

Contents

1. The Political Content and the economic basis of Revisionism.	... 3
2. Imperialism and war.	... 12
3. Problems of war and peace; Khrushchov Revisionism.	... 16
4. 'Three Principles of Peace' of the Russian Social Imperialism.	... 24
5. The Russian social Neo-Colonialism.	... 33
6. About the Theory of Differentiating the Political Forces of the World.	... 44
7. The Three World Theory and the Revisionism of the Deng Gang.	... 53
8. Socialism and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat: Revisionism of the Communist Party of Russia.	... 61
9. Bourgeois Rights in Socialist Society and the Right and Left Deviation.	... 69
10. Socialism and the struggle Between Two Paths Under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.	... 76
11. Class struggle in Socialism: Liu-Deng Revisionism.	... 97
12. Communists Should unite Nationally and Internationally Against Revisionism.	... 107

Against Revisionism

The entire pre-Marxian 'socialism' was demolished during the life time of Marx himself. Since then, the history of the entire communist movement is the history of the struggle between Marxism and revisionism. In this struggle invariably revisionism is always defeated and Marxism continues to win ever new victories.

After the passing away of Marx and Engels, when the international communist movement was besieged by the opportunists of the second Inter-national, Lenin demolished it and defended, enriched and re-established Marxism. After

the passing away of Lenin, Stalin built the first great socialist state in the world in the course of bitter struggle against the traitorous gang of Trotsky, Kamanev, Bhukarin and Zinovev, and in the face of resistance by the international counter-revolutionary forces. After the passing away of Stalin, Mao-Tse-Tung played a pioneering role in defending Marxism during the sixties of this century, when the international communist movement was threatened by the Khrushchov traitor gang.

To-day, the international communist movement is encircled not only by the Khrushchov traitor gang but also by the chinese Liu-Teng revisionist gang. As Lenin defended Marxism by defeating the revisionists of the second International and as Mao defended Marxism-Leninism by defeating Khrushchov revisionism, the onerous duty of defeating the Russian and the Chinese revisionists and to stand guard as sentinals on their graves defending the revolutionary proletarian inter-nationalism, rests on the shoulders of the communist revolutionaries all over the world.

It is only through the struggle against the opportunists of the second Inter-national, Lenin achieved the unity of international communists in the third Inter-national. In our times, the unity of the inter-national communists could be achieved only in the struggle against the Russian and chinese revisionists.

The Russian revisionism which emerged in the sixties and the Liu-Teng revisionism which emerged in the seventies are none other than the new editions of opportunism of the second Inter-national, defeated by Lenin at the threshold of this century. Their political content and the economic basis-except for the variations due to concrete historical conditions - are in no way different from that of the revisionists of the second Inter-national.

1. The political content and the economic basis of Revisionism

Revisionism is a bourgeois trend in the proletarian movement. Mao said: 'Revisionism is one form of bourgeois ideology.' It pays lip service to Marxism. But in reality casts aside the revolutionary essence of Marxism. It preaches parliamentarism, legalism, reformism and economism, abandoning the revolutionary activities and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the proletarian movement. The petty bourgeois 'aristocratic' sections in the working class is its class basis. Mao said:

1. Mao-Tse-Tung Selected Works (MSW) Vol-5, P. 435

"The rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie."¹ This 'aristocracy' which compromises with the bourgeoisie and its ideology, abandoning the dictatorship of the proletariat and the revolutionary practice, is in fact a new type of bourgeoisie.

With regard to this, Engels pointed out, during the middle of the 19th century itself. In his letter to Marx in October 1858, he mentioned about "the English proletariat is actually becoming more and more bourgeois"² and about the growth of "bourgeois proletariat"³ sections. Both Marx and Engels have referred to this trend, which cropped up among the English working class during the period between 1858 and 1892. During this period only Britain was an industrially developed country, with a monopoly over the world market and the colonies. The British bourgeoisie created an upper class aristocracy in the proletariat, by 'bribing' a part of its hoardings accumulated through intensive plunder of the countries of the world than its own proletariat.

The institutions which represented these classes spoke about achieving socialism through reforms, without the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In a profound sense, Engels referred to these institutions as 'bourgeois labour parties'⁴. He also wrote "... to be led by, men sold to or at least paid by the bourgeoisie"⁵ and 'those very worst English trade unions which allow themselves to be led by them.'⁶ In 1874 Marx wrote about 'getting rid of the whole lot.'

At the close of the 19-th century changes took place heralding the dawn of the Era of imperialism. The finance capital of not one but of several imperialists reached the stage of monopoly. They created 'labour aristocracy'

with vested interests and 'bourgeois labour parties' in all the developed countries. A part of the super profits obtained in the conditions of monopoly were set aside as a bribe to corrupt this labour aristocracy. Thus the process of rise and development of a labour aristocracy and its joining ranks with the bourgeoisie, through economic means matured and become a reality. Lenin wrote that, 'imperialism has the tendency to create privileged sections also among the workers, and to detach them from the broad masses of the proletariat.'¹ This economic reality — this change which occurred in the class relations — took the political form of opportunist trend in the second inter-national.

When the first world war broke out in 1914-18, the opportunist trend reared its head under the banner of 'defence of Father land'. It was 'Social chauvinism and social imperialism'² under the leadership of Plekhanov and the like, and 'centerism'³ in its favour under the leadership of Kautsky. Social chauvinists are those who are socialists in words and chauvinists in deeds. Lenin mentioned about them as, 'these people are our class enemies. They have gone over to the bourgeoisie'⁴ and as "the bourgeois with in the working class movement."⁵

Lenin adds further about them: "they represent a stratum or groups or sections of the working class which objectively have been bribed by the bourgeoisie (by better wages, positions of honour etc) and which help their 'own' bourgeoisie to plunder and oppress small and weak peoples and fight for the division of the capitalist spoils".⁶ This, stratum of workers turned bourgeois and the labour aristocracy who are quiet philistine in their mode of life, in the size of their earnings and their entire outlook..... In the civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie they inevitably and in no small numbers take the side of bourgeoisie."⁷

1. A talk of Mao, August 1964

Quoted in the book 'Leninism or Social Imperialism'

2-7. Lenin Collected Works (LCW) 23, P. 112-113

1. LCW 22 P. 283

2-6. LCW 24 P. 75-77

7. LCW 22 P. 194

privileged

Having said this, Lenin elaborated the class basis of opportunism and social chauvinism as follows: "Social chauvinism and opportunism have the same class basis, namely, the alliance of small section of privileged workers with 'their' national bourgeoisie against the working class masses; the alliance between the lackeys of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie, against the class the latter is exploiting."¹

Thus, Lenin who elaborated the economic basis of opportunism of the second International, summed up its political content as follows: "...Class collaboration, repudiation of revolutionary action, unconditional acceptance of the bourgeois legality, confidence in the bourgeoisie and lack of confidence in the proletariat."² and "opportunism in the upper ranks of the working class movement is bourgeois socialism not proletarian socialism."³

The Khrushchov revisionists came to power in the Soviet Union, during the sixties. They proclaimed the party of all people and the state of all by abandoning the proletarian party and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They proclaimed 'three principles of peaceful co-existence' to implement ~~the~~ imperialist policies by abandoning international revolution. Thus, they joined company with the reactionary ruling classes abandoning the international working class. They established parliamentarianist bourgeois communist parties, which have abandoned the dictatorship of the proletariat and the revolutionary activities by splitting the communist parties through out the world.

When Mao exposed Khrushchov revisionism, he pointed out the existence of 'a privileged section' which consisted of 'degenerated elements' in the party, government, industrial establishments and among intellectuals. He said that this section is against the workers, peasants, majority of intellectuals and employees'. He said that 'a major chunk

1-2. LCW 22 P. 112

3. LCW 31 P 231

of this privileged bourgeois section is the social basis of the Khrushchov gang' and 'this section has, captured the leadership of the party and the state'. More over he said, "the contradiction between the soviet people and this privileged stratum is now the principal contradiction inside the Soviet Union."¹ He clarified the revisionist regime in Russia as "bourgeois dictatorship, fascist dictatorship of German type and Hitler type dictatorship" and the Soviet Union as a "social imperialism" and its class basis as "a new type of bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie."²

The classification of social imperialism is not a new thing.

Lenin pointed out that in Britain, the leaders of 'Fabian society' who gave up the dictatorship of the proletariat and spoke about reforms, to "gaily share the feast of England's monopoly of the world market and colonies"³ and to beg for the concession of getting a share in the profits of the imperialist capitalists were aptly described as "Fabian imperialists."⁴

During the 1914-18 world war, the opportunists of the second International under the banner of 'defence of father land' supported their respective 'own' imperialist bourgeoisie. Lenin called them as social imperialists, when they opposed revolutionary activities, uprising and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin wrote, "imperialist ideology also penetrates the working class"⁵. During the war, since they defended their imperialist bourgeoisie — its national and colonial exploitation and domination — in the name of defending their country, they were at the same time social chauvinists and social imperialists.

