

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

**PROGRAMMATIC  
PROCLAMATION OF THE  
SOVIET REVOLUTIONARY  
COMMUNISTS (BOLSHEVIKS)**

*(This programmatic proclamation has been  
distributed in the Soviet Union by the Soviet  
Bolshevik Communists)*

ISBN: 978-1-4357-7753-8

RED STAR PRESS  
LONDON 1975

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE  
TORONTO 2022

# CONTENTS

I. THE OPPORTUNIST CHIEFS OF THE CP OF THE SOVIET UNION UNDER THE MASK OF MARXISM.....	1
II. STALIN AND PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY .....	14
III. RULE OF BUREAUCRACY .....	46
IV. OPPORTUNISTS IN THE WORLD ARENA .....	56
V. COMMUNISTS, FORWARD!.....	82







## I. THE OPPORTUNIST CHIEFS OF THE CP OF THE SOVIET UNION UNDER THE MASK OF MARXISM

The decisive moment is approaching today in the development of the communist movement. In the conditions when every communist party must adopt for itself a historic decision and embark on the road to revolutionary Marxism or to opportunism, it is necessary for the communists of the whole world to listen also to the voice of their Soviet comrades.

Now it is pretended that the latter's opinion is being expressed in those decisions and declarations that are issued by the present-day leadership of the CPSU. But whoever is somewhat familiarized with the internal life of our country, whoever has come more or less in contact with the masses of our people and with the Party rank-and-file, cannot help knowing that all these decisions and declarations not only do not reflect the real convictions and aims of the overwhelming majority of the Soviet people, of the overwhelming majority of the members of the CPSU, but they are in flagrant contradiction with them.

The Chinese and Albanian communists have

shown strict adherence to principles and revolutionary self-denial in exposing modern opportunism. The documents of the Communist Party of China and of the Party of Labour of Albania have fully exposed the road of treachery towards the interests of socialist revolution followed by the leadership of the CPSU after Stalin's death. Thus, we shall often merely repeat and substantiate the theses of the Chinese and Albanian comrades. But in these cases, too, we shall speak as a rule on our own behalf so that everybody should know that this is the way the Soviet communist thinks, this is the way millions of Soviet communists think. However, we consider the discovery of the causes that brought about antagonism between the leadership of the CPSU, on the one hand, and the bulk of the Soviet communists, of the Soviet people, on the other, as our most important duty. The opportunist leaders of the CPSU must be unmasked from their rear, in terms of their social position inside the USSR, there where they cannot conceal their rotten content by any masks, there where they have indeed usurped power and have opposed themselves to the people.

It is exceptionally difficult to understand this very complicated situation from outside. It is,



however, absolutely indispensable to understand this situation from both practical and theoretical viewpoints. Here we come across a phenomenon constituting in itself the «internal» danger and, for that matter, more serious to the communist movement, such a phenomenon that will threaten us during the whole period of transition from capitalism to communism. The comprehension of the situation of the opportunists inside the USSR will help the world communist and workers' parties more correctly to appraise also their actions in the international arena, their hypocrisy with regard to the revolutionary and liberation movements and the distortion by them of the idea of the struggle for peace.

We believe it is not necessary to prove that the gist of the contradictions in the present-day communist movement is concentrated on the question of the «personality cult». Each of the divergent sides considers this question as a touchstone of the loyalty to Marxism-Leninism. And this is but natural because the point is for the first experimentation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is evident that the communist movement cannot surge forward if this question is not clarified.

There was a moment (immediately after the 20th Congress of the CPSU) when the critics of the «personality cult» deceived many communists through the sensational character and the appearance of veracity of the exposures made by them. But even then the opportunists were unable to win over the most determined proletarian militants, the most tried and tested ones. And then such comrades — and first and foremost the communists of China and Albania — realized the base and slanderous character of the campaign unleashed by the leadership of the CPSU. Subsequent years showed what huge damage was caused to the communist movement by the actions of the opportunists who were quite unable to find a positive solution to the burning problems facing the communist movement. The events of recent days clearly show the demagogic essence of the opportunist outcries about the «personality cult», their counter-revolutionary and anti-Marxist character.

As a matter of fact, the opportunists started with the criticism of the «personality cult» of Stalin and ended with the criticism of the «personality cult» of Khrushchev. And the matter here consists not only in the fact that Khrushchev, whom

the opportunists used to exalt as a «great Marxist» and whom they did not intend to give to anyone, proved to be himself guilty of that very sin for which he criticized Stalin. The fact is that Khrushchev's example made quite clear the absurdity of the very positions of the opportunists, of the very idle talk about the «personality cult», while substituting the subjective concept about the rule of one person in the socialist state to the social explanation of the forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat. One must have lost all and every idea about historic materialism to say such things. Stalin's titanic personality was still giving to the opportunist myth the appearance of a truth. But that which happened with Khrushchev definitely discredited the revisionists. Nobody can think that Khrushchev had any personality, any personal merit. Every child is aware of this in the Soviet Union. It was no secret to anyone that Khrushchev's cult was created (and with great efforts) by his own circle. The social basis of personal authority in this case quite clearly manifested itself. It is understandable to the Marxists that a leaders' qualities are directly determined by the social environment which produces him.

And we have what to say if we compare from

this point of view Stalin and Khrushchev.

But it is a fact, the opportunists will say, that Stalin was for a long period the all-powerful leader of the Soviet State and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and that people were singing praises to him. We by no means intend to deny this. But how is it possible that people claiming to be Marxists assert that this was fortuitous, that it was in contradiction with the will of the Party and of the people, that the Party and the people were building socialism in opposition to Stalin and without him? How can they reconcile themselves with the thought that a man who was not relying on any social group, who was not representing any class, only due to the strength of his mind and character could lead for 30 years in succession a party and a whole state? The critics of the «personality cult» who believe in the possibility of such an extraordinary and unpunishable arbitrariness are themselves raising Stalin to the level of the superman, they themselves are turning away from Marxism and reconciling themselves with the «personality cult» in theory. The limpid history of the Soviet people's 30-year class struggle for socialism loses, under the pen of these traitors to Marxism, all its grandiose social meaning

and turns into a mystery of the Madrid palace, into an obscure, vile and disgusting piece of gossip, in which calumny engenders calumny. The picture presented by the opportunists can be forced upon the imagination of a petty-bourgeois, it must be tasteful to the appetite of the bourgeois intellectual who always goes about with his personality and, therefore, he is ready to attribute everything in this world to the personal will. The Marxists, however, cannot be content with the tales of «personal will» of the petty-bourgeois and, of course, they must analyse the social reasons of such a situation.

It must be pointed out that the necessity of such a social analysis is clearly recognized by the majority of the Soviet communists. Here, too, one feels the work of the great school of Marxist education through which they have gone. Immediately after the 20th Congress, at the general meetings of the grass-root organizations of the CPSU, mass demands were put forth by the Party rank-and-file calling on the Central Committee to make a truly Marxist appraisal of Stalin's activity. This demand was so persistent that the leadership of CPSU was obliged to resort to persecution against various Party members and to the dis-

solution of a series of Party organizations which were acting in a particularly compact manner. Later, in 1957, in the Party meetings, all those who had criticized the decisions of the 20th Congress were made to repent. But public opinion, even in silence, was so terrible, having such a unity that the opportunists had recourse to extreme measures. Opposing their «humanism» to Stalin's «harshness» they rehabilitated without any verification, without any juridical procedure, all the political prisoners, playing with their offended feelings and granting them the right to vote in society. But, as this was not sufficient, they proclaimed again general amnesties of bandit elements who had terrorized society more than once. All this so-called «policy» was crowned with Khrushchev's meeting with one of the repented bandits, and with a generous recompense because he had finally decided to become honest. General indignation obliged the official press to put an end rapidly to the descriptions full of admiration of this «humanitarian act». But there had been thrown so much dirt into the limpid stream that for a certain time its waters remained somewhat troubled. A considerable contribution to this was rendered by those remnants of the old society that

for 40 years in succession were compelled to dissimulate their opinions and their real feelings, and that now, all of a sudden, acquired the possibility openly to express their anger against the dictatorship of the proletariat. Literature became the principal arena of their activities. It is there that the new rots also turned.

But however active these fighters against the «personality cult» proved to be, the opportunists realized that not everybody would fall into this trap. The criticism against Stalin had to be reinforced at all costs by arguments resembling the Marxist arguments. A person guilty of so many sins cannot remain a Marxist-Leninist in theory. Otherwise, this would be the most surprising phenomenon in the world. Being aware of this, the opportunists and their lackeys have been for more than ten years looking for theories in Stalin's works, and if not for theories at least for particular theses, and if not for particular theses at least for particular allusions which should contradict Marxism-Leninism. They seek but find nothing.

They began to make fun of the philosophic chapter of Stalin's short course «History of the CPSU(B)», and everything consisted in the fact

that the number of the particularities of dialectics presented by Stalin was raised from 4 to 12, which is difficult not only to put into effect but also to remember. They set to the job of criticizing Stalin's work «Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR». Nothing came out of it and they remained silent. Rejecting by words in a comprehensive manner Stalin's articles on questions of linguistics, they arrived at the conclusion that there were in them some distortions. And thus they acted in the same way dozens of times in the most diverse fields: yells, victorious reports, but in fine we see the Lilliputians at the end of their strength at Gulliver's foot.

They will tell us that at present one of Stalin's most important theses on which he had based his actions, namely, the thesis that on drawing near to communism the class struggle becomes fiercer and assumes ever more complicated forms, has been rejected. But for the time being let us leave theory aside, messieurs opportunists. How would you, yourselves, define that struggle which broke out in the USSR after Stalin's death and in which you are so actively taking part, isn't this a class struggle? Isn't its fierceness the best proof of Stalin's correctness? Replying to these questions, the



opportunists have no other choice but to agree with us or to become a laughing stock for all the Marxists.

Thus, the critics of the «personality cult», if they intend to adopt a somewhat serious attitude towards this matter and convince other people of their correctness, ought to explain this surprising circumstance that Stalin who, in their opinion, had gone so far in the direction of practical errors, remained an orthodox Marxist in theory. In our eyes, such an incompatibility does not exist, for we consider that Stalin's activity finds full explanation and justification. And if there have been any errors in it, historically speaking, Stalin could not understand them and avoid them.

The question arises: Why do the opportunists get hold of a viewpoint whose absurdity does not constitute any big secret? Those who stand for a social analysis of the «personality cult» are demagogically accused by the opportunists of allegedly attempting to connect the «personality cult» with the very nature of the socialist order. But why, then, all these exaggerations? Why could not these or other particularities of Stalin's activity be conditioned not by the essence of socialism in general, but by the concrete historic conditions in

which Stalin was acting? There is no doubt here that the opportunists need the criticism of Stalin's «personality cult» for their selfish interests, that this criticism should be used by the opportunists as a kind of smokescreen to cover their ugly features and actions. And one is more inclined to think so because a decade has elapsed since Stalin's death, while the opportunist leadership of the CPSU is so far obliged to prove its value not by actual successes, but by criticising those who have long since ceased to exist.

