

THE NEGATIVE LINES WITHIN THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT OF CANADA ON THE QUESTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL

by a member of the Workers College
Committee of CPC(M-L)

The opportunist chieftains of a number of small sects which proclaim themselves to be "genuine Marxist-Leninists" are coming up with a line to attack the international communist movement and Mao Tsetung Thought. This line is expressed as follows: "There is no Communist International" and therefore no "uniform discipline"; as a consequence "revolutionaries in each country must orient their policies on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought and their analysis of the concrete conditions." (**CPC(ml), A Caricature of Communism**, Mouvement Revolutionnaire des Etudiants du Québec, Montreal, 1975, p. 55). Another version of this line is: "CPC(M-L) has made the mistake of considering the Communist Party of China as the direct leadership of the international communist movement. They have then extended this role to the Chinese state." (Dave Paterson, "Reply to CPC(M-L)'s Call for Unity", **Canadian Revolution**, Vol. 1, No. 2, August-September 1975, p.10) The line that there is no Communist International is being used to deny the universality of Mao Tsetung Thought as the Marxism-Leninism of our era, the most advanced theory leading the world communist movement. It is also being used to slip in an attack against Comrade Stalin, and to negate the leading role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B) in the world communist movement from the end of world war II until his death in 1953. This aspect of the line is expressed as follows: "It (the Soviet Union) has deserted all principles of proletarian internationalism, and has consistently since the end of the Second World War followed a course of 'socialism in words, imperialism in deeds.'" ("Imperialism and Canadian Political Economy Part 2", by Workers' Unity, **Canadian Revolution**, *ibid.*, p.32) An opportunist newspaper in Quebec called **En Lutte!** gives the same line as follows: "After the Second World War a new crisis arose within the international communist movement when the leaders of the Soviet Union definitively broke from the principles of Marxism-Leninism." (**En Lutte!**, Supplement to No. 41, Vol. 2, No. 20, June 19, 1975) These lines are variations of the line promoted by liquidator and anti-communist Jack Scott, former Chairman of the Progressive Workers' Movement, an anti-revisionist group formed in Vancouver, B.C. in 1964 and liquidated by Scott in 1970. His line on the Communist International was also used to deny the existence of the international communist movement, to mystify the history of the communist movement as a cover from which he has launched attacks against Comrade Stalin and Mao Tsetung Thought.

In an article written on the "history" of the Communist International, **Progressive Worker** tries to mix up the dissolution of the Comintern with the rise of modern revisionism. The article says:

"Every single party now calling itself 'Communist' owes its existence to the International, even though most of them no longer adhere to its principles. They explain away the absence of an International Communist organisation with the claim that it has outgrown its usefulness and is no longer needed. The real reason, however, lies in the fact that most of them have long since abandoned the revolutionary program and objectives of the International and their abject fear of invoking its revolutionary spirit equals that of the ruling class.

"The International may be temporarily extinct but the revolutionary spirit which gave it birth is now more widespread than ever before.... We look forward to the day when the International of the working people once again occupies its rightful role as the General Staff of the Revolution." (**Progressive Worker**, Vol. 5, No. 3-4, January-February 1969, p.15)

The Communist International (Third International) was founded under the leadership of Lenin in March 1919, and was dissolved by the unanimous action of all its affiliated parties on July 10, 1943 because of the concrete political situation, namely the anti-fascist war. Comrade Stalin explained that the international communist movement dissolved the Comintern in order to strengthen the unity of the anti-fascist alliance. "**The dissolution of the Communist International... facilitates the organisation of the common onslaught of all freedom-loving nations against the common enemy — Hitlerism. It exposes the lie of the Hitlerites to the effect that 'Moscow allegedly intends to intervene in the life of other nations and to 'Bolshevize' them.**" Comrade Stalin added the measure would aid in organising the progressive forces in the various countries and would help to "unite all the freedom-loving peoples into a single international camp for the fight against the menace of world domination by Hitlerism." (**The Communist**, November 1943, cited by William Z. Foster, **History of the Communist Party of the United States**, International Publishers Ltd., 1952, pp. 414-415) The dissolution of the formal organisation of the Third International had nothing to do with the abandonment of the "revolutionary program and objectives of the International".

Jack Scott and his ilk do not clarify the momentous historical development of the three Internationals as they arose during specific periods of historical development of the international proletariat. Instead the opportunists confuse both the role of the The Internationals and the role of the Communist Parties in each country. The International was neither a guarantee nor a substitute for the individual communist parties in each country. Jack Scott and his ilk do not discuss the role of The International in itself, nor do they discuss the rise of opportunism in various communist parties but, instead, muddle everything up. What is the relation between disbanding the Third International and the rise of opportunism in various communist parties? There is none. Then why is Jack Scott talking about it? He is raising the issue in this manner in order to 1. suggest there is no international communist movement at this time and 2. refuse to wage a thorough-going and uncompromising struggle against opportunism in the communist movement in Canada. This means that he and his friends want to cut the communist movement adrift of the international communist movement and consolidate Canadian exceptionalism, the most damaging form of opportunism in this country.

We have shown in the article: **NEGATIVE LINES WITHIN THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN CANADA ON THE QUESTION OF MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT** that opportunists do not consider Mao Tsetung Thought as the Marxism-Leninism of our era. By not doing so, they are sometimes pitting Marxism-Leninism against Mao Tsetung Thought and other times add Mao Tsetung Thought as corollary to Marxism-Leninism. In either case, they refuse to base their thinking on the Marxism-Leninism of our era, Mao Tsetung Thought. In this article we will show that they also deny the existence of the international communist movement and are attempting to cut lose the communist movement in Canada from the international communist movement and consolidate opportunism.

There are very definite stages in the historic development of the world communist movement. The first socialist writers were Utopian socialists who voiced the disillusionment of the masses with the "bitterly disillusioning caricatures" of the Liberty, Equality and Fraternity — the "victory of reason" proclaimed by the French bourgeois democratic revolution against feudal absolutism. The most outstanding Utopian thinkers were Saint Simon, whose **Geneva Letters** appeared in 1802; Fourier whose first work was published in 1801; and Robert Owen who took over the management of New Lanark, one of the new cotton textile towns which he converted into the communist utopian village in 1800. Engels teaches the international proletariat that at this period the capitalist mode of production, and with it the antagonism between bourgeois and proletariat, was not very developed. Large-scale industry had just arisen in England and was still unknown in France. At this stage the proletariat was only then separating itself from the propertyless masses as the nucleus of a new class, the special and unique product of modern large-scale machine industry. The proletariat at this stage was incapable of independent political action and appeared as an oppressed, suffering estate of society, which could only be helped from outside, from above. Engels says: "**This historical situation also dominated the founders of socialism.**" The immature stage of capitalist production was reflected in immature theories. The solutions of social problems which lay hidden in the undeveloped economic conditions, that is in the rise of modern industry and the modern proletariat, were produced out of men's heads. These solutions were inevitably utopian, and the more detailed they were, the more they receded into mere fantasy. The utopian thinkers made a great contribution to the thinking of the modern proletariat, but they were inevitably unscientific because, at that time, capitalist production was little developed. (Frederick Engels, **Anti-Duhring**, International Publishers, 1939, pp. 282, 290)

The first detailed and theoretical program of the modern communist movement was **The Communist Manifesto** written by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels between December 1847 and January 1848. The Manifesto was written for the Communist League, an international association of workers, and it proclaimed the outlook of proletarian internationalism with its historic call, **WORKING MEN OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!** The basic thought of the Communist Manifesto is that "economic production and the structure of society of every historical epoch necessarily arising therefrom constitute the foundation for the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently (ever since the dissolution of the primeval communal ownership of land) all history has been a history of class struggles, of struggles between exploited and exploiting, between dominated and dominating classes at various stages of social development; that this struggle however, has now reached the stage where the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat) can no longer emancipate

itself from the class which exploits and oppresses it (the bourgeoisie), without at the same time forever freeing the whole of society from exploitation, oppression and class struggles." (F. Engels, "Preface to the German Edition of 1883", **Communist Manifesto**, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1968, pp. 7-8) This scientific formulation marks a great leap in human thought; it transformed history into a science in the service of the modern proletariat. The radical rupture from all previous modes of thought which the Manifesto reflects represents the culmination at a new stage of development of the most advanced currents of 19th century European thought: German philosophy, English political economy and French socialism. The theory of **scientific socialism** created by Marx and Engels was brought by these revolutionary intellectuals to the modern proletariat.

The practical organisation of the class, however, followed a zig-zag course; a course marked by ebbs and flows of revolutionary class struggle. The Manifesto itself was written after Marx had engaged in intensive ideological struggles against the French sectarian and doctrinaire socialist, Proudhon, and came at a time of great revolutionary upheaval in Europe. The Manifesto was published in February 1848, just a few weeks before the French Revolution of February 24, 1848. This revolution triggered bourgeois revolutions in Germany, Hungary and many other European countries. But by this time the modern proletariat participated as an independent force, with its own rudimentary political self-consciousness. In June 1848, the first great battle between the modern proletariat and the bourgeoisie took place in Paris. The bourgeoisie ruthlessly crushed the proletarian insurrection, which "drove again into the background, for a time, the social and political aspirations of the European working class." (*ibid.*, p.9) The Manifesto marked the theoretical advance of modern scientific socialism over primitive utopianism. But when the European working class had recovered sufficient strength for another attack on the ruling classes, Marx organised the International Workingmen's Association, in London on September 28, 1864 — not on the principles which they had laid down in the Communist Manifesto, but on a programme "broad enough to be acceptable to the English Trades' Unions, to the followers of Proudhon in France, Belgium, Italy and Spain, and to the Lassalleans in Germany." (*ibid.*, p.10) Engels tells the proletariat that Marx drew up the programme of the First International to the satisfaction of all the parties because he trusted to the intellectual development of the working class which was sure to result from **combined action and mutual discussion**. He knew that the very course of class struggle, the defeats even more than the victories, would emancipate men's minds from various dogmas and sectarian schemes and thus prepare the way for a more complete insight into the conditions of working class emancipation. In the course of its nine year history, the International did change the consciousness of working men, and thus greatly advanced the principles of the Communist Manifesto between 1864 and 1872 when the First International had to be disbanded.

