalist contradictions are getting worse; he proclaims the very notion of 'the final goal' as groundless and unconditionally rejects the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat; he denies the divergences of principle existing between liberalism and socialism and the theory of class struggle which, he pretends, cannot be carried out in a wholly democratic society governed by the will of the majority". (V.I. Lenin: *Selected Works* in 2 vol. Albanian edition, vol. 1, page 110).

By embarking on this road, social-democracy turned itself into a loyal supporter of the capitalist order of things, into a servant of the bourgeoisie into a most important ideological and political abettor of the bourgeois policy in the workers movement. It has aided the bourgeoisie to oppress and exploit the workers of their country and the peoples of other countries, to suppress their revolutionary and liberation movement. "It has been verified by practice" Lenin says, "that the

militant group in the ranks of the workers movement who adhere to opportunist trends, are better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeoisie themselves. If workers were not under the guidance of such people, the bourgeoisie would not be able to stand their ground" (Works, vol. 31, page 259, Albanian edition).

But social-democracy today has gone a step further in its betrayal when compared with the time of the 2nd International. At present it is characterized by a growing tendency towards the right. Beginning from 1955 the social-democratic parties in Western Europe like the English Labour Party, the social-democratic parties in France, Austria, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Western Germany and in the Scandinavian countries, have changed their programs or have been engaged in elaborating new programmatic procedures. What characterizes these programs and new programmatic procedures? They are characterized by the eclectic blending of the old opportunist theories with the "modern" bourgeois theories, by their permanent renunciation of the principles and ideals of socialism, by their open support for the capitalist order of exploitation and by their frenzied opposition to communism.

If the former reformists avowed, even in words alone, that the establishment of socialism was their ultimate goal, present-day social-democrats have openly rejected this end. They preach that they are in favor of the so-called "democratic socialism", which has nothing in common with true scientific socialism. It is its negation, its replacement with certain bourgeois liberal reforms which do not tamper in any way with the basis of capitalist society. What kind of socialism is that when most of the social-democratic programs have discarded an elementary demand of socialism to abolish private property of the means of production?

Following the well-known statements of the socialist International "Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism" (1951), the new programs direct the working class not against capitalism as such but against "unsupervised" capitalism. Nationalization of a part of the enterprises by the bourgeois state, the establishment of state monopolist capitalism in the economic life of the country, the adoption of certain bourgeois-democratic reforms—all of these figure in the new programs and statements of the social-democrats as facts that go to prove that the basis of socialism has allegedly been laid in certain capitalist countries. At the same time, they deny the socialist character of transformations in the socialist countries. They repeat in this manner, openly or in a roundabout way, the bourgeois theories in vogue on "people's capitalism", "capitalism under control", "organized", "democratic" and so on.

The bourgeois reactionary press has more than once hailed this departure of socialism and in defence of capitalism. In a leading article under the title "Burial of Marxism" the "Washington Post and Times Herald" newspaper wrote: "84 years after its establishment at the historic Congress at Gotha, the German Social-Democratic Party in its Congress at Bad-Gotsberg, renounced Marxist ideology and, in fact, ceased being socialist in the true sense of that word. It reconciled itself to the principle of 'free individual initiative, wherever that is possible in economic life'"

The new programs of the social-democratic parties have cancelled out all mention of contradictions, antagonism and class struggle, have levelled down all boundaries between the oppressed and oppressors, between the exploited and exploiters. In place of the class struggle they preach "the sense of responsibility" of man "in general". Thus the program of the German Social-Democratic Party has it: "Freedom and democracy in industrial society are possible of attainment only if as many individuals as possible raise their social conscience and express themselves as willing to share responsibility. The social-democrats uphold the solidarity and 'harmony of all people' the attaining of their 'above classes' objective—democratic socialism".

Since "democratic socialism" does not encroach upon the basis of the capitalist order in any way,

but it is a kind of "reformed capitalism", it naturally follows that there is no need whatsoever for a socialist revolution. "Democratic socialism", according to them, will come about through "spontaneous economic evolution", through limitation of the prerogatives and power of the monopolist unions and through the aid of the capitalist state itself. Nevertheless, in order to attain this ideal, it is necessary that the social-democrats come into power and the only way to achieve this is through electoral campaigns to obtain the majority of votes in the bourgeois parliament. Speaking highly of the declaration of the socialist International on "The aims and tasks of democratic socialism", one of its leaders, Brauntal, has said that this declaration "puts an end to the discussions on the dictatorship of the proletariat", "does away with the revolutionary class war method to achieve socialism", and "rejects adherence to any socialist theory."

The social-democrats have severed all connections with Marxism-Leninism, with the theory of scientific socialism and with the materialistic conception of things. The program of the Austrian Socialist Party has it: "Socialism is an international movement which does not at all demand an obligatory similarity of views. Regardless of where the socialists draw their points of view, from a Marxist or any other social analysis, from religious or humanitarian principles—they all aim at a common goal". Speaking at the Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party at Gotsberg, its former Chairman, E. Olenhauer, said "the demand to make K. Marx's and F. Engel's political program the substance of the social-democratic program for 1959 is more anti-Marxist than can be imagined" and he added; "We cannot be understood if we speak in terms of the past, we cannot solve the problems of today with our old conceptions."

Present-day social-democracy has not only slipped into positions of philosophic idealism and upholds idealism, but tries to find support in, and even fuse entirely with its extremist form—religion. Thus, for instance, the programs of German, Austrian, Swiss and other social-democratic parties maintain that "democratic socialism" has its roots in Christian ethics and doctrine, that socialism and religion, far from eliminating, are completely at one with each other. Speaking at the Congress of the Austrian Socialist Party in 1958, the author of the new program, B. Kautzky, said: "We would like to draw up a program, which would be fully endorsed by Marxists and non-Marxists alike, by atheists and socialist believers in religion alike". A similar attempt to reconcile Christianity with socialism, religious idealist conception with socialist materialist conception, is made also in an interview given to the correspondent of the Italian newspaper "Unita" by Guy Mollet and which was published in this paper on February 22 of this year.

Such, in general, are the ideological views of the present social-democrats. What should be stressed in this connection is that their programs, as a rule, are more leftist than their acts. If the right socialists still try, in words, to pose as socialists in order to deceive the workers, in deeds they have long become staunch defenders of the capitalist order. Both when they are in opposition as well as when they are at the head of bourgeois governments, or take part in them, the heads of social-democracy serve to preserve and strengthen the bourgeois order through all their views and acts. All the socialist demagogy of the social democrats has been shown up by experience. Socialists have more than once been in power, at the head of bourgeois governments both in England, France and elsewhere. They are at the head of or take part to this day in the governments of capitalist countries. And what have they done for the workers, for socialism? They have done nothing but follow Leon Blum's instructions: that being in power the socialists should be "faithful directors of capitalist society".