And in spite of that, in this case, many things are explained by Khrushchev's removal. Everybody knows that this charlatan dwarf put into effect all the political and, particularly, economic programs that his group was proposing to him. Now we are being told that he alone is to be blamed for all the failures of the «great decade». There is no doubt that in this case the opportunist chiefs of the CPSU sacrificed Khrushchev for the sake of the USSR public opinion, crossing out by a stroke of the pen the lamentable results of their common ten-year activity and shifting the responsibility for all this on the scape-goat, Khrushchev. But instinctively feeling that this explanation could barely stand and was leading to

conclusions which are not at all desirable, the opportunists are now generally trying to avoid laying the emphasis on Khrushchev's removal.

Actually, while comparing Stalin to Khrushchev we cannot help recalling the words of Marx that history repeats itself twice, but at the beginning it appears to us in the form of a tragedy, while later in the form of a comedy. What happened under Khrushchev was neither more nor less than a parody of the opportunist campaign of exposing Stalin's «personality cult»: betraying in Khrushchev's person a buffoon and a renegade, in Stalin's person a revolutionary leader and thinker.

## II. STALIN AND PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY

If we sum up all the charges levelled by the opportunists against Stalin, they may be generally included into one rubric — Violation of Proletarian Democracy. Stalin, according to the allegations of the opportunists, had usurped power in the country and the Party, he had liquidated the best and most skilled cadres of the Party and State workers.

While criticizing Stalin, the opportunists opposed Lenin to him, thinking this was the best and the most evident argument for them. And we agree that this comparison suits the occasion, but on the other hand it hits the opportunists themselves. «Intransigence», «fierceness», «dictatorial behaviour» — where was all this vocabulary found? Are we perhaps quoting the «Pravda» editorial of the recent years devoted to the «personality cult»? No, these are usual definitions to Lenin's activity during the entire Russian revolution, made by the opportunists. Why should the present-day leadership of the CPSU not recall the fact that they are now repeating in Stalin's address all what was attributed once to Lenin? And what

metamorphosis! Lenin, according to the modern opportunists, allegedly comes out almost as a supporter of the thesis «Don't resist evil through violence». In order to denigrate Stalin's revolutionary tactics, whose criticism is of direct vital importance to them, the opportunists are willing to forget the past and present Lenin in an «ennobled» form according to their viewpoint. «We are the Jacobins of the proletariat» — these words of Lenin's must be well remembered by all those who are now seeking to do up Lenin and give him the appearance of Jesus Christ.

But did there exist a certain difference in the character of the actions of Lenin and Stalin? Yes. By comparing these two revolutionary leaders, the opportunists (in full conformity with their bourgeois world outlook) reduce everything to the personal qualities of these men. It is clear, however, that Lenin's and Stalin's activities as Party and State leaders belong to two different periods of the development of our revolution, periods radically differing from one another. Lenin's death almost coincided with the end of the offensive period of the European revolution, so that on Stalin's shoulders fell the duty of directing the first proletarian State at the moment of its com-

plete solitude in the world arena, in the conditions of the lack of a considerable basis for the building of socialism. The break-up of the weak link in the chain of capitalism was a weakness of the revolution itself. «...A backward country can easily begin because its adversary has become rotten», — Lenin wrote — «because its bourgeoisie is not organized, but for it to continue demands of that country a hundred thousand times more circumspection, caution and endurance. It will be different in Western Europe; there it will be immeasurably more difficult to begin but immeasurably easier to go on... Revolution in a backward country which, to a considerable extent owing to this backwardness, events have put — of course, for a short time and, of course, in particular questions — in front of other, more advanced countries, this revolution, of course, is inevitably doomed to experience moments of the greatest difficulty and gravity, and most disheartening as well in the near future...»<sup>1</sup> No wonder that in such a desperate situation the measures, too, adopted by the Bolshevik Party led by Stalin were

---

<sup>1</sup> V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 27, Moscow 1974, pp. 284, 291.

of a desperate and exceptional character. The economic front was almost the most dangerous and, in any way, much more complicated than the civil war fronts.

Indeed the German revolution did not lead to the victory of the proletariat, but to the victory of the bourgeoisie; and this dashed the hopes for the much awaited direct revolutionary aid from Europe. The NEP helped in saving the country from hunger, but it did not solve the question of financing the building of the big engineering industry, without which there can be no socialism. Socialism had to be built entirely with the country's internal resources. Agriculture had to be the material basis of the entire socialist up-building. But its embarking on this road was connected with very great political and organizational difficulties.

After the victory of the revolution, after its final assertion, agriculture was unorganized, it was not checked and was distributing its resources to private small farmsteads. Speculation, which was reigning on this ground, the infection of a part of the proletariat by the selfishness of ownership, — such was the picture of the petty-bourgeois element that had plagued the country.

Only an iron organization, only the strictest records and control, the strictest discipline in work could save the socialist revolution in these conditions. Was it possible to achieve all this through democratic measures?

Quite the same thing should happen also in the field of ideological struggle. We shall draw attention to the fact that the possibility of carrying out the proletarian revolution in Russia was achieved because at a given moment the petty-bourgeoisie, after having realized that the bourgeois means for the settlement of the immediate vital tasks were useless, wavered to the side of the proletariat, practically recognizing its political incapacity. Precisely «wavered», — this is the term used by Lenin. But, just like a weak person who, at the moment of danger, completely trusts himself to a strong one, and after the danger has disappeared at once begins to boast and attribute victory to himself, so the petty-bourgeoisie, right from the moment of the overthrow of Tsarism and the big bourgeoisie became at once both strong and exacting. And at the same time, due to its nervous weakness, it conceived the victory of socialism only in the form of an immediate idyllic support to Russia on the part of insurgent Eu-



rope. At the moment when the hope for a «world» revolution vanished, when it became clear that socialism had to be built by one's own efforts and means the last revolutionary impetus of the petty-bourgeois ideologists disappeared without leaving any traces and their connection with the Bolsheviks broke off. «Profound» and far-sighted doubts started here and outcries were heard for the salvation, at least, of a part of the revolutionary gains through surrender to European imperialism; there were charges levelled against the «extremist» Bolsheviks — in other words, orgies of empty words were unleashed aimed at masking the timid spirit of the petty-bourgeoisie.

Of course, the best weapon for the petty-bourgeois demagogues of that time was the demand for democracy, the demand to «address one's self to the masses». And we would advise the present-day opportunists to recall that it was not Stalin, but Lenin that wrote at that time:

*«When the Mensheviks shout about the 'Bonapartism' of the Bolsheviks (who, they claim, rely on troops and on the machinery of state against the will of 'democracy'), they magnificently express the tactics of the bourgeoisie... The*

*bourgeoisie quite correctly takes into consideration the fact that the real 'forces of the working class' now consist of the mighty vanguard of that class (the Russian Communist Party, which—not at one stroke, but in the course of twenty-five years—won for itself by deeds the role, the name and the power of the 'vanguard' of the only revolutionary class) plus the elements which have been most weakened by being declassed, and which are most susceptible to Menshevik and anarchist vacillations... The slogan 'more faith in the forces of the working class' is now being used, in fact, to increase the influence of the Mensheviks and anarchists, as was vividly proved and demonstrated by Kronstadt in the spring of 1921... Our slogans are: Down with the tub-thumpers! Down with the unwitting accomplices of the whiteguards!... Get down to business-like, practical work that will take into account the specific features of the present situation and its tasks. We need not phrases but deeds.»<sup>1</sup>*

The petty-bourgeois ideologists were trying

---

<sup>1</sup> V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 33, Moscow 1974, pp. 26-28.

to turn inner party democracy into a shield for their opportunist activities. Let us recall the countless discussions forced upon the Party by the Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries (SRs) at the most critical moments for the revolution, spending much valuable forces and time. And it was not Stalin, but Lenin that sponsored the famous resolution of the 10th Party Congress prohibiting all and every faction in the Party. And from the formal standpoint this was, no doubt, a violation of democracy.

To be able to understand how and why so much power was concentrated in Stalin's hands, we must consider the situation created at the Party's 15th Congress. While reading the Congress minutes, one is instinctively surprised by what was taking place. The opposition elements demand and implore the adoption of an elementary democratic attitude towards them, they demand a mere exchange of views while the entire Congress cries out: «Down with the opposition elements! Long live Stalin!». And this did not bring about the suppression of proletarian democracy, but its assertion. The Congress defended the revolutionary cause against petty-bourgeois phraseology. And the representative of

this revolutionary cause was Stalin who, for the first time, firmly and definitely raised the question of building socialism in only one country, displayed the historic determination to introduce agriculture into the framework of socialist construction through total collectivization and led the country's industrialization.

The Party and the people trusted Stalin. Is there any need for such trust in the leaders at this stage? Everyone claiming to be a Marxist must recognize that we should consider democracy, just as all other social phenomena, in a historic and concrete manner. In its first stage, proletarian democracy (especially in such a country as backward Russia) ought to be expressed in the strongest possible centralization of state power. The proletariat applied such a centralization in the face of the danger of death, in the conditions of the very fierce class struggle, just as military discipline is carried out on the front. We ask: is it necessary to have faith in the commander, in whose hands is the destiny of the revolutionary army at a decisive moment? It is clear that the opportunist phrases about democracy conceal the bourgeois individualism and the efforts to ensure, in due time, the possibility to desert. He who wants to

fight can't do without a commander. And while Stalin is no longer alive today, we shall fight in the battalions under Mao Zedong and Enver Hoxha.

Let us consider this question from the viewpoint of the organization of work. It is clear that at the level of Russia's economic development at that time, the division of work not only could not be weakened, but it was not even developed at a sufficient rate. The function of the state power, as one of the functions of social activity, assumed a special importance in its independence. And this was not a negation of democracy. The popular masses conscientiously passed over the power to the representatives elected by them, who in the revolutionary struggle proved their Marxist tempering and their loyalty towards the people.

Lenin used to say that we had to pay for ignorance in the most diverse forms. In this case he stressed the need of employing the old bourgeois specialists in the service of the proletariat. But the pay for our ignorance had apparently to assume also other and more complicated forms. This can be very easily understood if things are specifically considered. Thus, for example, the former Budi-onist who had become a secretary of the regional

Party Committee could not settle on the general plane the political and economic problems by himself. He used to say: «Give me the decree and I shall force it on anyone you like by means of a pistol». In this way the effective power was lawfully concentrated in the hands of those who possessed knowledge, revolutionary experience and authority. Was this good from the viewpoint of the abstract socialist ideals? Let us suppose it was bad. But what opposition in connection with this can be raised by those who really want to carry out socialism from theory into practice? And precisely, this withdrawal (and not only the employment of old bourgeois specialists) was the «pay» towards the old order of things due to our general ignorance, the withdrawal from full socialist equality, inevitable in the conditions of our cultural backwardness. The opportunists like to engage in phraseology with regard to their opponents, that they allegedly are more leftist than common sense. But where are they themselves when they refuse to understand the logic of the actual social development? In addition to this, it is clear that they want to become more papal than the pope, more democratic than the popular masses themselves who have solved the question

of whether the leaders are needed in the war and whether one should obey them long before the democrats of the cabinets.

Being prepared to recognize the need of centralism in theory, these pseudo-Marxist traitors can by no means accept it in practice and reconcile themselves with its ideal reflection in the heads of people. To build socialism with that human material which we actually have, thus also with those concepts existing in the present-day society, — such was Lenin's instruction. The Bolsheviks, led by Stalin, carried out this instruction of his.

