

CHOU YANG

**THE FIGHTING TASK
CONFRONTING WORKERS
IN PHILOSOPHY
AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Speech at the Fourth Enlarged Session of the
Committee of the Department of Philosophy
and Social Science of the Chinese Academy
of Sciences Held on October 26, 1963

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

H. 500

CHOU YANG

**THE FIGHTING TASK
CONFRONTING WORKERS
IN PHILOSOPHY
AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Speech at the Fourth Enlarged Session of the
Committee of the Department of Philosophy
and Social Science of the Chinese Academy
of Sciences Held on October 26, 1963

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1963

CHOU YANG

THE FIGHTING TASK
CONFRONTING WORKERS
IN PHILOSOPHY
AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Speech at the Fourth Enlarged Session of the
Committee of the Department of Philosophy
and Social Science of the Chinese Academy
of Sciences Held on October 26, 1963

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
Printed in the People's Republic of China

PHILOSOPHY and the social sciences constitute an important front in the ideological struggle. In the present domestic and international situation, what should be our function on this front and what tasks should we undertake?

A great debate of world historic significance is now going on in the international communist movement between revolutionary Marxist-Leninists and modern revisionists. This debate, which has attracted world-wide attention, has a vital bearing on the future of the world revolution and the destiny of mankind.

While terming their own pronouncements "a remarkable model of the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory", the modern revisionists call true Marxist-Leninists "dogmatists" and "pseudo-revolutionaries" and level preposterous attacks against them. Who are the true Marxist-Leninists, and who are the false Marxist-Leninists? Who are the genuine revolutionaries, and who are the pseudo-revolutionaries? These questions are posed to every revolutionary party, every revolutionary and every thinking person, compelling them to give close attention to the debate and to think over, study and weigh the issues carefully, so as to distinguish truth from falsehood and decide on what path to follow.

Together with all other revolutionary people and parties in the world, the Communist Party of China stands firmly in the forefront of the fight against imperialism and is waging a tit-for-tat struggle against the modern revisionists who willingly serve imperialism. By its irref-

utable arguments in "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement", the Central Committee of our Party has defended Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary spirit of the 1957 Moscow Declaration and the 1960 Moscow Statement.

The socialist revolution continues to develop in depth in our country, and a nation-wide socialist education movement is being unfolded. Our people have overcome many difficulties, achieved great successes and accumulated rich experience in socialist construction. Facts have confirmed and will continue to confirm the correctness of our Party's general line for socialist construction and the policy of self-reliance and also the invincible might of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's theories on our country's socialist revolution and socialist construction. All the aspiring revolutionary people who have awakened rejoice over our achievements and place great hopes on the Chinese people.

In these circumstances, it is obvious that we workers in philosophy and social science will achieve nothing unless we actively participate in the great struggles against modern revisionism and for socialist revolution and socialist construction. We should actively and systematically refute modern revisionism on the academic front and carry on the revolution on the ideological front and the building of the ideological superstructure of socialism, so as to serve our socialist revolution and socialist construction on the political and economic fronts.

As ideology, both philosophy and social science are part of the superstructure of society and, together with the natural sciences, serve the socialist economic base and the revolutionary political struggle in China. It will not

do unless they serve the economic base or the current political struggle. Politics is the concentrated expression of economics. As soon as he became a dialectical materialist, Marx grew dissatisfied with Feuerbach's philosophical theories, divorced as they were from politics. He pointed out that contemporary philosophy could become true only when combined with politics. "Theory is only actualized in a nation in so far as it is the actualization of the nation's needs." ("Introduction to *Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Law*", *Collected Works of Marx and Engels*, German ed., Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1958, Vol. I, p. 386.) In the words of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, "The fate of philosophy depends on the extent to which it meets the needs of social classes." That is to say, theory must meet the needs of the times before it can play a positive role, influence millions of people, become a material force and help to change the face of the world. Only thus can our ideological front become a truly militant, vigorous and revolutionary one.

This means that our workers in philosophy and social science must actively join in the struggle against modern revisionism, study Marxism-Leninism anew, and raise the banner of criticism in every branch of ideology. Without destruction there will be no construction; without the defeat of the old the new will not prevail. This is the law of development in theory and science. Unless revisionism is defeated, unless this adverse current is checked, Marxism-Leninism cannot be strengthened or developed. Marx said in his early years that "the superiority of the new trend lies precisely in the fact that we do not anticipate the future dogmatically but wish to find the new world in criticizing the old". ("Marx to A. Ruge, September 1843", *Works of Marx and Engels*,

German ed., Berlin, Vol. I, p. 344.) The whole value of Marx's theory lies in the fact that it is critical and revolutionary in its essence.

It means that we must earnestly learn from Comrade Mao Tse-tung and skilfully apply the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method to the study of the problems and lessons of our revolution and construction, to the study of the problems and lessons of the people's revolutions throughout the world and to the study of our own history and world history, and that we must give priority to the study of current problems in our research work. Academic research will become lifeless if it loses its close links with current struggles. Partiality for the classical combined with contempt for the modern would lead our research work astray.

It means that in the course of struggle we must train and temper a contingent of combat-worthy Marxist-Leninist theorists who can stand up to storm and stress, so as to provide a strong backbone and nucleus for the ranks of philosophy and social science.

This is what the current revolutionary struggle demands and what the people of our country and the world expect of us. This is the fighting task confronting us, a task we cannot shirk.

Together with the whole Chinese people, our workers in philosophy and social science have taken part in our country's socialist revolution and socialist construction. They have realized the importance of the struggle against modern revisionism and have taken up new studies and begun new explorations in the course of the struggle. They have scored achievements in scientific research and teaching and have rendered service to the people. Young people have gradually matured. On the whole, our ranks

are good. But what we have accomplished still falls far short of what the objective situation demands of us.

How should we carry on the struggle against modern revisionism on the academic front? How should we rank the subjects of our research to accord with actual needs? What are the correct methods for training and tempering our forces? These are the questions which must be solved in developing our work in philosophy and social science and which will be discussed at the present session. I would like to state my views on these questions. And I hope that you comrades will criticize and correct them wherever they are wrong.

**I. THE HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF
MARXISM-LENINISM IS ONE OF DEBATE WITH,
STRUGGLE AGAINST AND VICTORY OVER
DIVERSE ANTI-MARXIST-LENINIST
IDEOLOGICAL TRENDS**

In the discussion of the current struggle against modern revisionism, it is best to review how Marxism-Leninism has grown and developed in the course of debate and struggle against diverse anti-Marxist-Leninist ideological trends, because we shall then know how to carry forward the cause of our revolutionary predecessors.

Throughout their lives, Marx and Engels waged firm and repeated struggles against anti-proletarian theories on behalf of the proletarian revolution. It was on the basis of their scientific analysis of capitalist society and their summing up of the lessons of the revolutionary working-class movement, and through debate with the exponents of antagonistic ideas, that the founders of

Marxism laid its theoretical foundation, dialectical materialism and historical materialism, formulated the theory of surplus value and discovered that class struggle had been the motive force of historical development since the dawn of civilization and that class struggle would inevitably lead to the dictatorship of the proletariat; they thus transformed utopian socialism into scientific socialism. They levelled their theoretical criticism in the first place against Hegel and Feuerbach whom they had regarded as teachers and held in esteem. And it is precisely from the works of these two masters that Marx and Engels assimilated the quintessence of classical German philosophy while at the same time critically evaluating it. They sharply criticized their contemporaries, the Left Hegelian theorists, and refuted all sorts of feudal, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois socialist theories and schools all of which were based on an idealist historical outlook. Marx and Engels first wrote a series of polemical works, including *The Holy Family*, *The German Ideology*, and *The Poverty of Philosophy*, and then, as everybody knows, wrote the *Communist Manifesto* together. Later, Marx devoted himself to writing *Capital*, and Engels wrote *Anti-Dühring* and *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*; these works were comprehensive and profound expositions of Marx's thinking in philosophy, political economy and socialist theory. In this way they gradually freed the working-class movement from the influence of utopian socialism and various pseudo-socialist ideological trends and established the leading position of Marxist thought in the international working-class movement, thereby facilitating the tremendous growth of the movement with Western Europe as its centre.

This struggle was an extremely arduous one. Marx once said that they had devoted decades of effort and labour to exploding illusions about the future structure of society and to inculcating scientific socialism in the minds of the workers. Since scientific socialism is based on materialism, whoever wants "to give socialism a 'higher, idealistic' orientation, that is to say, to replace its materialistic basis . . . by modern mythology with its goddesses of Justice, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" will do "mischief" to socialist theory. ("Marx to F. A. Sorge, October 19, 1877", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, pp. 375-76.) On this question, Marx took an uncompromising stand.