In November 1871, Marx wrote to F. Bolte, an American of German descent active in the First International, to explain that the International had been founded in order to replace the socialist or semi-socialist sects by a real organisation of the working class for struggle. He says that the International could not have maintained itself if the course of history had not already smashed sectarianism. After the defeat of the revolution in Europe in 1850, many revolutionaries had engaged in all sorts of sectarian politics and organised various rival sects in exile. Marx refused to engage in these sectarian activities, and used the time of the ebb of revolution to prepare for the next surge of revolutionary struggle. In these difficult years of poverty and exile, Marx devoted himself with revolutionary discipline and self-sacrifice to carry out a thorough study of the economic structure of capitalism. The whole theoretical existence of the proletarian party proceeded from the study of political economy. Marx explains to Bolte that "**the development of socialist sectarianism and that of the real working-class movement always stand in inverse ratio to each other.**" He says that sects are justified (historically) so long as the working class is not yet ripe for an independent historical movement. "**As soon as it has attained this maturity all sects are essentially reactionary.**" He adds: "**Nevertheless, what history exhibits everywhere was repeated in the history of the International. What is antiquated tries to re-establish itself and maintain its position within the newly acquired form.**"

He analyses the history of the International as a "continual struggle of the General Council against the sects and amateur experiments, which sought to assert themselves within the International against the real movement of the working class." Marx says that while struggle was conducted at the congresses, much more was conducted in private negotiations between the

General Council and the individual sections. He describes the Proudhonist sects as a "mere sectarian organisation and, as such hostile to the organisation of the real workers' movement striven for by the International." Then by the end of 1868 the Tsarist agent Bakunin joined the International to undermine it from within with his Democratic Socialist Alliance. Marx and Engels, who although they did not have concrete proof (later uncovered after the October Revolution), correctly estimated that Bakunin's splittist and wrecking activities were the work of a police agent provocateur. His theoretical program was a mish mash of Left and Right, and Marx characterised him "Though a nonentity as a theoretician he is in his element as an intriguer." Marx then urged Bolte to put an end to all sectarianism and amateur groups in the United States where the International had been re-organised, and to expel those who could not be disciplined. ("Marx to F. Bolte", November 23, 1871, Marx, Engels, Lenin, Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism, Moscow, 1972, p. 55) A nonentity as a theoretician, and in his element as an intriguer; these are the qualities of sectarian splitters, and thorough anti-communists, as Bakunin was. Thus we can see that the two-line struggle in the International was then between the Marxist line of trusting to the intellectual development of the working class through combined action and mutual discussion which he advanced with scientific theory, and the splittist activities of various sects who wanted to organise away from the real workers' movement. Indeed Marx and Engels frequently lectured the American socialists for having reduced Marxism to a dogma, and "rigid orthodoxy" which they considered a "credo and not as a guide to action", that they could not adapt themselves to the theoretically helpless "but living, powerful, mass labor movement marching past them." (V.I. Lenin, "Preface to the Russian Translation of Letters from J.F. Becker, J. Dietzgen, F. Engels, K. Marx and others to F.A. Sorge and others", Marx and Engels, Letters to Americans, p.274) Engels exclaims in one letter "Had we from 1864 to 1873 insisted on working together only with those who openly adopted our platform where should we be today?" Marx and Engels constantly chastised the American socialists to become part of the real workers movement and to bring it scientific theory.

The high tide of class struggle in this whole formative period of the communist movement was the Paris Commune begun March 18, 1871. Marx had warned the working men of Paris to act extremely cautiously in the difficult circumstances facing them. The Prussian army stood at the gates of Paris; the French bourgeoisie was prepared to capitulate and sacrifice the working masses in order to make an easy peace with Bismark. Yet when the workers "stormed heaven", Marx enthusiastically, and energetically gave every assistance to the Commune possible, and mobilised the full resources of the First International to its aid. This great event, the first successful insurrection of the modern proletariat against the bourgeoisie, was closely studied by Marx. It was this actual spontaneous action of the working class against the bourgeoisie which gave rise to the scientific formulation, dictatorship of the proletariat. "From the very outset the Commune was compelled to recognize that the working class, once come to power, could not go on managing with the old state machine; that in order not to lose again its only just conquered supremacy, this working class must, on the one hand, do away with all the old repressive machinery previously used against itself, and, on the other, safeguard itself against its own deputies and officials by declaring them all, without exception, subject to recall at any moment." (F. Engels, Preface to The Civil War in France, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1966, p. 15) Smash the old state, and "safeguard itself against its own deputies and officials." This is a very profound insight, and has been borne out by the two subsequent proletarian revolutions of world importance, The Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 in Russia, and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China in 1966. The idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat is thus fundamental to Marxism. The Paris Commune was the first dictatorship of the proletariat. With its defeat, the sectarians tried to take over the First International, already beset with persecution from reactionary European authorities. Rather than let the old content take over the new form Marx organised the International's headquarters re-located in New York, and in 1872, formally dissolved it.

With the disbanding of the International did this mean that the international communist movement was liquidated? Not at all. Marx gave a severe lecture to his former student and comrade, Liebknecht, who compromised basic principles of scientific socialism to form unity with the decaying Lassallean clique. One of the principles sacrificed by Liebknecht's unprincipled compromise with the Lassalleans was proletarian internationalism. Marx explains clearly that the actual proletarian international duty of the modern proletariat is to organise revolution against the bourgeoisie in its own country. Marx says clearly "The international activity of the working class does not in any way depend on the existence of the International Workingmen's Association. This was only a first attempt to create a central organ for that activity, an attempt which was a lasting success on account of the impulse it gave but which was no longer reasonable in its first historical form after the fall of the Paris Commune." (K. Marx, Critique of the Gotha

Programme, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1972, p. 21) Marx re-iterates that the class struggle is national in form but is international in substance. The actual organisation of the First International just marked a stage in the development of the international communist movement, and proletarian internationalism by no means ended with its dissolution in 1872.

After the dissolution of the First International Marx and Engels concentrated their practical organisational work in assisting the various European socialists to organise the political parties of the proletariat. They spent a considerable amount of time and energy in struggling against various opportunist tendencies in the German Social Democratic Party. A most significant theoretical work from which I have already cited is the Critique of the Gotha Programme, which gives a correct method for uniting communists. In 1875 what was historically most important was a real movement, in the working class to overcome the ebb of revolution after the defeat of the Paris Commune and the reign of reaction in Europe. Marx was ruthlessly severe and mercilessly criticised the Gotha Programme because of the specific historical conditions at the time. One reason was that Marx and Engels were more intimately connected with the German communist movement than with any other, and they were particularly perturbed by the retrograde step marked by the draft programme. Secondly, Marx and Engels were in a violent struggle against Bakunin and his anarchists, who had only a few years before tried to wreck the International and were carrying on a vicious gossip and slander campaign against Comrade Marx to discredit the man, and thus undermine the influence of Marxist science in the working class movement. Marx and Engels were accused of being the source of all the programmes, and responsible for all the actions of the German socialists. Marx described the opportunist program as "thoroughly objectionable" and one that "demoralizes the Party." He advised that if no agreements could be reached on questions of principle "one should simply have concluded an agreement for action against the common enemy." (Ibid. p. 6) He said the Lassallean leaders came forward to unite because political circumstances forced them to. They should have been told that there would be no bargaining over principles, and they would have had to be content with a programme of action or a plan of organisation for a common action. Because of the repression of the German socialists under Bismark's Anti-Socialist Law in 1878, the Critique could not be published before Marx died.

During the turbulent period of state repression against the socialists Marx and Engels waged a ferocious war against two currents of opportunism in the newly united ("Compromised") German Social-Democratic Party. Marx not only condemned the compromises with the Lassalleans but also the compromises with the "whole gang of half-mature students and super-wise doctors" ("doctor" in German is equivalent to Ph.D. in science) "who want to give socialism a 'higher, ideal' turn, that is to say, to replace its materialist basis (which calls for serious, objective study by anyone) by modern mythology, with its goddess of Justice, Freedom, Equality, and Fraternity. Dr. Hochberg, who publishes the Zukunft, is a representative of this tendency and has 'bought his way' into the party — with the 'noblest' intentions, I assume, but I do not give a damn for 'intentions'. Anything more miserable than this programme or the Zukunft has seldom seen the light of day with more 'modest' presumption." (Letters to Americans, ibid., p. 276) This is an example of the contempt and vigorous combative attitude Marx took towards opportunists who degenerated socialism into high moral earnestness. Marx and Engels also had to struggle against a gossip campaign promoted by Johanne Most to the effect that Marx and Engels supported Most's anarchist theories. These gossips were meant to cover the rightist opportunism of Dr. Hochberg and Eduard Bernstein. Marx and Engels insisted that a responsible socialist editor exercise control over this "crew of doctors, students and professorial socialists," and they would openly combat "such dissipation (Verluderung — an even stronger word in German) of the party and its theory" unless the tendency of Hochberg and Co. changed. Marx and Engels greatly assisted the German Social Democratic Party in this period of confusion. After the Anti-Socialist Law the Party vacillated between the anarchism of Johanne Most and the opportunism of Hochberg and Co., and only under the most rigorous guidance from Marx and Engels did they find the correct path.

The struggle was a very vigorous one, but Marx and Engels did everything possible to keep it within the ranks of the Socialists away from the eyes and ears of their common enemies. Their methods of struggle have served as a model for the communist movement since. On the one hand uncompromising struggle within the movement for a correct theoretical position, and action guided by a desire to attack the common enemy. In this struggle they were merciless. Of one opportunist in the Hochberg Right group Marx says: "These fellows, zeros theoretically, incompetent practically — want to take the teeth out of socialism (which they have trimmed up according to university recipes) and out of the Social Democratic Party in particular, to enlighten the workers or, as they put it, feed them 'the elements of education' through their confused half-knowledge, and, above all, to make the party respectable in the eyes of the philistine. They are poor counter-revolutionary wind-bags."

(Ibid., p. 277) The result of Marx's furious attack was that the opportunists retreated and disappeared from sight. The most outstanding polemical work to emerge out of this sharp ideological struggle in this period, is Frederick Engels' point by point refutation of Herr Eugen Duhring's: "Revolution in Science (Anti-Duhring)" first published as a series of articles in the Leipzig Vorwarts in 1877. This refutation of the "ignorant arrogance" of professor Duhring was subsequently published as a book, and became a popular working man's handbook of scientific socialism throughout Europe.

As a consequence of the vigorous struggle against opportunism led by Marx and Engels the "counter-revolutionary windbags" were defeated. The leading socialists promised to rectify their "miserable" way of managing the socialist press, and in 1880 Liebknecht visited Marx and promised an "improvement" in all respects. Thus by 1882 Engels could write to one of his comrades about these battles already being in the past. "In Germany things are going ahead excellently on the whole. To be sure, Messrs. Literati of the party have tried to turn it toward reactionary, tame-bourgeois education, but this failed miserably. The infamies to which the Social-Democratic workers are everywhere subjected have made them every where much more revolutionary than they were even three years ago... These people (the party literati) would like to beg off the Socialist Law at any prices by mildness, meekness, toadying, and tameness, because it makes short work of their literary earnings." (Ibid., pp. 277-8). Engels celebrates the toughening of the "Social-Democratic workers" who are made "much more revolutionary" by the "infamies" to which they were everywhere subjected. From 1883 when Marx died until 1895, Engels continued to wage uncompromising struggle against petty bourgeois philistinism and all tendencies to compromise with opportunism. He especially had contempt for the middle-class parliamentary representatives the German working men were forced to elect to office because of the electoral rules. He denounced their "petty bourgeois prejudices", and said the "Philistinism" of Social Democratic deputies was "colossal", and he said "A petty bourgeois Socialist fraction is unavoidable in a country like Germany." (Ibid., p. 278) In 1885 his fight with the opportunist deputies over their vote in favour of a subsidy to a steamship company was so ferocious it almost split the Party. Marx and Engels also wrote continuously to British and American socialists educating them against their narrow and hidebound sectarian spirit, and urging them insistently to merge with the labour movement to destroy this sectarian spirit. They studied and wrote on a whole range of questions in world politics; made extremely close studies of the colonial revolutions around the world, and educated the modern proletariat to ally themselves with the oppressed and colonial nations and peoples.

It is correct to suggest that in the seventeen years between 1872 and the International Socialist Workers' Congress in 1889 held in Paris that there was no central authority, no universally recognised advanced theory by the vanguard of the proletariat in the modern industrialised world at that time? To suggest such would be sheer nonsense. The building of the German Social Democratic Party, the violent struggles against right and left opportunism, the constant struggles to bring scientific knowledge to the advanced working men in all countries of Europe and America, all helped create the material conditions for the re-organisation of a particular, organisational form of the communist international suitable to the historical conditions. But certainly proletarian internationalism existed, consultation, exchange, struggle for a correct path, all this took place across the borders of the various bourgeois states. The proletariat is inherently a revolutionary, internationalist class, which aspires to grasp the most authoritative science, the most advanced theory of the day in order to change the world, to remake it in its own interest and outlook, and in the course to destroy the old bourgeois social order. This is an objective historical process and is independent of anyone's will, or of any particular organisational form which may or may not exist.