Let us dwell even briefly on the activity of the French Socialist Party and its leader Guy Mollet, who has more than once taken part in and even headed the French government, and whom the revisionists consider a left-wing element and conduct hearty talks with. When at the head of the government, the French socialists set the dogs loose on workers on strike, incited the outbreak of the dirty war in Indochina, undertook police repressions against the people of other colonies, carried

on the fighting against the Algerian people with more ferocity, approved the North Atlantic Pact and the re-arming of Western Germany. Guy Mollet's government signed the agreements for "the European Common Market" and "Euratom", it was one of the organizers of the military aggression on Egypt, Guy Mollet's betrayal paved the way for personal rule in France and so on and so forth. Speaking of Guy Mollet's activity even the labourite weekly "Tribune" wrote at the beginning of 1957 that "Mollet is a disgrace to France as well as to socialism".

These are the true features of social-democracy today. Many representatives of the bourgeoisie have not been wrong in stressing the great role of the social-democratic parties in suppressing the revolutionary movement of workers and in defending the capitalist order, they have not been wrong in singing their praises. Thus, for instance, T. Junilla, director of a capitalist bank in Finland, has said: "In the struggle to win over industrial workers spiritually only the social-democrats can serve as a powerful force against the communists. If the social democrats lose this battle, it may very well be the end of democracy in Finland. This is why, being a bourgeois member of the conservative party, I feel obliged to state that we need a united, militant, social-democratic party which firmly upholds northern democracy". The English bourgeois newspaper Financial Times wrote in the same vein on June 28, 1963: ". . . the industrialists are scared less by the Labourites, and some of them cherish the opinion that a Labour government would open up better perspectives for development than the Tories."

It is precisely because the social-democrats are agents of the bourgeoisie in the workers movement that the Marxist-Leninists have always had it clear that without a determined struggle to unmask and smash the social-democrats ideologically and politically, the working class cannot wage its struggle and carry it on to victory, ". . . Bourgeois parties of workers" as a political phenomenon, V.I. Lenin has written, "have already been set up in all advanced capitalist countries. . . . Without a resolute, relentless war on all fronts against these parties—or, what amounts to the same thing, against groups, trends and so on—it is futile to speak of the struggle against imperialism, or of Marxism, or of the workers socialist movement" (V.I. Lenin: "Against Revisionists", Albanian edition, page 368). J.V. Stalin too, as a revolutionary and consistent Marxist, has stressed: "Present-day social-democratism is the ideological support of capitalism. Lenin was a thousand times right when he said that the present social-democratic politicians are 'true agents of the bourgeoisie in the workers movement, lackeys of the capitalist class from the workers ranks' and that 'in the civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie' they will undoubtedly take sides with the 'Versailles' against the 'Communards'. 'No end can be put to capitalism without putting an end to social-democracy in the workers movement. Therefore, the epoch of the death of capitalism is at the same time the epoch of the death of social-democracy in the workers movement'" (J.V. Stalin: Works, Albanian edition, vol. 10, p, 242).

The 1960 Moscow Declaration too, stressing the fact that the right-wing leaders of social-democracy have aligned themselves openly with the imperialists, uphold the capitalist system, split the workers movement and that they are "enemies of communism", called upon the communists to continue to expose them.

But the modern revisionists, with N. Khrushchev's group in the lead, as renegades and foes to Marxism, act entirely at variance with the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, with the instructions of the Moscow Declaration; they pursue the line of joining in and fusing with the right-wing leaders of social-democracy. And this is not accidental: social-democrats of today and modern revisionists have common things together, they proceed in the same direction and towards a common counter-revolutionary objective.

Modern Revisionists Have Slipped into the Positions of Social-Democracy

Just as the old opportunists and reformists betrayed Marxism-Leninism, the cause of the working class, of the revolution and of socialism, so do the modern revisionists betray these ideals and are pursuing the same road as their forerunners who are at the same time their spiritual inspirers. Those who have changed are not the social-democrats but the modern revisionists, who have fallen into the treacherous positions of social-democracy.

Rejecting Marxism-Leninism, the social-democrats claim that "problems of today cannot be solved by old concepts". Following in their wake, the revisionists too, speculate with the newer conditions and phenomena, and, under the guise of fighting "dogmatism" and upholding "the creative development of Marxism" claim that many things today should be looked at with a critical eye, that what was right 30 years ago cannot be such any longer, that atomic weapons and the danger of a nuclear war makes it indispensable to revise our views and stand on many questions of strategy and tactics, that he who abides by the basic theses of Marx and Lenin in the sixties of the 20th century is a dogmatist who takes no account of the great changes that have come about in the world, and he who consults the classic works of Marxist-Leninists in order to analyze and explain the present historical process, is afflicted with the mania of quotations and so and so forth. Hence, Marxism-Leninism is outdated for revisionists too, it no longer suits the newer conditions, it should be "enriched" with new ideas and new conclusions. Just like all the old opportunists and reformists, the revisionists too are stripping Marxism of its critical and revolutionary spirit and are attempting to turn it from a weapon in the hands of the working class into a weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie to be used against the working class.

"Not the class struggle but the solidarity and harmony of all men who possess the sense of responsibility towards society"--this is the motive power of present-day society, the social-democrats maintain. The revisionists too have erased the class struggle from their books, and in fact have replaced it with the idea of class reconciliation in the name of "preserving peace" in the world, they have renounced this struggle in the name of "saving the world from the danger of nuclear war", and instead of the class struggle they preach "peaceful coexistence" as the only method to solve all the vital problems that stand before human society. "Peace at all costs, peace with all and above all", "Christian love for everybody", "abstract humanism above classes", these are the ideas that the modern revisionists preach far and wide. In the name of this ideal the revisionists make common cause with the enemies of the class, with the imperialists and reactionaries of various countries and their agents and lackeys—the right-wing leaders, social-democratic leaders and the Titoite clique, while, on the other hand, they fight furiously against all those who loyally uphold the interests of the working class and their Marxist-Leninist ideology—the communists parties and all the revolutionary communists.

The social-democrats have long given up the revolution and preach that socialism will come about through reforms within the framework of the bourgeois order of things, of democracy and bourgeois legality. Following in their tracks, the revisionists too have abandoned the revolutionary way, saying that the way to socialism is the way to an ever broader democracy, the way of observing and carrying out bourgeois constitutions, the way of "reforming structures". Just like the social democrats, the revisionists too, identify the struggle for democracy with that for socialism, confine the struggle for socialism to that for democracy. Dragging Kautzky's and Bernstein's theories from their burial place, they express themselves in and only in favour of the "peaceful" and "parliamentary" way, which they hold up as a world strategic principle, and they have concentrated all the efforts on the struggle for votes in order to win the majority of seats in bourgeois parliaments.