Already in Marx's and Engels' lifetime, attempts to tamper with or discard their dialectical materialism, historical materialism and theory of class struggle occurred among German Social-Democrats. Marx's *Critique of the Gotha Programme* was shelved for sixteen years, and when Engels demanded its immediate publication and solemnly declared that any further delay would be a crime, the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party still placed many obstructions in the way. The criticism of Dühring also met with much opposition within the leading clique of the German Social-Democratic Party. In publishing "The Introduction to 'The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850'" which Engels wrote late in life, *Vorwärts*, the organ of the German Social-Democratic Party, deliberately deleted some of the most important passages about the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat, so that Engels was presented as an unqualified supporter of the "tactics of peace" and an opponent of the use of "force". He strongly

protested against this. When Kautsky and others compiled a history of the socialist movement, they did so behind Engels' back; thus Engels learned of the ulterior motives of the revisionists before his death. A revisionist, anti-Marxist faction had already cropped up within the Marxist ranks.

This phenomenon may seem strange. How can certain people who had previously been supporters of revolutionary scientific socialism degenerate into counter-revolutionary anti-scientific revisionists? Yet it is not at all strange. Everything tends to divide itself in two. Theories are no exception, and they also tend to divide. Wherever there is a revolutionary, scientific doctrine, its antithesis, a counter-revolutionary, anti-scientific doctrine, is bound to arise in the course of the development of that doctrine. As modern society is divided into classes and as the difference between progressive and backward groups will continue far into the future, the emergence of antitheses is inevitable. This has long been borne out by the history of Marxist philosophy and the social sciences and also by the history of natural science. Science and the history of science themselves reflect the unity and struggle of opposites, and science develops through such unity and struggle.

What the opportunists and revisionists dread and hate most and have therefore tried in every way to revise is the Marxist theory of class struggle, and particularly that of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. As Engels said, "Hence, their fanatical hatred of Marx and all of us — because of the class struggle." ("Engels to F. A. Sorge, January 18, 1893", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, Moscow, p. 537.) This is the heart of the matter. On this central issue Marx

and Engels took the most determined and clear-cut stand. In their circular letter to A. Bebel and others, they solemnly declared:

For almost forty years we have stressed the class struggle as the immediate driving power of history, and in particular the class struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat as the great lever of the modern social revolution; it is, therefore, impossible for us to co-operate with people who wish to expunge this class struggle from the movement. ("Marx and Engels, to A. Bebel, W. Liebknecht, W. Bracke and others ('Circular Letter'), September 17-18, 1879", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, Moscow, p. 395.)

Later Engels emphatically pointed out:

The development of the proletariat proceeds everywhere amidst internal struggles. . . . Unity is quite a good thing so long as it is possible, but there are things which stand above unity. And when, like Marx and myself, one has fought harder all one's life against self-styled Socialists than against anyone else (for we regarded the bourgeoisie only as a *class* and hardly ever involved ourselves in conflicts with individual bourgeois), one cannot be greatly grieved that the inevitable struggle has broken out. ("Engels to A. Bebel, October 28, 1882", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, Moscow, p. 427.)

Thus, that which is unified breaks into two — into two conflicting parts.

Marxist-Leninist parties always treasure the unity of the ranks of the proletariat, but Marxist-Leninists must never co-operate with those who expunge the class

struggle from the movement and must never surrender principle for the sake of unity. This is the most important and most precious behest the founders of Marxism have left us. Any betrayal of this behest is a betrayal of Marxism itself.

To persevere in or to abandon the class struggle of the proletariat, to persevere in or to renounce the dictatorship of the proletariat — here is the fundamental line of demarcation between Marxism and revisionism.

Soon after Engels' death, first Bernstein and then Kautsky came out and made systematic revisions of Marxist doctrines. The leadership of the Second International founded by Engels gradually fell into the hands of the revisionists. As capitalism was then undergoing a period of relatively "peaceful" development, a labour aristocracy emerged within the working class and a revisionist trend and faction began to overrun the workers' movement in Europe. The earliest representative of this trend and faction was Bernstein.

In 1899 Bernstein published his book *The Prerequisites of Socialism and the Tasks of Social-Democracy* in which he made a thoroughgoing revision of Marx's doctrines in the fields of philosophy, economics and politics, and proclaimed his notorious formula that "the movement is everything, the final aim is nothing". The struggle against revisionism began as soon as revisionism emerged. The historical mission of consistently combating revisionism and defending Marxism then fell upon the shoulders of a great young proletarian revolutionary — Lenin. In the same year, Lenin published "A Protest by Russian Social-Democrats" and "Our Programme" and launched fierce counter-attacks against Bernsteinism and its disciples in Russia. With these works Lenin

entered the arena of history as a staunch proletarian revolutionary and mature Marxist. Shortly after, he published *What Is To Be Done?* in which he opposed economism with its belittlement and renunciation of theory, and laid a solid ideological foundation for the building of the Russian Social-Democratic Party. In *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, he refuted the opportunist tactics of the Mensheviks in the democratic revolution. In *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* he made a profound and devastating criticism of revisionism in philosophy and defended and developed Marxist dialectical materialism. In *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, he refuted Kautsky's reactionary theory of ultra-imperialism and scientifically and penetratingly dissected imperialism. In *The State and Revolution* and *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, he ably developed the teachings of Marx and Engels on the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder, he vigorously denounced the treachery of the opportunists of the Second International, criticized at length "leftist" thinking which alienated the masses and elucidated Marxist strategy and tactics.

What is there to feel strange about? The inflated revisionist leadership of the Second International was bound to topple from its throne, because it had become a lackey of the bourgeoisie and was opposed to revolution, science, communism and the people. The "nobodies" led by Lenin now came forth to replace them.

Through these debates, the treachery of Bernstein and Kautsky was fully exposed. After the victory of the October Revolution, they launched still more vicious attacks on Lenin and all other revolutionary Marxists.

Kautsky even spread the slander that the dictatorship of the proletariat as advocated and practised by the Bolsheviks would lead only to "Tartar socialism", which fell far short of "Asiatic socialism" because Asia had given birth to a Confucius and a Buddha. Kautsky hoped that the young Soviet Republic would soon collapse. But what happened? Despite armed foreign intervention and despite Kautsky's wild abuse, the Soviet Union towers as the first great socialist state in the world. History has testified to Lenin's thesis that socialism would triumph first in one country, and Lenin has gone down in history as the founder of this state. And what has become of Kautsky and his like? They achieved nothing but everlasting shame as renegades from the proletariat.

Stalin spoke most highly of the theoretical contributions made by Lenin in the period after Engels' death. He held that Lenin had summed up according to materialist philosophy the most important scientific achievements of that period and had refuted the anti-materialist factions in various fields within the Marxist ranks. He quoted Engels as saying that "materialism must assume a new aspect with every new great discovery" and maintained that "none other than Lenin accomplished this task for his own time in his remarkable work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*". (Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism", *Works*, FLPH, Moscow, 1953, Vol. 6, p. 93.) Stalin held that Lenin had developed Marxism with respect to the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution, and particularly with respect to the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He pointed out that Lenin had advanced Marxism to a new phase — Leninism.

After Lenin's death, Stalin carried on Lenin's cause and waged a bitter struggle against the opportunist fac-

tions within the CPSU, which were represented by Trotsky and Bukharin. In this struggle, Stalin defended and developed Marxism-Leninism. He wrote "The Foundations of Leninism", "Concerning Questions of Leninism", "The Social-Democratic Deviation in Our Party", "Once More on the Social-Democratic Deviation in Our Party", "The National Question and Leninism", "The Right Deviation in the C.P.S.U. (B.)" and many other works, most of which were later included in the two collections entitled *Problems of Leninism* and *On the Opposition*. In his later years, he wrote *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* and *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.* He succeeded Lenin and led the Soviet people through the stresses of national construction and in building the first socialist state and winning the world-historic victory of the anti-fascist war.

In China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung conducted a fierce debate against the various opportunist lines within the Chinese Communist Party. Despite the sneer of "narrow empiricism" and despite the political attacks and isolation to which he was subjected, he integrated the universal truth of Marxism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution and creatively developed Marxism-Leninism by drawing on new revolutionary experience under new conditions. During the period of the Chinese people's democratic revolution, Comrade Mao Tse-tung wrote many works, including "Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society", "Why Is It That Red Political Power Can Exist in China?", "A Single Spark Can Start a Prairie Fire", "Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War", "On Practice", "On Contradiction", "On Protracted War", "The Question of Independence Within the United Front", "Problems of War and Strategy", "On

New Democracy", "Reform Our Study", "Rectify the Party's Style of Work", "Oppose Stereotyped Party Writing", and "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art". After the victory of the revolution he wrote "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship" and "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People", among other works. These are the fruits of his persistent struggles against "Left" and Right opportunism within the Party. It is by following the line laid down by Comrade Mao Tse-tung that the Chinese people have won great victories in their democratic and socialist revolutions, carried forward the great cause of the October Revolution and further transformed the face of the world.