By 1889, with the recovery from the most profound and prolonged economic crisis capitalism had suffered to date (lasting from 1873 through to 1889) the modern proletariat once more rallied forces for a new outbreak of struggle against the bourgeoisie.

The great class battles in Europe and America for the eight hour day enacted by law, which the First International had proclaimed as a demand in its 1866 Geneva Congress, reached a political high tide in 1889 when the International Socialist Workers' Congress adopted May 1st, the day of the American proletarian demonstration for the eight hour day, as the international May Day festival of the international working class. The successful convening of the Congress, the first actual congress of the Second International, was due solely to the energetic and principled struggles waged by Frederick Engels against the opportunists in the European socialist movement. The opportunists were headed by a group of French "possibilists" (who believed it was "possible" to reform capitalism from inside parliament without destroying it) and they split away from the revolutionary socialists. Engels, who was sixty-eight years old at the time, flung himself into the battle against these splitters like a young man. Engels not only castigated the op-

portunists, he castigated the compromisers with opportunism — Liebknecht, Bebel and others. He denounced the "possibilists" as having sold out to the government, and denounced the British Social-Democratic Federation under Hyndman for having joined the possibilists. Engels exclaimed: **"The writing and running about in connection with this damned congress leave me hardly any time for anything else."** (May 11, 1889 cited, *ibid.*, p. 278). He tries to arouse his conciliatory comrades; the possibilists are busy, but our people are asleep, Engels writes angrily. He described the fight against the possibilists as identical to the fight against Bakunin anarchists: **"With the anarchist flag merely exchanged for the possibilist one: the selling of principles to the bourgeoisie for small-scale concessions, especially in return for well-paid jobs for the leaders (city council, labour exchange, etc.)"** (*ibid.*, p. 279). The best cure for the conciliators who Engels tried to arouse was the vicious attacks made by the possibilists against "authoritarian Marxism" and their desire to form the "nucleus of a new International." A month before the Congress, Engels remarks on how much energy he had to spend to convince Bebel and others what the line of the possibilists meant. When the possibilists could not seize control of the leadership of the Congress, they did their utmost to split and wreck the Congress, and even called a separate one of their own in Paris on the same day the official congress began. The possibilists were completely isolated however, and only a few fraudulent foreign delegates attended their splittist congress. Engels was jubilant that the conciliators in the German Social Democratic Party had not been successful. **"It serves our sentimental conciliatory brethren right, to get this stiff kick in their tenderest spot for all their protestations of friendship. That will probably cure them for some time to come."** (*ibid.*, p. 279) Thus it is clear that the Second International of the world communist movement also came into existence through sharp two-line struggle, and that the world authority in the communist movement led a vigorous uncompromising struggle within the movement to unite it on the basis of the practical needs of the mass movement, without surrendering the long-term interests of the proletariat to some sectarian group of opportunist splitters. Engels, a thorough historical materialist used his scientific outlook as a guide to action, to advance the world communist movement to a higher level of the organisation, and to wage uncompromising struggle against all forms of conciliation to opportunism. In 1891 he ran another round of struggle against his old comrades in the German Social Democratic Party by insisting that they print Karl Marx's *Critique of the Gotha Program* as an instrument of theoretical struggle against the opportunist trends in the German Social Democratic Party. He fought ruthlessly against all forms and expressions of bourgeois respectability within the proletarian movement, and all philistine sentiments.

Engels' death in 1895 was a great set-back for the communist movement, just as the death of Marx in 1883 had been. There was no one to carry on a ruthless, uncompromising stand against opportunism in the German Social Democratic Party. Eduard Bernstein, who despite his promises in 1882 to resolutely change his views and come under the authority of Marxist scientific socialism, revealed his treacherous class nature in the Stuttgart Congress of the German Social Democratic Party (October 3-8, 1898) in which he issued a statement *in absentia* expounding a number of revisionist views. The old conciliators, Bebel and others, advocated ideological struggle against their opponent but failed to take organisational measures against him. At the Lubek Congress of the German SDP (September 9-15, 1901) the Right-wing had already taken shape, having gotten their foot in the door in 1898, with its own program, its own press, and leader, Bernstein. The catch-phrase of these revisionists was the "freedom to criticise Marxism". What Bernstein advocated in theory, the French opportunists were putting into practice, namely participating directly in the bourgeois government. Millerand, an opportunist socialist sat in a French government with the butcher of the Paris Commune. Thus revisionism, and the conciliatory attitude towards it, was an international bourgeois trend in the international communist movement in this period. We can thus conclude this period by saying that the era of Marxism ended with the death of Engels in 1895. While the two-line struggle continued and certain of Engels' most devoted followers at the time, Karl Kautsky being the most outstanding, did wage a sharp struggle against revisionism, neither he nor any other socialists in Western Europe rose to meet the historical tasks of the new era, the new stage to which capitalism had evolved.

The communist leader who rose to fight for Marxism and raise it to a higher level by thoroughly applying it to the concrete historical situation was V.I. Lenin. Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. At the turn of the century capitalism had changed from laissez-faire industrial capitalism, to monopoly finance capitalism. Leninism did not originate after the First World War. Leninism as an integral theory developed in 1903. Lenin writes: **"Bolshevism as a trend of political thought and as a political party, has existed since 1903. Only the history of Bolshevism during the whole period of its existence can satisfactorily explain why it was able to build up and to maintain under most difficult conditions the iron discipline needed for the victory of the proletariat."** (V.I. Lenin, *Left-Wing Com-*

munist, an Infantile Disorder, cited by J. Stalin, *On the Opposition*, (1921-27), Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1974, p. 134) Stalin teaches the proletariat that Bolshevism and Leninism are one — two names for the same thing. The essence of Bolshevism is the building of the political party of the proletariat of a new type. This type of party is of persons absolutely dedicated to proletarian revolution, who make revolution their profession. Such a party is completely uncompromising and non-conciliatory with any form of opportunism: Lenin was a relentless revolutionary, and a Party man through and through. Thus within the Second International there arose two trends during the peace period (in western Europe, in Russia they had the good fortune of having a revolution, counter-revolution, peaceful, non-peaceful, legal and illegal existence as a rigorous training ground for their revolutionary army) before World War I. These trends were; on the one hand, revisionism (Bernstein, Millerand, the German and British trade unionists and so forth) together with the conciliators with revisionism (Kautsky, Rosa Luxemburg, Liebknecht, Bebel, etc.) who refused to wage a relentless war against the opportunists as Marx and Engels had done during their lifetimes; and, on the other hand, Bolshevism, Leninism, which was either denounced or sneered at in Western Europe as being "Russian" and "barbaric", "fanatical" and so on. Lenin waged a relentless organisational and ideological battle against all forms of conciliation, liquidationism, and opportunism. He advanced revolutionary theory on the nature of the proletarian party, and evolved the principles of democratic centralism as the only proletarian method of organising revolution. Leninism is the theory of the strategy and tactics of proletarian revolution. The great crisis in imperialism signalled by the outbreak of World War I to re-divide the world markets between the two camps of imperialists (Anglo-French, and Austro-German — later American and Japanese joined the Anglo-French to pursue their own interests) saw the complete degeneration of the Second International into social chauvinism and social imperialism, a phrase created by Lenin to describe the leaders of the Second International who betrayed every Second International resolution on imperialist war, and every Marxist principle of proletarian internationalism, to join the imperialists in "defence of the fatherland" against a rival imperialist power. Only Bolshevism stood firm to the line of the Second International on the question of imperialist war, and organised to turn the imperialist war into a civil war against their own ruling class. In short, every "socialist" party of the Second International split from their own policies, violated their own general political line, in order to support imperialist war, or conciliate with the opportunist supporters of imperialist war. Because of the profound world-shaking nature of this crisis, events were extremely condensed. Twenty years passed in a day; it was a period of qualitative leaps. Overnight the whole conciliatory line of compromising with opportunism was revealed in its true perspective, and shown to be nothing more than a "revolutionary verbiage" to cover the most gross social chauvinist, social-imperialist, traitorous outlook imaginable. It took Comrade Lenin several days to believe that the German Social Democratic Party, to that moment considered by the international communist movement to be the world authority of socialist practice and theory, could change into its opposite, could make such a complete capitulation to the imperialist ruling class of Germany and so grossly betray the German proletariat as well as the international proletariat and oppressed nations. Lenin did everything he could to re-organise the European socialists on the basis of proletarian internationalism to oppose the imperialist war. Lenin organised the Zimmerwald Left Group at the International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald, Switzerland (September 3-5, 1915) which consisted of eight delegates who represented the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks and the Left Social-Democrats of Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Germany, Polish Social-Democratic opposition and the Social-Democrats of the Lettish Region. Led by Lenin this group fought the Centrist majority of the Conference and tabled drafts of a resolution and manifesto which denounced the imperialist war, exposed the treachery of the social-chauvinists, and emphasised the need for active struggle against the war. The drafts were all defeated by the Centrist majority. However a number of amendments by the Zimmerwald Left Group were included in the manifesto of the Conference. The Left Group did not split from the Centrists at this time because they recognised this as only the beginning of a long struggle against imperialist war and social imperialism. The Left Group served as a rallying point for the internationalists within the world Social-Democratic movement, and at the Second International Socialist Conference held near Berne in April 1916, 12 out of 43 delegates were in the Left Group and they won as many as one half the votes on a number of proposals they made. These Zimmerwald Left Group delegates carried on extensive revolutionary work, and many of them went on to play a prominent part in the founding of Communist parties in their countries.

Lenin also did everything he possibly could to assist the Spartacus or Internationale group of the German Social-Democratic Party which split from the opportunists and campaigned against the imperialist war. This group, led by Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring,

Clara Zetkin, Wilhelm Pieck and others, made a number of errors on questions of theory and policy, especially with regards to forming an iron-disciplined Bolshevik Party capable of leading the inevitable revolutionary upsurge of the masses and freeing themselves organisationally from the Centrists led by Kautsky.

But Lenin's most profound contribution to the international proletariat was to lead the first successful proletarian revolution in his own country, Russia. The organisation of the proletarian revolution, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country had as its central objective **"the development, support and awakening of the revolution in all countries"** (V.I. Lenin, *Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, cited by Stalin, p.180) This is precisely in keeping with Marx's instructions to the German Social Democratic Party in 1875 that the **"international function of the German working class...is to challenge its own bourgeoisie."** This same idea is expressed by Comrade Stalin: **"The world significance of the October Revolution lies not only in the fact that it constitutes a great beginning made by one country in causing a breach in the system of imperialism and that it is the first centre of socialism in the ocean of imperialist countries, but also in that it constitutes the first stage of the world revolution and a mighty base for its further development."** (J. Stalin, "October Revolution and Tactics", *ibid.*, p.181) Thus at one stage the centre of Comrade Lenin's work was mobilising the elements within the Second International opposed to the imperialist war and engaging in very close-quarter struggles for passage of resolutions against the war. At another stage all of Lenin's work was concentrated in organising the actual seizure of state power in Russia, and defending it in civil war. After conditions ripened still further with the defeat of German imperialism and the victory of the bourgeois revolution in Germany, the formation of the German Communist Party on December 30 - January 1, 1918-1919, created conditions for another stage in organising world revolution. The Third International was organised by Lenin in March 1919, and the First Congress of the Third International was held from March 2 to March 6, 1919.