Of course, it is not a question here of crystal clear purity and holiness of the opportunists. After a servile-like stand adopted for 40 years in succession towards the dictatorship of the proletariat they suddenly acquired the possibility to discuss its merits and shortcomings and discovered one of the «weak» points in the ideology of the socialist society under construction. Well, we are indeed made up only of weak points, for we are the living life, while you are full of virtues because you have come out from the political grave, you are grown old maids, unable to commit sins and to become fecundated.

These enemies of Marxism, of course, do not even understand that if you speak of the «personality cult», the latter began at the time when Lenin was buried in the Mausoleum and Stalin took his oath on Lenin's coffin. Then, let us carry it to the end, gentlemen! Would you dare to violate this «cult» and this oath? Is it not you perhaps that are less worthy than anybody else of such a thing, you that swear everyday and every hour on Lenin? Where is the adherence to principles in this? We swear on Lenin and Stalin, but we are not double-dealers. We declare openly and publicly that the proletariat has its own leaders, in whom we see the highest realization of the possibilities of our class and of humanity as a whole, in whose exaltation in fact we assert everything of the best we have.

The oath taken before Lenin was a testimony of the fact that the offensive period of revolution had ended. Now, the logic of revolutionary development could not help becoming eclipsed by very complicated social contradictions; it was not being revealed to the masses in its living naturalness. This logic had to be understood and explained by the leaders. Now everything had to be built up with faith in what was gained, with faith in the



leader.

We addressed ourselves to the very fact of the revolution as a manifestation of magnificence. And this was right. This is the way we appraised also the people that carried out this revolution. But the canonization of the past was inevitably leading also to the canonization of the present. Stalin was realizing this very well and used to speak of it always in a laconic and clear cut manner. Stalin is a banner.

The power which Stalin received from the Party and the people was based only on the acceptance of his qualities as a great revolutionary thinker and fighter, on the general faith in him, for he remained a determined helmsman of Leninism even under the blows of the «rightists», of the «leftists» and of all sorts of opportunists. To speak today of Stalin's «personality cult» as a violation of democracy, as of ignoring the will of the party and the people, is the greatest affront to the most sacred feelings of our men and women, an affront that can be committed only by those who have not been with us in our first march towards socialism, or those who cannot forget the heavy hand of the dictatorship of the proletariat that they experienced on their own shoulders.

And here we come up to the question of «repressions» that Stalin used to make. Messieurs the opportunists, attempting to conceal the social basis of these repressions, are making efforts to present Stalin as a man who, fearing rivalry, used to get hold of and shoot down everyone in whom he noticed a wise and sensible man. Of course, this was quite groundless, even with regard to Stalin's closest circle. Otherwise, e.g., the members of the opportunist clique should admit that they lived in Stalin's days only because, from the intellectual viewpoint, they did not deserve any attention at all. It is absolutely preposterous to explain in this way the repressive actions taken against the responsible workers at the grass-root, most of whom Stalin, of course, had never known personally. The vicious attitude of the opportunists is seen precisely in the fact that they, alleging that Stalin was bloodthirsty and cruel, had never seriously tried to understand the causes of the repressive actions.

To all those who do not preach the principle of «Do not resist evil» the physical response to the physical blow is understandable. But the question becomes much more complicated when we deal with politics, where the direct results of this or

that political action will be seen perhaps after decades. Should industry in the Soviet Union be built up at the price of untold efforts and privations? Was Stalin right when he used to say: we shall either do this or they will destroy us? We think that the best answer to this question could be given by the soldiers of the patriotic war, who were holding in their hands the weapons produced by the Stalinist industry. And it was precisely the Mensheviks and SRs that were opposed to industrialization. They were crying out that agriculture was being sacrificed on behalf of industry. Thus, objectively, they wanted the Russian peasants to submit to fascist slavery. Stalin used to persecute the main bulk of the petty-bourgeois ideologists who were nothing else but individuals that were changing colour and smuggling themselves into the ranks of the Bolsheviks. Herein lies the gist of the «famous Moscow court trials». Stalin delivered Russia from the «fifth column».

To be able to understand to what extent this is true, to what extent did Stalin in his actions take into consideration the problem of the development of fascism, we shall draw attention to the fact that fascism as a social movement was a direct response by the European bourgeoisie to the Oc-

tober revolution.

One cannot hear without indignation and disgust the efforts of the opportunist leaders of the CPSU to whitewash the Menshevik and SR traitors, to deny the facts of their direct connection with the German fascists. The opportunists do not mention Trotsky's name — he was too much avowed as one of the possible Russian Führers. But under Khrushchev secret talks were very insistently held with a view to rehabilitating Bukharin. The value of the rehabilitations effected by the opportunists is, however, shown by a very clear example. Tukhachevsky has now been rehabilitated, this real political adventurer who was called by no one else but precisely by Trotsky and Bukharin as a man of «Napoleonian dough». It is said that Tukhachevsky's materials, falsified by the German intelligence service, were given to Benes who handed them over to Stalin. But why do they not say that Tukhachevsky was sentenced not on the basis of the espionage materials, but for having been involved in the Trotskyite-Bukharinite conspiracy, in which several high-ranking Soviet military personalities headed by Tukhachevsky made up the special striking group for the overthrow of the Stalin Government by the

force of arms? At the final trial in Moscow, it was not the German intelligence service but Bukharin himself that made a detailed testimony. Follow his authentic words: «As it is a question of a military coup d'état, due to the very logic of things, exceptionally great will be the specific weight precisely of the military group of plotters. Hence, a typical Bonapartist danger can arise and the Bonapartists — I had, among other things, Tukhachevsky in mind — will above all settle the accounts with their own allies, with the so-called inspirers, according to the Napoleonian pattern». And so on and so forth. Why don't the opportunists, while rehabilitating Tukhachevsky, tell these facts? Even in the foreign press, people with anti-fascist inclinations used to write with concern and surprise that Tukhachevsky, during his trips to Berlin and other European capitals, was discrediting the strength of our army and exalting the fascist Wehrmacht, which was impermissible for a man that headed the General Staff of the Red Army. Why should the opportunists, who make so much profession of their love for justice, not recall that the Moscow trials struck more than at anyone else at Trotsky who was staying abroad, while the execution of Tukhachevsky and his col-

laborators definitely suppressed the spirit of the «Judas of the Russian revolution»?

Thus, we may draw the conclusion that the repressive actions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the Stalin dictatorship up to 1934, were directly aimed at the petty-bourgeois opportunists who were opposed to the building of socialism in our country, to collectivization and industrialization. Could one act, and should one act, in this way, according to Lenin's viewpoint? Here is his answer:

*«Let the Martovs, the Chernovs, and non-Party philistines like them, beat their breasts and exclaim: 'I thank Thee, Lord, that I am not as «these», and have never accepted terrorism.' These simpletons 'do not accept terrorism' because they choose to be servile accomplices of the whiteguards in fooling the workers and peasants. The Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks 'do not accept terrorism' because under the flag of 'socialism' they are fulfilling their function of placing the masses at the mercy of the white-guard terrorism. This was proved by the Kerensky regime and the Kornilov putsch in Russia, by the Kolchak regime in Siberia, and by Menshevism in Georgia. It was proved by the heroes of*

*the Second International and of the 'Two-and-a-Half' International in Finland, Hungary, Austria, Germany, Italy, Britain, etc. Let the flunkey accomplices of whiteguard terrorism wallow in their repudiation of all terrorism. We shall speak the bitter and indubitable truth: in countries beset by an unprecedented crisis, the collapse of old ties, and the intensification of the class struggle after the imperialist war of 1914-18—and that means all the countries of the world—terrorism cannot be dispensed with, notwithstanding the hypocrites and phrasemongers. Either the whiteguard, bourgeois terrorism of the American, British (Ireland), Italian (the fascists), German, Hungarian and other types, or Red, proletarian terrorism. There is no middle course, no 'third' course, nor can there be any.»<sup>1</sup>*

But in Lenin's days, the opportunists will argue, the repressive actions were fewer. This is true. But the point is that in Lenin's days the clash between the country's proletarian and counter-revolutionary forces had not reached the final

---

<sup>1</sup> V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 32, Moscow 1974, pp. 355-356.

stage yet. The real battle had to be fought against petty-bourgeois ideologists with regard to collectivization. And precisely here they were crushed by the Bolsheviks led by Stalin. And this happened because the Russian peasantry proved to be more revolutionary than their ideologists. This moment is quite important and for this reason we devote special attention to it. As a matter of fact, the peasant masses of Soviet Russia that went through three revolutions, that were accustomed to trust the Bolsheviks owing to their work, had felt, on the threshold of collectivization, the tendency of their differentiation. And in spite of the fact that the Russian kulaks had not reached a considerable thickness (which provides today to the opportunists a pretext to make sterile judgments alleging that in our country there was nobody to be expropriated as a kulak), the incompatibility of these embryos of the bourgeoisie with the Soviet power quite clearly showed to the peasantry what lay in store for them on the road of development based on private ownership.

Precisely for this reason, although collectivization was carried out, due to necessities, much earlier than it should have been done in favourable conditions, although some hasty Soviet func-



tionaries used to advance its time limits violating thereby the Party directives, although there were special cases of acting against collectivization, the Russian peasantry as a whole joined the collective farms and did not respond to collectivization by uprising, for which they were called upon by the Mensheviks and the SRs. The peasantry followed the life, they followed the revolution in practice. But this could not be done by its learned ideologists, for they were the personification of theoretical possibilities of the peasant conscience, the personification of the peasant weakness. Therefore, their liquidation was being affected also in the interests of both the proletariat and the peasantry.

Well, the opportunists would say — although we tried to rehabilitate Bukharin, although we intend to erect a memorial to Tukhachevsky, we do not criticize Stalin so much for the repressive actions taken up to the year 1934. But how can those of 1937 be justified? With Lenin, there is nothing to explain such repressive actions. The opportunists rejoice in vain, hoping that they will not have to do anymore with Lenin. But Lenin will smash them this time, too.

To be able to make a class appraisal of the

1937 repressive actions suffice it to ask the following question: which class suffered from these repressive actions? The proletariat? No. There were arrested some people who had come out from it and who held high posts. But the class itself was out of any attempt. Per contra, as long as the repressive actions complied, to a large extent, with the question of social origin, the proletarian position and origin served as the best warranty against repression. For this reason, many people from the high strata of Tsarist Russia at that time used to go to factories and work there. And this always saved them. Did the peasantry perhaps suffer in 1937? Again no. And if individual peasants have some sad recollections, they are related to the year 1929 when they were expropriated as kulaks. Did perhaps the arrests in general not have a class address and did they not express the class interests of someone? The opportunists are trying to smuggle in precisely this thought and for this very reason they attempt to attribute also schizophrenia to Stalin and to explain the repressive actions by this. It is clear however that such a view in itself can serve as a testimony that they are out of order with their own brains.

The 1937 repressive actions, in their social

meaning, were directed in a quite definite manner: they were aimed against the existing bureaucratic machinery, against the remnants of the exploiting classes and a part of the intelligentsia. Now it is clear why precisely these strata are so fiercely attacking the «personality cult» and why our working masses display a surprising love, in the eyes of the opportunists, for Stalin's memory. Messieurs the opportunists arrogantly speak of «our nature of a slave», saying that our people need a Tsar, and other such mean things and non-senses. But, as we see, the matter is very simple, consisting in the class sense of the people. The latter, to tell the truth, even formerly had thought that the bureaucrats and «former bureaucrats» should be smashed even now they do not leave aside this view. Stalin, as we know, used to do this on a well-grounded basis. That is why the people feel that Stalin is «theirs», that he is a representative of the people.