Lenin described the similarities between the opportunist imperialism of the second International and the Fabian

1. Ninth Comment of CPC dated 14 July 1964, On the Open Letter of the CC, CPSU dated 14 July 1963
2. Leninism or Social imperialism?
3. LCW 23 P. 112
- 4-5. LCW 22 P. 285 - 286

imperialism in Britain at the close of the 19-th century. "Fabian imperialism and social imperialism are one and the same thing. Socialism in words imperialism in deeds, the growth of opportunism in to imperialism..... opportunism, or reformism, inevitably had to grow into a phenomenon of world wide importance, socialist imperialism or social chauvinism".¹ He catalogued the social imperialists who existed throughout the world as "Plekhanov and Co. in Russia, the Scheidemanns in Germany, Renaudel, Guesde and Sembat in France, Bissalati and Co. in Italy, Hyndman, the Fabians and the Labourites (the leaders of the "Labour Party") in Britain, Branting and Co. in Sweeden, Troelstra and his party in Holland, Stauning and his party in Denmark, Victor Berger and the other "defenders of the father land" in America and so forth."²

In the sixties Khrushchov revisionism emerged as social imperialism in an entirely different situation from that of the Second International. The opportunists of the second International emerged as social imperialists, by aligning themselves with the imperialist ruling classes of their countries. But the Khrushchov revisionist clique which came to power by capturing the Communist Party and the Soviet Socialist Country built and nursed by Lenin and Stalin, converted the Soviet Communist Party into a revisionist party and the socialist Russia into a social imperialism. However, both of them have not differed in having the privileged 'aristocracy' as its class basis and in aligning with the bourgeoisie against the majority of the people after abandoning the revolutionary activities and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Hence, Lenin identified the opportunists of the second International and Mao identified the Russian Khrushchovite revisionist gang as 'Capitalist class' and as 'Class enemies'.

1. LCW 29 P. 50.

2. LCW 24 P. 75-76

In socialist countries revisionism strives for the capitalist path. It tries to restore capitalism. While fighting against Khrushchov revisionism in the international communist movement and the capitalist roaders internally, Mao said: "The revisionists deny the differences between Socialism and Capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line"¹. "Capitalist path means to abandon class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the socialist society". During the cultural revolution, he pointed out that "at present, our objective is to struggle against and overthrow those persons in authority who are taking the capitalist road..."² He called upon the party committees at all levels to 'dismiss from their leading posts all those in authority who are taking the capitalist road'³

More over during the struggle against the Khrushchov revisionist gang, he pointed out the constant spontaneous generation of the basis for new bourgeoisie and said "the political degenerates and new bourgeois elements may emerge in the ranks of the working class among government functionaries as a result of bourgeois influence and the pervasive corrupting atmosphere of the petty bourgeoisie."⁴

Mao, who pointed out that several members of the party are not willing to continue the revolution and attributed it to the fact that, "they have become high officials and want to protect the interests of high officials"⁵. More over while pointing out the continuous generation of bourgeoisie in the party and in a section of the proletariat, he pointed out that "both with in the ranks of

1. MSW 5, P. 485

2-3. May 16 circular of CC, CPC, 1968

4. CPC, A Proposal concerning the general line of the International Communist Movement, 14 June 1963.

5. Beijing Review 18.6.76, Mao Makes 5 P. 363

the proletariat and among the personnel of state and other organs there are people who take to the bourgeois style of life."¹

In a different context he said "you are making the socialist revolution, and yet do not know where the bourgeoisie is. It is the right in the Communist party — those in power taking the capitalist road..."²

The capitalist roader, revisionist, Teng clique which wormed its path to power after Mao, abandoned class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the country, by declaring that "class struggle no longer constitutes the principal contradiction" and that "the central committee has systematically liquidated the erroneous theory of 'continuing' the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat."³ More over by elaborating the "three world theory" of Mao as a strategic united front against the hegemonistic super powers⁴, abandoned International revolution. It has included all the revisionist and reformist parties the world over, which have abandoned the dictatorship of the proletariat (including the Euro-Communist parties, Poland, Rumania and Chekoslavian Parties) in its friendly and fraternal camp. It has snapped its ties with the genuine revolutionary movements and parties all over the world. This clique represents the new-bourgeoisie in China.

Thus, from the Fabian league to the opportunists like Kautsky and Plekhanov of the second International and Liu-Teng revisionists, those who join the ranks of bourgeoisie, by abandoning the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat are in essence the bourgeoisie within the working class.

1. Beijing Review 23,3,1975
2. Beijing Review 9-4-1976 (MM-5, P.268)
3. CPC, Document of the 12-th congress
4. 1977, Nov,1, Editorial people's daily

In his days, Engels differentiated between the "bourgeois labour party" of the old privileged trade unions of the minority and the actual majority of the masses at the grass root level and appealed only to the latter who were not poisoned by the "respectable bourgeois prejudices".¹ Lenin who concluded that "the epoch of imperialism cannot permit the existence, in a single party of the revolutionary proletariat vanguard and the semi-petty-bourgeois aristocracy of the working class, who enjoy morsels of the privileges of their 'own nations' 'great power status'² declared that 'opportunism is our principal enemy' and "the aim of Socialism at the present time cannot be fulfilled and real international unity of the workers cannot be achieved without a decisive break with opportunism, and without explaining its inevitable fiasco to the masses".³ Mao, who overthrew Khrushchovite revisionist renegades internationally, gave a clarion call to the communists all over the world and to the Soviet People. In the domestic struggle against revisionists, he fought 'to overthrow capitalist roaders' in the party and in power. In all those struggles, they have not bothered about majority or minority in the working class organisations and in its membership. On the other hand, they took into account "as of the real objective significance of its policy, does its policy represent the masses, does it serve them' i. e. does it aim at their liberation from capitalism, or does it represent the interests of the minority, the minority's reconciliation with capitalism".⁴ Always - even now - it is this aspect which should be kept in mind by all the communist revolutionaries.

1. LCW 23 P. 129
2. LCW 21 P. 267
3. LCW 21 P. 32
4. LCW 23 P. 119

2. Imperialism and war

Imperialism is a particular stage of capitalism; its highest stage; the stage of monopoly. Its colonial character differs qualitatively from the colonial characters of the preceding capitalist and the much earlier social orders. Export of capital is its special character. Imperialism will haunt like a ghost for the export of capital, to any corner of the globe where raw materials are available. It hunts for the export of capital and enlists not merely, the backward countries, but even the advanced countries. For an assured plunder and exploitation of those countries through the export of capital; it converts them into colonies and spheres of influence,

Lenin said, "to the numerous 'old' motives of colonial policy, finance capital has added the struggle for the sources of raw materials, for the export of capital, for spheres of influence, i.e; for spheres for profitable deals, concessions, monopoly profits and so on, economic territory in general."¹

Thus, in the rivalry between the imperialists for colonies and spheres of influence, the whole world is divided among a handful of imperialists. When the imperialists think that, it is impossible to expand their domain and exploitation without overthrowing some one among them, they redivide the world according to their strength, through military balance of forces and through wars. Before capitalism developed into imperialism, only about 25 crores of people were under the colonial domination. But after the rise of Imperialism and just before the first world war about 60 crores of people and after the war about 125 crores of people came under the colonial domination. The fact that, the imperialists unleashed two great devastating world wars, like which mankind had never seen before, in order to redivide colonies and spheres of influence, clearly shows the colonial savagery of the imperialists.

Imperialism is a factor which foretells aggressive wars in this era. Hence Lenin said, "imperialist wars are absolutely inevitable under such an economic system, as long as private property in the means of production exists."²

At the same time, imperialism has developed its peculiar adverse characteristics also. As stated, by Lenin imperialism is the 'decaying', 'Moribund' capitalism; monopoly capitalism. Since it has immensely socialised labour, it is the capitalism which has fulfilled the material basis for the transition to socialism. Hence imperialism "indicates the beginning of its transition to socialism."³

1. LCW 22 P. 299
2. ibid, P. 190
3. LCW 23 P. 107

Imperialism means the omnipotence of monopoly trusts, syndicates, banks and groups of finance capital have replaced capitalism in which unrestricted competition existed. It has got the potential to oppress and to exploit the working class to an unprecedented degree. It impels the working class in capitalist countries to prepare for the revolutionary struggles against monopoly — for the revolutionary civil wars.

At the same time, the export of finance capital by imperialism hastens capitalist growth even in backward countries, and as a consequence the growth of working class. Through this, it hastens even the struggle against imperialism.

Hence, the working class struggles in the capitalist countries and the struggles of the oppressed people in backward colonial countries converge against imperialism. This will further hasten the movement for world socialist revolution.

Hence, Lenin stressed that in this era, "struggle against national oppression and of proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and consequently, also the possibility and inevitably, first, of revolutionary national rebellions and wars; second of proletarian wars and rebellions against the bourgeoisie; and third of a combination of both kinds of revolutionary war etc."1

During the entire era — the era of imperialism and socialist revolutions — till imperialism is thoroughly wiped out, the aggressive wars unleashed by imperialism and the revolutionary wars waged by the proletariat and the oppressed nations are inevitable.

The possibilities for such wars are not averted completely by defeating the bourgeoisie in one country or in several countries. As Lenin said, "only after we have

1. LCW 23 P. 80

overthrown, finally vanquished and expropriated the bourgeoisie of whole world, and not merely of one country, will wars become impossible".1

Whether it is a revolutionary war or a war among the imperialists, both weaken imperialism and carry the revolution forward. Revolutionary wars overthrow imperialists directly and establish the rule of the revolutionary classes, of the proletariat. By damaging each other during their struggle in an imperialist war, they in effect weaken imperialism itself, "...there by accelerating and facilitating the revolutionary battles of the proletariat. In other words..... instrumental in making the revolution a practical inevitability...".2 The first two world wars proved this truth. Hence Mao said: that "to see the ills of war but not; not its benefits is a one sided view".3 and while mentioning about the possibilities of the third world war, Mao said: there are only two possibilities. Either revolution will stall war, or war will hasten revolution."

As long as imperialism exists — in this entire era (era of imperialism and socialist revolutions) — wars are inevitable. The Khrushchov revisionist renegade clique, altered the above mentioned unalterable Leninist theory for its imperialist aims. ●

1. LCW 23. P. 80

2. Stalin Selected Works (SSW) Vol. 1, P. 49

3. Mao, A critique of soviet economics, P. 60

3. Problems of War and Peace Khrushchov Revisionism

After choking marxism to death, the Russian revisionist renegades are vociferously shouting about world peace from the top of the world.