The social-democrats consider the capitalist state as a state above classes, as an interpreter and champion of the interests of society as a whole, they are opposed to breaking up the old bourgeois state machine, they are opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat, which, according to them, is

the negation of democracy, is a totalitarian rule and so on and so forth. And the revisionists spread the illusions that the capitalist state may change its class nature, that it may become a state that will express not only the interests of the bourgeoisie but also those of the proletariat and of the labouring masses, they say that Lenin's thesis on the indispensability of breaking up the bourgeois state apparatus must be modified, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is an out-dated idea, or, at most, suitable only for backward countries, that it may take not only various forms but also quite a different content. Both the social-democrats as well as the revisionists slander against the dictatorship of the proletariat and describe the entire period of its rule as a period of mass terror and arbitrariness, as a period of brutal violation of laws, of socialist democracy, and so on and so forth. In their practical political activity too, the modern revisionists are proceeding in the footsteps of the traitorous leaders of social democracy. As a matter of fact, they have joined with the enemies of socialism and of the peoples—with the imperialists and particularly with the American imperialists, and with the reactionaries of various countries. For the sake of getting closer to imperialism, for the sake of achieving Soviet-American collaboration, which is N. Khrushchev's and his group's highest aspiration and ideal, the revisionists do not hesitate even to betray the true friends and allies of the Soviet people, the vital interests of the socialist countries, the working class, the peoples and nations oppressed and exploited by the imperialists. A proof of this lies in such activities of the revisionists headed by Khrushchev's group as their adventuresome and capitulating attitude in the Caribbean crisis, in their pressure exerted on socialist Cuba to capitulate to the American imperialists, sacrificing its dignity and its sovereignty, in their union with the Indian reactionaries against the People's Republic of China, with the Titoite clique and with Venizelos against the People's Republic of Albania, in the infamous Moscow Treaty for a partial ban on nuclear tests, which is high treason to the interests of the Soviet Union, to the other socialist countries and to peace in favor of the American imperialists, as well as in a number of other facts.

Anti-communism permeates all the ideology and practical activity of the modern social-democrats, they slander the socialist countries and communist parties, they split the workers movement, counter scientific socialism with "democratic socialism" which is no other than reformed capitalism, try their utmost to preserve the capitalist order where it prevails and re-establish it where it has been overthrown. The modern revisionists are also carrying on anti-socialist and anti-communist activities on a wide scale. N. Khrushchev's group and their followers have split the socialist camp and the international communist movement and are speeding ahead towards degenerating the socialist countries into "docile bourgeois republics" and the communist and workers parties from parties of social revolution into "parties of social reforms". N. Khrushchev and his group deny the proletarian class nature of the socialist state and the communist party, they are liquidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and the communist party in the Soviet Union under the pretext of turning them into the state and party of "the entire people". The revisionists are organizing and reorganizing with a view to changing the forms of management of socialist economy after the pattern of Titoite Yugoslavia, violating the Marxist principles of managing socialist economy, they belittle the experience of many years of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries, and call on all to learn from the experience of capitalist countries, going as far as to stretch their hands to the imperialists for aid, credits and capital investments "to build socialism and communism", as Khrushchev himself did of late. Under the guise of fighting "the cult of the individual and its consequences", they have done away with the sound Marxist-Leninist cadres and have rehabilitated the traitors and enemies of socialism, living or dead. They have flung open the door of the socialist countries to the unhindered penetration of bourgeois ideology, of all kinds of alien antisocialist trends and manifestations in art, letters and in all the life of country, in the name of "freedom of conscience" and of "an abstract humanity above classes". This "liberal" and "humanist" socialism of the modern revisionists is getting closer and closer to the so-called "democratic socialism" which the leaders of the modern social democracy preach.

Thus, all the given facts show clearly that the modern revisionists are proceeding along the

treacherous tracks of the social-democrats. This is very clear to the socialist leaders who have openly expressed their approval, their joys and hopes regarding the traitorous course followed by N. Khrushchev's group and their followers. Here are some of their statements:

In a speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations at its last session P.H. Spaak said: "N. Khrushchev is trying to test peaceful coexistence and the West should not make it difficult for him to make this experiment. It would be a terrible and inexcusable mistake to discourage him. At this moment the future line of demarcation will not be any longer between communists and non-communists, between colonized and colonizers, between ideologies and races. We are witnesses of the struggle between those who wait the opportune time and inhuman doctrinaires on one hand and those who have had confidence in progress and have never ceased to hope, on the other. Let us not let this great occasion slip from our hands".

In his interview on February 24, 1964, the chairman of the English Labour Party, H. Wilson, pointed out that he was the first of the Western politicians who visited Russia after the death of Stalin and, on his return from there, reported to W. Churchill, Prime Minister at that time, that "a great change was taking place in Soviet politics" and that this "is of major importance as regards relations between East and West". He is fully justified to be proud of his farsighted anticipations which today have become realities.

Before going to Moscow with the socialist delegation to talk with Khrushchev Gerard Jacques, director of the newspaper of the French Socialist Party stated: "We have long given up engaging in polemics with the Soviet Union and admit that this country is in the full phase of evolution. . . The problems raised are those of democracy and the democratic guarantees of the single party, of the role of the socialist party in socialist society, of the nature of the socialist regime and its structure. The attitude maintained by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the divergences between Moscow and Peking throws ample light on the attitude of this party towards dogmatism and political sectarianism".

After his return to Paris from colloquies with N. Khrushchev, the Secretary General of the French Socialist Party, Guy Mollet, stated that he became convinced that "a positive evolution is taking place in the Soviet Union", which, according to his words, were summed up in these matters: "Admittance of many ways to build socialism", "end of the proletarian dictatorship", "internal evolution" and so on. Whereas an interview granted the newspaper *Unita* (Feb. 22, 1964), Guy Mollet declared "I am convinced that the communist world has embarked on the road to transformation".

These statements of the leaders of social-democracy are at one with the statements made by the leaders of imperialism and their spokesmen who also express their support for N. Khrushchev's revisionist line and consider him "the best friend of the West in Moscow". They say that "The Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev acts like an American politician" and affirm that the officials in the State Department in the USA are of the opinion that "the United States should facilitate N. Khrushchev's task to a certain extent" and so on and so forth.