But were the repressive actions really necessary? The opportunists, referring to the country's internal situation, allege that no such necessity existed. Meanwhile, they close their eyes «like naïves» before the non-essential fact, in their opinion, that in the West fascism was growing as a

tempest cloud and was openly declaring that it was directed against the USSR. The opportunists, who remember every slap in the face they were given by Stalin, have begun to suffer from amnesia when it is a question of history, and they brush aside the fact that it was precisely during the years 1936-1937 that the danger of war was particularly great. Was it necessary, on the verge of the war, to purge once more the rear from all the irresolute and dangerous elements; on the verge of the war, in which the imperialists wanted to see the Soviet Union face Hitlerite Germany alone? The answer to this was given by the Russian Vlasovs, the Ukrainian Banderas, the Crimean punishers who remained unexecuted in the year 1937.

Should we believe the opportunists who say that in 1937 those who were executed were not the ones who ought to have been executed. The opportunists have been particularly touched because, in their words, the best part of the Party and State machinery had been liquidated. To be able to clarify this let us refer to Lenin. « Why do we do these foolish things? » — Lenin used to ask — « The reason is clear: firstly, because we are a backward country; secondly, because education

in our country is at a low level and thirdly, because we are getting no outside assistance. Not a single civilized country is helping us. On the contrary, they are all working against us. Fourthly, our machinery of state is to blame. We took over the old machinery of state, and that was our misfortune. Very often this machinery operates against us. In 1917, after we seized power, the government officials sabotaged us. This frightened us very much and we pleaded: 'Please come back.' They all came back, but that was our misfortune.»<sup>1</sup>

But the whole evil consisted in the fact that the question was by no means confined to the fight against the remnants and traditions of the old state apparatus. These traditions provided, so to speak, only the «aroma» to the new bureaucratism which was growing on a new ground. Bureaucratism had become a scourge for the revolution, a dangerous and subtle foe.

The number of bureaucrats of the capitalist type in our country should not be limited only to the people that have directly come from the old

---

<sup>1</sup> V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 33, Moscow 1974, p. 428.

classes, from the old apparatus. The conditions were such that even those communists who were unable to preserve themselves in so complicated a social position could slip into bureaucratism. But the Leninist prescription of the attitude towards the bureaucrats apparently should have been extended to the degenerated communists. And in this way we replied to the question: Was Stalin right in carrying out the purge of the bureaucratic apparatus during the whole of his activity and especially on the verge of the war?

The objections concerning his policy, as we see, may have only a partial character, they may have to do with the justice of particular decisions. But the whole matter consists in the fact that the opportunists seek to reject Stalin in principle. They rehabilitated all those who had suffered sometime at the hands of Stalin. The counter-revolutionary bands which participated in the 1905 punitive expeditions, the renegades who used to steal the money of the people, the German policemen... they all bear today on their foreheads the seal of martyrs. They all were kissed, both figuratively and directly, by the «great Marxist» — Khrushchev, and the present-day opportunists attribute their liberation, as they did formerly, to

themselves as a merit. Is it to be surprised that historians were permitted to enter into the archives of the Ministry of Interior only by Khrushchev's personal authorization? This «great supporter of the truth» was afraid of putting on the table those documents which he himself had proclaimed as false. His successors are continuing the same foul work and now they are seeking to substantiate the most monstrous charges against Stalin, which Khrushchev framed up but was unable to prove. In any way, had there been unjustified victims during the repressive actions? We believe there may have been. But who is to be blamed for this? In the first place, bureaucracy is responsible for this. Perhaps some of the 1937 events are determined by the fact that the bureaucratized apparatus at that time waged the fight against bureaucratism and against the petty-bourgeois tendencies in a bureaucratic manner; by the fact that the petty-bourgeoisie was destroying itself through its denunciations. Messieurs the intellectuals were denouncing, slandering, settling accounts, bearing false testimony... and, of course, sometimes against honest and faithful individuals. And it is precisely these spiders that are now mourning for the trampled humanism and

are spitting upon a big shadow!

Stalin's attitude towards the excesses that were taking place in those days is seen better than anywhere else in the fact that he had his commissar of internal affairs Yezhov shot down and this exclusively for bureaucratism during the purges. It must be realized that Stalin had no other hands besides this bureaucratic apparatus and practically he could act only at the level of this apparatus.

But who would dare to accuse the dictatorship of the proletariat of causing victims? Forty centuries of the human history known to us is the history showing how the oppressors used to kill, rob, torture and violate the oppressed; during 40 centuries the oppressors did nothing else but try to suffocate the conscience of the oppressed depriving them of their elementary development, of the elementary habits of social activity. And now, when the oppressed finally seized power, when they were under the most difficult conditions of total blockade, lacking knowledge, experience and sufficient material resources, when under the threat of an exterminating war, they were compelled to build their own society, they are required to do this without mistake, with white gloves. Who else can think of such a demand ex-



cept the oppressors, except the bourgeoisie which after its defeat suddenly became an ardent defender of humanism and moral purity. If the Soviet power is guilty before some of its worthy sons, in this case, you, gentlemen, have no reason to come forward among them. These sons had been willing at any moment to lay down their lives for the Soviet power. And if they could hear you today, you would not be in a very good position.

Stalinism, if it is given a general definition, represents in itself the character of action of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a sum of measures used by the dictatorship of the proletariat in the conditions of a country of small peasants, for the building of the foundations of socialism. Indeed, finding itself on an economic ground hostile to it, a ground reviving capitalism incessantly and to the broadest extent, the proletariat cannot help carrying out in practice its own dictatorship by any means, at any cost. Particularly fierce and accompanied by some inevitable errors ought to have been this struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeois character in Russia, where it broke out for the first time. There is no doubt that this difficult experience will greatly facilitate and

make more rational the actions of the working class of other countries under similar conditions. This experience will be conducive to avoiding also the situation that has been created in the Soviet Union today. Indeed, the growth of bureaucracy has resulted in the gradual creation, between the revolutionary centre and the people, of a bureaucratic stratum dividing them, hampering them to act in full unity. Creating and consolidating the State apparatus and accomplishing thereby a job of very great historic importance, which ensured our economic successes all along the road of the construction of the foundations of socialism, Stalin was standing on the ground of this bureaucratic apparatus, he was fighting against it with the help of this very apparatus and for this reason he could not defeat it definitely. He was seeing how the hydra of bureaucracy was growing although he was mercilessly cutting off its heads which were rising again. In his efforts for revolutionary purity he did not trust (and one can hardly say he had no reason for this) all those that were surrounding him (only Molotov proved to be his worthy comrade in arms). Stalin's personality is really a heroic and sacred personality. Stalin stands high in history as an example to the rev-

olutionaries, as a warning to those wavering and as a terror to the enemies.

### III. RULE OF BUREAUCRACY

Stalin's death untied the hands to bureaucracy. The smallest part of it that had preserved its loyalty to the socialist state and considered as its mission to serve it, followed, of course, Stalin's line. The major part which had long since been living only for itself saw the possibility to liberate itself from the proletarian control in general, from the communist leadership from above which aimed at hitting the selfish velleities of bureaucracy and, in the final analysis, gradually side-tracking it through broader forms of the people's sovereignty. But could bureaucracy openly declare its rule without suffering in our country an immediate blow? Of course not. In order to assert itself in the conditions of the socialist state, bureaucracy had to prove that it was a supporter of the just course, that not only it remained faithful to the revolutionary ideals, but that it remained more faithful to them than Stalin did. It should present its delivery from the Stalin grip as the delivery of the whole people from this grip. Of course, it was impossible to play such a trick so easily. The more so that the working class of the USSR rejected from the very outset all the inven-

tions of the opportunists and adopted an entirely intransigent attitude towards them. The more so that a part of the Party and State leadership (Molotov, Malenkov, etc.) true to the dictatorship of the proletariat attempted to oppose bureaucracy openly.

Being itself the material embodiment of the centralization of power and its excessive shortcomings, bureaucracy did everything possible to attribute to Stalin these shortcomings and to turn away from itself the attention of the working people. But if Stalin is to be blamed for everything, then one must resolutely renounce the methods of the «personality cult» — such should the logic be. The bureaucrats, however, by no means want to change their customs, their great brutality. And precisely for this reason, smashing the «personality cult» methods in theory, they receive with an exceptional irritation and hatred every practical move for the democratization and restriction of their power because the «personality cult» methods are not Stalin's methods, but methods of bureaucracy itself which even in Stalin's days was intoxicating the Soviet reality, and even after Stalin it suffocates and persecutes everything alive, active, really soviet.

Indeed, the «personality cult», if we speak of such a thing, was a mere repetition (although a higher repetition) of the cult of bureaucracy, of which every representative in his office was a «personality». The opportunists make of the «personality cult» a cause of bureaucratism, while it is only its effect. It was precisely the bureaucrats that profaned the love fostered by the entire people for Stalin, converting it into a mechanical rite, and not without selfish calculations, because this provided them the possibility to ask for the adoption of a similar attitude also towards them. And by raising Stalin to the skies before the eyes of the people, the bureaucrats used to whisper and abuse in their own family circle. They used to hate Stalin because he was the mainstay of the socialist State which was feeding on the lymph of the people, while they were rotten supports of the state. Is it to be surprised that the bureaucrats are seeking to put on their resentment against Stalin a humanitarian and democratic cloak? As a matter of fact, under the guise of criticism against Stalin, the bureaucrats vomit all their hatred against the dictatorship of the proletariat which they were serving being compelled by Stalin.

Can the usurpation of power on the part of

bureaucracy and the fight against it be considered as a manifestation of the class struggle? As is known, the opportunists generally deny the existence of the class struggle in the Soviet Union. It is self-understood that it is not in their interest for them to speak of the class struggle in which they play an anti-popular role because this is dangerous for them. The more so this question deserves an attentive and comprehensive analysis.

The bourgeois class policy of Soviet bureaucracy has been quite clearly manifested in the fact that its first move was the formal removal of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Of course, this has been done under the pretext that allegedly it is no longer necessary in the Soviet Union. And this is happening in the conditions when half of mankind is still under the yoke of capitalism, when even inside the USSR, for that matter, one cannot help seeing the consequences of the world class conflicts and the bourgeois influences. Bureaucracy opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Party of the proletariat «the state of the whole people» and the «Party of the whole people». But when speaking of «the state of the whole people» and «the party of the whole people» they only say that this state and this party are

led by the «leaders», that is to say the bureaucrats who now no longer represent any working class, none except their own selves.

But look at the Soviet bureaucrats! Can there be a question of real re-election of every responsible person in our country — a re-election not from above (in the bureaucratic way), but from below (through the democratic method)? Accordingly, the bureaucrats rule over the whole practical life of the entire country. The people cannot remove them even if they will like such a thing. While bureaucracy can remove any functionary of the party or state apparatus if he will be for it too honest and faithful towards the interests of the people. Notice the salaries of our bureaucrats, their motorcars and villas. When these things are touched, they begin to cry out shockingly about «vulgarization of Marxism», about the «departure from the principle of material interest» and, finally, about «Stalinism». The conversion of the bureaucrats from servants of the state into its lords in the USSR has indeed taken place.