"The growth of world socialist forces, has resulted in profound revolutionary transformation in the whole gamut of international relations; in the interest of all people societies it has become possible to revise the problems of war and peace, (it should have been 'Leninist principles' — author)".¹

1. Communist No.11, 1963.

proclaiming thus 24 years ago, the Russian revisionist renegades, casually overthrew Lenin's formulation, that, "imperialist wars are absolutely inevitable under such an economic system, as long as private property in the means of production exists."¹

"The balance of forces in the world arena has radically changed in favour of socialism and peace and against imperialism and aggression; the socialist forces are progressively mustering the possibilities to rein in the imperialist trend of behaving anarchically in world politics." "To-day the policies of imperialists are not dominating the international relations". "The armed forces of socialist countries are such that, if a world war is declared it will end in the suicide of imperialism."² Citing the above reasons the the Russian revisionists are saying, "A world war could be averted, "The possibility to abolish war from the life of society will certainly raise, even before the complete victory of socialism, when capitalism continue to exist in a part of the world."³

World war could be averted. But, the only path to achieve it is to wipe out the domination of capital from the soil of the earth and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin said while telling about averting world war and its horrors. "It is impossible to slip out of the imperialist war and achieve a democratic, non-coercive peace without overthrowing the power of capital and transferring state power to another class, the proletariat."⁴ Hence he said, ".....and my duty as a representative of the revolutionary proletariat is to prepare for the world proletarian revolution as the only escape from the horrors of a world slaughter."⁵

1. LCW 22 P. 190

2-3. Communist No. 11, 1963

4. LCW 24 P. 67

5. LCW 28 P. 288

This is the Leninist outlook about avoiding the world war. Khrushchov revisionists 'revised' it citing the growth achieved by the world socialist forces as a cause. They have hatched a revisionist theory according to which world war could be averted by the peace movement itself, irrespective of a worldwide proletarian revolution. Abandoning the preparations for revolution they are shouting about 'world peace and disarmament'.

All these are just new editions of the arguments advanced by the opportunist, centerist Kautsky of the Second International, who ultimately degenerated into a renegade, at the beginning of this century. At that time, Kautsky sanctified imperialism through his theory of super imperialism. He preached that, the rivalry among the native finance capitals is at the verge of elimination by the diligent joint exploitation of the world by the multi-national finance capital; and imperialism could create an era of new hopes and opportunities for prosperity within the capitalist edifice; refuted the fact that, imperialism is a particular stage of capitalism and the inherent nature of capitalism is competition and anarchy in production. Kautsky sermonised that, it is not good for the imperialists to hanker after winning more colonies, when peaceful growth and a prosperous future is possible within the imperialist system; it is definitely not good to embark on war and 'intensified enmity will produce evil consequences'; 'it is better to develop capitalism through peaceful means' and 'capitalism devoid of colonies, armaments and wars of plunder is possible.' Kautsky talked about a new stage where in the possibilities for new forms of struggles with the minimum of loss and sufferings. France Mehring and Rosa Luxemburg castigated him as a "street walker."¹ Lenin who commended this remark as apt, razed all the arguments of Kautsky.

1. LCW 21 P. 232

Imperialists portion out the world among themselves as colonies and spheres of influence, according to their strength. "There is and there can be no other way of testing the real might of a capitalist state than by war"¹ Hence, Lenin who conclusively proved that, every imperialist savagely indulges in building up its armed might, to be stronger in order to obtain more colonies and spheres of influence through revisionism, said about the demand for disarmament: "A bourgeoisie armed against the proletariat is one of the biggest, fundamental and cardinal facts of modern capitalist society. And in face of this fact revolutionary Social Democrats are urged to 'demand' 'disarmament'! that is tantamount to complete abandonment of the class struggle point of view to renunciation of all thought of revolution. Our slogan must be arming of the proletariat to defeat, expropriate and disarm the bourgeoisie, these are the only tactics possible for a revolutionary class tactics that follow logically from, and are dictated by the whole objective development of capitalist militarism. Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world historic mission, to consign all armaments to the scrap-heap. And the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but only when this condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before."²

The Khrushchov revisionist gang howling like Kautskyites about disarmament, is persisting in its gibberish about the 'evil consequences' of war. It says, whatever may be the price it should be paid — to avert war — to liberate humanity from 'the destruction of war', 'the nuclear disaster'. In reality that price is nothing other than the betrayal of the world revolutionary movement. Instead of supporting and carrying forward the revolutionary wars, to strike at the roots — of imperialism and capitalism — to prevent 'world war' and 'nuclear disaster', these revisionists are offering it as a price to prevent wars peacefully.

1. LCW 21 P. 341

2. LCW 23 P. 81

They say: 'the struggles of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movements could be viewed only in relation to the struggle to prevent a world nuclear war'¹ Infact, all that they preach through this is that, the world proletariat and the revolutionary forces should remain unarmed and should refrain from the revolutionary activities. In this regard what Lenin said about Kautskyites at the beginning of this century will be applicable to the Russian revisionists also. He said: "It..... would be downright treachery to the proletariat to dissuade it from taking revolutionary action, without which all promises and all fine prospects are only a mirage."²

The Russian revisionist's advance the following reasons to substantiate their contention that, imperialist wars could be averted even while imperialism exists. (1) Socialist countries are strong enough to bridle imperialism. (2) Due to the armed might of the socialist countries imperialists realise that it will be suicidal to start a war. The absurdity of both these assumptions could be understood, even by a casual analysis.

Imperialist war is the extension of imperialist policies. It means, war breaks out as a result of mad quest of the imperialists for colonies and spheres of influence. The strengthening of the socialist camp could neither reduce nor remove the imperialist's need for colonies and spheres of influence. On the other hand as the dawn of socialist states shrinks the imperialist market, its necessity will further increase. As a consequence the chances for savage war will increase instead of decreasing. Hence, Stalin said "to eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism."³

1. Communist, No. 11, 1963

2. LCW 21 P. 233

3. Stalin, Economic problems of socialism in the USSR.

The military strength of the Socialist countries is an another argument put forward by these people. It says that, the war policies of the imperialists are restrained by the might of the socialist countries, because, if they venture to unleash a war its consequences will be suicidal. The truth is that even before the dawn of the first socialist state in the world or even before it mustered the strength referred to by these people, whenever the imperialists clashed in their quest for colonies it resulted to a certain extent in the destruction of some or other imperialists. The aggressive imperialists faced utter destruction, is the lesson of the two world wars. To be more precise the imperialists, who suffered utter destruction in the first world war, initiated the second world war. Hence to indulge in imperialist war is either to win domination or to commit suicide, is not something which the imperialists are ignorant of. Colonial domination and spheres of influence are vital problems for imperialists. Hence, it is this vital problem which decides their life and death in the colonial war of extension and consolidation. That is why, Lenin said that, under imperialist economy imperialist wars are inevitable. Neither the existence of socialist states nor their being powerful could alter this. To affirm, will be a Kautskyite imperialist myth and a fiction about a vegetarian tiger.

Next, the Khrushchovite Russian revisionists threaten about the danger of destruction of humanity itself, its resources and its culture, as a result of war, as a result of nuclear war. To avoid this contingency, they scream war should be avoided. On the surmise that, even a minor war may lead to a world war, they oppose revolutionary wars.

War and its catastrophic consequences cannot be averted either by screaming and shouting or by mere peace movements or by spreading illusions about disarmament; on the other hand it is only by quickening the revolutionary wars, by the capture of political power by the proletariat wars could be averted — definitely not by opposing all wars.

Opposing revolutionary wars means offering cannon fodder to the imperialist wars. Hence, Lenin said that, the only path of salvation from the horrors of extermination of the world, is to prepare for the proletarian world revolution.

The Russian Khrushchovite revisionists by asserting that the imperialist wars could be prevented when imperialism still exists refute the following Leninist truth. "Imperialism is a fierce struggle of the great powers for the division and redivision of the world".¹ "wars cannot be abolished unless classes are abolished and socialism is created".²

The revisionists strive to prevent wars, by mustering support generally from the small countries, by putting forward the peace movement and disarmament. Consequently they "evade all the concrete questions of revolution"³ It is true that, the demand for disarmament gets the support of several small countries. The fact is "disarmament as a social idea springs, evidently, from the peculiar 'tranquil' conditions prevailing, by way of exception, in certain small states, which have for a fairly long time stood aside from the world's path of war and blood shed..... the petty striving of petty states to hold aloof the petty bourgeois desire to keep as far away as possible from the great battles of world history, to take advantage of one's relatively monopolistic position in order to remain in hide bound passivity — this is the objective social environment which may ensure the disarmament idea a certain degree of success and a certain degree of popularity in some of the small states. That striving is of course reactionary and is based entirely on illusions, for, in one way or another imperialism draws the small states into the vortex of world economy and world politics".⁴ Hence Lenin said, "objectively, disarmament is an extremely national, a specifically national programme of small states. It is certainly not the international programme of international revolutionary social-democracy."⁵

1. LCW 23 P. 82

2. LCW 21 P. 299

3-5. LCW 23 P. 84, 86, 87

The object of peace movements could be to rally the people for a struggle to preserve peace and to prevent the next world war. But it can never accomplish the task of overthrowing capitalist system and establishing socialist social system. In other words, peace movements can never be an alternative to the revolutionary wars. Peace movements could serve as an instrument of social change only when they are linked with the revolutionary civil wars. In that sense, during the first world war the call to "convert imperialist war into a civil war" was not only a call for revolution, but also a call for peace, was an instance.