Although many delegates were blocked from reaching Russia by the Entente powers, most of the major European countries were represented; John Reed represented the United States communists. The Third International rose in tribute to Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, assassinated by the Whiteguard German fascists and the social fascists who led the German government. In his speech to this Congress Lenin declared that the masses had discovered a practical form of dictatorship of the proletariat, Soviet power, and he pointed to many other forms which the masses had given rise to in the world revolutionary movement at the time. But the one form which was victorious was Soviet power, and so the word Soviet became synonymous with the idea of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, just as the Commune had been the form of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat in 1871.

But the situation between 1871 and 1919 was vastly different; the communist movement had moved from one era to another, from a lower to a higher stage. The proletariat had learned the necessity to concentrate its powers in one political party. The undivided leadership of one party, the Communist Party, was the principal factor in the preparation for the success of the October Revolution. Without Bolshevist tactics the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the conditions of imperialism would have been impossible. Only a Bolshevik Party can rally around itself the vast majority of the masses, including the peasants, petty producers, urban non-proletarian masses and attack the main enemy. The Paris Commune in 1871 was divided into two political parties, the International Workingmen's Association (Proudhonist) and the Blanquist, neither of which was communist. As a consequence the Parisian proletariat made several serious tactical mistakes (not seizing the gold in the National Bank, not seizing Versailles immediately, not rousing the peasant masses against the old state). All of these historical lessons of the Commune had been absorbed by the Bolshevik Party, and they led a step-by-step fight to isolate the political parties of compromise and launched their assault against the bourgeoisie with great precision and preparation. Thus Lenin could tell a mass meeting of Russian communist revolutionaries to celebrate the founding of the First International:

"Now that the meaning of the word 'Soviet' is understood by everybody, the victory of the communist revolution is assured. The comrades present in this hall saw the founding of the first Soviet republic; now they see the founding of the Third, Communist International, and they will all see the founding of the World Federative Republic of Soviets. (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p.485)

The Third International was a most necessary organisational form for generalising and organising the mass revolutionary upsurge of the modern proletariat and the awakening colonial masses in the East. The Third International set out as its thesis the universality of Bolshevism and clarified the profoundly revolutionary democratic nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat compared with the fraudulent democracy of the bourgeoisie. The central theses of the First Congress of

the Third International clarified the nature of revolutionary proletarian democracy (i.e. democracy for the people, dictatorship over the handful of reactionary enemies), as compared to the illusory and hypocritical "parliamentary" democracy upheld by the Second Yellow International. Thus the central difference between the Third International and the Second International was that the Third International stood for the dictatorship of the proletariat, while the Yellow International stood for the dictatorship of the imperialists.

Lenin spent considerable time clarifying the nature of this dictatorship in order to overcome the philistine bourgeois notions about "parliamentary democracy". He wrote:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is a special form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of working people (the petty bourgeoisie, the small proprietors, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc), or the majority of these; it is an alliance against capital, an alliance aiming at the complete overthrow of capital, at the complete suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie and of any attempt on its part at restoration, an alliance aiming at the final establishment and consolidation of socialism." (Lenin, Forward to the Published Speech "Deception of the People with Slogans of Freedom and Equality", 1919, cited by Stalin, p.145)

In a further elaboration of the nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat he said:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat, if we translate from this Latin, scientific, historical-philosophical term into simpler language, means the following:

"Only a definite class, namely the urban workers and the factory industrial workers in general, is able to lead the whole mass of the toilers and exploited in the struggle for the overthrow of the yoke of capital, in the process of the overthrow itself, in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the victory, in the work of creating the new socialist social system, in the whole struggle for the complete abolition of classes." (Lenin, A Great Beginning, cited Ibid.)

The tactics for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat thus had universal significance for the world proletariat. Lenin says correctly in his exposure of Kautsky's attack against proletarian internationalism, and his distortion of Bolshevik tactics as being purely a Russian phenomenon, **"Bolshevism is a model of tactics for all."** (Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, *ibid.*, p.145) Bolshevism teaches the modern proletariat how to unite the vast majority of the people around itself in order to isolate the main enemy to the maximum and then attack it. Leninism is Marxist theory at a new and higher stage of development, and as Marxism was universal for the world proletariat, so Leninism was universal for the modern proletariat and the oppressed nations and peoples dominated by the imperialist powers. The Third International helped bring the theory and tactics of Leninism to the proletariat and oppressed peoples around the world. The Soviet Union became the centre of world revolution, the citadel of proletarian power, for what was thought at this time of great revolutionary upheaval to be a relatively short period of time before the western European countries burst out in revolutionary flame, and the modern proletariat rose up to wipe out imperialism for all time.

But this did not occur. The revolutionary tide ebbs and flows. Imperialism was able to drown the German revolution in the workers' blood, execute the Hungarian revolution, set up a fascist dictatorship over the proletariat in Italy, and defeat the revolutionary upsurge in France, Britain and North America. But the great upsurge of the masses in Asia, India, Persia, Turkey, and most important, China, opened a second front of revolutionary struggle against imperialism. The East was awakened by the Russian revolution; the citadel of proletarian power lay athwart industrial Western Europe, the seat of capital, and colonial and semi-colonial Asia.

Great Lenin died in 1924. From the time of his death until his own death in 1953, Comrade Stalin led the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B), and was the authoritative figure in the international communist movement. In 1924-25 Comrade Stalin led the CPSU(B) and the international communist movement on the correct path during the ebb of revolution. He resolutely opposed the despairing thesis that the temporary and partial stabilisation of imperialism meant that imperialism had recovered, or that world revolution was no longer possible, and most especially that socialism could not be built within the Soviet Union relying on the political alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, and the correct handling of contradictions between city and countryside. Stalin's leadership to the international communist movement is summed up in the thesis of Bolshevization of the parties affiliated to the Communist International adopted by the Fifth Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Comintern held in Moscow, March 21- April 6, 1925. The essence of this thesis was that the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries should destroy all the remnants of their Social-Democratic origins, that is destroy the federalist system of organising the Party, change the base of the Party from the community (place of residence) used by the Social Democratic Parties to win elections, to Party cells in the factories, revolutionise the method and style of work, institute democratic centralism, and so forth. Very

extensive consultations were held with all the major Parties and detailed analysis made of the shortcomings and weaknesses necessary to overcome in the period of the lull in revolution in order to prepare for the next upsurge, the next crisis of imperialism. Comrade Stalin analysed the main task for the Communist Parties in the west. He said: **"That task is to link the Communist Parties in the West with the trade unions. That task is to develop and bring to a successful conclusion the campaign for trade-union unity, to see that all Communists without fail join the trade unions, to work systematically in them for combining the workers in a united front against capital, and in this way create the conditions that will enable the Communist Parties to have the backing of the trade unions."**

"If this task is not carried out it will be impossible to transform the Communist Parties into genuine mass parties or to create the conditions necessary for the victory of the proletariat..." (J. Stalin, Work of XIV Conference of RCP(B), p.200) He says further: **"If the Communist Parties want to become a real mass force, capable of pushing the revolution forward, they must link up with the trade unions and get their backing. Failure to take this specific feature of the situation in the West into account means leading the cause of the communist movement to certain doom."** (*Ibid.*, p. 202)

Comrade Stalin also analysed the contradictions within the colonial and semi-colonial countries. He pointed out that some were capitalistically developed and developing colonies, and others were lagging and more backward. This meant that some of the national bourgeoisie would split to support revolution, while another section would prefer to deal with the imperialists. **"Hence the task of the communist elements in the colonial countries is to link up with the revolutionary elements of the bourgeoisie, and above all with the peasantry, against the bloc of imperialism and the uncompromising elements of 'their own' bourgeoisie, in order, under the leadership of the proletariat, to wage a genuinely revolutionary struggle for liberation from imperialism."** He said from this that **"Only one conclusion follows: a number of colonial countries are now approaching their 1905."** A year later the united front of the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie in China launched a revolutionary war, the Northern Expedition, against the warlords and imperialists. In April 1927, the national bourgeoisie under Chiang Kai-shek split with the proletariat and dealt with the imperialists, and staged a bloody coup d'etat against the revolutionary forces in Shanghai.

The third question facing the international communist movement was what course for the Soviet Union. Lenin has analysed the period facing the Soviet Union as follows: **"The transition from capitalism to Communism represents an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope is converted into attempts at restoration."** He states further that **"...the bourgeoisie, whose resistance is increased tenfold by its overthrow (even if only in one country), and whose power lies not only in the strength of international capital, in the strength and durability of the international connections of the bourgeoisie, but also in the force of habit, in the strength of small production. For, unfortunately, small production is still very widespread in the world, and small production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale."** He concluded: **"For all these reasons the dictatorship of the proletariat is essential."** Lenin also stated that **"the new bourgeoisie" was "arising from among our Soviet government employees."** (V.I. Lenin, cited in *Political Report Ninth National Congress, Communist Party of China*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1969, pp. 8-9) As far as the final victory of socialism is concerned Lenin analysed the contradictions between the socialist state in the world of capitalist states as follows: **"We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Union side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end."** This is why Lenin said: **"Final victory can be achieved only on a world wide scale, and only by the joint efforts of the workers of all countries."** (V.I. Lenin *Eighth Congress of the RCP(B)*, March 18-23, 1919. *Report of the Central Committee and Report on Foreign Policy Delivered at a Joint Meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Moscow Soviet*, May 14, 1918, cited *ibid.*, p.216)

It fell to Comrade Stalin to lead the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet people to safeguard and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, bring about socialist industrialisation and agricultural collectivization, and achieve tremendous successes in socialist revolution and construction. In the course of this history of struggle Comrade Stalin, a great Marxist-Leninist, cleared out a number of counter-revolutionary representatives of the bourgeoisie who had sneaked into the Party, including Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin, Rykov and others. They were all enemies of Leninism, and tried to sabotage the Leninist line on a number of questions in order to strangle the socialist revolution.

Trotsky opposed Lenin's and Stalin's theory that it was possible to build socialism in one country, and set out his reactionary "theory of permanent revolution," stating it was impossible for a nation state to break free from

"material dependence on the world economy" and impossible to carry out socialist construction through self-reliance. He opposed the dictatorship of the proletariat, saying it would come into collision with the masses of peasants. He slandered and attacked Stalin for turning the state machine into an "unheard of tool for force and for strangling the independence of the people." He concentrated his attack on the Communist Party, the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He opposed the correct leadership of the Party under Stalin under the cloak of "fighting bureaucracy" and "restoring inner-Party democracy". He tried in vain to turn the CPSU(B) into a bourgeois-type Party with factions (such as Bernstein achieved in the German Social Democratic Party), that is, into a revisionist party, a party for the restoration of capitalism.

Trotsky attacked socialist industrialisation and agricultural collectivisation in order to restore capitalism and make the Soviet Union dependent on the imperialist states for modern industry. He tried to break the worker-peasant alliance with an ultra-leftist scheme to tax the peasantry to pay for an "ultra-industrialisation scheme." In this way he hoped to disrupt relations between town and countryside. Zinoviev and Kamenev also raised a hue and cry about the Soviet Union being technically and economically backwards, and formed an alliance with Trotsky in the summer of 1926.