Isn't it perhaps the opportunist leadership of the CPSU and the whole of the Soviet bureaucracy that proclaimed the programme of the building of communism and that are now making



efforts to build this communism? The secret of such a haste of the Soviet bureaucrats is immediately revealed if we recall that in connection with the yet unbuilt communism they have removed the dictatorship of the proletariat. But suffice it to have a close look at it to see, not in words but in deeds, what this programme and this building mean. While reading the opportunist programme, one cannot help being surprised with its complete emptiness and with its deplorable declarative character. It speaks of the construction of kindergartens and creches, of parks and swimming pools, of the growth of democracy, but it contains no analysis of that reality which is a starting point of all these great achievements; thus, it has nothing concerning the road to be followed. We can imagine the shock of the opportunists with regard to such a declaration!

Bureaucracy has transformed social demagoguery into a bulwark of its well-being. The people instinctively feel the real state of affairs and say that the bureaucrats will live for a long time in communism.

The opportunists are boasting of such splendid achievements of the USSR such as the conquest of space, the development of the electric-

power basis, etc. But do these things go to their credit? Aren't these the fruit of the seed sown by Stalin? Aren't these successes a result of the inertia of our previous movement? To shout about achievements is an easy thing. Let the opportunists speak of initiatives of their own that have not ended with shame.

Can there be any doubt with regard to the most complete degeneration of bureaucracy, to the full emptying on its part of all the forms of socialist life and of socialist conscience when one directly sees our daily life today? Most complete lack of all enthusiasm in the masses, full indifference towards work, a social life transformed into a farce, complete rule of selfish principles, suppression of everything alive, active and fresh — such is the balance-sheet of the rule of bureaucratic order. One must completely lose his conscience, have no brains at all and lose even the smallest concepts and memories of revolution and Bolshevism; finally one must be definitely sold out not to see this thing and deny it. Of what service to the people, of what connection with the masses can the bureaucrats speak while they have shot down more than once the striking workers? All the efforts of the opportunists are aimed at de-

ceiving the Soviet men and women, at corrupting our youth, at distorting the revolutionary history, passing over in silence the fact that its whole essence has consisted in the assertion of Bolshevism which represents in itself the most complex and the highest culture of revolution. The opportunists revise Bolshevism, they put on all its manifestations the seal of dogmatism and Talmudism, revenging themselves against Bolshevism for their humiliation before it in the past and for the covert fear they have before it today. We must tear off the curtains of the traditional Bolshevik glory of this clique, of its Marxist phraseology and its foggy promises. And there comes forward before us the raging, selfish, unsatiated and at the same time coward petty-bourgeois. The Soviet bureaucrat however is not a real bourgeois either; the social conditions do not permit him to become such. He is an absurd parody of the bourgeois, he is a petty-bourgeois inclined on the ideology and state of a bourgeois. That is why he tries with might and main to have recourse to the «western» way of life. Masking his servilism with bombastic phrases about the ampleness of his concepts, scoffing at the really Marxist views which he calls dogmatism and orthodoxal obstinacy, the Soviet

bureaucrat completely degenerates, passing in every way into the dirty atmosphere of the bourgeois life so dear to him, which he makes his own also in his way of conduct and in dressing and even in the works of art serving for household use. We do not accidentally say for household use. Before the eyes of all, the bureaucrat is compelled to adhere to the limits of Soviet respectability; in his private circle he gives free vent to his real feelings; here he relaxes from the Soviet principles. In his private circle he surrounds his soul, tortured by ideology, with the rags of the bourgeois world and views films which, due to their corruptive content, are prohibited even in bourgeois Europe. It is precisely on this basis that there grow open traitors to the homeland like Penkovsky.

Listen what nonsenses the bureaucrats say when it is a question of socialist theory. Was there any dogmatism in Stalin's days? Yes, there was. We answer in this way without fearing this fact at all. Dogmatism has been a natural and inevitable result of the same general ignorance of ours, of the apprenticeship period in mastering Marxism on the part of the masses. We dogmatically use every weapon up to the moment of its mastery. The free, creative use comes jointly with the mas-

tery. Such is the case also in the domain of dialectic thinking. This is understandable to every one that likes to understand something. This initial dogmatism must be overcome, but this does not mean that we ought to sell Marxism, as the opportunists do, in order to replace it with the bourgeois freedom of thought. The bourgeois are free in their thinking because it is entirely empty.

We cannot say, however, that these people do not bother at all about Marxism. The tragicomism of their position consists in the fact that they can preserve their very existence only by preaching Marxism in words. They feed themselves by reading that book in which their death sentence is inscribed. Is it to be surprised that they are seeking to distort what they read, to weaken the force of this sentence? Taking advantage of the fact that they are not known by the others, they are attempting to bind Marxism hand and foot, to cut off all its «sharp corners» so that it may take seat in their petty-bourgeois comfort. Before us there stands a class enemy, and an enemy that is the more dangerous as he has donned our uniform, as in the crucible of the class battle he may be taken for one of us, may be entrusted and so we may be stabbed on the back.

## IV. OPPORTUNISTS IN THE WORLD ARENA

While inside the USSR opportunism led to the loss of the socialist course and to the disorder of social organization, its consequences are still more serious and more dangerous in the international arena. In the conditions when special national detachments of communists are in different stages of development, when they often not only have not overcome the Stalin era, but they have not reached it yet, the false criticism of the opportunists directed at Stalin should have caused a very great damage to the communist movement, it should have armed all the wavering petty-bourgeois elements within it, the elements that in all sorts of ways shirk revolutionary discipline, submission to Party unity and complete abnegation, without which the communist cannot be a communist. The actions of the opportunist leadership of the CPSU opened a vista for all sorts of demagogy and covert treachery among the ranks of the communist parties, to speculate on the loftiest and most sacred things for a communist: the truth and ideological purity. Now a possibility has emerged for every disturber and

double-dealer, for every bankrupt ambitious person, not to submit to the revolutionary leadership, to the revolutionary leaders, accusing them of «Stalinism». The criticism of Stalin's «personality cult» became in this way the greatest provocation in scale of the whole communist movement, a provocation aimed at depriving its special detachments of their «command».

But while speaking of opportunism in the world arena, we must examine its influence not only in the internal organization of the communist movement, but also in the international policy of the communists. We said above that the opportunists in their theories say nothing of their own, but they distort the factors which actually exist. They have nevertheless found an «actual» explanation to their departure from the revolutionary ideals, to their departure from revolutionary actions in the world arena — that is the struggle for peace.

When it is a question of war and peace and when an abstract choice between them is proposed, it is understood that every normal person would unhesitatingly choose peace. Speculating on this natural and very strong aspiration, the opportunists are seeking to present the situation as

if they stand for peace without any reservation and doubt, whereas their opponents are trying to engage themselves in a certain policy under the threat of total extermination, they are making efforts to build communism on the atomic ruins, etc. «Peace at any cost» — Khrushchev openly declared once. «We are threatened by atomic war, above all, let us ensure the existence of mankind, then all the rest» — the opportunists say, echoing him. The impression is created as if the question of the safeguard of peace and the exclusion of war from the relations between the peoples is a question entirely independent of the class struggle and can be settled apart from the social problems. The United Nations resolution on the settlement of all the inter-state conflicts in a peaceful way, the banning of atomic weapons, total and general disarmament — such is the plan for the establishment of eternal peace on earth, a plan put forward and insistently defended by the opportunists. Apparently, one should step down from the moon in order to be able to map out similar plans and ask why do the imperialists not agree with so reasonable proposals. Indeed, why do the imperialists not like to liquidate their overseas bases and colonial armies, which would immediately lead



them to the loss of every influence of theirs on the terrestrial globe, and to the triumph of a series of national-liberation and social revolutions? Why do the imperialists not want to disarm, which would at once lead to the loss of their class rule and of their assets? One need not at all study Marxism to arrive at such foolish questions. They will tell us that the imperialists fight not only against the proletariat, but also against one another instigated by predatory tendencies. That is true. But this fact, too, cannot be treated only on the subjective plane. Some capitalist may not, personally, be insatiable; maybe he does not want to expand his wealth. But the realization of a higher profit is necessary to him as a condition for his own existence. If everything would depend on the personal qualities of the capitalists, we think that we could bring them to their senses (which the opportunists are trying to do). No, it is not only a question of their personal qualities. These qualities of theirs are determined by material factors. As a matter of fact, the war is not a result of the personal will of anyone, but an economic imperative for capitalism. The internal contradictions of the capitalist system result in that the capitalist countries, in search for new markets, clash

with one another, that the super-production crisis seeks a way out for the productive forces of the capitalist society and these forces, not properly directed, assume the form of arms production. The war is an inevitable result of the present-day social relations in the capitalist world. To speak of the establishment of peace on the basis of a general agreement with the capitalists means to speak of the destruction of the capitalist system under the terms of an agreement with its representatives. The full idiotism of such a plan is self-evident. Precisely for this reason, defending their conception of peace, the opportunists are trying by every means to produce on the peoples the impression of successes being achieved on the road of disarmament, etc. For the sake of this, they openly betrayed the interests of the people — they signed the treaty on banning the atomic tests in three environments. In compliance with this treaty, the USSR was deprived of the possibility to carry out atomic tests in general, whereas the United States preserved this possibility because the treaty has not been extended to the underground tests which the USA could carry out and is carrying out. No enemy can really be more terrible to us than opportunism.

Only the opportunists do not notice that to present peace as the first and principal duty means to lie down and raise your hands. This is a capitulating attitude on which the imperialists acquire the possibility to speculate by military threat and attain their purpose in every specific political and international question. Accordingly, «by saving mankind» we should proceed towards endless concessions. Logically, at the end of this so-called humanitarian road, both we and the whole mankind must kneel down and put the imperialist yoke on our necks.

«This is a slander», the opportunists would declare; «we do not intend to withdraw to such an extent». But to what extent do you intend to withdraw, gentlemen? That is to say that you, too, cannot help admitting that the struggle for peace has a limit for all those who do not agree to purchase peace at the price of slavery. That is to say that it is not a question of the leaders of the CPSU standing in general for peace, whereas the communists of China and Albania stand generally for war. That is to say that the opportunists and the revolutionary Marxists understand in a different way the importance and the specific weight of the struggle for peace in the programme

and actions of the communists.

We declare: yes, war is a terrible thing and must be consistently fought against in order to completely exclude it from the life of humanity. But you can fight against war and be consistent in this fight in different ways. You can rise against war as against a fact. This is the way the pacifists fight against war; indeed the opportunists likewise are inclined on this. It is clear that such a fight for peace represents in itself the bourgeois-democratic trend which aims at eliminating one of the worst consequences of the capitalist system — the war, without touching this system essentially. As we see, the formal consistent attitude of this kind is in fact a flagrant inconsistency. To be able to fight in a really consistent manner against war, one must fight the source and cause of wars in the present-day world — imperialism. In other words, the communists cannot bring the question of war and peace to the forefront and examine it separately; it may be for them only a part of their general struggle for socialism. «We do not deny this», the opportunists would say. Well then, how could you present as a general line of the communist movement the struggle for the effect (peace) instead of its cause (socialism).