Peace movements may be useful to avert a few particular wars. They may be useful — to extend the peace period — to post-poner war. But, they are not adequate to put an end to the reality that the wars between the bourgeois countries are inevitable, because "For all the successes of the peace movement, imperialism will remain, continue in force and consequently, the inevitability of wars will also continue in force."¹

But the Khrushchovite revisionists are preaching about "closely linking the struggle against monopoly" for the welfare of the proletariat with the struggle amongst the people for peace"² and about "averting war"³ without a revolutionary civil war. Through this the Khrushchovite revisionists have undertaken Kautskyite "priest" work of "consoling the oppressed"⁴ since the sixties.

1. Stalin, Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR.

2-3. Communist No. 11, 1963

4. LCW 21 P. 231

4. 'Three Principles of Peace' of the Russian Social Imperialism

The 'three principles of peace' which we mention here are the three combined principles namely 'Peaceful co-existence', 'Peaceful competition' and 'Peaceful transition' put forward by the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party. These three principles of peace are the ideological weapons put forward by the Khrushchov revisionists to convert Soviet Union - the first socialist state of the world - into a social imperialism.

When Russia emerged as the first socialist state in the world through 1917 October revolution, it was encircled by the imperialists and countries with differing social systems. Lenin, who advanced a theory about the successful revolution in one country and accomplished it; also recognised the existence of countries with diametrically opposed social systems. It does not mean that, the two contradictory social systems could continue to exist peacefully.

The development of imperialism and the victory of socialist revolution in Russia, divided the countries of the world into two camps. On one side the camp of a handful of oppressing imperialist countries. On the other side, the camp of oppressed colonies, semi-colonies and dependent countries, in which a great majority of people live. On one side the camp of moribund capitalist countries. On the other side the new world of emerging socialist camp. Leninism teaches that, the contradictions between these two antagonistic camps could be resolved only by a worldwide socialist revolution. Hence, there could be no quarter in Leninism for the proposition that countries with two contradictory social systems could peacefully co-exist for ever.

On the contrary, during this entire era-era of imperialism and socialist revolutions-aggressive wars, launched by imperialism and the revolutionary wars launched by the proletariat and the oppressed nations, are inevitable till imperialism is destroyed and socialism achieves worldwide victory. Hence, during the intervening period-during the era when capitalism is totally destroyed from the entire world - peaceful co-existence between different social systems, can never be a means to remove the possibilities for the out break of a war.

Lenin, who for the first time propounded the theory that, because of the inevitable law of uneven political and economic development of capitalism, victory of socialist

revolution in one particular country or in a number of countries is possible, proved it in practice. Lenin considered that, if socialist revolution is carried out successfully in a single country, in the conditions of encirclement by the capitalist countries, then it is duty bound to devote itself to a worldwide victory of socialist revolution. Lenin who incessantly thought about the victory of world revolution, repeatedly emphasised that, the victorious October socialist revolution is a part of the world socialist revolution. He said, "after expropriating the capitalists and organising their own socialist production, the victorious proletariat of that country will arise against the rest of the world - the capitalist world - attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries, stirring uprisings in those countries against the capitalists and in case of need using even armed force against the exploiting classes and their states".¹

Lenin said that, it is not merely rousing the revolutionary uprisings of the oppressed classes the world over but, "in the era of imperialism a socialist government had to prepare for and wage a revolutionary war."² It is an epochal matter. While defending itself in a capitalist world, it should prepare for and wage a revolutionary war. Before it could wage a "decisive battle"³ to completely overthrow capitalism, in alliance with the international proletariat, it should undertake adequate preparations. In fact this period of preparation will be the period, in which it will exist peacefully with the countries having contradictory social systems.

Hence, as far as the victorious proletariat is concerned peaceful co-existence is nothing but a policy to gain time to prepare for the decisive battle. Hence,

1. LCW 21 P. 342
2. LCW 21 P. 404
3. LCW 27 P. 333

Lenin said "we had to 'prepare for and wage' a revolutionary warbut the question whether it is possible to carry on a revolutionary war now, immediately, must be decided exclusively from the point of view of whether the material conditions permit it, and of the interests of the Socialist Revolution which has already begun"¹ He again said that, "it is not in order to 'capitulate' to imperialism but in order to learn and prepare to fight against imperialism in a serious and effective manner"²

Lenin said all this in reply to those who opposed him in establishing peace with Germany through an agreement, after the victory of October revolution. This is the essence of Leninist principles on peaceful co-existence.

The Khrushchovite revisionists say that, "the principles of peaceful co-existence are obtaining increasingly broader recognition among the states of different social systems"³ There is no doubt that, in the conditions of no other alternative but to recognise the existence of socialist countries in the world, even the imperialists recognise peaceful co-existence. It does not mean imperialism has become a 'Paper tiger'. On the other hand, as far as these people are concerned, peaceful co-existence is to gain time to muster sufficient strength to swallow up, not only the countries with differing social systems, but also the countries with all sorts of social systems — particularly the socialist countries as they are their direct enemies. This is proved by the first two world wars. The imperialists resorted to 'peaceful co-existence', after all their efforts to defeat Socialist Soviet Union were frustrated as soon as it came into existence at the end of the first world war. But, soon after this, the imperialists mustered strength and attempted to destroy Soviet Russia is a part of known history. We know full well that, Soviet Russia achieved victory under the leadership of

1. LCW 26 P. 146
2. LCW 27 P. 64
3. Communist No.11, 1963

Stalin — the great leader of Soviet Russia — with the assistance of the world revolutionary forces and by successfully handling the contradictions among the imperialists.

Hence, the object of accepting the policy of 'peaceful co-existence' by the countries with various social systems is not to avert war, but to gain time; as far as the socialist countries are concerned to engage in the preparations to conduct a decisive revolutionary war and as far as the imperialists are concerned to launch a full scale aggressive war.

Stalin in his address to the 15th congress of the communist party of Russia, mentioned about the possibility for peaceful co-existence with the capitalist countries as follows: "whereas a year or two ago it was possible and necessary to speak of a period of a certain equilibrium and 'peaceful co-existence' between the U. S. S. R. and the capitalist countries, to-day we have every ground for asserting that the period of 'peaceful co-existence' is receding into the past giving place to a period of imperialist assaults and preparation for intervention against the U. S. S. R.

True, Britain's attempts to form a united front against the U. S. S. R. have failed so far. The reasons for the failure are: the contradiction of interests in the camp of the imperialists; the fact that some countries are interested in economic relations with the U. S. S. R.; the peace policy of the U. S. S. R.; the counter-action of the working class of Europe; the imperialists fear of unleashing revolution in their own countries in the event of war against U. S. S. R. But this does not mean that Britain will abandon her efforts to organise a united front against the U. S. S. R., that she will fail to organise such a front. The threat of war remains in force, despite Britain's temporary set backs.

Hence the task is to take into account the contradictions in the camp of the imperialists to postpone war by

'buying off' the capitalists and to take all measures to maintain peaceful relations.

We must not forget Lenin's statement as regards our work of construction, very much depends upon whether we succeed in postponing war with the capitalist world, which is inevitable, but which can be postponed either until the moment when the proletarian revolution in Europe matures, or until the moment when the colonial revolutions have fully matured, or, lastly, until the moment when the capitalists come to blows over the division of colonies.

Therefore, the maintenance of peaceful relations with the capitalist countries is an obligatory task for us.

Our relations with the capitalist countries are based on the assumption that the co-existence of two opposite systems is possible. Practice has fully confirmed this.

What follows from this is that, 'peaceful co-existence' for the victorious proletariat is to postpone a war with the capitalist world and for that purpose try hard till the end for peaceful relations with the countries with differing social systems.

Aggressive war is the character of imperialism. Hence peaceful co-existence is against the imperialist aggressive wars. It facilitates the growth of anti-imperialist revolutionary movements in the imperialist as well as in the oppressed countries. It is Leninist concept that, the socialist countries while making all-out efforts to prolong the period of peaceful co-existence with the capitalist countries, should assist the development of the proletariat in the imperialist and the oppressed countries; and for the development and success of the national liberation revolutionary movements.

It was because of this, while addressing the 15th congress, Stalin wanted the Russian communist party to set its tasks as follows :-

(1) In the sphere of international revolutionary movement.

(a) to strive to develop the communist parties throughout the world;

(b) to strive to strengthen the revolutionary trade unions and the workers united front against the capitalist offensive;

(c) to strive to strengthen the friendship between the working class of the USSR and the working class in the capitalist countries;

(d) to strive to strengthen the link between the working class of the USSR and the liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries.

(2) In the sphere of USSR's foreign policy:

(a) to combat the preparations for new imperialist wars;

(b) to combat Britain's interventionist tendencies and to strive to strengthen the USSR's defensive capacity;

(c) to pursue a policy of peace and to maintain peaceful relations with the capitalist countries;

(d) to expand our trade with the outside world on the basis of strengthening the monopoly of foreign trade;

(e) rapprochement with the so called 'weak' and 'unequal' states, which are suffering from oppression and exploitation by the ruling imperialist powers."¹

1. SSW 10 P. 295-7

Thus, for Stalin 'peaceful co-existence' indicated the period of preparations to develop the world revolutionary movement and to defend the Socialist Russia. But for the Khrushchovite revisionists 'peaceful co-existence' is a principle to abandon revolution. Their principles about 'peaceful transition' is an explanation to this.

These people who say that, "the socialist revolution is carried out as a result of internal development of class struggle in every country. The concrete conditions in each country determine its ways and forms. It is the general line to revolutionarily overthrow the rule of capital and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in some form". Say that, "to make the utmost use of the peaceful path unrelated to the civil war which is available to-day is the duty of the proletariat and the communist parties".¹ Thus they are preaching peaceful transition after throwing-out the general line to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Instead of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in capitalist countries, through revolutionary civil wars, they are preaching parliamentarianist class collaboration, path of, 'converting parliaments into a tool of peoples' will'. They casually brush aside the universal truth of Marxism that, the proletariat cannot seize political power without smashing the existing state machinery of the bourgeoisie.