Stalin wrote many works criticising the position of the Opposition, including *The Foundations of Leninism, Concerning Questions of Leninism, Questions and Answers*, criticising Trotsky's opportunist fallacies and defending Leninism. He said that **"lack of confidence in the socialist potentialities of our work of construction leads to liquidationism and to degeneration."** (J.V. Stalin, *Questions and Answers, Works, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, Vol. 7, p. 169*) Stalin believed the victory of socialism was possible in the Soviet Union because of the strong worker-peasant alliance backed by the international proletariat and the people in the colonies and semi-colonies. He pointed out that Trotsky's fallacies would "clear the way for a bourgeois democratic republic." (J.V. Stalin, "Political Report of the Central Committee to the Sixteenth Congress of the CPSU(B)", *Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1955, Vol. 12, p.365*) Stalin pointed out that Trotsky supported industrialisation in words but in deeds opposed it.

Radek, Bukharin and Rykov openly protected the interests of the Kulak class by putting forward the theory of the "dying out of class struggle." They alleged the greater the victories of socialism won, the less sharp the class struggle would become, the class enemy would withdraw from their positions without putting up any resistance, the kulaks would "peacefully" grow into socialism and so on. All this opposed collectivisation of the countryside.

Stalin pointed out that Bukharin, Rykov and company were the agents of the Kulaks in the Party, and warned against the theory of "dying out of class struggle" because **"it lulls the working class to sleep, undermines the mobilised preparedness of the revolutionary forces of our country, demobilises the working class and facilitates the attack of the capitalist elements against the Soviet regime."** (J.V. Stalin, "The Right Deviation in the CPSU(B)", *Works, FLPH, Moscow, 1955, Vol. 12, p.41*) Under Stalin's leadership, the Soviet Party and people resolutely waged repeated struggles against Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin and other representatives of the bourgeoisie who had wormed their way into the Party, utterly frustrated their opportunist line and finally purged them from the Party.

Stalin was thus able to lead the Soviet people to fulfill the proletarian internationalist duty of industrialising the country and collectivising agriculture. At this period however Stalin did not correctly analyse that class contradictions still existed in the Soviet Union, and that class struggle continued. Despite this theoretical shortcoming however, Stalin continued to lead the dictatorship of the proletariat, and gave great assistance to the international proletariat, and took great interest in and concern for the rising struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations in the colonial and semi-colonial countries in the East.

Comrade Stalin's leadership in the Third International was reflected in the correct orientation of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International in July-August 1928. This great congress was the forum of militant two-line struggle between Marxism-Leninism and various revisionist trends. The Congress analysed post-world war one events into three periods: from March 1917 to the end of 1923, marked by a series of revolutions and revolutionary struggles in Russia, Germany, Hungary, Turkey, Bulgaria, China, India, Korea and elsewhere; the second period, from 1924 to the end of 1927, the time of "relative, partial and temporary stabilization", signalled by a growing offensive by the employers and comparatively defensive struggle of the proletariat; the third period, beginning in 1928 when the relative capitalist stabilisation had come to an end, opened a new wave of struggles; between workers and employers, colonies and imperialists, among the imperialist powers, and between the capitalist and the socialist world. The struggle inside the Congress centered on the question of the "third period." Bukharin led the line that opposed the theory of the sharpening of class struggle on the international scale as a cover for his own collaboration with the kulak class. He gave the line that U.S. imperialism was an ex-

ception to the developing world capitalist crisis. The majority of the communist leaders around the world rejected Bukharin's and Trotsky's theses, and in the ensuing struggles a number of counter-revolutionary monsters leaped out to oppose Marxism-Leninism. In Canada a reflection of this international two-line struggle was the Trotskyism of Spector, and the Bukharinism of Macdonald. The left-in-form opportunism of Spector had covered the right opportunism (open trade unionism) of Macdonald. Thus the Communist Party of Canada had gone through the whole period of lull without Bolshevism itself, without preparing for the revolutionary storms of the 1930's, and thus they failed in their proletarian international duty to the workers and oppressed nations in the world. This set back revolution in Canada a considerably long period of time. It was as a result of the very sharp class struggle within the Sixth Congress of the Third International that various opportunists were forced to jump out. Thus Comrade Stalin made a very valuable contribution to the workers around the world, as well as to the oppressed nations by taking a resolute stand against opportunism in the international communist movement. (W. Foster, *Ibid.*, pp. 265-6) The Sixth Congress of the Communist International was a great inspiration and guide to communist militants around the world.

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International, held in Moscow from July 25 to August 21, 1935 also gave great assistance to the international communist movement in rectifying deviation by a number of communist parties from the general line of the Sixth Congress. The Marxist-Leninist fighter Georgi Dimitroff, head of the Comintern and hero of the Reichstag fire trial, smashed the social democratic line about fascism being a "revolt of the middle class." He correctly analysed it as "the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital." He proposed the general line of organising a workers' united front which could mobilise around itself a people's front of intellectuals, farmers, and other democratic sections of the masses under the leadership of the proletariat. Such a united front in the capitalist countries should wage struggles for democracy, against fascism and war, and for the peoples rights against reactionary finance capital. The Seventh Congress suggested a number of forms of realising this united front, but the essence of its content was a united front of the working class gathering around itself the broadest sections of the people under the leadership of the modern proletariat to isolate the main enemy to the maximum and mobilise the people against fascism and war. (Foster, *Ibid.*, pp. 320-21)

One of the vicious slanders peddled by the fascists and repeated by the Trotskyites, social democrats and other opportunists in the working class movement was that Comrade Stalin dominated the world's communist parties, and that he issued instructions to them on all questions. This slander aimed to break the solidarity and loyalty of the most advanced workers and their parties to the Soviet Union, and to Comrade Stalin, the leading authority in the international communist movement and a beloved friend of the revolutionary leaders and people around the world. The most authoritative assessment of Comrade Stalin written during this period was penned by Chairman Mao Tsetung of the Communist Party of China, in 1939 itself leading a successful national democratic revolution against Japanese militarism. Chairman Mao wrote in celebration of Comrade Stalin's sixtieth birthday, "Congratulating Stalin is not a formality. Congratulating Stalin means supporting him and his cause, supporting the victory of socialism and the way forward for mankind which he points out, it means supporting a dear friend. For the great majority of mankind today are suffering, and mankind can free itself from suffering only by the road pointed out by Stalin and with his help." Chairman Mao asks who are the real friends of China, and treat the Chinese people as their brothers: "They are the Soviet people and Stalin." He concludes his essay: "Stalin is the true friend of the cause of liberation of the Chinese people. No attempt to sow dissension, no lies and calumnies, can affect the Chinese people's whole-hearted love and respect for Stalin and our genuine friendship for the Soviet people." (Mao Tsetung, "Stalin, friend of the Chinese People", December 20, 1939, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Foreign Languages Press, 1965, p. 335) The lies and calumnies spread against Comrade Stalin by all the enemies of the people were of the very same nature as the lies and calumnies spread against Lenin, Marx and Engels. Because the class struggle had advanced to a much higher stage, naturally the lies and calumnies became greater, and their intensity more vicious. This simply reflected the sharpening of the class struggle on a world scale, and communists looked upon this as a sign of the strength of the communist movement internationally and treasured its unity like the apple of its eye. The steadfastness and loyalty of the international communist movement reflected by the staunchness of the Third International is one of the glorious tributes to the Marxist leadership of Comrade Stalin, and the Soviet people, who had made the Soviet Union a citadel, a mighty fortress of socialism in defence of all the workers, oppressed peoples and nations of the world. All progressive mankind looked to Comrade Stalin, to the Soviet Union, to the mighty Third International as the hope for the deliverance of mankind from fascism, and all reaction.

The greatest test of the proletarian internationalism, of the steadfastness, loyalty, courage and scientific outlook of the CPSU(B) led by Comrade Stalin and the Soviet Union was the Nazi aggression launched against the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941 by Hitlerite Germany, and all of Western Europe which lay prostrate under the yoke of Nazi domination. Comrade Stalin proved equal to the task of Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Armed Forces, and the Soviet people equal to the task of defending their homeland, and repelling the fascist beast right across Europe to its lair where they put it to death. Lenin's prediction proved that "the existence of the Soviet Union side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end." Because Comrade Stalin had followed the course charted by Lenin, resolutely opposed the capitalist raders within the CPSU(B) and industrialised the country and collectivised the agriculture relying in the main on themselves, on their own efforts, the Soviet people were militarily, politically and spiritually prepared to meet an enemy of a considerably greater force, draw him deep within the Soviet territory, and then wipe it out. Such a brilliant strategy demanded both the iron discipline and revolutionary initiative of the masses, first and foremost from the Soviet communists, who led the whole people to defeat the main enemy. During this war the Soviet Union received the support from the proletariat in the capitalist countries, and the support from the colonial and semi-colonial peoples around the world. The Chinese people played a particularly heroic role in tying up the Japanese militarists in this period, thus making it impossible for them to open an eastern front against the Soviet Union. The Communist Parties all around the world made many glorious sacrifices in the world war against fascism.

On May 15, 1943, a resolution was circulated to all the member parties of the Third International consulting them on a proposal to dissolve the Third International, and on June 10, 1943 the affiliated parties gave their unanimous agreement to the dissolution of the Third International. This was an important and correct political decision, just as the decision to dissolve the First International was correct. In each case the specific historical conditions facing the international proletariat, although in no way similar, led the leaders of the communist movement to dissolve a certain organisational form of the international communist movement. In 1943 the circumstances were determined by the anti-fascist war. The dissolution assisted the various communist parties to advance their initiative in building the united front of the peoples in struggle against the common fascist enemy. It helped strengthen the united fight against the Hitler-Mussolini-Tojo alliance of fascist imperialist powers. Did the dissolution of the Third International mean that the international communist movement had been dissolved? Not at all. The proletarian internationalist duty of every communist is to lead the masses in struggle against the main enemy in one's own country. But opportunists who are always very good at taking resolutions and accepting them without question, and then do nothing whatever to implement them, indeed, do just the opposite, have never been deterred from doing bad things, or stimulated to do good things by formal organisational connection. Indeed opportunist elements worm their way into the political party of the proletariat precisely to advance their self-interests, not the interests of revolution, and when they are resolutely opposed they make all sorts of noise, do their best to disrupt and split the Party of the proletariat.