It is obvious to all that in China the broad masses supported the Chinese Communists and the left-wing revolutionaries because the Communists and the left were in possession of the truth. The monstrous evils of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism were overthrown, and those who had been despised led the broad masses of the workers, peasants and intellectuals making up over ninety per cent of the population, seized state power and founded the people's republic. An earth-shaking change was effected.

Soon after Stalin's death, the leaders of the CPSU totally negated him. They followed in the wake of the Tito clique of Yugoslavia and sank deeper and deeper into the mire of revisionism. Modern revisionism is a repetition and a still more vicious outgrowth of old-line revisionism under new conditions and is the result of the attempt to cater to disintegrating imperialism. Because modern revisionism has arisen in a large socialist country which is moreover the birthplace of Lenin, it has far greater capacity to confuse people and is much more

pernicious than the old revisionism. At the same time, the forces of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism are also stronger today than when they fought against old revisionism, and they are growing apace in the fight against modern revisionism. Revolutionary people and parties everywhere are increasingly placing their hopes on the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, including the Communist Party of China, and the genuine Marxist-Leninist groups and individuals, whose thinking increasingly represents the banner of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and the banner of world revolution.

In the current great debate between revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism, the modern revisionists have concentrated their unscrupulous and vicious attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao Tse-tung. This is by no means accidental. It is because Comrade Mao Tse-tung has always firmly stood at the forefront in defence of Marxism-Leninism and against modern revisionism that they hate him so much.

For more than forty years Comrade Mao Tse-tung has led the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people in arduous and untiring struggles against imperialism and all kinds of counter-revolutionary forces at home. Applying Marxist-Leninist principles and methods, he has correctly solved the problems of the Chinese revolution, repeatedly defeated both Right and "Left" opportunism, and thus led the Chinese revolution to victory.

The Chinese people have come to understand Comrade Mao Tse-tung's greatness through their own experience, and the people of the world have also come to know him through the practical achievements of the Chinese revolution and his writings. All the calumnies poured on

Comrade Mao Tse-tung by the modern revisionists are of no avail and cannot in the least hurt him.

In violation of the correct principles laid down in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, the leaders of the CPSU arbitrarily denounced a fraternal Party, the Albanian Party of Labour, as "anti-Marxist-Leninist" at their own Party congress, thus bringing an inter-Party dispute into the open before the enemy for the first time. Since then they have committed a great many base acts against the Chinese Communists and against all Communists who do not approve of their wrong line. They consider this tactic clever, and have been arrogantly using it for quite a number of years. Actually it is not at all clever and will only ruin their prestige and make things more difficult for themselves. If they do not turn back and correct their errors, they are bound to fall on still harder times. If you doubt this, just wait and see!

There are three things the modern revisionists fear: first, imperialism; second, genuine Marxism-Leninism, or what they call dogmatism; and third, the revolutionary people. Cowardly as mice, they dare not let the people of their own countries read the replies of those whom they label "dogmatists" to their criticisms, and they try to quarantine these replies as though they were the plague. This single fact suffices to indicate the kind of future that is in store for the modern revisionists.

Lenin has said:

. . . . I have seen too many sights in the history of the revolution to be disturbed by the hostile looks and shouts of people who abandon themselves to emotion and are unable to reason. ("Report on the Ratification of the Peace Treaty Delivered at the Fourth All-Russian

Extraordinary Congress of Soviets", *Collected Works*, fourth Russian ed., Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1950, Vol. 27, p. 158.)

He also said that his "fate" was "one battle after another against political stupidity, vulgarity, opportunism, etc. ("Letter to Inessa Armand, Dec. 18, 1916", fourth Russian ed., Moscow, Vol. 35, p. 209.) Certainly, such was not the fate of Lenin alone. It was the fate of Marx and Engels, and of Stalin too. Indeed, it is the fate of all revolutionaries.

Looking back over the history of Marxism-Leninism, we can see that it gained ground and advanced step by step through "one battle after another". For more than a century, neither the enemy's attacks from without nor the enemy's "revisions" from within have been able to defeat it. On the contrary, it is precisely through repeated struggles against external and internal foes of all shades that the forces of Marxism-Leninism have grown strong.

In the beginning, Marxism was but one of many doctrines and schools in the socialist movement and this school consisted only of Marx and Engels. But because it is right and because it truly and scientifically represents the revolutionary proletariat's interests and needs, Marxism has finally vanquished all antagonistic ideological systems in struggle and won the world-wide support of the revolutionary working class and the revolutionary people.

Lenin, too, was once in the minority in the struggle against revisionism. On the revisionist side at that time were the leaders of the Second International, the German Social-Democratic Party, which enjoyed great prestige,

and such veteran leaders and authoritative theorists as Bernstein, Kautsky and Plekhanov. Lenin was beneath their notice. Nevertheless, as Lenin's thinking embodied the truth and reflected the needs of a new era, the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, it was not crushed by the then rampant revisionism; instead, it eventually triumphed over revisionism and became the great banner of the whole international communist movement.

True revolutionaries, true proletarian revolutionary fighters and true Marxist-Leninists, who are militant materialists, are dauntless. They fear neither isolation nor the abuse of the reactionaries and revisionists. For they know it is not these seemingly formidable giants but "nobodies" like themselves who represent the future. All great men were once nobodies. Provided they possess the truth, those who are seemingly isolated in the beginning are sure to be victorious in the end. So it was with Lenin and the Third International. On the contrary, the celebrities and big battalions are bound to decline and to dwindle and putrefy when they lose possession of the truth and therefore lose the support of the masses. So it was with Bernstein and the Second International. Under particular conditions, things are bound to change into their opposites.

There is inevitably a realignment in the forces of revolution in the course of the struggle between the proletariat and the revolutionary people on the one hand and the forces of reaction on the other and in the course of the struggle between Marxism on the one hand and opportunism and revisionism on the other.

Marx and Engels once mentioned that the centre of gravity of the European working-class movement had

temporarily shifted from France to Germany after the defeat of the Paris Commune. When history demanded that the German working class should stand at the forefront of the proletarian struggle, both Marx and Engels were proud of it. But Engels noted at the same time, "How long events will allow them to occupy this post of honour cannot be foretold." (*Preparatory Note to the Peasant War in Germany*, *Selected Works of Marx and Engels*, FLPH, Moscow, 1958, Vol. 1, p. 653.)

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Russia became the focal point of the various contradictions in the era of imperialism. When Kautsky was still a revolutionary, he said that the centre of revolution would shift from Germany to Russia. While Kautsky later became a renegade from the revolution, Lenin still quoted with approval this earlier prediction of Kautsky's.

Then the storm of revolution reached the East. Marx, Engels and Lenin all spoke highly of the awakening of the peoples of the East and had the warmest sympathy for it. They consistently held that the revolutionary peoples of the East were the great ally of the proletariat of the Western capitalist countries and that their revolutionary movement would in turn influence and promote the proletarian revolution in these countries. At a time when the European working class was under the corrosive influence of revisionism, Lenin recognized the emerging power of the multi-million peoples of Asia who "have been drawn into the struggle for these same European ideals".

In their quest for truth from the West, progressive people in Asia finally discovered Marxism-Leninism and adopted the proletarian world outlook as the instrument for studying the destiny of their countries.

History has shown that whether the party or country is large or small, the proletarian party of a country can make its own specific contribution to the development of Marxism-Leninism, provided it is able to stand in the van of the people's revolutionary struggle, correctly lead it to victory and so enrich the experience of the proletarian revolutionary movement. If, on the other hand, a proletarian party fails to stand in the forefront of the people's revolutionary struggle, discards the banner of revolution, renounces the revolutionary tradition of its own country and adopts a passive or even negative attitude towards the cause of the proletarian revolution, then it is bound to become an opportunist, revisionist party and forfeit its place in the ranks of the vanguards of the international proletariat.