About the national liberation movements they say: "On the basis of an united front with the peasants and the patriotic national bourgeoisie, the object of the proletariat and the communist parties is to develop and to strengthen the national front and to prepare conditions for the establishment of a national democratic government and for the transition to the non-capitalist path of development".²

1-2 Communist, No. 11, 1963

Their utterances about national democratic front, national democratic state and parliamentary front are nothing beyond the parliamentarianist state. The non-capitalist path of development is nothing but the capitalist path. Thus these revisionists who follow the parliamentary path of surrender, abandoning the path of revolutionary civil war for the socialist revolution, say: "peaceful co-existence and economic competition between the two world systems is the acute expression of world wide class struggle in the present conditions."¹ It was about these persons Lenin said: "He who accepts the class struggle cannot fail to accept civil wars, which in every class society are the natural, and under certain conditions inevitable continuation, development and intensification of the class struggle. That has been confirmed by every great revolution. To repudiate civil war, or to forget about it is to fall into extreme opportunism and renounce the socialist revolution."²

So far as the Russian revisionists are concerned, to engage in 'peaceful competition' means to get rid of the imperialists by developing the economy of their country on par with or surpassing the imperialists and to establish their economic and political predominance in all countries through various means (i.e. inter-national division of labour). This is nothing but 'social neo-colonialism' which profess socialism while practising colonialism.

Thus, the Khrushchev revisionists' policies — of the new bourgeoisie which came to power in Russia after Stalin — the three principles of peace, 'peaceful co-existence', 'peaceful competition' and 'peaceful transition' are nothing other than the policies of social imperialism which profess socialism while striving for hegemony over the entire world.

1. Communist No. 11, 1963

2. LCW 23 P. 78

5. The Russian Social Neo-colonialism

The seventh Stuttgart Congress of the Second International in 1907 passed a resolution to the effect that, 'the colonial policy of socialism could play a constructive role'. The supporters of this resolution stressed that, the imperialists of the advanced European capitalist countries civilised the backward Afro-Asian and Latin American countries by subjecting them as colonies; and this kind of protection is beneficial to those countries to get rid of their backwardness, hence colonies under socialism will result in civilising those countries. Lenin condemned this

resolution describing "it would be an outright desertion to the bourgeois point of view. It would be a decisive step towards subordinating the proletariat to bourgeois ideology, to bourgeois imperialism."¹ But to-day the Russian revisionists are fulfilling their 'constructive inter-national duty' through their socialist colonial policy, while paying lip service to Lenin.

Generally after the second world war imperialists are adopting neo-colonial methods like intervention, coups, installing puppet regimes, establishing military alliances, establishing military bases and creating their agents in the name of military and economic aid, using countries as a market for the export of capital, as a source of raw materials, as a market for their goods and to control political, economic and military activities; and to create spheres of influence through various military friendship treaties. Russian social imperialism² is no exception to this. The only difference is that it is implementing neo-colonial policies under the cover of socialism.

The 'three principles of peace' particularly 'peaceful competition' is an ideological weapon for the neo-colonial policies of Russian social imperialism.

'Friendship', 'natural ally', 'inter-national duty of a socialist country', 'assistance to the national liberation movements', 'assistance to the newly independent states', 'opposition to colonialism', 'opposition to monopoly capital', 'aid', 'support', 'proletarian inter-nationalism, all these are the 'socialist' trade marks put forward by Russia to practice its neo-colonial policies.

1. LCW 13 P. 76-77

2. Sources for the statistics about the 'Social imperialism: Editorial of people's daily 1977 Nov. 1, 'Leninism or Social Imperialism' and the following issues of Beijing Review 11-1-74, 29-3-74, 7-1-75, 6-2-76, 2-12-77, 16-12-77, 2-6-78, 17-11-78, 1-6-79.

It is under these socialist trade marks Russian social imperialism has devised and practicing plans to convert various countries of the world into its spheres of influence, plans to keep them always under its economic domination plans to utilise them militarily for its strategic purposes and plans to facilitate its economic exploitation and plunder.

The Russian social imperialism which is competing with the world's greatest imperialism- the American imperialism- for world hegemony has devised its political, economic and military plans accordingly and implementing them. It is deploying its military bases and its armed forces all over the world. It is converting its entire economy into a war economy. It is operating as the second biggest merchant of death by selling arms all over the world.

Economically

'Inter-national division of labour' 'socialist inter-national division of labour' 'integration of economy', 'multilateral integration', 'new forms of co-operation', 'long term co-operation', etc, are plans to keep its friendly countries under economic bondage. Thus, it converts the economic plans of its 'friendly' countries to conform to its short term as well as long term plans-into its integral parts. In this way, the Russian social imperialism prevents its 'friendly' countries from building an integrated all round economic system and after their economic pains to serve the requirements of its own plans.

It is rightly pointed out by an Indian magazine 'The financial express' that the regulated production by Moscow is an unjust interference in the Indian industrial sector and the 'Indo-soviet integration of national plans' and the 'Indo-soviet economic co-operation' are meant to convert India into a source of basic raw-materials to Moscow.

Russia exports capital to the third world countries in the name of 'aid' to the 'friendly' countries, and 'economic aid' to the newly independent countries. Through this it utilises those countries as a market for its goods, as a market for the basic raw materials and as a land to exploit cheap labour power. Taking advantage of its pre-eminent position, it robs immensely through unequal trade. (e.g.) During 1954-72 Russia exported capital to the third world countries to the tune of 13,000 million American dollars. Through this, it has kept under its control vital industrial sectors and more than one thousand large industrial enterprises. Robbed huge amounts by exporting industrial products (valued about \$16000 million) to these countries during the years between 1955-77. During the same period, it has imported raw materials (rubber, coffee, sugar etc) worth \$19000 million from these countries in exchange for its capital export.

Russia is robbing the third world countries through unequal trade. In spite of its tall talk about 'equal' mutual interest, the truth is quite contrary. During 1955-82 alone Russia got a profit of about \$11,300 millions through its trade with the third world countries. It robs 'usually' by over pricing its exports and under pricing its imports to the tune of about 20-30% of its value. Motivated by profit it adopts unhealthy capitalist trade practices like exporting sub-standard and out-dated goods to other countries and by exporting to other countries the goods it imports, at a higher price. (Purchased oil at a low price from Arab countries and sold it to the west European countries at a higher rate). About 70% of the industrial tools and machineries which Russia exports to India are usually sold at 20-30% and some times even at 200% higher price. For instance, in 1967 Russia sold to India 1500 tractors at double the price it sold to western countries. In the same year the nickel which was sold to Eastern Europe at the rate of Rs. 1500 per ton was sold to India at the rate of Rs. 3000 per ton. Russia demands

India to re-pay about 75-80% of its loans in the form of traditional goods (coffee, tea, cotton, jute etc). All these are purchased at 20-30% less than the inter-national market price. In 1972, Russia exported cotton to India on conditions of re-export after being spun into yarn. In this bargain, because of over pricing India incurred a loss of Rs. 2 crores, says 'Financial Express.' That is, Russia sold to India Rs. 700 worth of cotton for Rs. 2,600. Russia 'helped' India by constructing an aluminium plant of 5 lakh ton capacity, on condition that, all the machineries and instruments for its construction should be purchased only from it, and the loan should be paid back in kind, in the form of products of the plant.

Russia has converted most of the third world countries as a market for the export of its machineries. Out of its total export of machineries about 80% is exported to the third world countries. It concludes agreements with the third world countries to import things which it requires, in lieu of the loans it gives them. Russia never hesitates to engage even in dirty business deals. For instance, after despatching a ship load of cement for a particular price according to an agreement, it sold the very same consignment to another private firm for a higher price.

The Russian social imperialism apart from utilising this sort of economic 'aid' for making profits, make use of it even to apply political pressure. It adopts the diplomacy of putting pressure by withholding aid to the countries which refuses to fall in line to its dictates. By adopting this diplomacy with the countries like Egypt, Sudan, and Syria it created crisis.

That, imperialism draws into its capital export market not only the backward countries but also the developed countries is a truth applicable even to Russia. It adopts various strategies to bring under its domination, not only the third world countries but even the entire lot of European countries.

C.M.E.A is an instrument for the neo-colonial plans of Russia. Through this, it exports capital to the C.M.E.A. countries by way of 'aid' and 'loans.' Between 1954-74 the C.M.E.A. countries received aid from Russia to the tune of about \$10,000 million. In these countries, Russia is participating in the construction of more than 1,300 projects. It is the character of the imperialists to eliminate competitors and to monopolise markets by making use of its exclusive domination. Russia controls the C.M.E.A. countries by making use of its monopoly in heavy industries and in market for the raw materials. During 1955-73 alone the value of industrial products exported by Russia to Bulgaria, Hungary, GDR, Chekoslovakia and Poland was about \$35,000 million. In this transaction it netted a profit of more than 25%. It exploits through unequal trade agreements (prices, exports and restrictions on imports) and long term trade agreements. During 1955-73 alone, the total loss incurred by the above mentioned five countries amounts to \$19,000 million. Moreover Russia imports rare metals, strategic raw materials and unrefined raw materials by compelling these countries.

Russia is scheming to enter into the West European countries also, in the name of 'opposition to monopoly capital' and 'pan-European economic co-operation.' It is trying to realise it through 'capital co-operation scheme' and through mergers with the European Banks.

Thus, Russia is trying to bring under its control the economy of the third world and the European countries; and to make them subservient to its interests of domination, through various economic schemes. It controls the vital sources of economy of the 'friendly' countries through various kinds of economic schemes. Through various forms like raw materials, market, foreign trade, production schemes, forced loans, labour power required for the capital, etc it exploits and dominates them.