We can give examples of this from the history of the Communist Party of Canada. In 1925 the Communist International instructed the communist parties to Bolshevise themselves in the lull period in order to prepare for revolutionary high tide which was inevitably going to follow. Macdonald and Spector received these instructions, agreed with them formally, but maintained the federalist party structure, refused to integrate the immigrant workers with the Canadian workers, refused to organise the Party in Quebec, refused to revolutionise their own thinking and style of work. When the class struggle at the Sixth Congress in 1928 exposed them as thorough anti-communists (Spector a Trotskyist, Macdonald a peddler of the Canadian exceptionalism line) their betrayal of the Canadian communist movement was exposed. But the new leadership did not rectify the situation. In fact they, outdid Macdonald and Spector. Instead of simply accepting the line of the Third International and not implementing it, McEwan, Buck, Smith, Ryerson, Carr and other revisionists took the decisions of the Seventh International and actually implemented an opposite line: they tried to build an anti-fascist united front under the hegemony of the bourgeoisie. As a consequence the party was virtually liquidated in 1939, and in 1941 the revisionists had to beg the state to let them out of jail so they could organise the "anti-fascist" united front. Does this mean the line of the Third International was wrong? No, of course not. Does this mean that the Canadian communists did not play a progressive role in the struggles of the day? No, this would also be an incorrect assessment. The Canadian masses did want revolution; they did love and trust Comrade Stalin and look to the Soviet Union as the way forward. Over 2,500 Canadians fought in the Republic of Spain and the Canadian Communist Party brought forth the outstanding Marxist-Leninist fighter, Dr. Norman Bethune, who under the guidance of Mao Tsetung Thought, made an

everlasting contribution to communism, and to proletarian internationalism. But the leadership of the Communist Party of Canada were in the main opportunists — they had divided interests. Part of their interests were for revolution: but a good part of their interests were for themselves. A true communist can have no interests for himself; he must only be interested in serving the people. Thus the communist leaders in Canada were not true communists like Norman Bethune, and they degenerated even further after World War II. The point we are making here is that it did not matter whether there was an organisational form for the international communist movement or not. It is a law of dialectics, as Marx explained with respect to the history of the First International, that old content tries to move in and take over the new form. Karl Marx organised the First International to combat utopian socialist sects; the sects tried to turn the First International into a sect. Frederick Engels organised the Second International in a struggle to defeat the opportunists; the opportunists moved into the Second International and succeeded in taking over that form for themselves. Did this mean that there was no advance from the First International to the Second International? This would be nonsense to think so. Did the collapse of the Second International mean a defeat for the modern proletariat? Quite the contrary. It exposed opportunism to the working class so they could see its ugly features in great detail. It educated the working class for the collapse of the Second International and the world shaking victory of Bolshevism in Russia demonstrated in a great revolutionary storm the correctness of Leninism. The first victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat showed that Leninism was mandatory for the proletariat of all the countries in the world, that Leninism was Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, and was of universal significance to the proletariat and oppressed nations. The Third International gave organisational expression to the victory of Leninism, and given the concrete historical conditions of the time, this proved to be the most adequate, practical form in which to advance the international communist movement. When this organisational form had finished serving its purpose, and new conditions demanded new forms of strengthening proletarian internationalism, the Third International was dissolved. Anyone who denies this historical fact is either muddled-headed or an outright opportunist. The dissolution of the Third International in 1943 had nothing whatsoever to do with the liquidation of the international communist movement. Just the opposite occurred. The international communist movement grew in depth and breadth during and after World War II.

Did the dissolution of the Third International mean that the two-line struggle within the international communist movement had ended also? If it had, it would have been dead. But it was very much alive, and very sharp indeed. In fact one can say a new phase in the two-line struggle began in the international communist movement with the dissolution of the Third International. This phase of struggle is properly called the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. We have already stated that in fact the Communist Party of Canada never did become a real communist party, a Bolshevik Party. Lenin had noted in 1921 that the new communist parties were such in name only:

"In the overwhelming majority of countries our Parties are still very far from being what real Communist Parties, real vanguards of the genuinely revolutionary and only revolutionary class, Parties in which all members take part in the struggles, in the movement, in the everyday life of the masses, should be." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. X, p.299, cited by Fergus McKeen, "Communism Versus Opportunism. An Examination of the Revision of Marxism in the Communist Movement of Canada", PCDN, Vol. 3, No. 435, August 17, 1974, p.30)

In 1925 the Communist International instructed the western communist parties in particular to Bolshevise themselves. This process, as our investigation shows, did not take place in Canada. Indeed after the dissolution of the Third International the two-line struggle intensified in Canada, as well as in a number of other countries. In August 1943 the Communist Party of Canada was illegally liquidated and the Labour Progressive Party was created. During the May 20-22, 1944 convention of the CPUSA, Browder pushed a line to liquidate the Party and established a social democratic organisation called the Communist Political Association. Browder's book, *Teheran: Our Path in War and Peace*, was an open declaration of modern revisionism and liquidationism. The International communist movement reacted with the publication of Jacques Duclos' article, "On the Dissolution of the Communist Party of the USA", published in the theoretical organ of the Communist Party of France, *Cahiers du Communisme*; the *New York Worker* reprinted it on May 27, 1945. In his article Duclos criticised a number of communist parties in Latin America for following the Browder line, especially the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba and its leader Blas Roca, who warmly hailed Browder's line in the March 1945 edition of *U.S. Political Affairs Magazine*. (McKeen, *ibid.*, p.30) There was a definite trend of revisionism in 1945, and there was a sharp struggle in the international communist movement against it.

An important event in the international communist movement to take assessment of the new alignment of forces which emerged after World War II, and to assist

the communist movement in overcoming the revisionist line which was showing itself in the course of class struggle against U.S. imperialism after the war, was a meeting of Nine European Communist Parties held in Warsaw at the end of September 1947. A.S. Zhdanov's Report at the Informational Conference of Representatives of the Communist Parties of Nine European Countries was printed in *Pravda* on October 22, 1947. In the portion of his report on the "tasks of the communist parties" he gives the following assessment of the international communist movement, at that time:

"The dissolution of the Comintern, in accordance with the requirements of the development of the labour movement under the conditions of the new historical situation, has played a positive role. The dissolution of the Comintern has forever put an end to the slanders of the enemies of Communism and the labour movement to the effect that Moscow allegedly interferes in the internal life of other states, that the Communist Parties of the various countries allegedly act not in the interests of the peoples but on orders from abroad.

"The Comintern was formed after the First World War, when the Communist Parties were still weak, when ties between the working classes of various countries were almost non-existent, and when the Communist Parties had no generally acknowledged leaders of the working-class movement." ("On the International Situation", *Political Affairs Monthly*, January 1948, Vol. 5, No. 1.) Then Zhdanov analysed how the various parties grew strong in both Europe and Asia, that the Comintern began to restrict the development of the communist movement, and it had to be dissolved to maximize the unity and growth of the various Communist Parties. He says new forms of liaison had to be created.

"However, the present situation of Communist Parties also has its shortcomings. Some comrades have come to believe that the dissolution of the Comintern meant the liquidation of all liaison, of all contact between the fraternal communist Parties. Yet experience has shown that such dissociation among the parties is incorrect, harmful and, in essence, unnatural. The communist movement develops within a national framework, but at the same time, has general problems and interests for parties of various countries. A rather strange picture results: the Socialists, who outdid themselves in order to prove that the Comintern dictated directives from Moscow to Communists of all lands, re-established their International; whereas Communists refrain even from meeting among themselves, not to speak of consulting with each other on questions of mutual interests, fearful of the slander of enemies with respect to the 'hand of Moscow'. Representatives of the most varied kinds of activity — scientists, co-operators, trade unionists, youth, students — consider it possible to maintain international contacts, to consult with each other on problems of their work, to arrange international conferences, but Communists even of allied countries hesitate to establish friendly contacts among themselves. There is no doubt that such a situation, if it were prolonged would be pregnant with extremely harmful consequences for the development of the work of fraternal parties. This need of consultation and voluntary coordination of the activities of the separate parties is ripe, especially now when continued isolation may lead to the weakening of mutual understanding and, at times even to serious errors." (Ibid., p.24)

Following this meeting a new form of consultation between the various communist and workers parties was established called the Communist Information Bureau, which published the Marxist-Leninist and progressive journal, *For a Lasting Peace...* At the very time Zhdanov was making his assessment of the dangerous situation which might arise if the Communist parties do not find a way to consult with one another to sort out various contradictions, the Yugoslav Titoist, revisionist, Trotskyist clique was trying to subvert the People's Republic of Albania and turn it into a colony of Yugoslavia. Tito, a notorious national chauvinist, made no efforts to disguise his imperialist schemes with respect to Albania. In November 1947 the Yugoslav revisionists brought enormous pressure to bear on the Albanian Party of Labour to reduce Albania to a virtual colony of Yugoslavia. The February 1948 Eighth Plenary meeting of the Albanian Party succumbed to the pressure of the Yugoslavians and adopted a number of economic ties between the two countries which would have virtually led to the elimination of the Albanian government. This plenum, a black stain on the history of the Albanian Party of Labour, also considered the unification of the Albanian armed forces with the Yugoslav armed forces. Open attempts were made to divide Albania from the Soviet Union, and anti-Soviet tendencies were manifested. The Titoites directly interfered in the internal Party and state affairs of the Albanian nation. The Yugoslavian revisionists pressed very hard for their plans to colonise Albania, tried to force Soviet advisors to be withdrawn from the Albanian army and attempted to secure the integration of the army under the supreme command of Tito. Comrade Enver Hoxha's staunch resistance to the anti-Marxist, anti-Albanian position of the Yugoslavs was of critical importance. The Titoites conspired to occupy Albania with their army under the subterfuge that Greece was planning to invade Albania and Yugoslavia was going to "protect" it. Comrade Enver Hoxha raised this question in the central committee and on his proposal the Albanian communists rejected the

proposed army divisions being stationed in Albania. This historic act of resistance saved Albania from military occupation and enslavement. Furthermore Comrade Hoxha informed Comrade Stalin about Tito's demands and interference in Albanian affairs. At this difficult time for the Albanian Party and state, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B) came to their assistance. A letter from the CPSU(B) Central Committee to the Central Committee of the CP of Yugoslavia severely criticised them for their anti-Soviet attitude, for following an opportunist line which led to the re-establishment of capitalism, for violations in Leninist norms in the inner life of the Party, and for the arrogance and conceit of the leaders of the CP of Yugoslavia. "Such an abnormal state within the Yugoslav Communist Party constitutes a serious danger for the life and development of the party." (letter of the CC of the CPSU(B) to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, May 4, 1948, cited. *History of the Party of Labour of Albania*, the Naim Frasherri Publishing House, Tirana, 1971, p.318) The Communist Party of Albania expressed its proletarian internationalist solidarity in the following manner:

"At the most critical moment of the fierce conflict which existed between the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Albania and the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, a conflict caused by the anti-Marxist Yugoslav leadership, the help of the Bolshevik Party of the Soviet Union, which was extended to our Party and to all other sister communist parties, was the great salvation of our people, of our Communist Party. ("Communique of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Albania, July 1, 1948." Ibid., p.319)

The conflict between the Marxist-Leninist leadership of the Communist Party of Albania led by Comrade Enver Hoxha and the modern revisionist, anti-communist, agent of U.S. imperialism, Tito, thus goes back a considerable length of time. Those who suggest that there was no international communist movement after World War II, or that the CPSU(B) under the leadership of Comrade Stalin did not exert a revolutionary and authoritative role in the international communist movement are either ignoramuses or anti-communists. It was Comrade Stalin and the CPSU(B) which came to the aid of its fraternal party, the Communist Party of Albania, to assist it against the social-imperialist schemes of Tito, and behind his machinations of Anglo-U.S. imperialism, which was trying to dominate all of the Balkans in order to undermine the solidarity of the People's democracies in Eastern Europe and turn back the clock of history. In June 1948, the Communist Information Bureau, representing the CPSU and communist parties from Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Poland, France, Italy, and Czechoslovakia, wrote an authoritative statement "Concerning the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia". The statement criticised the attitude of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia to the military personnel of the Soviet Union stationed in their country. It criticised the theory that small-scale agriculture in the countryside does not give rise to capitalism, and opposed the line of buying and selling land as, well as buying and selling wage-labour, and the line that the peasantry is the leading force in the country. They strongly criticised the petit bourgeois nationalism of the Party, the liquidationist line of Tito, Kardelj, Dijas, and Rankovich, denounced the bureaucratic structure in the Party, the lack of elections of comrades to leading posts, the lack of criticism and self-criticism, and the sectarian bureaucratic organisation of the Party modeled on Trotsky's theories of cultivating military leadership. The Yugoslavs were criticised for being arrogant in response to criticism — they arrested central committee members without allowing them to publish their criticisms of the Party's leadership. They had also passed a number of leftist laws nationalising small and medium sized businesses and caused shortages of supplies and dislocation; they did the same with their grain laws. Their announcement that capitalism had ended was ultra-leftist and did not correspond with the predominance of small scale agriculture in the Yugoslavian countryside.