Certain persons who claim to have "creatively developed Marxism-Leninism" have actually thrown it overboard, and yet they are arrogantly trying to monopolize the right to interpret Marxism-Leninism. Like the French king who proclaimed "L'Etat, c'est moi" ("I am the State"), they talk as if "Le Marxisme-Léninisme, c'est moi" ("I am Marxism-Leninism"). Whoever refuses to endorse the resolutions of their Party congress and the programme of their Party is accused of departing from Marxism-Leninism and violating so-called international discipline. What does this abominable attitude reveal except their deep-seated great-power and great-party chauvinism and their extremely backward feudal ideas on the line of succession and their out-and-out reactionary idealistic view of history?

The revolutionary storm is bound to rise and the sparks of Marxism-Leninism are bound to fly everywhere. No one can stop them.

What tremendous changes have taken place in the world revolutionary forces and revolutionary situation as compared with the times of Marx or Lenin! A number of new socialist countries have come into being since World War II. The people of the Asian, African and Latin American countries have awakened or are awakening; they are rising in heroic battles against imperialism and old and new colonialism. A widespread struggle is being waged by the people of all countries for world peace, national independence, people's democracy and socialism. For a long time in the past, the working-class movement and the struggle centring around it were mainly confined to the advanced capitalist countries in Europe and North America. Now, however, the people's struggle against imperialism, headed by the United States, and the struggle of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism are being waged on a much broader — indeed, on a world-wide — scale. In a number of countries the vanguard of the proletariat formerly standing at the forefront of the struggle is now corroded by modern revisionism, while the proletariat and revolutionary people of many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America who have long been looked down upon now stand in the front line of battle.

In Europe, North America and Australasia, leaders of certain Communist Parties are increasingly singing the same tune as the social democrats in defence of the interests of imperialism and capitalism. As a result, there is hardly any substantial or even formal difference between them and the social democrats. Moreover, they are expelling true Marxist-Leninists from the Party and taking other measures to create splits. Under these

circumstances, political parties genuinely representing the revolutionary proletariat are bound to appear on these continents. Such a process is also taking place among some of the Communists in Latin America and Asia. Some people who for a time fail to see things clearly and are misled by the revisionists will sooner or later learn from the facts, part ways with revisionism and return to the road of Marxism-Leninism.

In short, whatever the country or place may be, where there is oppression, there will be resistance; where there is revisionism, there will be Marxism-Leninism fighting against it; and where expulsion of Marxist-Leninists from the Party and other measures are taken to create splits, new outstanding Marxist-Leninists and strong revolutionary parties are bound to emerge. Changes are taking place which are contrary to what the modern revisionists and modern dogmatists expected. These persons are creating their own opposites and will be buried by them in the end. This is an inexorable law.

Reviewing the past and looking forward to the future, what else can we see but the magnificent spectacle of ceaseless growth for Marxism-Leninism and constant victories for the cause of proletarian revolution?

Lenin once said that the ideological struggle between revolutionary Marxism and revisionism at the end of the nineteenth century was the prelude to great revolutionary battles by the proletariat.

The present struggle between revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism is the prelude to new and still greater revolutionary battles by the world proletariat.

It can be anticipated that the next fifty to a hundred years will be the great epoch of the thorough transfor-

mation of society, an earth-shaking epoch without any parallel. In this great epoch, the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, leading the revolutionary people, who account for more than ninety per cent of the world's population, will overcome every difficulty on the road of revolution and march to the complete victory of the revolutionary cause of the people of the whole world.

II. REFUTE MODERN REVISIONISM AND STUDY ANEW AND PROPAGATE MARXISM-LENINISM — THE MOST IMPORTANT CURRENT TASKS ON THE FRONT OF PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

“A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement” and the articles by the Central Committee of our Party preceding and succeeding it have profoundly and thoroughly exposed and refuted modern revisionism both politically and theoretically. The essence of the present debate between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism is whether or not to accept the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, whether or not to accept the fact that the people still living under the imperialist and capitalist system, who comprise two-thirds of the world's population, need to make revolution, and whether or not to accept the fact that the people already on the socialist road, who comprise one-third of the world's population, need to carry their revolution forward to the end.

To take an active part in this debate, to study Marxism-Leninism anew, to refute modern revisionism and bourgeois ideology in all its manifestations on the academic

front and to defend, propagate and develop Marxism-Leninism — these now constitute the most important tasks for Chinese workers in the fields of philosophy and social science.

Revisionism in the academic field is the mouthpiece of revisionism in politics and is a variety of bourgeois ideology. It serves the revisionist political line, provides it with a theoretical basis, and tries to justify it and to sway public opinion. The revisionist thinking of a section of people in Soviet academic circles is growing steadily along with the development of the revisionist political line of the leadership of the CPSU. Supporting the "combat against the personality cult", they have repudiated all Stalin's theoretical writings under the slogan of "eliminating the consequences of the personality cult". To repudiate Stalin completely is in fact to negate Marxism-Leninism, which Stalin defended and developed. On the pretext that times have changed, they brazenly declare Leninist theories to be outmoded. They energetically praise the line and programme formulated at the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, lauding them as "a model of creative Marxism-Leninism", "the supreme achievement of contemporary social-scientific thought" and "the Communist Manifesto of the present epoch".

Let us now see how the modern revisionists have tampered with the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism in its main aspects: philosophy, the theory of socialism and communism and political economy.

In philosophy, like the old revisionists, the modern revisionists replace materialism by subjective idealism, revolutionary dialectics by vulgar evolutionism and sophistry, and the Marxist-Leninist theory of class

struggle by the hypocritical bourgeois theory of "supra-class" human nature.

The old-line revisionists were enamoured of the once fashionable slogan of "back to Kant". Bernstein declared dialectics to be "the treacherous factor in Marx's doctrine, the snare lying in the way of any logical consideration of things". The Russian revisionist philosophers represented by Bogdanov and Lunarcharsky grew pessimistic about the future of the revolution after the failure of the 1905 Revolution. They believed that the best way out was to seek the aid of subjective idealism and theology, and openly advocated a combination of Marxist materialism with Machism and of socialism with religion in order to turn revolutionaries into "God-builders". This reactionary tendency in the Second International and inside the Russian Social-Democratic Party was thoroughly repudiated by Lenin. It was for the purpose of refuting the God-builders that he wrote his great work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. The modern revisionists dare not openly advocate combining the philosophical thought of Marx and Lenin with the modern reactionary philosophical trends of the Western bourgeoisie, but resort to more covert and cunning ways to emasculate dialectical materialism and historical materialism and to smuggle in reactionary bourgeois philosophical views. Since they pursue the line of betraying socialism and capitulating to imperialism in politics, it is only logical that they should betray the proletarian stand in philosophical thinking.

In political practice, the modern revisionists replace proletarian dialectical materialism by the imperialist and bourgeois philosophy of pragmatism.

Pragmatism, which originated in the United States in the late nineteenth century, is a subjective idealistic philosophy of the bourgeoisie in the era of imperialism. It denies objective reality, objective laws and objective truth. It holds that truth is nothing but an instrument used by man to achieve his immediate purposes in his acts of coping with the environment, and its motto is that "it is true because it is useful". It is an out-and-out philistine philosophy and represents the reactionary outlook on life of the decadent and moribund bourgeoisie. It is the philosophy *par excellence* of U.S. imperialism. The bourgeoisie can no longer act on the basis of knowledge of objective laws and principles of truth in contradistinction from falsehood and of right in contradistinction from wrong, since these laws and principles are diametrically opposed to their interests. They can only observe society and deal with the environment in a pragmatist way and they need a pragmatist philosophy to rationalize their actions. At the same time, pragmatism is a philosophy the imperialists and bourgeois reactionaries use to benumb the revolutionary consciousness of the masses. It causes the masses to consider only superficial appearances and not the laws of social development and the broad prospect for changes on a world scale; it causes the masses to seek only their immediate interests and not to struggle for their complete emancipation.

The representatives of modern revisionism are all worshippers of the United States politically. What they follow in all their policies is the American brand of pragmatist philosophy. Of course, they do not openly admit their belief in pragmatism, for that would interfere with their disguise as revolutionaries.

Lenin gave a good description of the old revisionism.

To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chops and changes of petty politics, to forget the basic interests of the proletariat, the main features of the capitalist system as a whole and of capitalist evolution as a whole; to sacrifice these interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment — such is the policy of revisionism. (“Marxism and Revisionism”, *Selected Works*, FLPH, Moscow, 1950, Vol. 1, Part 1, p. 94.)