Militarily

Through Warsaw pact organisation, Russia has established 'friendly relations' and 'Military co-operation' with its European member states. In fact this organisation is controlled by Russia itself. Under the seal of 'limited sovereignty' and 'Inter-national dictatorship' it is stationing its army in the territories of its member states. Through military co-ordination it has established its domination over the armies of these countries.

It has established military bases in various countries all over the world. Russian military bases and military establishments are found in Eastern Europe, Mangolian Republic, Cuba, Africa and Asia and in the mediterranean and Indian ocean regions. It stations about 7 lakhs of mercenary forces outside its borders, throughout the world.

Imperialists could protect or redivide their spheres of influence and colonies only through their military might. Hence, it is not surprising that, the imperialists are engaged in increasing the strength of their arms and armaments at a feverish pace. Russia which is competing with America for hegemony over the world, is expanding its military might in competition with it.

In keeping with its neo-colonial objectives it is militarising its entire economy. It is spending 20% of its total national income on military. It is spending more than one lakh million dollars per year for military purposes. Either directly or indirectly 60% of the industrial sector is engaged in the production of military hardware. Moreover, it is boasting that, at any moment its entire economy could be geared to military purposes.

It is increasing its military expenditure competing with the American imperialism. In 1961 while America spent

\$ 40 million for military, Russia spent only \$ 20 million, where as in 1977, while Russia spent \$ 120 million, America has spent \$ 100 million. By 1977 itself, Russia stood next to America in the total export of arms. Russia contributes about 37% to the total arms export of the world. It exports arms approximately to 20 countries. During 1955-72 the value of arms export was worth \$ 28,500 million.

There is no alternative for the Russian social imperialism, which is militarising its entire economy, other than exporting its surplus arms.

That is why it is increasing its arms sale in extent and quantity every year. It stands as the world's greatest merchant of death. In its total 'aid' to the third world countries, arms aid is more than its economic aid. Countries asking for 'aid' receive guns not food. In 1966, of the total Russian exports to the third world countries, arms export constitutes \$ 300-400 million, while the economic aid was \$ 1,200 million. Whereas in 1972, the arms aid became \$ 1,100 million and economic aid \$ 580 million. But, the Russian social imperialism never helped the national liberation movements by its arms sales (i. e.) Russia never helped the national liberation movements in countries like Thailand, Malasia, Philippines, Cambodia, etc. When Vietnam took sides with China in the 'great debate' it tried to curtail the aid.

The Russian social imperialism, which is competing with the American imperialism, in increasing its armed forces, military expenditure and armament export with hegemonic intentions is doing it by oppressing its own people. In Russia 50% of peasants and 20% of urban population live below poverty line. Between 1960-74 the income tax was trebled. In the industrial production the share of consumer goods has decreased from 30.8% in 1957 to 25.5% in 1973. At the same time the rate of increase

of the national income has decreased gradually from 11% in 1950 to 4.3. in 1977.

The Russian social imperialism in order to realise its ambitions of world hegemony is putting on the mask of 'support to the national liberation movements' and 'international duty of a socialist country.' It has established puppet regimes in Yeman and Afghanistan through conspiratorial coups in the name of 'international duty of a socialist country'. It has despatched its mercenary force countries like Zaire, Chekoslavakia, Eritrea and Ethiopia — Somalia. In Kampuchia it involved Vietnamese troops in support of the counter revolutionary gang. In Ethiopia-Somalia dispute, it employed \$ 10,000 million worth of armaments and 10,000 soviet and Cuban mercenaries. Despatched lakhs of Russian mercenaries to Afghanistan. In the name of 'support to the national liberation movement' it conspired to create dissensions and discord in the Angolan National Liberation Movement. Apart from this it sent 10,000 cuban mercenaries and 1,000 military experts to Angola. Renovated 10,000 K.m. of sea and air routes for military supply. Despatched war ships to Western Africa. Angola and Gulf countries to put military pressure on them. It tried to annex northern border regions and sea regions of Japan and Spartakas islands off Norway coast.

Apart from these, it is also following a policy of creating political regional zones, mutual 'friendship' treaties and through them to expand its neo-colonial domination. After its failure in its efforts to bring the Asian countries under its influence through Asian joint defence plan it has placed, "South east Asian peace plan", and "Indo-China Federation plan", which is a part of the "Asian joint defence plan". Along with these, by concluding military pacts with various countries in the name of "joint friendship treaties", it has brought the military activities of those countries under its control. It is using countries like Cuba, Vietnam and India

as a tool to establish its political and military influence over the third world countries all over the world.

Colonialism and hegemony are the inter-nationalism of the Russian social imperialism. It is to fulfill this duty it is formulating all conceivable theories and practicing them. By putting forward the so called united front of the international workers and peasants, in which it is shamelessly and openly declaring, that, Russia represents the international working class and that it is not only the principal Ally of the national liberation movements but also a dominating force.

".....it is the struggle between the soviet movement under the leadership of Soviet Russia and a small gang consisting of imperialist countries opposing Soviet states, which determines the relations among human societies and the formations of the entire states of the world" said Lenin. Misquoting this, the Russian revisionists insist upon all the liberation movements to submit to its hegemonistic objectives. In keeping with this theory, apart from creating bourgeois communist parties which support Russian social imperialism all over the world, It is merging all the bourgeois parties and states in its 'friendly' camp.

The Social Imperialism is scheming to co-ordinate with the reactionary forces of all the countries for its hegemonistic purposes, through the theory of national democratic front and state which betrays the national liberation movements and surrenders to the parliamentary path and to the bourgeoisie.

The neo-colonial policies of the Russian social imperialism is deceptive and cruel. The Russian Khrushchov - Gorbhashev gang in the name assistance, aid to the national liberation movements and fulfilling the inter-national duty; safeguarding the sovereignty, peace and democracy, protecting its interests and that of its friends, opposing imperialism and colonialism and above all the interests of socialism-

is totally betraying the inter-national revolution through its policies like peaceful co-existence and peaceful transition, colluding with the capitalist states and classes through various political and economic treaties and agreements, and subjecting them to its domination through economic, political and military 'assistance' and in this way establishing its social imperialist empire by removing imperialism through peaceful competition, increasing its military might as a guarantee against 'imperialism' and revolution; undertaking military activities like interfering, toppling and aggression against states and forces which are obstacles to its objective of domination, and for which purpose it keeps all its arms 'ready for every war' and establishes military bases all over the world. This is nothing but out and out social neo colonial domination. The hang-man and the priest always serve the ruling bourgeoisie by respectively oppressing the revolutionary classes and pacifying the oppressed people. In those days when Kautsky worked like a priest, it was pointed out by Lenin. To-day Russian social imperialism is itself both the hang-man and the priest. It is inter-nationalism of the Russian revisionists. The inter-nationalism defined by Lenin is quite contrary to this. He says "There is one, and only one, kind of real inter-nationalism, and that is working whole heartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in one's own country and supporting (by propoganda, sympathy, and material aid) this struggle, this and only this, in every country without exception"

6. About the Theory of Differentiating the Political Forces of the World

'The old world of capitalism... and the rising new world,'¹ a large number of oppressed nations and an insignificant number of oppressor nations² 'the socialist camp and the imperialist camp'³ '...a handful of advanced' capitalist countries which exploit and oppress vast colonies and dependencies, and the huge majority consisting of colonial and dependent countries which are compelled to wage a struggle for liberation from the imperialist yoke'⁴

1. LCW 33 P. 150

2. LCW 31 P. 240

3. SCW 4 P. 240 (Two Camps)

4. SSW 1 P. 64

thus, Lenin and Stalin by differentiating the entire world into two camps, clarified the basic contradiction of this era of imperialism and socialist revolution.

It is a vital, basic analysis for the inter-national proletarian movement to devise its epochal principles of strategy and tactics. But, if the political forces of the world are not examined in its particular conditions, this basic analysis could have no practical importance. Because, even while the basic contradiction remain the same, changes occur in the political forces of the world — i. e., in the political forces divided into opposite camps — as a result of the contradictions becoming more and more sharp. Analysing and classifying these changes through continuous observation is necessary for the international proletariat to decide its policies of immediate practical importance.

On that basis, the leaders of the proletariat Lenin, Stalin and Mao guided the world proletarian movement, by clearly perceiving the changes which occurred in both camps of political forces of the world in this era and classifying them correctly.

Lenin, who examined the world forces after the first, world war, put forward the idea of dividing the world into three kinds of political forces, in his address to the second congress of the communist inter-national in June 1920.

"In the first category he placed colonies, semi-colonies and the defeated countries of the first world war. In this there were countries being oppressed by the imperialists like India, Persia, Turkey and China, and countries which were defeated in the war, like Germany and Austria. In this it is significant that Russia is a socialist country. In these countries lived 125 crores of people out of 175 crores of world population. In the second category, he placed the countries which were not affected by the world

war. They are Holland, Norway, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, the Balkan states and the central and south American states. Since these countries remained neutral, they benefited economically. In the third category, he placed countries like America, Britain, France, and Japan which won the war and were benefited by it.¹

After the revolution Russia gave a call to the countries of the world, to conclude a peace treaty in order to cease war immediately and to establish peace. In the context of America, Britain and France rejecting the call, it concluded a peace treaty with Germany in 1918. At the same time America, Britain and France all the three jointly exerted economic pressure against Russia. In 1920-21 Russia established diplomatic relations with various countries like Poland, Turkey and Persia.

By 1920, Germany began to regain its past eminence in economic strength. Japan and Italy also developed. Germany was determined to recapture the colonies it has lost during the world war. Even Italy and Japan planned to regain their lost positions, to obtain new spheres of influence and to expand their colonies. This created fresh changes among the world political forces.