The Information Bureau cautioned that the elimination of the kulaks as a class requires detailed preparatory work in the countryside in order to prepare conditions for the collectivization of agriculture; has only brings irreparable harm. The Information Bureau further denounced the fact that the Yugoslav Party put itself outside the Information Bureau of fraternal parties. The Yugoslav Party had fallen under the domination of nationalists, and it was no longer a proletarian internationalist party. Its line that the socialist countries were more of a threat to Yugoslavian independence than imperialism showed that in fact Yugoslavia was on its way to becoming a colony of U.S. imperialism. The Information Bureau called on the genuine elements to make the party rectify its errors and return to the path of proletarian internationalism.

The CC of the Communist Party of Albania gave its full approval to the resolution of the Information Bureau and in a special communique condemned the treacherous, anti-Soviet and anti-Albanian course taken by the leadership of the CP of Yugoslavia. At the Eleventh Plenum of the Communist Party of Albania held in September 1948, the Party analysed the events leading up to the Eighth Plenum and denounced the decisions of the Second and Eighth Plenum as anti-Marxist and harmful. Further the Eleventh Plenum reaffirmed:

"the unshakable determination of the Party to follow the policy of friendship and close fraternal collaboration with the Soviet Union and with the Bolshevik Party led by J.V. Stalin, which stood at the head of the socialist camp and of the entire workers' revolutionary democratic and anti-imperialist movement in the world. The Party stressed that it was a duty to study the experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and to apply it in a creative manner under the conditions of Albania." (Ibid., p.323)

Thus while it is true that the struggle against modern revisionism did begin after World War II — or one can say the two-line struggle developed to a different stage at that point in history — only the modern revisionists, Trotskyists and Titoites, together with their imperialist masters, would claim that the Soviet Union acted in a social-imperialist manner after the Second World War. The correct assessment of the alignment of class forces at the end of World War II is as follows. The world was split up into two camps: the anti-imperialist democratic camp and the anti-democratic imperialist camp, with aims and objectives diametrically opposite.

"The democratic camp was made up of the Soviet Union and the countries of the people's democracies. At its head stood the Soviet Union. It was supported by the entire international democratic and workers' movement, by all progressive-minded persons fighting in defence of democracy, freedom and the independence of peoples. The aim of this camp was to secure world peace, the independence of the peoples, democracy and progress towards socialism. This could be attained only in struggle against imperialism.

"The imperialist camp had the USA as its leading force. It relied on the reactionary classes and on all the anti-democratic forces in the capitalist countries. The aim of this camp was to save the old capitalist order, to suppress the workers' revolutionary and national liberation movements, to re-establish the capitalist regime in the countries of people's democracy. By making use of their great economic and military potential, the U.S. imperialists sought to establish their domination over the world. To achieve this aim, the imperialists headed by the USA launched a frenzied hostile campaign against the Soviet Union and against all the socialist freedom and peace-loving forces." (Ibid., p.246)

This overall scientific assessment of the class alignment of forces indicates that the test of proletarian internationalism of a single communist, or a communist party is its attitude towards imperialism: does it devote its central energy and struggle to fight imperialism, or is there some other interest in mind. This becomes the touchstone to distinguish between genuine Marxism-Leninism, and sham Marxism-Leninism, i.e. real Trotskyism and revisionism of the Tito, Khrushchev variety. "The attitude towards imperialism is a question of the content of political line. It serves as a gauge for assessing practical actions, and in the end, a demarcation line which divides two warring camps, dividing those who defend the vital interests of the peoples and of the future of mankind from those who trample them underfoot, dividing revolutionaries from reactionaries and traitors." (Report on the Activity of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, cited in *Mass Line*, Vol. 5, No. 55, May 25, 1975, p.35)

In 1952, the year before Comrade Stalin died, he wrote a book called *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*. Stalin correctly analysed for the first time on the level of theory that there are contradictions arising between the productive forces and the relations of production under socialism. He warned that if the line advocated by revisionist theoreticians who denied the decisive role of the relations of production, and took the technocratic bourgeois line that forces of production are decisive was adopted, then indeed the conflict between relations of production and productive forces would "become a serious brake on the further development of the productive forces." (J.V. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, P.75) Stalin died before he could sort out these questions within the Soviet Union.

After Stalin died Khrushchev's revisionist clique usurped the leadership of the CPSU, and the Soviet state. As a result of this seizure of state power by counter-revolutionaries, the Soviet Union turned into its opposite. From the dictatorship of the proletariat it was turned into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The socialist gains were liquidated, capitalism restored, and from being the citadel of proletarian internationalism, the Soviet Union degenerated into a social-imperialist state. Whereas before the revisionists who had wormed their way into and taken over the Social Democratic Parties simply used the old state power to serve as the agents of the monopoly capitalists, in the case of the Soviet Union the social-imperialists laid hold of a vast, powerful state apparatus, and, within a short period of time, became one of the two superpowers seeking world hegemony.

The main events in the two-line struggle in the international communist movement after the death of Stalin in 1953 are as follows. All of the revisionist elements in all the communist parties, for revisionism is an international bourgeois trend, began to revive and gnaw at the foundations of their parties and to undermine the unity of the international communist movement. In the first years they were busy trying to get the reins on their own par-

ties. Khrushchev began to launch his poison about the "cult of the individual." In the years 1954-55 the preparations of the revisionists for their general onslaught against Marxism-Leninism assumed wide proportions. There were three main directions to their work: spreading the idea of the dying out of class struggle; in coming to terms with the Titoite clique and rehabilitating it; and in substituting the people's struggle in defence of peace with collaboration with the heads of imperialism. As a consequence of this capitalist elements in Hungary and a number of other countries were given free play in the cities, and especially in the countryside. Bourgeois ideology and culture were given free play. In Albania contrary-wise the fight against these bourgeois elements was intensified further. In May 1955 Khrushchev arbitrarily rejected the decision the Information Bureau made about Yugoslavia in 1948, and the assessments of all the communist and workers parties in regard to the betrayal of the Tito clique, and went to Belgrade at the head of a Soviet party and government delegation. Khrushchev acted in a high handed manner, and informed the Albanian Party it was simply going to change the assessment of the Information Bureau and print it without having the members meet. He humiliated himself before Tito and the imperialists. He advanced the Hungarian revisionist Imre Nagy who was becoming a big menace to socialism in Hungary; he openly opposed socialist collectivisation of the countryside, and principles of democratic centralism in the party.

The biggest single offensive against Marxism-Leninism launched by the Khrushchevite revisionists was at the 20th Congress of the CPSU in February 1956 when, after three years of preparation, Khrushchev unleashed a fierce attack against the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, and against the Marxist-Leninist general line which had been followed by the CPSU under the leadership of J.V. Stalin. Khrushchev launched his revisionism under the cloak of it being "a creative development of the Marxist-Leninist theory in the conditions created by the changes in the ratio of world forces in favour of socialism." He launched his line of "peaceful competition between the two systems." In addition the Central Committee of the CPSU declared Yugoslavia a "socialist" country, thereby tearing up all the Information Bureau decisions, and openly supporting the liquidationist line of the Titoite traitors. The attack against J.V. Stalin was a direct blow against his revolutionary work, against the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the socialist order. It had the definite aim of justifying the liquidation of the Marxist-Leninist line of the CPSU worked out by its former congresses and of having a new revisionist line adopted and revising Marxism-Leninism. The 20th Congress was welcomed by all revisionists, especially the Titoites. It caused a tense situation in the international communist movement.

The revisionist line was advanced by Palmiro Togliatti who headed the opportunist leadership of the Communist Party of Italy; he pushed the line of being against the "hegemony of a single party" which was simply a way of attacking the unity and the common political line in the international communist movement based on Marxism-Leninism. He advanced the creation of "many countries", the thesis of "poly centrism", and came forward with the slogan "Italian road to socialism." The Canadian Party (Labour Progressive Party) came out with a programmatic position in favour of the "parliamentary road to socialism" as early as 1952. Revisionism also spread to socialist countries, and deepened especially in Poland and Hungary. The dictatorship of the proletariat, under the influence and interference of Khrushchev, was paralysed, and various counter-revolutionary groups, disguised as "cultural groups" were set up in various cities. The international imperialists and revisionists together organised the counter-revolutionary revolt in the Polish city Poznan in June 1956, and the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary in October-November 1956. This was a grave event; the Workers' Party was destroyed; people's democracy was in danger of a complete liquidation; anti-communist hysteria was kindled around the world. The Khrushchev group hesitated to send troops, but under great pressure from below they sent in Soviet troops. The counter-revolution was the result of the work of the Soviet revisionists and Yugoslavs. The Hungarian counter-revolution failed, but its roots were never destroyed. Nagy was sacrificed, but his close collaborators kept their key political positions in the state and re-organised ruling party.

The Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of China opposed the revisionist turn of events. Chairman Mao wrote, **On the Correct Handling of Contradictions** on February 27, 1957, in response to the rise of modern revisionism, and he referred specifically to the counter-revolutionary events in Hungary and to the rioting and damages caused to China by various counter-revolutionary actions. Khrushchev suffered a setback in his plans to have his revisionist theses adopted by the international communist movement at the meeting of the communist and workers parties in Moscow in November 1957. Both Comrade Enver Hoxha and Chairman Mao spoke at this conference, together with Marxist-Leninists from several other parties. The iron logic of the Marxist-Leninist scientific positions forced the revisionists into retreat. The Declaration of the Moscow 1957 Conference summed up the experience of the international communist movement and the universal

laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction, and defined the common tasks of the communist and workers' parties, as well as the norms governing relations among them. The Declaration was based on the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism. Revisionism was defined as the principle danger to the international communist movement. It exposed its sources, namely the existence of bourgeois influence, as the internal source, and capitulation to imperialism as the external source. The Communist delegations made a concession to the revisionists by leaving in the incorrect formulations about the 20th Congress opening a new stage in the international communist movement. This concession was necessary to defend the Soviet Union from the frenzied attacks unleashed against it by the enemies of communism, and to preserve the unity of the movement. In general however the Moscow 1957 Declaration marks a victory for the Marxist-Leninist forces in the struggle against revisionism. The Yugoslav Titoites hated this Declaration and denounced it as a "return to Stalinism." Meanwhile Khrushchev's policy of demagoguery, eclecticism and contradictions, of first praising the U.S. and wanting to have close collaboration with it; then denouncing the U.S. in the most ultra-left manner.

The Khrushchev revisionist group attempted a decisive blow against the international communist movement with a sudden stab in the back at the meeting held in Bucharest in June 1960 of the delegations who had gathered to attend the Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party. According to the agreements in the communist movement this meeting was only to decide on a time and place for a meeting of the communist and workers parties. But even more disturbing than turning the meeting in Bucharest into a formal session of the international communist movement, the Soviet Party issued a document a few hours before the meeting launching slanderous attacks against the Chinese Communist Party, and Khrushchev did his utmost to have these calumnies discussed in the meeting, and to have the Communist Party of China expelled from the international communist movement. The atmosphere was very tense. The Chinese delegation rejected the slanderous charges. The Albanian Party rejected the procedure being followed as a violation of the norms of the international communist movement, and demanded a special meeting to be called according to the rule of procedure. This position won the support of a number of Parties. Despite its persistent efforts at the Bucharest meeting the Soviet Union did not succeed in expelling the Communist Party of China from the international communist movement. It was decided to hold a meeting of all the communist and workers parties in Moscow in November 1960. A special commission to prepare for it was set up comprising 26 communist parties including the Albanian Party of Labour.