Towards a Complete Fusion of the Modern Revisionists with the Social-Democrats

The falling of the modern revisionists into the ideological position of the social-democrats in major issues constitutes the basis of the complete amalgamation of revisionists with the social-democrats. By pursuing this course and recommending it to communist and workers parties of different countries, the modern revisionists with N. Khrushchev's group in the lead, aim at causing the degeneration of the communist parties into reformist parties of the social-democratic type, at impregnating the working class with bourgeois ideology and reformist illusions, at weakening the

revolutionary fighting spirit of the working class movement, and alienating it from the only correct road against the capitalist order of oppression and exploitation.

The revisionists, of course, do not, as a rule, proclaim their hostile intentions openly. They accompany every step they take to the detriment of the cause of the revolution and of communism, with demagogical slogans and clothe it with all kinds of justifications. Their anti-Marxist action of fusing with social-democracy too, they try to justify with the pretext that the social-democratic parties too are allegedly workers' parties and that the unity of the working class is essential in the struggle against capitalism. Let us dwell in brief on this matter.

Workers Parties or "Bourgeois Parties of the Working Class"?

Are the social-democratic parties really and truly workers parties? To judge whether a party is a party of the working class or not it does not suffice to look at the name it attaches to itself. Hitler's party too, called itself "nationalist socialist"! The only correct criterion is whether or not it defends and upholds the interests of the working class, whether or not it fights for its cause. And in order to elucidate this matter one should see to whose advantage are the ideology, policy and all practical activities of this or that party. "Don't bush faith in phrases", Lenin teaches us, "but rather see to whose benefits they are" (Works, vol. 19, p. 33, Russian edition). And if we look at this manner from this prism, from the prism of class, which is the only correct, Marxist-Leninist criterion, then it becomes clear to every true communist that the social-democratic parties are not workers parties, but they are, as Lenin has dubbed them "bourgeois parties of the working class". We showed above through numerous facts, that in both ideological views, political views and all-around activities, modern social-democracy is nothing other than, as Lenin says, "a political detachment of the bourgeoisie", "a promoter of its influence", "a true agency of the bourgeoisie in the workers movement".

From the point of view of its social make-up, too, the social-democratic parties have undergone and are undergoing visible changes. The number of workers in their ranks are becoming less and less and the number of elements of the petty bourgeoisie and of the workers bureaucrats are increasing. The modern reformists have themselves launched the slogan "the de-proletarianisation" of the social-democratic parties. And this has been expressed in the new programs of many social-democratic parties. Thus, for instance, the program of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party has it: "At the beginning socialism was the concern of the working class which used to be exploited by capitalism alone. . . . Now socialism is the concern of all mankind. It pertains to every man with a sense of responsibility for the welfare of society".

This is for the groundwork, for the masses of the social-democratic parties, whereas as far as the leading cadres are concerned, the higher up you climb in the hierarchy of the social-democratic parties, the fewer workers you find in them. As a matter of fact many social democratic leaders have long become real capitalists: many of them take part in the administrative councils of the biggest banks and own packages of solid shares, drawing millions upon millions of dividends each year. Thus, for instance, according to returns of the recent years, 410 principal functionaries of the German Social-Democratic Party occupied 929 high paid posts in the major banks and corporations of Western Germany, 62 social democrat personalities were directors of the firms Mannesman, Klekner, Krupp, Flick and others. The same situation prevails in other social democratic parties of the West like France, England, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries and so on.

This is the kind of "workers' class" the social-democratic parties represent. The modern revisionists, who are themselves nothing but traitors to the working class, have every reason to stick the label of "workers' party" not only on themselves, but only on the social-democrats, but also on any English bourgeois conservative party if such a thing is dictated by their anti-Marxist and anti-revolutionary

plan of action.

It is therefore obvious enough that the argument of the modern revisionists pretending that the social-democratic parties are parties of the working class, is altogether a false one. Hence, their slogan on "the need for unity of the working class" is demagogical, a pretext to justify their union with the "bourgeois parties of the working class".

The workers' movement in almost all the advanced capitalist countries has been split. Who is to blame for this split? Who hinders the achievement of unity and action in the workers movement? The 1960 Moscow Declaration points out that the originators and promoters of this split on a national and international scale are the "ruling classes, the right-wing leaders of social democracy and the reactionary leaders of the trade unions". Under these circumstances, in order to realize unity of action in the workers movement, the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists are guided by the following considerations:

- a) that unity of action may be attained only in battle with splitters, therefore they wage a relentless and persistent war of principle against the splitters—the treacherous leaders of social-democracy;
- b) that all efforts should be concentrated to achieve unity of action at the base with the working masses of the socialist parties, that the watchword of the Marxist-Leninists for unity of action could and should be: reliance on the masses, alliance with the leftists, uncompromising combat against the treacherous right-wing leaders who cause the split in order to expose and isolate them;
- c) that by soliciting unity of action with socialists, the communist parties should consider this not as collaboration between two political parties of the working class but as collaboration between a proletarian and non-proletarian party in order to achieve some specific objectives. In connection with this it is essential to always keep in mind and strictly observe Lenin's teachings, who has more than once stressed with force that it is essential that, when concluding an alliance or agreement with other movements for this or that question or objective, the revolutionary party of the working class will maintain its political independence at every moment and in every situation, so that it may not lose sight at any moment of the basic interests of the working class in its fight to achieve its final objective—the triumph of socialism and communism.

Every departure from Marxist-Leninist positions brings about as a consequence the alienation of the working class from its revolutionary line of action and its fall into the mire of opportunism. Such is the attitude of the Marxist-Leninists towards unity of the workers movement.

But what stand do the modern revisionists maintain in connection with this? They have not only given up fighting the splitters of the workers' movement—the right-wing leaders of social democracy but, what's more, they are advocates of unity "at all costs" and "under the conditions" with these traitorous splitters. The revisionists even rise against all those who fight against the right-wing leaders of social-democracy and who expose their betrayal, considering this fight as "sectarian", "dogmatic", as "insolent" and "dangerous attack" and so on.

But everybody knows that social-democratic leaders like Spaak, Guy Mollet and others, with whom N. Khrushchev and his followers conduct "hearty talks" and try to achieve unity "at all costs" are servitors and agents of the bourgeoisie, who have even been and continue to be at the head of bourgeois governments in many capitalist countries. Therefore, unity with these traitors is by no means a unity of the workers movement, but an attempt at unity between the working class and the bourgeoisie, for the subjection of the working class to the bourgeoisie, unity and collaboration with the reactionary bourgeois governments pretending to be "socialist".