The modern revisionists go even farther. They cater to imperialism, sacrifice the fundamental interests of the proletariat on major questions of principle and bargain away principles as though they were commodities. On the one hand, they yield and surrender to the nuclear blackmail of U.S. imperialism, while on the other they gang up with the U.S. imperialists to conduct nuclear blackmail against the people of the world. Nuclear fetishism and nuclear blackmail are the basis of their theories and policies. The modern revisionists do not believe in the strength of the people and deny that the people are the makers of history. They do not believe that historical development will unquestionably lead to the destruction of nuclear weapons by man and not the other way round. They preach that in the face of nuclear weapons questions of principle cease to exist and that principles are already liquidated. “What is the use of principles, if the head is cut off?”¹ — such is their pragmatist philosophy of survival. Thus the sufferings of the people, the world revolution and the communist ideal

¹ “Left of Common Sense”, *Pravda*, Aug. 16, 1963.

can all be totally ignored. This is the way in which the modern revisionists have replaced the revolutionary philosophy of the proletariat by the philistine philosophy of mere vegetative existence.

Since the representatives of modern revisionism are essentially pragmatists in their approach to objective truth and objective laws, it is only natural that they look down upon theory. The modern revisionists regard the basic theories of Marxism-Leninism not as truths which must be adhered to, but as expedient tools and as apologetics which they can wilfully concoct and revise in order to serve their immediate interests.

The modern revisionists have wantonly distorted and revised the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the laws of contradiction, and spread their views about the merging and reconciliation of contradictions.

On the pretext of what they call the characteristics of the transition from socialism to communism, they preach a "new way of putting the question", namely, "the overcoming of opposites through their uniting (merging)",¹ claiming that under socialist conditions "new phenomena" or "new processes" emerge in which "dialectical opposites, contradictions, turn into differences and differences merge into unity".² Some of their philosophers even claim that the law of the unity and struggle of opposites is outmoded under socialist conditions.

¹ P. N. Fedoseyev, "The 22nd Congress of the CPSU and the Tasks of Scientific Research Work in the Field of Philosophy", in the magazine *Voprosy Filosofii* (Problems of Philosophy), 1962, No. 3.

² M. B. Mitin, "The 22nd Congress of the CPSU and the Tasks of Scientific Work in the Field of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy", in the magazine *Voprosy Filosofii*, 1962, No. 4.

This theory of the merging or reconciliation of contradictions and the theory that the laws of contradiction are outmoded constitute a radical revision of materialist dialectics.

The Marxist-Leninist view is that the law of materialist dialectics, the law of the unity of opposites, is a universal law which governs nature, society and the development of thought, and which is applicable to the past, the present and the future. In other words, it is applicable to class society, to socialist society which is transitional between class and classless society, and also to the classless communist society of the future. Contradictions exist everywhere and at all times. They are differentiated into antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions, but not into reconcilable and irreconcilable contradictions. Contradictions are all irreconcilable and have to be resolved through struggle. Contradictions and the struggles to resolve them are always the motive force that pushes human society forward.

Whether or not a person persists in Marxist-Leninist revolutionary dialectics is shown by whether or not he dares to face and acknowledge the contradiction between the imperialists headed by the United States and the people of the world, whether or not he dares to face and acknowledge the fact that class contradictions and class struggles exist in all countries, and whether or not he dares to face and acknowledge the two types of contradictions (antagonistic and non-antagonistic) within socialist society. All conservatives and opportunists, all those who do not desire but fear revolution, dread change and evade or deny contradictions. On the contrary, all revolutionaries who take upon themselves the transformation of the world desire change, courageously face

contradictions and resolve them by revolutionary means. As old contradictions are resolved, new ones arise and must be resolved by new methods. History thus advances with the endless resolution and emergence of contradictions. Only thoroughgoing revolutionaries can be thoroughgoing revolutionary dialecticians.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has shown outstanding theoretical courage and genius in developing dialectics. For the first time in the history of Marxism-Leninism he penetratingly and systematically revealed the contradictions within socialist society in his work, "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People", and set forth the necessity for differentiating the two types of contradictions and for using different methods in handling them. This is a great contribution of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's to the development of Marxist-Leninist theory. On the basis of the laws of materialist dialectics, he is guiding the socialist revolution and socialist construction of our country from one victory to another. He is teaching us correctly to understand and handle the contradictions confronting us, to remain sober and alert in the face of the continued existence of classes and class struggle in socialist society and of the danger of a restoration of capitalism, and to take the correct and necessary measures to avert this danger. All this immensely fortifies the Chinese people's immunity to revisionism.

In the past, some comrades one-sidedly emphasized the "moral and political unity" of socialist society and failed to see that contradictions, classes and class struggle continue to exist in it, and that the struggle against bourgeois ideology within socialist society remains a main task of the dictatorship of the proletariat for a long period after the seizure of power. They only recognized solidarity

and unity and denied the existence of internal contradictions in socialist society and the fact that contradictions are the motive force of social progress. They thus denied the universality of contradiction and did away with dialectics, and as a result the "theory of absence of conflict" spread far and wide.

The mistakes in their understanding of contradictions in socialist society paved the way for the modern revisionists of today. The modern revisionists have formulated a theory about the merging or reconciliation of contradictions, in order to provide a philosophical basis for their fallacies concerning "a state of the whole people" and "a party of the entire people". Moreover, they have extended this theory of the merging or reconciliation of contradictions to the sphere of international struggle, so as to present a philosophical justification for their line of "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition". They use the fictitious contradiction between the survival of mankind and nuclear weapons to cover up the class contradictions and national contradictions of real life. They hold that the appearance of nuclear weapons has rendered senseless the principles of class analysis and class struggle. They say that "the atom bomb does not adhere to the class principle". They hold that the contradiction between imperialism and socialism, the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations, the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and the contradictions among imperialist powers and among monopoly-capitalist groups within an imperialist country can and should be reconciled and merged. Such is their conclusion and their political purpose.

Completely discarding historical materialism, the modern revisionists substitute the bourgeois theory of human nature for the Marxist-Leninist teachings on class struggle and proletarian dictatorship, for scientific communism. They have dropped the proletarian banner of revolution and raised the bourgeois banner of the theory of human nature. They have equated the concept of humanism so-called with that of scientific communism and completely merged scientific communism with bourgeois humanism.

They say, "Communist ideology is the most humane ideology",¹ they talk of humanism as "the highest embodiment of communism", and they assert that "humanism in the broad sense of the word merges with communism",² and that "the communist system means the triumph of humaneness".³ They harp on such slogans as "Everything for the sake of man and for the benefit of man", "Man is to man a friend, comrade and brother" and "Long live the fraternity of all the peoples and all men on earth". They brag about "peaceful coexistence" as "the most humane, *the proletarian method of class struggle in the international arena*", and about the plan for universal and complete disarmament as "the highest expression of humanism".

¹ Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, adopted at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU.

² *Foundations of Marxist Philosophy* (in Russian), edited by the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Moscow, 1962, p. 548.

³ O. V. Kuusinen and others, *Foundations of Marxism-Leninism* (in Russian), Moscow, 1959, p. 751.

Tito boasted: "We are communists but communists first of all should be humanists."¹ American bourgeois scholars have applauded "Titoism" as "a much more humane variety of Marxism than the world has yet known", claiming that it "has re-established the connection between Marxism and the fundamentals of Western liberalism".² Thus one can detect the subterfuge of the modern revisionists in propagating "humanism" and their theory of human nature.

Marxist-Leninists have always taken a scientific and analytical attitude towards humanism. We fully appreciate the positive and enlightening role played by the various trends of bourgeois humanism from the Renaissance in Italy in the fourteenth-sixteenth centuries up to the mid-nineteenth century. Today there are still bourgeois humanists, with whom we wish to establish an alliance in the common struggle against imperialism and in defence of world peace. Nevertheless, proletarian communism and bourgeois humanism are two fundamentally different world outlooks. We are firmly opposed to substituting the theory of human nature in the abstract and the preaching of fraternity for the standpoint of class analysis and class struggle; we are against describing communism as humanism and against placing humanism above communism.

As the revolutionary world outlook of the proletariat, communism is built on the solid scientific basis of dialectical materialism and historical materialism. The great

¹ Tito's toast at a luncheon given in his honour by the People's Council of Zrenjanin on Nov. 19, 1953.