The Khrushchev plot had failed; in Bucharest revisionism suffered its first defeat. This was a defeat for modern revisionism as a whole, which from then on began to decline. It was then clear that the leadership of the CPSU headed by Khrushchev was a clique of traitors and constituted a grave danger to Marxism-Leninism and socialism. After the Bucharest meeting the modern Khrushchevite revisionists attacked the Albanian Party in many ways in order to split it, and intimidate it. All these methods failed. The Khrushchevite revisionists had also organised all sorts of plots and conspiracies in other communist parties including the Communist Party of China. But these various conspiracies were exposed one after another.

At the Moscow meeting of 81 communist and workers parties, the Chinese Communist Party and the Albanian Party of Labour severely criticised the revisionist line, and were able to win a number of communist parties to their position, and force the revisionists to retreat again. The Declaration approved by the 81 parties in general embodied the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist principles. The Khrushchevite revisionists had lost another round against Marxism-Leninism. Despite the fact that the Document contained some incorrect assessment and theses from the 20th Congress, the delegation from Albania and China, while opposing these formulations, agreed to incorporate them for the sake of the unity of the international communist movement.

But Khrushchev just threw this 81 Party document into the garbage as soon as he signed it. In October 1961 at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU Khrushchev, in complete violation of the 1957 and 1960 Declarations and in complete violation of elementary rules of the relation between fraternal communist workers' parties, publicly attacked the Albanian Party of Labour with slanders and accusations of the basest kind. The Chinese delegation soundly exposed the Soviet position, and the lackey role of the other revisionists who knew nothing whatever about Albanian-Soviet relations. The Khrushchevites thus took upon themselves the responsibility of becoming the splitters of the unity of the socialist camp and international communist movement. In November 1961 Enver Hoxha made a detailed analysis of Albanian-Soviet relations, and pointed out that the aggravation was the anti-Marxist and great state chauvinist policy pursued by Khrushchev and his revisionist group. Until June 1960 state relations between the two countries had been normal. Comrade Hoxha concluded his speech:

"For the sake of the unity of the communist movement and the socialist camp, of the interests of our countries,

our Party has always been ready to settle the existing differences. But it has always been and is of the opinion that these problems will be resolved correctly only in a Marxist-Leninist way, in conditions of equality, and not under pressure and dicta. We are hopeful and confident of the sense of justice of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." (Enver Hoxha, speech delivered at the solemn meeting on the 20th Anniversary of the founding of the PLA and the 44th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Tirana, 1961, p.79, cited in *ibid.*, p.499)

The Albanian Party of Labour also wrote directly to the CPSU Central Committee to analyse the activity of the anti-Marxist Khrushchev group with objectivity and correctness:

"Being profoundly concerned about the present undesirable and very grave situation in Albanian-Soviet relations, which has its source in the brutal anti-Marxist actions of N. Khrushchev and his group, the Party of Labour of Albania calls on the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to view coolly the situation created and to take the necessary steps to normalize it..." (letter from the Central Committee of the PLA to the Central Committee of the CPSU, approved 12 October, 1961 and handed to the Soviet Embassy on 11th November, 1961.)

What was the answer of the revisionist group of Khrushchev to this frank and comradely act? The Soviet Union broke off diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania. This was an unprecedented split act on the part of the revisionists and showed their great power chauvinism, the same outlook as the Yellow International, the outlook of social-imperialism.

After this the Khrushchevite revisionists continued to violate the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary theses of the Moscow Declarations (1957 and 1960) of the international communist movement. They continued to make concessions to U.S. imperialism and to attack Marxist-Leninist parties, directing their main attack at the Communist Party of China and the Albanian Party of Labour. These two parties for their part considered it their historic duty to expose the demagoguery and manoeuvres of the Khrushchevite revisionist group, to lay bare its counter-revolutionary policy. They did not get caught up in trivialities and banalities. Rather they dealt with the principle issues facing the international communist movement, exposing the anti-Marxist views of Khrushchevite revisionism, its inconsistencies, eclecticism, its swinging from opportunism to adventurism, and its diversionist activities. The two leading Marxist-Leninist parties showed the true features of the traitors to Marxism-Leninism and showed them as violators of the joint declarations of the communist and workers' parties and as splitters of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

Khrushchevite revisionists continue to impose their line of rapprochement and reconciliation with Tito on the entire international communist movement. They covered up their revisionism with the slogan "struggle against dogmatism". But their pro-imperialist activities in world politics could not be hidden. In 1960 they supported the United Nations sending of forces to the Congo to undermine the liberation struggles of the Congolese government. In 1962 they accepted "international" control over Soviet ships and Cuban territory in the "Cuban missile crisis". They committed treason against the German people, the socialist camp, the people of Europe and the world, by abandoning the idea of signing a separate peace treaty with Germany and settling the German question, especially the question of West Berlin. In August 1963 Khrushchev signed the Moscow Treaty on the partial banning of nuclear weapons which was exposed by the Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of China as a plot to preserve the nuclear monopoly between the two superpowers. In October 1962 the Albanian Party of Labour, under the slogan "Let us draw once and for all a clear-cut line of demarcation from revisionism in all spheres", launched a very big campaign to bring the truth about revisionism to the international communist movement. On June 14, 1963 the Chinese Communist Party published **A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement** which is a great Marxist-Leninist document drawn up under the supervision of Chairman Mao Tse-tung. Communists from all around the world responded with great enthusiasm to these Marxist-Leninist materials published by these two truly proletarian internationalist parties. The resistance to revisionism grew everywhere. A great number of revolutionary communists broke from the revisionist leaders. In a number of countries (Australia, Ceylon, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Peru, Austria, England, Holland, Spain, France, Italy, etc.) new Marxist-Leninist communist parties, revolutionary groups and centres to fight revisionism were set up. In July 1963 the Soviet leadership responded to the Proposal of the Communist Party of China with a frontal attack of slanders and foul invective. In view of the split brought about by the Soviet revisionist leadership in the socialist camp and the international communist movement, the Party of Labour of Albania addressed an Open Letter to the Members of the CPSU. This letter exposed the treacherous efforts of Khrushchev to organise an illegal meeting of the international communist movement in Moscow in December 1964. This meeting was illegal because it violated all the

rules agreed upon by the communist and workers' parties in November 1960 in Moscow. Khrushchev had hoped to use this meeting to condemn the Communist Party of China and the Albanian Party of Labour and "expel" them from the international communist movement; and to strengthen the badly shaken ranks of the revisionist camp in order to impose his will on them. But the revisionists met with insurmountable resistance from revolutionaries all over the world. In all fields revisionism suffered defeats. Quarrels and disagreements broke out within the revisionist camp. Togliatti's "Testament" called for detaching the revisionist parties from the hegemony of Khrushchev's group and called for "polycentrism". In October 1964, in order to prevent total defeat for their anti-Marxist Leninist line, the revisionists in the Soviet Union removed Khrushchev from power. The new Brezhnev-Kosygin group pushed the Soviet Union even further down the path of revisionism into social-imperialism.

The real unity of the international communist movement could only be brought about through a determined struggle of principle of the Marxist-Leninists against the modern revisionists. The greatest historical event in this world struggle was the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution personally led by Chairman Mao Tsetung. In the course of this great revolutionary upheaval, the millions and millions of workers, peasants and youth, led by the Communist Party and Chairman Mao, seized political power from the handful of revisionists who were taking the capitalist road. The solving of a number of problems dealing with the question of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and the discovery of the form by which the masses from below could overthrow modern revisionism, marked a new historical stage of Marxism-Leninism, the stage of Mao Tsetung Thought. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution introduced a new revolutionary era. The historic Eleventh Plenary Session of the Eight Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party held during the cultural revolution pointed out that "We are now in a new era of world revolution" and that "Mao Tsetung Thought is the Marxism-Leninism of the era." (Eleventh Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China", August 12, 1966, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1966, pp. 9, 15). In May 1967 the Communist Party of China said "Marxism-Leninism has entered an entirely new stage — the stage of Mao Tsetung Thought." ("A Great Historic

Document", Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1967, p. 24) The same assessment was made at the 12th Plenary in October 1968, and by the Political Report of the Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China held in April 1969. The world revolutionary high tide of 1968 changed world politics. The Soviet Union exposed itself with the invasion of Czechoslovakia as a social-imperialist power — socialist in words, imperialist in deeds. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the adoption by 800 million Chinese people of Mao Tsetung Thought made China — Chairman Mao's China — the great new citadel of world revolution.

Today the matter is quite clear to Marxist-Leninists. As Comrade Hoxha says: "The Albanian people and all the peoples of the world nurture an ardent love and place deep trust in great socialist China, in her glorious Party and in Mao Tsetung, the great and beloved leader not only of the Chinese people and communists, but also the, dear and respected leader of all the peoples and communists of the world...The greatest enemy of U.S. imperialism and of Soviet social-imperialism are the peoples of the world, with great Mao Tsetung's China at the head." (Enver Hoxha, speech at the meeting with his electors of the No. 299 precinct in Tirana, October 3, 1974, PCDN, Vol. 4, No. 32, October 19, 1974) Here then is the international communist movement. It consists of all the genuine communist revolutionaries in the world who are united together by Mao Tsetung Thought, the Marxism-Leninism of our era.

It is the proletarian internationalist duty of the proletarian in each country to overthrow imperialism, especially the hegemonism of the two superpowers, colonialism, neo-colonialism and all reaction in their own countries. At the centre of the great proletarian internationalist world communist movement is the Communist Party of China led by Mao Tsetung, and its close ally and comrade, the Albanian Party of Labour led by Enver Hoxha, an outstanding Marxist-Leninist. Far from being "dissolved" or in any way weakened, the international communist movement is more profoundly united and revolutionary than it has ever been in its history. In the era of Marxism only several European countries together might have waged a successful revolution because capitalism was still in its laissez-faire growing period. In the era of Leninism it was definitely possible to build socialism in one country as vast and populous as the Soviet Union because imperialism is moribund, dying capitalism. In the era of Mao Tsetung Thought it is

possible for even a small country to defeat a large one, or a weak nation to overthrow a strong one because imperialism is being overthrown on a world scale. Each era in the development of the international communist movement is marked by the growing strength of the world proletariat and the decaying old age of the monopoly capitalists and other reactionaries. This is an objective law of social development. The international communist movement is a reflection of this objective class struggle and it exists independent of any organisational form, or the will of anyone. At the head of the international communist movement stands the world authority of Mao Tsetung Thought, the most advanced theory in the international communist movement. The facts of history show conclusively therefore that the authority and prestige of the international communist movement has grown from stage to stage from publication of the Communist Manifesto in 1848 to the declaration of Chairman Mao's historic May 20, 1970 statement. In the course of the growth and development of the modern proletariat it has solved many difficult problems, won great victories, and suffered serious defeats; but always it has advanced forward. The people and the people alone are the motive force in the making of world history. The dictatorship of the proletariat is inevitable. The class outlook of the proletariat is proletarian internationalism. Today the crystallised expression of this outlook is Mao Tsetung Thought. The International existed in those June days of the first insurrection of the modern proletariat in Paris, has existed ever since at one level or form or another, and will continue to do so until the cause of the world proletariat is everywhere successful and the exploitation of man by man everywhere eliminated. The International today marches forward under the glorious red banner of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. Today it is the proletarian internationalist duty of the Canadian Marxist-Leninists to further unite their ranks under this glorious banner and wage resolute struggle against all forms of revisionism and national chauvinism.

Long live the International!

Long live the unity of the international communist movement!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought!

Workers, oppressed nations and peoples of the world, Unite!

End item.