Formerly when they had not yet revealed so openly their treacherous features, the modern revisionists used to claim they are opposed to the right-wing leaders of social-democracy, that no unity was possible with them and so on, and they had even said a word or two against them. N. Khrushchev, for one, said at the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that the cause of unity of the working class is hindered by "imperialist reactionaries and their lackeys in the workers movement such as the anti-communist leaders of Social-democracy—Guy Mollet and Spaak. We know these leaders of anti-communism by name and we do not rely on them when we speak of unity of action of the working class". Whereas now it is the same Khrushchev who conducts "hearty colloquies" with and solicits the collaboration of such anti-communist leaders as Guy Mollet, Spaak, H. Wilson and their ilk to achieve "unity of the working class"! One of two things must have happened: either Guy Mollet, Spaak and Co have ceased to be anti-communists or N. Khrushchev himself has ceased to be a communist and makes common cause with the leaders of anti-communism, servitors of the imperialist reactionaries! So far there is no sign to prove the first, while there are plenty of facts to prove the second.

Regardless of the demagogical slogans they make use of in order to waylay the masses, the modern revisionists are not only in favour of "unity at all costs" with the social democrats including their traitorous leaders, but have gone even further, expressing themselves willing to collaborate with them "on any basis". Thus, in an article appearing in the "Komunist" review of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union No. 3, 1960, we read: "Unity of action with the reformists, even with the sworn ones on this or that issue is always possible, provided they really try to achieve any reform, be it ever so small, for the benefit of the working class, of the workers". Whereas the leaders of the French Communist Party, on the basis of a resolution of the plenum of the Central Committee during September 27 & 28, 1961 regarding collaboration with the socialist and other parties have stated: "We on our part, are ready to collaborate on any basis". (See the "Komunist" review No. 3, 1962, p. 95).

Thus, speculating on the slogan "unity", the revisionists sacrifice the principles, level off the distinction between communists and social-democrats, trample upon and sacrifice the basic interests of the working class. This is sham unity, unity in favour of the bourgeoisie and their agents in the workers movement, which aims at submitting the workers movement wholly to the bourgeois and reformist influence, at liquidating the revolutionary spirit and the revolutionary party of the working class. This is high treason to the cause of the working class and of socialism.

All of these things give rise to an important conclusion: full unity on sound basis of the workers movement can and will be achieved through bitter combat not only with the right-wing leaders of social democracy but also with the modern revisionists, against the workers movement to the poisonous and counter-revolutionary influence of social democracy and of its treacherous right-wing leaders.

Liquidation of the Communist Parties—the Goal of the Modern Revisionists

Facts go to prove that the hue and cry of the modern revisionists are raising about "unity" of the workers movement, is nothing but a bluff, a demagogical manoeuvre to cover their tracks. Whereas their true objective is to cause the degeneration of the communist parties into parties of the social-democratic type, and to join with the social-democrats under "any condition" and on "any basis" and then to liquidate the communist parties, to amalgamate them with the social-democratic parties.

The social-democratic leaders, who cannot plead ignorance of these attempts and intentions of the revisionists, have defined their stand and their tactics towards them in compliance with this. The social-democratic leaders pursue the same two-fold tactics towards the revisionists as the American imperialists and the Titoite clique do.

On the one hand, they sing praises to them for their revisionist line of action, back them up and encourage them as allies in their betrayal, incite them against Marxism-Leninism and against all those that stand loyal to it. To meet the revisionists halfway and to throw dust in the eyes of the masses, certain social-democratic leaders, have, especially of late, started to speak in terms similar to those of the revisionists and to make statements in favour of peace, peaceful coexistence and disarmament, they have somewhat changed their attitude towards the Soviet Union and towards the communists in their countries, and so on. This has, of course, nothing to do with any real, positive, basic change of the social democrats, but a mere change of attitude towards the revisionists for the above reasons. It is exactly this kind of "change" that the revisionists try, in a demagogical way, to hold out as "an inclination to the left" of the social-democrats, in order to justify their transition to the right, to justify their own line of approach and collaboration with them.

On the other hand the social-democratic leaders maintain a "superior" and "haughty" attitude towards the servile requests and appeals of the revisionists for approach and collaboration and demand more and more concessions. And what do the social-democrats demand?

In the ideological field they demand that the revisionists give up for good the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the role of leadership of the communist party, proletarian internationalism, and so on, not only in essence but also formally. In the field of politics, they demand "further democratic guarantees", toleration of many parties, consequently of bourgeois parties as well, and the distribution of power among them in socialist states, a change in the electoral system to allow lists of candidates including anti-socialist elements in them, etc. They demand in other words "the liberalization" of the socialist regime and its transformation into an ordinary bourgeois democracy.

In the economic field they demand abolition of the cooperative system in the countryside, of the "old forms" of organization and management of economy, in order to proceed towards alignment and "wide and all-round collaboration" of the socialist countries with the capitalist countries and so on.

In the field of international relations they demand further and bigger concessions towards the imperialists in the name of "preserving peace", renunciation of support for the revolutionary and national-liberation movements and even the sacrifice of the German Democratic Republic as a condition of establishing peace in Europe.

Such are the demands put forward, for instance, by Spaak, Guy Mollet and other social-democratic leaders. These demands are as similar as two drops of water to those made to the revisionists by the imperialists, particularly the American imperialists through Eisenhower, Dulles, Kennedy, Johnson and others.

The social-democratic leaders are convinced that the revisionists will continue to make further concessions, for this is an inevitable consequence of the traitorous line which the revisionists pursue. And facts go to prove more clearly as days go by that they are not mistaken in their calculations. In fact, having embarked on the road of degenerating the communist parties into social-democratic parties headed by them, the revisionists are now attempting to make the next move—to complete fusion with the social-democratic parties.

At the top of these efforts stands the revisionist "troika"—N. Khrushchev's group, Tito's clique and the revisionist leadership of the Italian Communist Party with P. Togliati in the lead. A living example of how to proceed along this treacherous road is that of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party. P. Togliati and other revisionist leaders have imposed on the Italian Communist

Party a line which is opportunist and reformist from top to bottom, a line that flagrantly deviates from the teachings and basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, a line which has replaced the class struggle, the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat with the so-called "Italian Road to Socialism" through "structural reforms" within the framework of "bourgeois democracy", of the bourgeois state "above classes", of the bourgeois constitution. And this is not all. Proceeding along their anti-Marxist road, P. Togliati and other revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party have long been trumpeting abroad the indispensability of changing the "character, functions and organizational structure" of their party, allegedly to fit the major political exigencies lying before it and the "transformations that have taken are are taking place in the economy, social and political structure of the country" "with the problems of the struggle for socialism in the advanced capitalist countries" and so forth and so on.

Just in what direction these changes will be made and what their objective is, is made clear by the "Document of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party for the national conference on organization" published in the newspaper "Unita" dated January 9, 1964. In this document we read: "The essential exigency is to look for and adopt a system of new contacts and connections among all forces which accept a socialist policy and future" in perspective so that "the separation existing among the various organizations of the working class may be organically overcome and the basis for a single party may be laid". It is even said that in light of the struggle against monopolist development of the country in order to direct the latter toward socialist development, we should look into the "problem of the relation and dialogued with the political, democratic catholic movement, which is the other major force, whose support is essential in building a new society in Italy".