The logic of the opportunists is distinguished by a simplicity which is not to be envied: the socialist countries occupy the leading position in the communist movement; their most important revolutionary task, in Lenin's words, is the consolidation of their economy; it follows from this that the economic development of the socialist countries must become in fact the main objective to which all the actions of world communism must be subordinated. It is understood that in this case the words «peace at any cost» appear as reasonable and they allegedly serve the world revolution. But it is not difficult to discover the selfish and dirty base of the whole of this opportunist logic. The socialist countries stand to the world communist movement as the part stands to the whole. «The working class of the USSR», Stalin declared at the 17th Congress of the CP of the Soviet Union (B), «is part of the world proletariat, its advanced detachment, and our republic is the cherished child of the world proletariat. There can be no doubt that if our working class had not had the support of the working class in the capitalist countries it would not have been able to retain power, it would not have secured the conditions for socialist construction, and, conse-

quently, it would not have achieved the successes that it has achieved... But it imposes serious duties upon us. It means that we must prove by our work that we deserve the honourable title of shock brigade of the proletarians of all countries. It imposes upon us the duty of working better and fighting better for the final victory of socialism in our country, for the victory of socialism in all countries.»<sup>1</sup> There is no doubt that the same thing can be said also of the camp of the socialist countries in general. Only by orientating themselves in all their actions and in all their plans on the basis of the processes taking place in the world communist movement, only by taking into consideration its general interests, the socialist countries can accomplish their really historic mission and carry out a correct revolutionary policy. While the opportunists, right from their first steps, practically began to insist on their hegemony on the whole international communist movement. They used the possession of the atomic weapons as a new argument in favour of their leading position.

---

<sup>1</sup> J.V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 13, Moscow 1954, pp. 387-388.

We repeat that the class aims cannot be attained within the framework of the struggle for peace. Not only that, but from the very moment when the struggle for peace is raised as a fundamental line of the world communist movement, it openly runs against the class struggle. Indeed, if the communist parties of the capitalist countries would lay down as their own main duty the struggle for peace, they would lose their class countenance and inside their countries they would merge with the current of the peace partisans, which has a democratic character. The implementation of such a policy would, coherently, make them renounce every action, however slightly resolute and revolutionary, in order to avoid entering into internal conflict with the other part of the peace partisans — with the representatives of the small, middle and even big bourgeoisie who are not interested in a revolutionary overthrow. Will the bourgeoisie, when feeling the possibility of such an overthrow, not begin seeking a way out in the war, in the war time emergency laws, in the military victory which would allow it to nourish its working class with the loot, and in the worst of cases, in a provoked military intervention? We are exposing

here not our speculative considerations, but the actual history of Tsarist Russia. By what kind of peace conferences and declarations can such a development of events be avoided? Apparently, in order to avoid «pushing» the bourgeoisie in this way towards war, the working people should renounce revolutionary actions and uprisings. If you will not conceive the struggle for peace in such a radical way and if you will speak of it as of the general line of the communists, this will mean to speak nonsense. And you would proceed on this road to the end; this would be a real counter-revolution.

The revolutionary and anti-colonial uprisings in case of victory always lead to foreign intervention, to the intervention of the world bourgeoisie. The history of Soviet Russia in the past, the destiny of South Vietnam and the Congo today are sufficient proofs to such a thing. In the process of foreign penetration, the revolution is transformed into a war of the said people against the foreign power or powers. We accept the just wars and we reject the predatory wars, the opportunists declare posing as Marxists. But of what general line of the struggle for peace can one speak in relation to the communist parties of the capitalist countries? A



general line for them may be only the class struggle against the capitalists within the country up to its armed forms and the revolutionary war against foreign interventionists.

The working people in the capitalist countries, too, need peace — the opportunists say. They hysterically cry out with regard to atomic death, losing all and every human dignity, stricken by a bestial terror. But whom do they scare by these threats? The men and women who are now dying in the millions from hunger and disease in the capitalist and dependent countries? Indeed, only with such a cynicism as that of the opportunists one can preach to a person dying of hunger as a first-rate duty the struggle for peace and not revolution. Is it perhaps that the opportunists want, through doomsday, to frighten the South Vietnamese partisans and the Congolese insurgents, their women and children? Doomsday for them has already come. In their sorrow, would they not like that their hardships be overcome at once through a world clash between capitalism and socialism? Is it not indifferent to them to die from napalm or from the atomic bomb? Of course, not all the oppressed peoples have come yet to the conviction that it is better to die stand-

ing than to live in prostration. But they all are proceeding in this direction, this is the tendency of their development. Consequently, the threat of atomic war, too, cannot annul the general line of the communists towards socialist revolution.

The destiny of the socialist camp and world peace is indissolubly linked with the development of the international revolutionary movement. The real contradiction between the communist parties of the socialist and capitalist countries arises because the opportunists, after having usurped power in the USSR, did not concern themselves with the revolutionary prospects of the socialist countries and they consider the question of their existence from a mere petty-bourgeois viewpoint. Precisely for this reason, the opportunists are seeking to convert also the world communist movement from a base and source of revolutionary strength of the socialist countries into a docile supplement of their own in the arena of the struggle for peace. Just as inside the USSR the opportunists took advantage of their temporary historic position to arrange themselves at the expense of their fellow citizens, so in the world arena they are trying to create a similar situation with regard to the communist parties and, in gen-

eral, to the working masses of the capitalist countries, subordinating the latter's interests to their own interests.

It is not difficult to understand that in order to be able to realize the international general line, the communist parties must rely on the whole working class and even on the whole bulk of the working people in the Asian, African and Latin American countries, whereas in the countries of developed capitalism they must rely only on the poorest strata of the working class and peasantry. In practice, however, we notice now an opportunistic departure of the communist parties of the major capitalist countries from this class principle. The European communists, for example, should reconcile themselves with the fact that the preservation of the principled Marxist positions would now inevitably lead to a marked decrease in their ranks. But is this an argument for the opportunist treachery? And is this a sign of weakness of the communists? As is known, precisely on the threshold of the October Revolution, there was a moment when the number of the Bolsheviks dropped considerably. Did Lenin make any concessions to the compromise parties only to increase the Bolshevik Party membership? No,

never. Did this prevent the Bolsheviks from seizing power at the decisive moment; did this prevent the whole of Russia from being bolshevized almost within a few days? Not at all. For decades in succession the communist parties in the Asian and Latin American countries have struggled in superhuman conditions and have sustained tremendous sacrifices for a mere initial effort of Marxist propaganda. Do you think the European communists would sell Marxism today for the dish of lentils of the petty-bourgeois glory?

Would this mean that the communists must renounce the unity of all the progressive forces in the fight against imperialism? No, it does not mean that. But they must achieve this unity not by departing from Marxism, not by merging in the petty-bourgeois mass, but by testing through sweat and patience, on the basis of actual facts, their correctness, the correctness of the Marxist analysis of class relations, of Marxist policy. Of course, this way of organizing the masses is much more complicated and difficult and much longer than speculation on their prejudices and on the moment inclinations. History, however, cannot be deceived; it can be given this or that direction only relying on the force of the imperative. That

is why Lenin used to say that the only correct policy was the principled policy.

Facts go to show that the cores of the future genuine communist parties are now taking shape within the European parties. Let them be for the time being only groups; they will grow without fail; they will turn away from the opportunist majority and they will emerge at the head of the revolutionary movement in their own countries. Their future successes are ensured by the fact that now the proletariat of the major capitalist countries is being rapidly revolutionized. But still the revisionists often represent the communist parties of the capitalist countries. It makes one inclined to laugh when hearing their braggings about successes which they measure with the increase in the number of the party membership. If they would supplement their programme with the thesis that Jesus Christ was the founder of communism, they would be provided an actual possibility to include sometime also the Pope of Rome into their ranks. The fact that the French and the Italian parties, in their competition for influence and for the increase of their membership have long since crossed all the limits permitted by Marxism clearly shows their attitude towards the bourgeois

intelligentsia. We are accused of dogmatism; but if the latter consists in the fact that we remember the lessons of revolutionary history, then we are prepared to admit that we are dogmatics. Yes, we still remember the fight of the Bolsheviki and Mensheviki at the Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party concerning the question of who must be a party member. Then the question arose: should the party be an organization of professional proletarian revolutionaries or an inn for the intellectual chatterers, for whom the entry into the party and the coming out of it, in their pain-stricken spiritual biography, is only a moment filling up the interval between the passion for some philosophical theory in fashion and a love affair.

Only in such parties as the French and Italian ones, in which the petty-bourgeois tendency of compromise has definitely suppressed the really revolutionary aspirations could the absurd illusion on the «peaceful» transition from capitalism to socialism arise. Even if the power, due to some accidentalness, would pass into the hands of such a party which by its class nature is a Russian salad, this would by no means be a victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dissolution, chaos and

elimination under the blows of the counter-revolutionary punishers would lie in store for such a party. And the working people following the opportunists would pay with countless victims for such a victory. Of course, there is here also a «victorious» variant — this is the road of the British labourites, the road of open collaboration with the capitalists. But the opportunists in the communist movement have not yet taken off the Marxist attire from their bourgeois skin. Therefore, they are seeking to present «peaceful» transition as a real proceeding towards socialism.

Defending their conception of «peaceful» transition, the opportunists refer to Lenin who used to speak of the possibility of such a transition of power into the hands of the proletariat in June 1917. But this possibility remained only a possibility. And it is quite significant that there has not been as yet registered in history any case, on the basis of which we could realistically judge on the conditions of «peaceful» transition. The opportunists are seeking in some way to adapt also the October Revolution, based on the facility of the initial reversal, to the theory of «peaceful» transition. But this is a sheer tale. Firstly, the reversal in October 1917 was almost a bloodless reversal not

because of the orientation towards the peaceful settlement of the class conflict, not because of the use of peaceful means, but because the forces of the proletariat inside Petrograd were much greater than the forces of the bourgeoisie, because the entire Baltic fleet was with the Bolsheviks and the whole artillery of the Petropavlovsk fortress, which had passed over to the proletariat, was directed towards the Winter Palace. On the other side, in October 1917 the power of the proletariat had just been proclaimed, while the real clash between the exploited and the exploiters continued for four consecutive years on the civil war fronts. Do the opportunists suggest to us to view precisely this bloody epos as a «peaceful» transition of power into the hands of the proletariat?

The opportunists refer to the «peaceful» transition of power from the hands of the bourgeoisie to the hands of the proletariat after the war in the East European countries. But only the opportunists can intentionally brush aside the fact that this transition was the result of the victory of the Soviet Union in the war, a result of the fact that the bourgeoisie of these countries was disarmed.

Today we can concretely judge of how in fact the struggle for peace conflicts with the revolu-



tionary liberation struggle when the opportunists convert the struggle for peace into a principal aim of theirs. This was best demonstrated by Lumumba's fate. Instead of supporting the revolutionary struggle of the Congolese people and helping the latter to liberate themselves from the petty-bourgeois liberal illusions, the leaders of the CPSU were in every way pushing the Congo towards the settlement of its problems through the United Nations Organization, that is to say through the «peaceful» way, pledging success to Lumumba with their participation in this organization. This demoralized Lumumba's supporters and helped the imperialists, by establishing the external control of the UNO over the Congo, to abduct Lumumba with the help of mercenaries and eliminate him. This is how the struggle for peace was shown as a general line of the opportunists! The truth is that Khrushchev's hands bear Lumumba's blood.