In this situation, Stalin classified the world political forces in a different way and placed it before the 15th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in 1927. "Of the 1,905 million inhabitants of the entire globe 1,134 million live in the colonies and dependent countries, 1,43,000,000 live in the U.S.S.R., 264,000,000 live in the intermediate countries, and only 263,000,000 live in the big imperialist countries."² This kind of division clearly showed the changes which took place in the imperialist camp as well as in the socialist camp.

1. LCW 31 P. 216
2. SCW 10 P. 289

Political and economic crisis sharpened in all the three countries Germany, Japan and Italy and one after the other all of them abandoned bourgeois democracy and adopted fascism. They geared their entire economy for war preparations. At this time (1935) the seventh congress of the communist international pointed out that, 'fascism unleashes national jingoism and war' and German fascism is the spear head of international counter revolution and the principal source of war.

In 1936, Germany, Japan and Italy formed an axis with the intentions of world hegemony. Italy launched aggressive wars against Ethiopia in 1935 and against Spain in 1936. Japan launched an aggressive war against China even by 1931 itself. Germany launched aggressive wars against Austria and Czechoslovakia in 1938.

In 1939, in the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of Russia Stalin classified, the principal countries of the world and declared "Germany, Japan and Italy as aggressive states and Britain, France and America as non-aggressive states"¹

It was on this basis Russia implemented its policies against the aggressive states in the international arena. Germany and Japan walked out of the League of Nations. Russia joined in it. In 1935, it concluded mutual defence pacts with France and Czechoslovakia. It concluded mutual aid and non-aggression pacts with Mongolian Republic in 1936, and with China in 1937. In 1938 in the wake of German aggression against Czechoslovakia and Austria, Russia called upon all the peace loving countries to join together.

Russia made efforts to form an international anti-fascist front in 1939, soon after Germany invaded Czechoslovakia and occupied it entirely. It negotiated with Britain

1. Editorial of peoples daily 1977 Nov-1

and France. During this period Chamberlin (Britain) was actively conspiring to destory Russia through Germany. In these unavoidable circumstances Russia signed a non - aggression pact with Germany.

By April-July 1940, Denmark, Norway, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxumburg and the British Isles were subjected to the threat of German invasion, Hitler attacked Russia in 1941 violating the pact with it. Then, Churchill (Britain) and Rooswelt (America) came in support of Russia. An Anti-fascist front emerged. In 1942 June, about 22 countries including Russia, America, Britain and China published a joint Anti-fascist declaration. During the same months Russia signed a mutual aid pact with America and Britain against Germany. Thus a powerful Anti-Fascist camp emerged against the fascist camp of Germany, Japan and Italy.

During the 25th anniversary (Nov 1942) of the great October Revolution Stalin said: "It is an undisputed fact that, in the war imposed by Hitler's Germany two opposite camps has emerged. One is the axis camp of Germany and Italy. The other is the allied camp of Russia, America and Britain"¹

After the second world war American imperialism emerged as the biggest imperialist power. At the same time Soviet Union stood against it, as a hero of the Anti-Fascist war and as the most powerful socialist country in the world. Between these two, there were numerous colonial, semi-colonial and capitalist countries in the Asian, African and European continents. In 1946, pointing out this situation Mao called upon, "The American people and the peoples of all countries menaced by U. S. aggression under the cover of anti-soviet slogans should unite and struggle against the attacks of the U. S. reactionaries and their running dogs in these countries. Only by victory in this struggle can a third world war be avoided."²

1. Editorial of Peoples' daily 1977 Nov. 1
2. MSW 4 P. 100

After the Suez-Canal incident in 1956, in the world political arena, he classified the political forces of the world in a different manner in three categories. Mao said: "One the united states, the biggest imperialist power, two, Britain and France, second rate imperialist powers, and three the oppressed nations"¹ To divide the political forces of the world in this manner was an apt classification at that time:

Converting Russia into a social imperialism by capturing power in the soviets by the Khrushchov revisionists marked an important change in the political forces of the world. The Russian social imperialism very soon developed its economic and military strength equal to American imperialism. Both America and Russia became the biggest imperialist super powers of the world. At the same time the defeat and debacle of America in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, and the growth and consolidation of Europe, Canada and Japan against America, indicated the dwindling fortunes of the American imperialism. This showed its defensive position in safeguarding its domination. At the same time, it indicated the aggressive, posture of the newly arrived social imperialism in the world political arena.

Subsequent to these changes, which occurred in the world political arena, Mao classified world as follows: He said "In my point of view America and Soviet Union constitute the first world. Japan, Europe, Canada, etc., of the inter - mediate countries belongs to the second world. We belong to the third world. The third world has the highest population. Except Japan the entire Asia belongs to the third world. The entire Africa belongs to the third world. It is the same even about Latin America"² Mao who classified world in this way into three categories in 1974, said in 1976, pointing out the differences existing between the two super-powers of the first world said "In this world America wants to protect its interests. Soviet Union wants to expand its interests. In no way this could be changed"³

1. MSW 5 P. 362
2-3. Editorial of peoples' daily 1977 Nov-1

Thus, why did the teachers of Marxism classify the world political forces frequently?

Lenin's reply to those who opposed peace treaty-the peace treaty concluded by Soviet Union with the German imperialism in 1918-the plea that it is "a surrender to imperialism" and "soviet government should defeat imperialism through a revolutionary war", will be an appropriate reply to this question.

The utter destruction of imperialism is the only way to solve the basic contradictions of this era. But, the destruction of imperialism is linked with the capture of political power by the proletariat in all countries, all over the world. This is possible only through a revolutionary civil war which the proletariat will wage in every country against their own ruling bourgeoisie. Thus, it is very essential to postpone the decisive war with the capitalist world, till the world proletariat rallies together and acquires sufficient strength to destroy imperialism; it is the duty of the revolutionary proletariat to extend the 'interim period' to the utmost by concretely understanding the contradictions (which has cropped up) in the imperialist camp by differentiating the world political forces and utilising them.

It was only on this basis, the victorious proletariat of the Soviet Union, signed a treaty with Germany in 1918, after the victory of the revolution, inspite of its being a bad one. Lenin said, "in anticipation of the movement when the rapidly maturing proletarian revolution in a number of advanced countries completely matured"¹

"bit by bit, before the workers in all countries have united (actually united i.e. by beginning the revolution). It is in our interests to do all that is possible, to take advantage of the slightest opportunity to postpone the decisive battle until the moment (or until after the

1. LCW 28 P. 11

moment) the revolutionary worker's contingents have united in a single great international army"¹

"It is our duty to do everything that our diplomacy can do to delay the moment of war, to extend the respite period"²

"by a separate peace treaty we free ourselves as much as possible at the present moment from both hostile imperialist groups, we take advantage of their mutual enmity and warfare, which hamper concentrated action on their part against us, and for a certain period have our hands free to advance and to consolidate socialist revolution."³

It was the above mentioned approach which enabled Lenin to conclude an agreement with Germany and Stalin to conclude agreements with countries like France, Chekoslovakia, Britain, America and china during the second world war and latter on to build an Anti-fascist United Front together with the imperialist states.

To correctly identify the changes every now and then occurring in the midst of the political forces of the world, is to guide the world proletarian movement, to defend itself from the onslaughts of the enemy, to gain time to strengthen itself in the face of enemy attacks, either to conclude pacts or to build united front by utilising the contradictions in the enemy camp, to identify the principal enemy at every stage in order to launch attacks on him by mobilising maximum possible forces by all means. Neither imperialist war nor revolutionary war is removed by the pacts or the united front formed in this way; on the contrary they widen the chances for hastening the growth of revolutionary wars and the destruction of imperialism.

1. LCW 27 P. 333
2. LCW 27 P. 379
3. LCW 26 P. 448

preparations to be victorious in the ultimate struggle with imperialism. But the communist party of China, in the name of three world theory (through an article published on 1st November 1977, on behalf of the editorial board with the title 'Chairman Mao's three world theory is a great contribution to Marxism-Leninism') has projected revisionism.

The most significant change which occurred on the face of earth after the second world war is the winning of political independence by shaking off the colonial yoke, by about 80 countries with a total population of more than 300 crores and the establishment of states under the leadership of the proletariat in countries with one third of the total world population. This has transformed the entire face of the world.

The Khrushchov revisionist gang projected revisionism in all fields on pretext of the transformation of the socialist countries into a decisive force. But the Chinese party projected revisionism in the political path of the inter-national proletarian movement on pretext of the great changes which have occurred in the national liberation movements in the inter-national arena.

Great changes should serve great revolutionary changes. It should serve communists only in that way. But the great changes (in the sixties by the Communist party of Russia and in the seventies by the Communist party of China) were made use of by the revisionists only to project revisionism.

Today colonial countries inhabited by a population of about 300 crores have won 'political independence' by shaking off their colonial yoke. Can these newly independent Afro-Asian and Latin American countries continue to remain as a principal force against imperialism for a long period? The people's daily after raising this question replies 'Yes' in affirmative. It says 'a great majority of world population of about 300 crores of enslaved people have shaken off the

yoke of colonial domination. In the balance of world class forces a radical change of historical importance has occurred. To-day several countries of the third world apart from having their own army, possess more armaments than the past and various ways and means to continue the struggles of the independent third world countries by making use of the state power in their hands.

There is no doubt that it is a great change when compared with the conditions which existed in 1920's during Lenin's times. It is a great change indeed that, the countries with 70% of the world population which were colonies and semi-colonies are to-day changed into countries in which the power is in the hands of native classes. But this truth is linked with the truth that, the political power and army have generally changed hands from the imperialists to the reactionary classes in these countries.

It means that, the political power and the repressive machinery in the hands of the ruling classes are used to oppress the broad masses and the revolutionary movements which are the genuine anti-imperialist forces in these countries. It is not strengthening but only weakening the anti-imperialist struggle.