These theses of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party are the continuation and further concretization of the opportunist views expressed long ago by P. Togliati. At the meeting of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party on June 24, 1956 Togliati said: "We can detect, as a matter of fact, a drift towards socialism, a more or less clear trend towards economic reforms and transformations of the socialist type even in countries where the communist parties far from taking part in the government, are not even a major force at times. . . . This situation exists today and assumes special significance in those regions of the world which have been emancipated from colonialism only recently. But also in very advanced capitalist countries it may happen that the working class, in its majority, may vote for a non-communist party and it cannot be excluded that in such countries even non-communist parties based on the working class, may express the urge coming from the working class for a drift towards socialism. Even where communist parties exist and are strong, there may exist side by side with them other parties which may have their basis in the working class and a socialist program. The tendency to bring about radical economic changes in a direction which, in general is that of socialism, many after all come also from organizations and movements which do not call themselves socialist".

What is new in the latest document of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party for the conference on the organization of the party, lies in the fact that attempts are being made to pass from pseudo-theoretical considerations to practical steps to set up the so-called "single organization of the working class", in other words the liquidation of the communist party as a revolutionary and independent vanguard of the working class.

We have already had the occasion to point out that these views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party are not at all original, but entirely the same as those of the Titoite renegades sanctioned in the program of the Yugoslav Communist League and already condemned unanimously by the international communist movement as profoundly anti-Marxist. It is in this revisionist program that we read: "The view that communist parties own a monopoly in every line of development towards socialism, and that socialism is expressed by them, is theoretically

incorrect and practically very harmful". We read there further: "The Yugoslav Communist League considers it dogmatic to claim the absolute monopoly of the communist party over the political power as a universal and perpetual principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of socialist construction".

The unity of views of the Italian Communist Party leaders with those of the Titoite clique extends not only to this, but to their entire line of action. This revisionist unity was clearly expressed in the joint Tito-Togliati communiqué signed in Belgrade on January 21 of this year, as well as in a leading article by Togliati on his return from a visit to Yugoslavia.

During this encounter in Yugoslavia Togliati and Tito did not keep it a secret that they talked about coordinating their joint activity in spreading the triumph of the "new positive course" in the communist movement, especially in Europe, and in overcoming the obstacles in the way of the unity of the workers and communist movement on the basis of this course. These talks pointed out again the "special role" which the leaders of the Italian Communist Party have assigned to themselves in the communist and workers movement in Western Europe (let us recall the theory of "poly-centralization", implying, of course, that one of the principal and most "attractive" centres of direction would certainly be the Italian Communist Party with Togliati at the head!).

To achieve their end—the triumph of the "new course", the degeneration of the communist parties, the revisionists with N. Khrushchev at the head, need, first and foremost, to break, subdue and set moving towards degeneration not only the Italian Communist Party which Togliati himself is zealously trying to do, but also the French Communist Party, as two major parties in Western Europe. It is precisely for this reason that the "Trojan Troika"—N. Khrushchev's group, Tito's clique and the revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party—are exerting strong and all-round pressure on the French Communist Party by the right-wing socialist leaders under Guy Mollet as well as by the various revisionist elements in the ranks of the French Communist Party itself like Raimond Gouyot and others.

The French Communist Party is a party with revolutionary traditions. It has formerly made valuable contribution to the struggle against various anti-Marxist trends ranging from the right-wing socialists like Leon Blum and Guy Mollet to Tito's clique of renegades. Now this criticism seems to have been suppressed either as a result of obedience to the "conductor's baton" or by the pressure on the part of revisionist elements who are bent on leading the French Communist Party towards the inglorious road of submission to anti-Marxist degeneration, to the line against which it fought.

Let us take, for instance, the latest document of the leadership of the French Communist Party—the draft resolution for the 17th Congress of the Party which will be held in May this year. It is said therein that for the sake of unity and collaboration with the socialist party, the French Communist Party has done much and is willing to do more, to smooth the "obstacles" in the way of this collaboration, that "it has given up the idea of a single party as an essential condition for transition to socialism. This idea upheld by Stalin constituted an abusive generalization of the specific circumstances under which the October Revolution came about. Later experience has proven that common objectives of the parties representing the working class of the cities and of the countryside, lead to an ever-deeper unity for transition to socialism, for building socialist society."

Here we come across a new major concession of principle which the French Communist Party is making to the social-democrats. Through this very serious step the French revisionists are jeopardizing the very existence of the Communist Party, they are proceeding towards its liquidation, towards its complete fusion with Guy Mollet's Socialist Party. This is another clear proof of whither the modern revisionists are leading the communist parties. No wonder the big bourgeois newspaper "Le Monde" greets this statement with these words: "The Communist Party firmly rejects the idea

of the single party". No matter how hard they may try to justify this step, how hard they may try to slander against Stalin, the revisionists of the French Communist Party will not succeed in covering up their betrayal, the plot they are hatching up to cause the degeneration of the French Communist Party into a social democratic one.

J.V. Stalin, like all consistent Marxist-Leninists, has never denied the possibility of collaboration with other parties in taking over the reins of state and building socialism. He has never universalized the special historical circumstances which determined the existence of a single party in the Soviet Union. It is an indisputable fact that it was precisely in Stalin's time that the communist parties in various countries of Europe and Asia, collaborated for the first time with other parties, both during the revolution in order to ascend to power, as well as after the assumption of power, during the construction of socialism. But it is clear in the documents both of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party and of the French Communist Party, the question is not whether the communist party may or may not collaborate with other parties during the socialist revolution and during the construction of socialism. The question here is that for the sake of this collaboration these documents erase all distinction between the communist parties and other parties, they deny in fact the necessity of the leading role of the communist party armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

J.V. Stalin however upheld just this idea, the idea of the leading role of the communist party, an idea which is not Stalin's alone, but a basic teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin emanating from the historic mission of the working class and from its Marxist-Leninist ideology which is the sole ideology of scientific socialism. This is clearly emphasized also in the 1957 Moscow Declaration in which we read: "the leadership of the masses by the working class, whose nucleus is the Marxist-Leninist party, during the accomplishment of the revolution in this or other form, during the establishment of the dictatorship in this or other form" is the general law of transition from capitalism to socialism.