Another clear example indicating that the imperialists can speculate on the struggle for peace in their actions against the revolutionary liberation movement is provided by the present-day situation in Vietnam. Today, the Americans accuse North Vietnam of the victories of the South Vi-

etnamese partisans and, under the threat of war between the two camps, they are seeking to compel the South Vietnamese to cease their struggle for liberation. Meanwhile, the imperialists can pin their hopes only on the weak nerves of the opportunists, believing the latter will exert reconciliatory pressure on the revolutionaries. Of course, such a situation, jointly with the provocative bombing of North Vietnam, would have been impossible if the Soviet leaders would pursue a somewhat resolute policy, if they would enjoy some world prestige. They spit on his face while he says this is God's dew — a Russian proverb goes. This is the only way one can understand the declarations made by the opportunists on paper, there where they should resort to ultimatum and to such counter-measures as to spoil forever the imperialist bandits' appetite to violate the borders of the socialist camp.

During the development of social contradictions the imperialists arrive at war, while the working people arrive at revolution. The danger of revolution increases still more the efforts of the imperialists to come out, through war, from the historic impasse on which they have landed. But does this mean that the working people should

renounce their revolutionary actions and revolution? The opportunists, due to their fear, lack of will and selfishness, will reply: Yes. The Marxists say: No, because it is impossible to turn one's self away from the development of objective contradictions which mirror the development of human history. The growth of the revolutionary movement, increasing the subjective aims of the imperialists for war, deprives them at the same time of the objective possibility to unleash such war. To fail to understand today this dialectic is tantamount to renouncing communism, to renouncing revolution. The opportunists, seeking to force upon the world communist movement the struggle for peace as a general line, as we see, are striving to create a semblance of peace, they are striving for an unstable and fraudulent agreement with the imperialists at the expense of the real warranty of peace — the development of the revolutionary movement. By disorganizing the masses, by disorganizing the communist parties, by weakening the military potential of the socialist countries, the opportunists, far from contributing to avoiding a global thermonuclear war, are indeed leading to such a war.

Does there exist any actual way to put an end

to the atomic blackmail of the imperialists, to their monstrous equilibration on the brink of thermos-nuclear war; does there exist an actual way to deprive them of the atomic weapon? Yes, there is. In what does this way consist? In talks, petitions, demonstrations, etc.? No; none of these can persuade the imperialists. There is only one way to thwart atomic blackmail: that is to affront them. The opportunists who spread panic with regard to the threat of a thermo-nuclear war do not notice a simple thing: If the imperialists could really start a total war, they would have started it long since. They would have started it yesterday, today, at this moment; because their situation has for a long time been requiring the use of all the forces, means and possibilities. Finding themselves on a revolutionary volcano, they feel the earth scorching under their feet. Would they hesitate, be it for a moment, to wipe out from the earth's face several hundreds of millions of men and women while they have liquidated many more during their class and colonial exploitation? They are prevented from doing it by the thought that they, too, would be wiped out from the face of the earth. The imperialists are by no means able to allow themselves to be annihilated for

ideal considerations, just to slam the door and to bid you goodbye. And they will not cross this threshold if the opportunists will not dismiss the revolutionary army of the world proletariat and if they will not undermine the military potential of the socialist camp. It is the opportunists themselves, by their weakness and irresolution, that arouse the arrogance of the imperialists; they brandish their missiles with a very flighty haste and then, when the conflict assumes an importance of principle, they withdraw, covering themselves and their allies with shame.

It is not a question of the imperialists respecting the rights of the Soviet Union — we say on our own behalf — but that they should respect the rights of all the peoples of the world.

And the Soviet workers will support us to a man. The peoples of the world must know that if in any place and for anything the Soviet Union has been covered with shame, it is not the Soviet workers that are to be blamed for this, who by their 50-year struggle have proved their revolutionary self-denial; it is the opportunists that are guilty of this. Fear prevents them from seeing the essence of atomic blackmail. But do you think that they always believe in this blackmail? No.

The opportunists themselves exploit this blackmail for their own selfish aims. This has been seen better than anywhere else when they broke with China, when they, under the pretext of the anti-atomic preparation, started to project everywhere in the USSR a film showing the horrors of the atomic attack. The opportunists are trying to disseminate in the socialist countries the atomic psychosis in order to scare our people, to make it so that those who would decide openly to rise against them would be unable to polemicize with them, proclaiming them as supporters of the atomic war. Indeed, the opportunists take a very active part in the atomic blackmail policy and they support this policy as much as they can.

The snake of capitalism cannot enter into a death clash with socialism, for it has been reduced to smithereens due to the internal contradictions of its social system. It is trying to muster its forces by all sorts of pacts and alliances in all the parts of the world, but all this is useless. Then, in its blind fury, this snake poisons those he can — the small peoples, the peaceful women and children in South Vietnam and in the Congo. We do not speak of high human virtues, but one must be entirely shameless not to say «no» to this monster,

not to smash its head and not to pull off its terrible tooth — the atomic weapon.

## V. COMMUNISTS, FORWARD!

To be able to act as we said above one needs great revolutionary energies, unexampled revolutionary initiative.

Here in the first place we must draw the attention to the fact that in our days all the social contradictions are entangled in a big and complicated sphere. If formerly there existed many scattered sectors, unlinked with one another, of the class struggle in which the local proletariat and bourgeoisie were clashing against each other; if the essence of the social problems in each one of these cases has been quite clear; if every communist party in these conditions could fully rely on its own efforts and on its own initiative, now the whole world has become a unique field of the social battle, in which socialism and capitalism are clashing like two organized forces; now the solution of this or that local crisis, as a rule, assumes a world importance.

Indeed, the unification of all the social ties and contradictions, far from removing the cause of revolution, raises it with an unprecedented toughness and to an unheard-of scale, not in a special form but in a general one: a unique com-



plex requires a unique solution. To be able to understand this clear and final form after a long development of the communist movement through special, national channels is of course a difficult thing. But it is the more so important now fully to declare: what Marx and Engels have said at the moment of the rise of the communist movement; what the Russian workers and soldiers inscribed on their banners prior to the October offensive, are becoming an actual historic task for us. We must prepare these things tirelessly and everywhere, determining all our thoughts and actions. We are speaking of world revolution.

Let us consider the question from the historical viewpoint. The development of capitalism in Marx' lifetime was an initial development which in fact was taking place within the limits fixed by the feudal epoch. Within these limits (with the exception of the USA) the capitalist world represented in itself such a narrow economic unity and its contradictions had become so much sharpened and interwoven that Marx was right in understanding the elimination of capitalism as a result of a common world revolution, of a universal revolutionary struggle.

But during the scramble for colonies and dur-

ing the monopolization of capital there came to the fore the most important law of the development of the capitalist countries — their unequal development. The unequal development of capitalism left no room for a revolution on all the continents. The economic situation, the power of the exploiters and the development of the workers' movement in different capitalist countries were very different. However, this unequal development created the possibility — and Lenin noticed this possibility — to break the weak link in the chain of capitalism. The Leninist theory of the revolution in one sole country was, no doubt, the further development of the theory of revolution.

Despite the different level of development and the different situation in capitalist countries, there have been created between them, in general, such relations that cannot be broken otherwise than by breaking all the correlations, that is the world, in its contradictory situation, has nevertheless become unique as in the days of Marx. It is but natural that in the present-day stage of the development of the class struggle we cannot help returning to the conception of Marx with regard to world revolution and, this time, definitely.

But does this mean that the Leninist theory

of the unequal development of capitalism and of the breaking of its individual weak links is now erroneous? Certainly not. The preparation of a total world revolutionary explosion far from excluding the breaking of the chain of imperialism in its weak links, the revolutionary struggle of the peoples in this direction, it presupposes this struggle, its incessant growth in every country. A «weak link» in our days is the whole of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the words of the Chinese comrades, they have changed into an «area of revolutionary storms». When the opportunists shout that the revolutionary Marxists underestimate the leading role of the socialist camp in the world communist movement with regard to this question, they openly engage in demagoguery and logical machinations. The role of the socialist countries is clear as well to China, Albania and to all revolutionaries. We shall speak of this in the future. This, however, does not impede the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America to be that weak point where the further liquidation of the links of the capitalist chain is being carried out. By denying this, the present-day opportunists behave themselves just like the European chiefs of the Second International, who used to deny the

Leninist theory of the victory of socialism in backward Russia. The defining of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America as «areas of revolutionary storms» is an addition to and a visible practical development of the Leninist theory of the «weak link». The opportunists who do not want to understand this run counter the Leninist theory, which now assumes a new and a much greater importance, and just as if closing the cycle, it is returning us again to the course towards world revolution.

We shall point out that the world revolutionary upsurge, at the beginning of which we are assisting, is the third one in order of time in the history of the development of the world workers' movement. The first of them belongs to almost the middle of the past century. At that time, in the fight against the utopian theories of socialism, against the projects of the evolutionary transition to socialism, there emerged the theory of scientific, proletarian socialism. The revolutionary movement was led by Marx and Engels. All this period is characterized by the majesty of the Paris Commune.

The second revolutionary upsurge, which began prior to the First World War, reached its zen-

ith during it; it was a new, higher stage in the development of the proletarian revolution. In this stage Marxism was developed and deepened by Lenin. This development of Marxism was now being affected in the direct fight against the opportunists of the Second International, and it served in the first place the liberation of the working class from their harmful influence. A result of the revolutionary policy of the Russian Bolsheviks, headed by Lenin, and of the revolutionary policy of the communist parties which were rising in Europe, America and Asia was the emergence and consolidation of the first state of proletarian dictatorship in the world — the USSR.

It is clear that by fighting the opportunists and defeating them, the communists can await the new revolutionary upsurge fully prepared to be in the lead of it. Naturally, the orientation towards world revolution will turn away from the communist movement the petty-bourgeois ideologists who can accept communism only if it is cooked with opportunist sauce. In other words, division in a series of communist parties existing today is inevitable. «Before we can unite, and in order that we may unite», Lenin used to say, «we must first of all draw firm and definite lines of

demarcation».<sup>1</sup> This is true in our days, too. The communist movement has no reason to advance while having the opportunist shells around it. The more so that in the process of the development of the revolutionary events the ranks of the communist parties will be swollen by thousands and tens of thousands of real proletarians of the town and countryside that have recognized the need for really revolutionary actions, who wholeheartedly remain true to the cause of communism. We are now faced with a great task: to suppress the rule of the opportunists in the world communist movement, to expose them and undermine their authority before the eyes of the working people in all the countries, to get the smoke replaced with the flame.

The revolutionary struggle requires not only bravery and determination at the decisive moment; it cannot develop successfully without a daily, tireless and continuous work, without an iron constancy, without a calm and realistic calculation. At the first moment, the very blow dealt to the opportunists, under any form, was a great

---

<sup>1</sup> V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 4, Moscow 1974, p. 354.

historic fact, a great revolutionary heroism. The peoples of China and Albania who underwent in this case difficult tests have deserved the gratitude and admiration of the whole world proletariat and the memory of their determination will live in the centuries. But the opportunists are mobilizing today all their forces, all their knowledge and capacities to discredit revolutionary Marxism and to bar its road towards the hearts of the working people. In these conditions, we must outdo the opportunists not only in the field of general revolutionary strategy (their cause here has suffered defeats from the very outset), but also in tactics. In order to prevent our revolutionary tactics from being changed only into a self-sacrifice, it is necessary clearly and accurately to define its essence.