² Charles P. McVicker, *Titoism, Pattern for International Communism*, New York, 1957, pp. xii & 296.

achievement of the founders of Marxism lies in the fact that they revealed the objective laws of development of capitalist society and defined the true historical mission of the proletariat. Contrary to this, instead of basing itself on a scientific analysis of objective social reality, all humanist theory proceeds from humanity in the abstract to produce blueprints for social reform in accordance with subjective desires; its foundation is historical idealism. As the theory of social revolution, communism stands for the attainment of socialist and communist society through class struggle, through proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat; humanism, on the other hand, advocates the solution of contradictions in real life and the materialization of humanist social ideals through "fraternity" among all people, which in effect is "fraternity" between the oppressor and the oppressed classes. As the ethics of the proletariat, communism stresses revolutionary collectivism and stands for the appropriate integration of personal interests with the collective interests of the masses, to which it gives the first place; humanism, on the other hand, sets personal dignity and personal happiness as the highest aims of life, which in fact means personal dignity and happiness for a tiny bourgeois élite and lack of personal dignity and misery for the vast majority of the population, and which in fact means advocating bourgeois individualism. As described in the *Communist Manifesto*, the ideal society we want to bring about is "an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all". But such a society can be brought about only through a communist revolution, as this revolution is itself "the common condition for the free development" of the in-

dividual. (Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology, Works*, German ed., Berlin, 1959, Vol. 3, p. 425.) All this shows that proletarian communism and bourgeois humanism are two totally different world outlooks and cannot be mentioned in the same breath.

The birth of scientific communism was a great leap in human thought. Now the revisionists have tampered with the teachings of scientific communism, and reverted to the preaching of human nature in the abstract and of "love of humanity", which Marxism-Leninism transcended long long ago, and to such slogans as "man is to man a brother". How can this be considered as anything but a great step backwards in thought? What else is this but the merging of proletarian ideology with bourgeois ideology? Isn't it true that those who claim they are against peaceful coexistence with the bourgeoisie in the ideological sphere are actually trying to reconcile and fuse Marxist materialism with all kinds of bourgeois idealism and even with Christianity through the medium of humanism?

The modern revisionists and some bourgeois scholars try to describe Marxism as humanism and call Marx a humanist. Some people counterpose the young Marx to the mature proletarian revolutionary Marx. In particular, they make use of certain views on "alienation" expressed by Marx in his early *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* to depict him as an exponent of the bourgeois theory of human nature. They do their best to preach so-called humanism by using the concept of alienation. This, of course, is futile.

In the early stage of development of their thought, Marx and Engels were indeed somewhat influenced by humanist ideas which were closely related to mechanical

materialism and utopian socialism. But when they formulated the materialist conception of history and discovered that class struggle is the motive force of social development, they immediately got rid of this influence. It is from this point that they parted company with Feuerbach. Feuerbach attempted to substitute "anthropology" or the science of man for "theology" or the science of God. But what he advocated was man in general and in the abstract, or in reality bourgeois man. Like God, man in the abstract has no objective existence. So although Feuerbach opposed the old religions, he created a new religion which worshipped man in the abstract and preached "love of humanity". As Engels said, the cult of abstract man had to be replaced by the science of real men and of their historical development. And the great credit for the establishment of this science, i.e., historical materialism, goes to Marx and Engels. They directed violent and merciless criticism against German "true socialism" which enthusiastically preached "humanism". They criticized "true socialism" as being "concerned no longer with real human beings but with 'Man', having lost all revolutionary enthusiasm and proclaiming instead the universal love of mankind". (Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*, FLPH, Moscow, p. 81.) Does not this criticism hit the nail right on the head!

As for alienation, it was a concept current in the classical German philosophy of the time. It denotes that the subject, at a certain stage of its development, produces its opposite, which becomes an external force alien to itself. This term was completely shrouded in mystery when Hegel used it in his exposition of idealism. Marx said, "With him it [dialectic] is standing on its head. It must be turned right side up again, if you

would discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell." ("Afterword to the Second German Edition", *Capital*, FLPH, Moscow, 1959, Vol. I, p. 20.) The same is true of the question of alienation. If we interpret alienation from the materialist viewpoint and in accordance with the dialectical law that a thing always divides itself in two and develops into its opposite, the term alienation which Hegel stood on its head will be turned right side up again, and we will then have to admit that alienation is a general phenomenon in nature and human society, which assumes diverse forms.

Hegel used alienation to expound the process by which his so-called Absolute Idea transforms itself into the external world and then turns back on itself. Unlike Hegel, Feuerbach used alienation to show how man, through his imagination, alienates his essence into and prostrates himself before God, and how when he comes to realize that Man is his own supreme essence and that the essence of God is the essence of man, he will be able to eliminate this phenomenon of alienation and destroy the cult of God. Unlike Hegel and Feuerbach, Marx borrowed this term to express his ideas on the alienation of labour. Just as man created God out of his own head and was governed by God, so the worker created wealth with his own hands and was governed by it. Wealth created by the workers' labour does not belong to them, but to other people. Thus this wealth, its appropriator and even labour itself become alien forces antagonistic to and dominating the workers. With this Marx exposed the irrationality of private ownership, and pointed out that in order to eliminate this phenomenon of alienation, it is necessary to eliminate private ownership and the antagonistic form of the social division of labour. Marx

later used the materialistic conception of history and the labour theory of value in discovering the law of surplus value which operates in capitalist society and exposing the secret of the fetishism of commodities. He thus further revealed the essence of capitalist private ownership and the fundamental contradiction of capitalist society, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

According to Marxism, only when socialism and communism are established through proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and only when capitalist private ownership with its remnants are thoroughly abolished, can the working class and the working people gradually and finally overcome the alienated forces which control and dominate them in capitalist society, emancipate themselves from the fetishism of commodities, become the real, conscious masters, not only of nature but also of society and, with full consciousness, begin to make their own history and master their own fate. This is what the founders of Marxism meant by mankind's leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom and what Comrade Mao Tse-tung meant when he said, "The epoch of world communism will be reached when all mankind voluntarily and consciously changes itself and the world." (*On Practice*)

The theory of alienation the revisionists and bourgeois scholars advocate is in fact the bourgeois theory of human nature, which is directed against the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They describe the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism as alien forces antagonistic to human nature. The Yugoslav revisionists assert that "ruling in the workers'

name is exactly the same as a regency's ruling in the king's name".¹ They maintain that in a socialist society under the dictatorship of the proletariat, people are not free politically, economically and ideologically and that there is some sort of "eternal human nature" and any restraint imposed on individuals by society represents the "alienation of man". Therefore, the only way to make man return to himself is to get rid of all kinds of social restraint. In their view, to eliminate the "alienation of man", it is necessary to destroy the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system. In advocating the return of man to himself, they are actually advocating absolute individual freedom and asking the people who live under socialism to return to the human nature of bourgeois individualism and to restore capitalism by which it is fostered.

The modern revisionists try to cover up their betrayal of the revolutionary cause of the proletariat by harping on the fashionable slogan of "humanism". They never tire of saying, "Everything for the sake of man." We would like to ask, for what kind of man? They have no love for the revolutionary people or the labouring masses. The ones they do have love for are the leaders of imperialism and reaction. They fear the people and the people's revolution. After World War II, "humanism" as advocated by the bourgeoisie became fashionable for a time. Though there were many different schools of "humanism", most of them reflected the anxiety, fear and despair of the decaying and moribund monopoly capitalists, and served as an opiate to lull the vigilance of

¹ P. Franitsky, "Notes on Humanism", in the Yugoslav journal *Nasha Stvarnost* Nos. 7-8, 1961, p. 68.

the people of the world against the imperialists' nuclear blackmail. The "humanism" advocated by the modern revisionists is intimately tied up with the contemporary humanism of the reactionary bourgeoisie of the West.

The humanism on the lips of the modern revisionists is not only profoundly reactionary when contrasted with scientific communism, it is even reactionary when contrasted with the bourgeois humanism which in the past once played a progressive role.

In the field of the theory of socialism and communism, the modern revisionists have been even more brazen in betraying Marxism-Leninism and the revolution. They have discarded the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the theory of the proletarian party, which form the essence of Marxism-Leninism.

The modern revisionists attempt, on the one hand, to write off class struggle and the proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries and, on the other, to deny that classes and class struggle as well as the possibility of the restoration of capitalism continue to exist in the socialist countries throughout the historical period of the transition from capitalism to communism. They have flagrantly abolished the dictatorship of the proletariat.

On this question, the leadership of the CPSU and the Tito clique support and echo each other.

The Yugoslav revisionists said that class struggle has already been abolished in their country, that no conditions whatsoever obtain for the "re-creation of the bourgeoisie as a class"¹ and that "the restoration of any system of exploitation of man by man has been precluded".²

¹ Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

² Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The leadership of the CPSU has also proclaimed that class struggle no longer exists in their country and that "the danger of capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union is ruled out".¹

The Yugoslav revisionists said: If more people are enabled by democratic means to take part in the "socialist" regime, "there is no need whatsoever to keep on waving the red kerchief of the dictatorship of the proletariat".² The leaders of the CPSU followed suit by declaring that "the dictatorship of the proletariat . . . has ceased to be necessary in the U.S.S.R. from the point of view of the tasks of internal development",³ and that at the present stage the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat has become a "state of the whole people". They also allege that, in conformity with this situation, the party of the proletariat has become a "party of the entire people".