Time was when the leaders of the French Communist Party bitterly criticised the leaders of the Italian Communist Party because the latter placed the communist party on the same level with the other so-called "workers parties", advanced the necessity of the existence of many parties under socialism and denied the indispensability of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party. Debating on these views of P. Togliati & Co, the organ of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party, "Cahier de Communisme" published in its January 1957 issue an article by the present member of the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party, R. Gorad, under the title: "In collection with 'the Italian Road to socialism'" pointed out the denial of the radical distinction between the communist party and other so-called "workers" parties permeated with the ideology of other classes, which, therefore, cannot fully represent true present and future interests of the working class, means, in fact, to place the communist party on a level with non-proletarian parties, to deny that "there is only one scientific socialism which clearly determines the historic role of the working class, the tactics and the strategy, which enables it to carry out its mission" and "to admit the possibility of a reformist 'way' to socialism placed on a level with the revolutionary way". "Cahier de Communisme" at the time likewise stressed that this means to slip into positions of Kardelj and other Yugoslav leaders, who have proclaimed the Scandinavian social-democratic way as one of the possible forms towards socialism thus erasing the radical distinction between scientific socialist ideology and social-democratic ideology which preaches reconciliation, class collaboration and peaceful integration, in other words, denunciation of socialist aims.

To deny the thesis on the role of leadership of the communist party as an essential condition of the transition to socialism, to place the communist party apart from other "workers", "socialist" parties, as the modern revisionists do, means to sever all connections with true scientific socialism and true socialist ideology, it means to renounce the principles and program of the communist party and to

join and fuse with the social-democratic parties on the basis of their anti-Marxist program. And that's exactly what the revisionists are doing.

There was a time when the French Communist Party did not agree with the treacherous, thoroughly revisionist line of the Italian Communist Party leaders with P. Togliati in the lead. Are there today any divergences between the French Communist Party and the revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party? If there are, then why do they keep silent about it? Why did the French Communist Party find it so easy to attack the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labor of Albania and keep silent towards the Italian revisionists? If there are none then why doesn't it say openly that it is d'accord with them and that it had been mistaken before? Or is it because "the conductor's baton" beats that tune?

To keep silent, to shut your eyes to the treacherous line and behaviour of the revisionists—such an attitude is not only anti-Marxist but also dangerous. It causes serious damage not only to the Italian Communist Party, which must be helped to see where Togliati's revisionism is leading it to, but also to the French Communist Party itself, to the entire communist movement. The revolutionary Marxist-Leninists are seriously alarmed at the catastrophe threatening the communist and workers parties. They cannot nor should not keep their silence when a group of traitors try to lead the communist parties like the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Italian Communist Party, the French Communist Party and others into the abyss, but they should raise their voice to help the genuine communists, members of these parties, to see the danger clearly, to understand where their present revisionist leadership is leading them to, before it is too late.

There was a time when the communist parties of France and Italy were set up at the Congresses of Tours and Leghorn, as revolutionary proletarian parties of the new types, detaching themselves from the socialist parties of that time which had betrayed the interests of the working class and of socialism, and severing all connections with the opportunists and reformists of the 2nd International adopting the Marxist-Leninist conditions and program of the communist International. Now we are witnessing a reverse process. The line of demarcation set at the Tours and Leghorn Congresses is being wiped out. The attempts of the modern revisionists to join up and fuse with those they had detached themselves from—the treacherous social-democratic leaders—by making to them repeated concessions, by renouncing the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, are becoming more and more evident. That is why the revolutionary communists of Italy and of France, as well as those of other countries, who are being threatened by the danger of revisionism, should rise up against these renegades. This is the only correct course to pursue. The attacks which the revisionist 'troika' under N. Khrushchev's leadership, are launching against the communist and workers parties, are very much like the treacherous acts of the social democrats of the 2nd International. That's why the Marxists should draw lessons from history, should pursue the revolutionary ways of former days in defence of the Marxist-Leninist party, in defence of the revolution.

On the eve of the 17th Congress of the French Communist Party finds itself on the horns of a dilemma: will it continue to give blind obedience to the 'conductor's baton' and allow the revisionist group in the leadership to plunge it definitely on the way of betrayal, or will it break the conductor's baton, correct its mistake, and return to the heroic revolutionary road of Marxism-Leninism? Many leaders of the French Communist Party have hurled insolent words and made impudent charges against the Party of Labour of Albania and its leadership. This we will not forget. Eventually, if not today, tomorrow, everything will be settled in a Marxist way. We are certain that those who have acted in this manner will eventually blush with shame. We are not indebted to the French Communist Party. Its leaders are indebted to the Party of Labor of Albania. Nevertheless, we sincerely call on the French Communist Party to turn to the way of revolution, before it is too late, for the good of the French people, of the French proletariat and of the international proletariat.

There is its place. Those who correct their mistakes command the respect of others and enjoy the support of the communists and of all the progressive people of the world, while the traitors are loathed by everybody. They are looked down upon and mercilessly fought by all as in the case of Khrushchev's group, Tito, Togliati and their loyal companions, against all the modern revisionists. A Stop Should be Put to the Treacherous Acts of the Revisionists; the Communist Parties Should be Protected!

Through their political course and through all their practical activity, the modern revisionists, with traitor Khrushchev in the lead, have created a grave situation in many communist parties and in the international communist and workers movement. They have wrecked the internal unity of certain parties in particular and of the movement in general and are proceeding post haste towards social-democratic degeneration of the communist parties, are trying to lead the whole world communist movement onto an opportunist and traitorous path. This reminds one of that period when as a result of the deviation of their leaders, the parties of the 2nd International strayed away from the revolutionary path, renounced Marxism, plunged definitely into the mire of opportunism and reformism, degenerated into "bourgeois parties of the working class".

The betrayal of the parties of the 2nd International which was expressed clearly especially during the First World War, when they crossed over openly to the social-chauvinistic camp, met—and it could help meet—with the firm resistance of the revolutionary communists with Lenin at the head. The latter, though in the minority, expressing the true fundamental interests of the working class, of the labouring masses waged a bitter struggle of principle for years on end to unmask the traitorous leaders of the 2nd International, to expose the opportunism and reformism of the parties of this International, in defence of proletarian internationalism and Marxism, for the purpose of setting up new revolutionary parties of the working class. "It is impossible", V.I. Lenin wrote at that time, "to carry out the tasks of socialism at present, it is impossible to achieve true internationalist unity of workers, without a through break with opportunism, without explaining to the masses the inevitability of its failure". Speaking of this struggle of Lenin, J.V. Stalin has written: "Every Bolshevik, if he or she is a real Bolshevik knows Lenin pursued the line of separation, of breaking with the opportunists in the Social-Democratic Party of Russia, as well as in the 2nd International, especially in the German social-democracy, long before the war, approximately beginning with 1903 & 1904 when the Bolshevik group was formed in Russia and when leftist elements appeared for the first time in German Social Democracy". (Stalin: Works, Albanian edition, vol. 13, p. 83). The firm struggle of principle by Lenin and other revolutionary communists to smash the opportunists and traitors of the 2nd International ideologically and politically, led to further major victories of Marxism-Leninism and of the world revolutionary movement, it was crowned with the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, with the setting up of new revolutionary parties of the new type, and with the failure of the 2nd International and its replacement by the 3rd Communist International.