Here again Lenin comes to our assistance. In fact, while analysing the problems of revolutionary reversal on a world scale, one cannot help noticing that the correlation of forces in the world arena recalls now, to one's surprise, the correlation of forces that existed in Russia on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution. We are faced with the same three main classes: the big bourgeoisie and the proletariat, which are in an

irreconcilable antagonism, and the peasant petty-bourgeois mass, which has been revolutionised in the extreme, but which is less stable and consistent than the proletariat. And the class division now in the world arena has assumed an original geographical delimitation: the bourgeoisie — the great imperialist powers; the proletariat — the countries of socialism; the petty-bourgeoisie — the countries under liberation of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They will tell us that in each of these divisions there are also internal class relations. We do not forget this. The above division does not lose on this account its importance in the analysis of the general report on the correlation of class forces in the international arena. The revolutionary Marxists may look forward with courage: they need not feel for with closed eyes; they possess the tremendous experience of a more than 100-year struggle of the proletariat, an experience that has been analysed and summed up in different stages by the greatest thinkers of mankind — Marx and Lenin.

To be able to correctly exploit this experience one should not lose sight of the fact that the success of the October Revolution and of the future world revolution is determined by the same con-



dition — by the ability of the proletariat to win over the democratic masses of peasantry, to detach them from the bourgeoisie and to organize them in the revolutionary struggle. Now the most important aspect of this problem is the attitude of the socialist countries towards the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who are struggling for their national and social liberation. In this a great harm has been done to us by the opportunists who adopt an open anti-Leninist stand. There is no doubt that the socialist countries can and must aid the liberated countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Meanwhile, we must by no means force upon them our communist programme, just as Lenin never used to impose it on the peasant masses and parties in Russia. The peoples that are liberating themselves must be convinced by their own experience of the need for socialist development. This however does not mean that the communists may forget the class principle and support anyone.

The countries under liberation of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which are in contradiction with the biggest capitalist countries, become themselves the arena of a terrible struggle between the people's democratic and bourgeois tenden-

cies, The communists should foster no illusion in connection with this. In these countries, just as it happened also in Russia, it is easier to start revolution and more difficult to carry it to the end. The understanding of this fact will help us to appraise more correctly also the prospects of the revolutionary movement in the biggest capitalist countries. Here we must not display scepticism, although we have to do with the bulwark of capitalism. The more the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America turn away from the political and economic dependence of the imperialist powers, the more American, European and, finally, Australian capital loses the ground under its feet, the more it is eroded by internal contradictions, the more the revolutionary movement in the biggest capitalist countries develops. We can speak right now of the result of that economic boom registered in the capitalist countries after the Second World War. A general crisis is seen in the skyline of capitalist economy. The exceptionally high tide of the strike movement that has swept over the capitalist countries today is a warning of the coming revolutionary storms. The communists of Europe, America and Australia must be prepared to emerge in the lead of this revolutionary upsurge

and for this purpose they must detach themselves from the opportunists and form their own organization. Precisely such parties as the Communist Party of Australia which is led by Comrade Hill will lead the working people of the capitalist countries in the future revolutionary battles. The proletariat of the great capitalist countries now finds it more difficult to move than the popular masses of Asia, Africa and Latin America, but when this proletariat will rise the last hour of the capitalist rule will strike. Precisely for this reason the communists of the capitalist countries must look forward with courage, realizing their great historic mission. However difficult it may be for them to pursue of a consistent revolutionary policy at the present time, whatever superiority the opportunists may have by surrounding them in every way, the more important and glorious is the task falling on their shoulders, the more splendid will be their victory.

Appraising today the prospects of the world revolutionary movement, we may say that they are great as never before. We are living at a time when, as Molotov has said, all the roads lead to communism. Sooner or later, all the trends of the revolutionary movement are now uniting into a

vehement river. Whatever hard tests may fall on the shoulders of the communists, whatever internal contradictions may be discovered in the communist movement, they will be unable to waver the dialectical Marxists. We must not fear contradictions; there is no development without them. We must not fear extremes; the opposites are the two fists of history through which it forges ahead.

But does this mean that we should not see to it that our actions be reasonable and aim at an objective, that our revolutionary energies be rationally spent, that we be consistent in the settlement of the problems of principle? It is precisely now that, getting prepared for the final battle against capitalism, the revolutionary forces must firmly unite and subordinate their partial interests to one single aim and to one single will. The Chinese and Albanian comrades are often criticized for not understanding the role of the USSR. However, nobody else but Mao Zedong has proposed at the Moscow meetings to specially emphasize the leading position of the Land of Soviets in the world communist movement. The Marxist-Leninists did everything possible in this respect, but everything has a limit. From the very moment when the authority, the material and

ideological power of the Soviet State were transformed fully and entirely into a weapon for the assertion of opportunism in the communist movement, the detaching of all the genuine revolutionaries from the present-day leadership of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics became inevitable and indispensable. There was a moment when the Russian revolution, at the price of countless losses, held in its hands the place d'armes for the proletarians of all the countries; it held the banner of the great revolutionary battles of the beginning of the 20th century. Now the communist movement must go to the assistance of the Russian revolution, the Soviet Union. And the open excommunication of the opportunist chiefs of the CPSU from communism, the open demand that they be removed from the leadership, is sufficient for this purpose. Such a demand would be a proof of the very great strength and of the development of the world communist movement. It would be welcomed by the working people of the USSR as an act of revolutionary solidarity because the Soviet men and women have never viewed the Soviet Union otherwise than as the first bulwark of the communist International.

There is no doubt that the isolation of the op-

opportunist chiefs of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the ranks of the communist parties would make them entirely powerless also inside the country. Indeed, the opportunist clique of the USSR stand on their feet only due to the fact that our men, although they clearly see the selfish and rotten character of Soviet bureaucracy, have not yet understood this on the social class aspect; they have not understood the need of a fierce and merciless struggle to the end. To force this conviction on them is tantamount to placing the opportunists in a disastrous situation, for in such a country as the USSR, they cannot stand even one hour by the force of arms. But do there really exist objective conditions in the USSR for the reversal of the opportunists? The communists in the other countries, not knowing closely the inclinations and life of the soviet working people and judging of the situation of the public opinion only from the press, maybe will overestimate the power of the opportunist tendencies (e.g. the importance of the petty-bourgeois turmoil of which treat our literary men). The communists in the other countries must know that all this is only rubbish floating on the surface and however densely it may float, it can decide on nothing.

The destinies of the USSR are in the hands of the workers and peasants, in the hands of millions of rank-and-file communists; and they will say their word. We must not lose sight of the fact that the criticism made by the opportunists with regard to Stalin was a precise blow and led to the temporary victory of the opportunists because it was directed at the ideological purity and the honesty of our people, at those qualities of our men and women which have raised them towards great heroic feats and tests. But even in these conditions the working class of the Soviet Union has not been shaken and has not fallen into the trap of the opportunist provocation. Its hatred for the opportunists is boundless and it is only the lack of a concrete programme of actions that leaves it armless for the time being. The Soviet peasantry is passing to an ever more determined opposition to the opportunists. Encouraged at first by Khrushchev's nonsenses, it understood very soon that the opportunists are virtually powerless. The agricultural crisis in the USSR cannot be resolved by any half measure. Indeed, we are faced here with the boycotting of a whole class, and only a really revolutionary, really democratic policy, pursued by the dictatorship of the proletariat, will open to the

Soviet peasantry prospects for the future.

Of course, this will not happen spontaneously. To upset the bureaucratic system in the USSR it is indispensable to have an organization of the revolutionaries, it is indispensable to have a bed through which to channel the anger of the people and the popular struggle. But for this we need not make any researches. There stands before us the tested road — the road of the re-creation of the proletarian party. Indeed, the CPSU has now been transformed into an entirely formal organization, into a screen providing a democratic appearance, to the rule of the bureaucrats. It is clear that the new really proletarian party will be nothing else than the regenerated Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks). All those who are prepared to fight against bureaucracy, all those who dearly cherish the great revolutionary victories of our people and the cause of world revolution must embark resolutely and forever on this road. The hour has come. From the many and separate cells of the CP of the Soviet Union (B) and up to their merger into a powerful and invincible avalanche which will sweep away the bureaucrats — this is the road that the Soviet communists must traverse. The activities of the



cells of the CP of the SU (B), their slogans and leaflets must develop into a real partisan struggle. The earth should scorch under the feet of the bureaucrats. And it is hardly necessary to say that this struggle will produce heroes! The opportunists, with their petty-bourgeois cynicism and their distrust towards people, see nothing else in the world than the principle of material interest. The communist heroism and faithfulness of our people, however, are limitless. Suffocated in the oppressive atmosphere of bureaucratic decomposition, some of our men and women are all over and lost. But show them the way and they will work miracles. However few and helpless the cells of the CP of the SU (B) may seem at the beginning, their organizers must clearly understand the historic importance of their initiative. Their persecution, no doubt, would excite the whole people and would confront the masses and the bureaucrats; but bureaucracy is unable to cope with this.

The end of the opportunists, however, may come sooner. The lack of all active support on the part of the communists makes possible their overthrow by the healthy forces that remain true to the people, within the very leading environment

of the Soviet State. The more so as many of the communists who had been deceived and had shown a certain weakness at the moment when the opportunists attacked Stalin have now become aware of their mistake. Just as once the Girondins, right on the morrow of the murder of Robespierre, had realized that they were powerless in the face of reaction, so a part of the leaders of the CPSU have realized how low they have fallen considering the results of the criticism of the «personality cult» on a world scale and the hostility with which the working people of the USSR received this campaign. We can pin great hopes on the Soviet military cadres educated by Stalin and who are better than anyone else aware of the deathly danger to which the opportunists submit the Soviet Union. Every person in whose heart there resounds still an echo of the clarion call of revolution, whoever has not crossed himself out of the book as a communist, ought to understand that as long as the opportunists had not been definitely exposed, collaboration with them has been only a mistake; whereas at present collaboration with them is a collusion in their crimes against the people. To overthrow the opportunists, and after having set up a revolutionary gov-

ernment to place bureaucracy between this government and the people as between the hammer and the anvil — this is the task facing the Soviet communists. It is by no means a question of total liquidation of the bureaucrats. Not at all. Only those who would openly resist the victory of democracy should be mercilessly smashed. The working class of the Soviet Union, after having taken the power into its own hands, must show the bureaucrats their place and compel them to pay back through work all what they have taken away from the people, to pay back the knowledge and capacities acquired due to the people's bread. The general political and economic direction must be affected in accordance with the people's will, in compliance with their convictions and demands. No doubt this will be a revolutionary, communist, internationalist policy; and the working people throughout the world will say: this is our policy.

Long live the sacred red banner, the banner of socialist revolution, the banner of Marx-Engels, Lenin-Stalin!

However the opportunists may try to sling mud on it, it has no stains. However hard they may try to lower this banner down to their level,

there are forces in the world that hold it at the due height — honour and glory to them! The hour is not far off when this banner will wave again over the land of socialism.

Long live the Bolshevik Communist Party of the Soviet Union!

Let our friends and enemies throughout the world hear: Bolshevism is reviving in Russia, just as the phoenix rose from the ashes and dust. We Bolsheviks are fully aware of the difficulty of the tasks facing us, but we shall endure both the sacrifices and hardships, blessing them.

Lenin's mind is with us,

Stalin's will is with us,

The great heart of our people is with us —  
We are invincible!