The leaders of the CPSU have energetically advertised their fallacies concerning the "state of the whole people" and the "party of the entire people", claiming them to be "new inventions by the party".

"New inventions" forsooth!

The so-called state of the whole people is nothing but an old device used by reactionary classes to cover up their dictatorship and deceive the working people. The bourgeoisie used to call the state under its dictatorship

¹ N. S. Khrushchov, "Control Figures for the Economic Development of the USSR for 1959-1935", report to the 21st Extraordinary Congress of the CPSU.

² Edvard Kardelj's interview with the Italian Communist Party delegation, Oct. 14, 1956.

³ Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, adopted at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU.

a "state of the whole people". The classical Marxist writers exposed this fraud long ago and scientifically expounded the class nature of the state. The state is always an instrument of class dictatorship. There is no such thing as a "supra-class" state or a state "of the whole people". The task of the proletarian revolution is not to establish a "state of the whole people", but to replace the state of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The state will disappear only with the ultimate elimination of classes through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin clearly pointed out, "The essence of Marx's teaching on the state has been mastered only by those who understand that the dictatorship of a *single* class [the proletariat] is necessary . . . for the entire *historical period* which separates capitalism from 'classless society', from Communism." ("The State and Revolution", *Selected Works*, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2, Part 1, p. 234.) In socialist society, the dictatorship of the proletariat has not fulfilled its historical mission so long as there still exist remnants of the old exploiting classes and the possibility of the emergence of new bourgeois elements, and so long as there still exist the class difference between workers and peasants and the differentiation between manual and mental workers. The dictatorship of the proletariat will disappear only with the attainment of a communist society when classes and class differences will have been completely eliminated. The dictatorship of the proletariat will not disappear before this.

Similarly, political parties have always been instruments of class struggle. There is no political party that is "supra-class" or "of the entire people". The leadership of the proletarian party is the core of the dictator-

ship of the proletariat. The proletarian party cannot wither away before the dictatorship of the proletariat. The withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat means the withering away of the state and of the party.

It is a fact that all socialist countries without exception, including the Soviet Union, are still far, far removed from the fulfilment of the historical mission of the dictatorship of the proletariat and from classless, communist society. In all these countries without exception there are still classes and class struggle. And there is still the danger of capitalist restoration. Therefore, the struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism still exists in all socialist countries, and the question of who will win has not yet been completely and finally solved. Only by upholding the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leadership of the proletarian party and carrying the socialist revolution through to the end, can the final victory of socialism and the transition to communist society be achieved. Conversely, if the dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian party are abolished, if the socialist revolution is left off unfinished half-way, it will lead to the loss of the fruits of the socialist revolution and the re-emergence of capitalism. The two different lines lead to different futures. This is an objective law independent of human will.

Both in theory and in practice, the fallacies of the state of the whole people and of the party of the entire people will inevitably result in the replacement of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by that of the dictatorship of another class, and the replacement of the party of the vanguard of the proletariat by a party of another character. There is no other possibility.

Yugoslavia has already set an example. The Yugoslav modern revisionists are the political representatives of bourgeois forces. They usurped the leadership of the party and the state and brought about the degeneration of the dictatorship of the proletariat into that of the bourgeoisie and of the proletarian party into a bourgeois one. Undoubtedly, whoever takes the path of Yugoslavia will have no better future.

In the field of political economy, too, the modern revisionists follow the old revisionists and try hard to revise the fundamentals of the Marxist-Leninist theory of capitalist imperialism by means of "new data on economic development". The old revisionists propagated the theory of ultra-imperialism and proclaimed that the Marxist theses concerning capitalist economic crisis and the inevitable collapse of capitalism were obsolete. Lenin thoroughly refuted this reactionary propaganda and made a profound analysis of the nature of imperialism as monopoly capitalism, as decadent and moribund capitalism. The modern revisionists propagate the view that the nature of imperialism has changed, that imperialism and colonialism have virtually ceased to exist, and that the Leninist theory on imperialism is obsolete. They say:

. . . Lenin advanced and developed his propositions on imperialism decades ago when many of the factors that are now decisive for historical progress, for the international situation as a whole, were absent.¹

¹ N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party, June 21, 1960.

They have also concocted various theories to hide the deep contradictions within the imperialist system, and praise the "vitality" of imperialism and embellish it. These theories of theirs are nothing but a rehash of the long bankrupt platitudes of the old revisionists. They are also different versions of such myths as "people's capitalism" fabricated by imperialist theorists, decked out in "revolutionary" phraseology.

In the field of the economic problems of socialism, Marxist-Leninists proceed from the collective interests of the working people and insist on the principle of "to each according to his work" on the basis of socialist ownership by the whole people and collective ownership. In other words, those who do not work shall not eat, those who work more shall receive more and those who work less shall receive less. In the interest of the high-income stratum, the modern revisionists have completely distorted the socialist principle of "to each according to his work" as set forth by Marxism-Leninism. They are actually using the slogan of individual "material incentive" and "material interest" surreptitiously to supersede the socialist principle of "to each according to his work" which Marxist-Leninists have always advocated. They describe their vaunted individual "material incentive" and "material interest" as "the motive force in the growth of socialist production",¹ as "the core and motive force of the socialist plan"² or, in Khrushchov's words,

¹ *Political Economy*, edited by the Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Moscow, 1962, in Russian, p. 499.

² "Planning, an Important Link in Running a Socialist Economy", *Travda*, Feb. 7, 1963.

as "the foundation for the raising of production and the growth of labour productivity".¹

The modern revisionists completely ignore the enthusiasm of the labouring masses for collective production in socialist society and are opposed to giving prime importance to political education which heightens the socialist consciousness of the masses. They are infatuated with the much vaunted idea of "individual material incentive", which can only lead people to the pursuit of purely personal interests, whet their desire for personal gain and profit, encourage the growth of bourgeois individualism and damage the socialist economy based on ownership by the whole people and on collective ownership or even cause it to disintegrate.

They also use the quest for profit to stimulate the management of enterprises and confuse socialist with capitalist profit in their attempt to replace the socialist economic principle of planning by the capitalist economic principle of profit, and so pave the way for the liberalization of the economy and the degeneration of socialist into capitalist economy. It is not surprising, therefore, that the modern revisionists are becoming more and more recipient to the fashions and vogues of bourgeois economic theory.

In the field of economic relations among socialist countries, under the guise of the international division of labour the leaders of the CPSU go to great lengths to slander the correct policy of building socialism by one's own efforts, which they term a "nationalist" policy.

¹ N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at a Meeting of Advanced Agricultural Workers of the States of the Central Black-Soil Zone of the Russian Federation in the City of Voronezh, Feb. 11, 1961.

Their attack is wrong in theory and has an ulterior purpose in practice, namely, to make some socialist countries dependent on them economically and hence subservient politically and obedient to their baton. Theirs is truly a policy of national egoism and great-power chauvinism. To this end, certain persons even demand that those socialist countries which are "backward in production" should confine themselves to developing agriculture and industries processing farm produce so as to provide agricultural products for other countries. This sounds like a variety of neo-colonialist theory under the signboard of "international socialist division of labour".

In short, the modern revisionists are savagely attacking the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism in every sphere of learning. Thus in every sphere they have set up concrete targets for our criticism. Revolutionary workers in philosophy and social science should come forward to smash the attacks of modern revisionism and in the course of this struggle further develop Marxist-Leninist theory in all spheres of learning.

III. IN ALL OUR RESEARCH IN PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, FIRST PLACE SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE SUMMING UP AND STUDY OF THE EXPERIENCE AND PROBLEMS OF CONTEMPORARY REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLES

In close co-ordination with current international and domestic struggles, we should give priority in all our research in philosophy and social science to studying the experience of revolution and construction in China and

to the new problems arising from the current domestic and international struggles.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out the fundamental direction for our Party's theoretical work in his "Reform Our Study" published in 1941 and in a number of other works published during the rectification campaign. These works continue to be the basic programme for our activity in philosophy and social science. In a recent speech at the Nguyen Ai Quoc Party School in Viet Nam Comrade Liu Shao-chi discussed the importance of the current struggle against modern revisionism and of the study of Marxism-Leninism. This too is a guide to our work in philosophy and social science.