Today too the betrayal of the modern revisionists, who have departed for good from Marxism-Leninism, from the principles of the revolutionary proletarian party and from the vital interests of the revolutionary proletariat and of the broad masses of workers, has met—and could not help meet—with the firm resistance and struggle of principle of the Marxist-Leninist parties and of revolutionary communists. This is a battle of major historical significance, a battle which concerns the future of the world revolutionary and liberation movement, a battle in defence of Marxism-Leninism, against revisionism, in defence of proletarian internationalism against nationalism and chauvinism, in defence of the socialist order against liberal bourgeois degeneracy, in defence of the revolutionary communist parties against social-democratic degeneration, in defence of the Marxist-Leninist unity of the communist parties, of the international communist movement and of the socialist camp, against revisionist splitters.

Just as the classic writers of Marxism-Leninism and the experience of the communist movement teaches us, the only right way to respond to the challenge of the revisionists is to muster all the efforts of the Marxist-Leninists for a determined uncompromising struggle against the revisionist renegades. The blows and pressures of the revisionists, foreign and internal, cannot be warded off by pursuing a vacillating centrist line, nor by preoccupying ourselves with maintaining a false and formal unity alone. The party cannot be rescued by sobs and sighs nor should it be sacrificed for the sake of saving the "prestige" of anyone, at a time when this "prestige" is being unscrupulously utilized to bury the great cause of the working class and of socialism.

N. Khrushchev's group has led the leaders of many communist parties into a blind alley. He has urged them to ignore the revolutionary past of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of their own parties, through false slanders against Stalin, he has put the old revolutionary leaders who have a brilliant past to their credit, in an embarrassing position. Many of them fell a victim to Khrushchev's line of peace and coexistence, which has now been clearly proved to be an anti-Leninist line, a line of getting closer to and collaborating with the enemies of peace and socialism—the imperialists. The tragic thing about some of them is that although they have got wise to a number of things, although they see that the line of N. Khrushchev's group is a revisionist line fraught with errors, nevertheless they do not find enough Marxist courage to tell themselves: Halt! They do not conduct themselves towards this matter as it befits them, as revolutionary Marxist-Leninists. They try to save the party in the revisionist line which is mortal to it. They try feebly to justify this road, of which they nurture doubts and are not in complete agreement, sometimes even talking in narrow circles about differences they have with N. Khrushchev. But that's all they do, they go no further, they do not take heart and bring these matters up for discussion in their parties in a Marxist-Leninist way. They agree to taking up and discussing materials sent to them by N. Khrushchev, but they are afraid to discuss in their party documents and written materials of other parties.

A big struggle takes place in their innermost conscience. N. Khrushchev's group too, are at work; they have won over many adherents in the leadership of many other parties, who exert pressure, blackmail and other manoeuvres to subject their parties to the conductor's baton. Following in N. Khrushchev's tracks many communist party leaders have entered into a blind alley with their political stand. It is of course right to ward off the danger that comes to world peace from western German militarism and from the imperialist Bonn-Paris axis, but it is altogether incorrect and anti-Marxist to give up the struggle against imperialism which is the main force of war and aggression, the bastion of world reaction, the greatest international gendarme and exploiter, the greatest enemy of the peoples of the world, as the 1960 Moscow Declaration has called it, under this pretext. It is correct and Marxist to fight against "personal power" and its consequences, but it is altogether anti-Marxist to follow blindly N. Khrushchev's pro-American policy and not to take advantage of the split that is becoming ever deeper in the imperialist camp. We know why this attitude is maintained. Of course, the bandmaster has struck that tune. But eventually, if this 'conductor' flirts with "personal power" for the adventuresome, anti-Marxist intentions, what will happen? Or is the bandmaster training other musicians to open the way to new adventures?

The revisionist camp is in a critical situation. Its ship has split, water is gushing in and it is foundering. N. Khrushchev's group are trying their best to avert the catastrophe. To side track further exposure they are raising a hue and cry about stopping polemics which they themselves started and why they formerly considered fully justifiable, necessary and Leninist. But under present conditions, to stop polemics would mean to every true Marxist and revolutionary to join with the traitors, to create facilities for them to distort and destroy Marxism-Leninism. In his attempt to mislead people, N. Khrushchev swears by unity. But the true revolutionaries and consistent communists will not be deceived by adventurers, demagogues and splitters! Revolutionary communists observe with fidelity great Lenin's teachings, which say: "Unity is a

great issue and a major slogan. But the cause of the workers' demands unity of Marxists not unity of Marxists with opponents and those who distort Marxism" (Lenin: Works, vol. 20, p. 211, Russian edition). Now it has become clear that N. Khrushchev and his group represent just these opponents and distorters of Marxism in the present communist movement. N. Khrushchev, on his part, continues to work splitting by diverse forms, through regional meetings, bi-partite pow-wows, dictating new instructions and tasks with a view to compromising and leading over parties and their leaders further ahead towards revisionism and betrayal. It is high time for everyone to stop and think, not to obey the "conductor's baton", to offer resistance to the traitors in order to defend Marxism-Leninism, the socialist camp and the Soviet Union, in order to defend the great revolutionary cause of the working class.

It behoves all communists to muster all efforts and fight the imperialists headed by the American imperialists. And the struggle against modern revisionism is a constituent part of the struggle against imperialism, for it is the offspring and ally of imperialism, the manifestation in theory and practice of bourgeois ideology, imperialism's "Trojan horse" in the socialist camp and the international communist movement. Great Lenin's words sound more contemporary than ever today when he said that without waging a firm and consistent struggle against opportunism and revisionism, no successful struggle can be waged against imperialism. Without exposing and smashing revisionism, no revolution can be affected, no socialism and no communism can be upheld and successfully built.

We are fully confident that, just as in the past, the present fight against modern revisionists, headed by N. Khrushchev's group, will be crowned with the further success of Marxism-Leninism, of socialism and of the international revolutionary movement. The revisionists will not succeed in the turning historical revolutionary process backwards. We are witnesses to the fact that the revisionists are being more and more exposed and discredited in their own countries as well as in the international communist movement, they are meeting with defeat after defeat, while the ranks of the parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism and those of the revolutionary communists are increasing and becoming stronger, their fight against the modern revisionists more and more intensive. The complete defeat of revisionism and the triumph of Marxism-Leninism are inevitable.