During the 1920's Lenin warned about the bourgeoisie and their political parties in these countries. He said that, it should be opposed when it joins hands with the imperialists against the democratic movements of the working people in spite of its anti-imperialist stance and when it is not revolutionary - when it is not in favour of revolutionary alignment of the workers and peasants. He also warned about the existence of the reformist movements created by the imperialists; by making use of these classes in its favour. He emphasised that the party of the proletariat in the developed countries and the revolutionary party of the proletariat in these countries should carry forward the national liberation revolution under its independent leadership, depending upon the broad sections

of the peasants, and even in those countries where pre-capitalist relations exists, attempts to propagate and to establish peasant soviets should be under-taken, and the world revolution is possible only through close integration of the proletariat of the developed countries with national liberation revolution of the backward countries.¹

In 1925, Stalin warned that, "...certain strata of the national bourgeoisie, the richest and most powerful strata, which, fearing revolution in their countries more than they fear imperialism, will prefer a deal with imperialism to the liberation of their countries from imperialism and will there by betray their own native lands (India, Egypt etc). In view of all this, those countries can be liberated from imperialism only if a struggle is waged against the compromising national bourgeoisie"²

In this way, only those reformist bourgeoisie and their political parties who struck a deal with the imperialists during the years 1920-25 has come to power in the majority of countries after the second world war, through the so called "political independence". There is no radical change in their striking a deal with the imperialists (even with the reactionary states) against the people's revolutionary democratic movements. On the contrary, now, they have got even the political power and the army in their hands. Hence, the bourgeoisie has become more reactionary than it was in 1920 and consequently has turned into an enemy of the revolutionary movements. In these circumstances, how could be the political power and the army in the hands of the bourgeoisie an added advantage to the anti-imperialist movement?

1. See: LCW 30 (Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the peoples of the East, Nov. 22, 1919) and LCW 31 (Report of the Commission on the National and the colonia Questions July 26, 1920).

2. SCW 7 P. 109

Hence, a great majority of the third world countries and their allies, and the alliances they are having with the second world countries can never be a means to deal a decisive blow against the imperialists and the hegemonic super powers.

When Lenin considered national liberation movements in colonies and dependent countries as a principal force in the anti-imperialist struggle, it was about the revolutionary liberation movements under the leadership of the proletariat of those countries, with the alliance of workers and peasants as its basis; it was about the revolutionary democratic movements for establishing the soviet power.

On the contrary, to alter, in the name of Lenin his theory that, the national liberation movements are the principal force of world revolution, as the alliance of reactionary classes of the colonial and dependent countries to be the principal force, is against the Leninist principles about the national liberation movements in the colonial and dependent countries. It is to advance the policy of counter revolutionary class compromise, as a revolutionary policy of class struggle.

"It is becoming quite clear that the socialist revolution which is impending for the whole world will not be merely the victory of the proletariat of each country over its own bourgeoisie"¹ said Lenin.. "that a coalition between the proletarian revolution in Europe and the colonial revolution in the East in a united world front of revolution against the world front of imperialism is inevitable"² said Stalin.

This is true even to-day. The oppression of the democratic movements of the toiling masses with the help of political power and the army by the ruling classes and the states of third world countries, considered to have achieved political independence and their dependence on

1. LCW 30 P. 159

2. SSW 1 P. 64

imperialists in political and economic spheres, enable the imperialists particularly the hegemonic super powers to sustain them as its pillars of domination.

Hence, there is no doubt that, the working class and the toiling masses of the third and the second world countries, by capturing power after overthrowing their respective ruling classes and their state, not only overthrow their reactionary ruling classes which are the supporting pillars of imperialism in their countries, but also the very imperialists from their soil. Therefore, Lenin's saying that, in this era of imperialism the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat of each country will succeed not merely by its struggle against its own bourgeoisie and its political power, but mainly through its struggle against world imperialism, is true even to-day.

When it is said that the national liberation movement is a principal ally of the world proletariat in its struggle against imperialism and the hegemonic super powers, it means the revolutionary movement in third world countries which fights for political power of the revolutionary classes including the workers and peasants but not the alliance of the states of the reactionary ruling classes of those countries. To say so, is to sacrifice Leninism to the bourgeois ideology.

The three world theory is nothing but a theory which apart from pointing out the principal enemy and the contradictions between the enemies, guides the international proletariat to weaken the enemy by utilising the contradictions between the enemies against the principal enemy; to postpone such confrontation till the international proletariat acquires sufficient strength to conduct a decisive war and to rally the maximum forces against the enemies. But the 'people's daily' article by stating that, 'this theory not only fulfills the present day strategic needs of the international proletariat, the oppressed people of the world and the nations, but also the strategic needs of the struggle for

the victory of socialism and communism', undoubtedly puts forward the united front built with the states of the second and third world countries against the hegemonic super powers, as a strategic device to destroy imperialism and hegemonism. It is nothing but to project reactionary compromising policy which is against class struggle and revolution by abandoning the unity of the proletariat and the toiling masses of the world, their struggle and their revolution against imperialism.

Lenin condemned the opportunists of the second international when they abandoned civil war under the slogan of 'defence of Father land' by compromising with their respective imperialist bourgeoisie. The opportunists of the second international who justified their slogan 'defence of father land' by citing Marx's support to the revolutionary wars waged by the bourgeoisie against the feudal domination during the pre-imperialist period, failed to see the epochal changes due to the growth of capitalism "from the liberator of nations, which it was in the struggle against feudalism, capitalism in its imperialist stage has turned into the greatest oppressor of nations"¹ Lenin, who pointed out this condemned the opportunists who viewed all wars alike forgetting the historical conditions. It is nothing short of asking them to compromise with the imperialist bourgeoisie of the second world countries and to abandon revolution. The contradictions between hegemonic super powers and the second world countries are the contradictions between two different imperialists, the contradictions between two oppressors, and not the contradictions between national uprising and imperialism. It is nothing but the theory of class collaboration of the opportunists of the second international to demand abandonment of the civil war against one of them, instead of utilising the contradictions between them.

In this way, the Chinese revisionists are coming out bare faced as rank revisionists who betray revolution by

grossly distorting Marxism-Leninism, by putting forward the alliance between the states of the third world countries as a principal force and abandoning revolutionary people and the revolutionary struggles, in place of the Leninist principle that, the national liberation movements are the principal force in the anti-imperialist struggle, and by preaching once again the same disgraced 'defence of father land' proposition of the second inter-national with the same arguments to the proletariat of the second world imperialist countries.

8. Socialism and the Dictatorship of the proletariat: Revisionism of the Communist Party of Russia

The 20th Congress of the Communist party of Russia, through its anti-Leninist policies of 'three peaceful principles' in international relations, 'national democratic state', 'parliamentary path' and 'war and peace' guided the parties of the world proletariat into class collaboration with the world reactionary forces by abandoning class struggle, to get engrossed in legalism and to abandon the revolutionary activities, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the civil war. Going a step further the 22nd congress perfected revisionism in all its dimensions, by guiding the Russian communist party to abandon the dictatorship of the

proletariat, class struggle and revolutionary activities and to indulge in class compromise.

The party programme adopted by the 22nd congress of that party accomplished this by proclaiming that the state of that country is no longer a proletarian dictatorship but has changed into a state of all people and the communist party of that country is no longer a party of the proletariat but has changed into a party of all people.

The reasons adduced by them are: the socialist transformation of property has been completed in Soviet Union. It has entered into a higher stage of socialist society. Now there are no antagonistic classes there. Hence there is no class struggle. There are only different sections of people like workers, peasants and intellectuals. Since it represents the aspirations of all sections of the people and the entire people have accepted Marxism-Leninism and the principles of Communism, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian party have become meaningless in the changed, developed, objective social conditions. It has transformed into a state of all people and the party of all people. With the fullfledged success of the socialist transformation of property, the necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian party has disappeared. It means, it has become superfluous in its highest stage.

To those who cited the teachers of Marxism for the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the socialist society they offered revisionist explanation that, 'it is exclusively for the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, the proletarian dictatorship and the proletarian party are necessary and not for the period of transition from socialism to communism'. In their 22nd congress programme they have announced that, in their country the period of transition from capitalism to socialism has come to an end and it is in the stage of transition from the highest stage of socialism to communism and in another quarter century fullfledged Communist society will be built.

"There is a revolutionary stage between capitalist society and the communist society in which one is transformed into the other. Parallel to this there is a political intermediate stage. During this inter-mediatory period the state cannot be anything other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."¹ Marx. "development towards communism, proceeds through the dictatorship of the proletariat"² Lenin. For those who questioned them citing the above two quotations, they explained that, what Marx and Engles referred to as communism is only socialism (lower stages of socialism). But their explanation is merely an unadulterated revisionist explanation.

The proletarian dictatorship is inseparably connected with the classes and class struggle. Lenin said, "They are afraid to admit that the dictatorship of the proletariat is also a period of class struggle, which is inevitable as long as classes have not been abolished, and which changes in form being particularly fierce and particularly peculiar in the period immediately following the overthrow of capital. The proletariat does not cease the class struggle after it has captured political power, but continues it until classes are abolished - of course, under different circumstances in different form and by different means".³

Here, while talking about the abolition of classes Lenin has not referred about the abolition of the antagonistic classes only. He says further, "what does the abolition of classes mean? All those who call themselves socialists recognise this as the ultimate goal of socialism, but by no means all give thought to its significance."

"In order to abolish classes completely, it is not enough to overthrow exploiters, the land owners and capitalists, not enough to abolish their rights of ownership; it is neces-

1. Marx-Engels Selected Works (MESW) 3 P. 26
2. LCW 25 P. 466
3. LCW 29 P. 420-421