In his "Reform Our Study", Comrade Mao Tse-tung time and again stressed the principle of integrating theory with practice to which Marxist-Leninists have always attached great importance. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to study both the present and the past and to lay stress on the application of theory, that is, the basic theories of Marxism-Leninism should be applied to the constant study and summing up of the lessons of specific struggles in order to draw new conclusions for guiding revolutionary action, thus turning theory into practice. Every new advance in the development of Marxism-Leninism has been achieved through the study and summation of new problems and new experience in the proletarian revolutionary struggle and through the integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution. But revisionism and dogmatism depart from this basic principle in two opposite directions. Revisionism discards the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and thus essentially betrays Marxism-Leninism, whereas dogma-

tism is divorced from reality and, so far from developing Marxism-Leninism, only makes it stagnate, with retrogression as the inevitable result.

In his essay, "Our Programme", written in the early period of his theoretical activity, Lenin on the one hand opposed the "renovation" of fundamental Marxist theory by the revisionists headed by Bernstein, pointing out that "there can be no strong socialist party without a revolutionary theory", and on the other hand opposed dogmatism, stressing the study of real life and the need for "an independent elaboration of Marx's theory".

We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists must develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life.

Marx's theory, he continued, "provides only general *guiding* principles, which, *in particular*, are applied in England differently than in France, in France differently than in Germany and in Germany differently than in Russia." In 1900, Lenin wrote in "The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement":

. . . in every country this combination of socialism and the working-class movement was evolved historically, in unique ways, in accordance with the prevailing conditions of time and place. . . . It is a very difficult process. . . .

The same process has taken place in China. Braving numerous difficulties in prolonged revolutionary struggles, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has persevered in combating both "Left" and Right opportunism, and particularly

dogmatism, always proceeding on the basis of concrete reality and integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. On this last question, Comrade Mao Tse-tung wrote in "Rectify the Party's Style of Work":

The arrow of Marxism-Leninism must be used to shoot at the target of the Chinese revolution. Unless this point is made clear, the theoretical level of our Party can never be raised and the Chinese revolution can never be victorious.

The leaders of the CPSU claim to have "creatively developed Marxism-Leninism", but while they give themselves and their followers the licence to revise it, they forbid others to develop it in a truly creative way and to "elaborate Marx's theory independently" as Lenin taught us. If anyone does so, they slap such labels as adherent of "nationalism" and "the personality cult" on him. While wantonly adulterating Marxism-Leninism, they demand that other Communist Parties should follow their every step and parrot their every word as if their adulteration were an "imperial edict". Consequently, whether they wield the baton themselves or whether they dance to the baton of others, the modern revisionists are at the same time modern dogmatists.

We must oppose both modern revisionists and modern dogmatists and must take an attitude completely different from theirs. We must study current revolutionary problems and strive to integrate Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese and world revolutions.

In 1938, Comrade Mao Tse-tung dealt as follows with the question of study in his report to the Sixth Plenary

Session of the Sixth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party:

What are the characteristics of the present movement? What are its laws? How to direct this movement? All these are practical problems. . . . The movement is developing, new things have yet to emerge, and they are emerging endlessly. To study this movement in its entirety and in its development is a great task forever claiming our attention. If anyone refuses to study these problems seriously and carefully, then he will not be a Marxist.

Study of practical problems is certainly not easy. It requires a mastery of abundant factual data, a good grasp of current struggles and an understanding of the Party's line and policies. If we are to be revolutionary workers in philosophy and social science, we must study practical problems. If we are afraid of difficulties and therefore avoid practical problems in our research work and concentrate our interest and energy on the past, our research will go astray in stressing the past more than the present. This trend must be opposed. We must give every encouragement and support to the study of practical problems by our workers in philosophy and social science and provide them with the necessary facilities.

It is a most important task for the workers in philosophy and social science to study and sum up our experience in revolution and construction.

This experience is extremely rich. Studying it and summing it up are most important for the guidance of our practical work and for the education of the future generations. Much of it is of great international significance, and the revolutionary people of other countries are

watching China's experience with fraternal and keen interest. They are profoundly interested in a wide variety of subjects ranging from armed struggle, land reform, the united front, the building of the Party, the establishment of revolutionary base areas, the building of the armed forces, rural policies, policies concerning industry and commerce and policies concerning culture, education and the intellectuals, all the way to our concrete experience and working methods, and particularly our experience in political work and methods connected with the mass line, as well as the new problems arising from the present socialist revolution and construction in China. Comrade Mao Tse-tung and the Central Committee of our Party have already made basic generalizations about this experience and these problems. We must take the thinking of Comrade Mao Tse-tung as our guide, thoroughly and systematically study this experience and these problems in all fields, expound and contribute to theory, and write revolutionary scientific works.

While intensifying our study of China's practical problems, we must also devote more attention to studying the current situation in other countries and the new problems and new experience arising in the international struggle.

To meet the needs of the revolution, we must make a careful and comprehensive analysis of the various forces involved in the international struggle. The academic research work now being done in this field is rather weak and should be strengthened. One must not adopt an exclusivist attitude in academic research. Every nation, whether advanced or backward, and every country, whether large or small, has its own contribution to make in the fields of revolutionary experience, revolutionary theory, science and culture. We should learn from them

modestly and must never entertain the least feeling of great-nation chauvinism.

We have to investigate the new phenomena and problems that have arisen in the capitalist world since Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, and particularly since World War II, and to study and critically evaluate the academic advances of the capitalist countries. Through such study and evaluation we can enhance our own ability to create new things of our own.

We have to study the new problems and new experience of the international communist movement, the positive and negative experience of the socialist countries, and the historical and social roots of modern revisionism and its manifestations in the political, economic, cultural and other fields.

We have to study the experience of all peoples in their struggle for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism, and in particular, the experience of the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

While stressing the study of present-day China and the contemporary world, we should also attach importance to the study of China and the world of yesterday and the day before yesterday. The study of our own history is of particular significance. Comrade Mao Tse-tung long ago criticized some of our comrades for their ignorance of Chinese history as reflecting a truly abnormal state of affairs. China is one of the oldest countries in the world. We should study her whole history since ancient times, while emphasizing the modern and the contemporary. Marx's penetrating understanding of the capitalist economy provided him with the key to understanding the economy of the past, just as the

anatomy of man is the key to the anatomy of the monkey, to quote his own metaphor. Twenty-two years ago, Comrade Mao Tse-tung set us the task of writing the economic, political, military and cultural histories of China in the last century, and this task we have not yet accomplished. It is high time we did so.

Another task Chinese historians should undertake is the compilation of a world history from the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint. We cannot rest content with the use of world histories compiled by foreign scholars. We should make serious and balanced criticisms of the distortions of world history by Western bourgeois and modern revisionist historians.

An important field of work for our philosophy and social science is the study and critical summation of China's historical legacy from the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint.

In his article, "The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War", Comrade Mao Tse-tung said:

As we are believers in the Marxist approach to history, we must not cut off our whole historical past. We must make a summing-up from Confucius down to Sun Yat-sen and inherit this precious legacy. This will help much in directing the great movement of today.

He pointed out the great importance of absorbing this historical legacy for the concrete application of Marxism in China and for giving it a national form.

Lenin wrote in the *Rough Draft of a Resolution on Proletarian Culture*:

Not the *concoction* of a new proletarian culture, but the *development* of the best models, traditions and results of *existing* culture from the point of view of the world outlook of Marxism and the conditions of the life and struggle of the proletariat in the epoch of its dictatorship.

Here Lenin called attention to two points in one's attitude towards one's cultural tradition: first, it is essential to abide by the Marxist world outlook, that is, the viewpoint of dialectical materialism and historical materialism; and secondly, it is essential to be guided by the political interests and needs of the proletariat.

In the last few years, much work has been done in Chinese academic circles in organizing and studying our historical legacy, and some excellent results have been achieved. We should give this work its proper place in the realm of philosophy and social science and continue to make progress.

Whether or not to absorb our historical legacy has long since ceased to be a question at issue. For the proletariat is the only true defender of all that is fine in our cultural legacy and its sole heir. The question now is, from what viewpoint and by what methods should we sift this historical legacy? In recent years as a result of studying Marxism-Leninism and Comrade Mao Tse-tung's works, more and more people have begun to study history and re-appraise historical events and personages from new points of view. This is a good sign. However, there are still people who do not approve of the study of history and the appraisal of historical personages and events from the viewpoint of historical materialism and by the

method of class analysis. This has aroused keen debate in academic circles.

The question of what attitude to take towards our historical legacy is in fact ideologically linked with the struggle between proletarian ideology and bourgeois and feudal ideology, with the struggle between two different conceptions of history, i.e., between historical materialism and historical idealism, and with the question of whether or not to raise the banner of Marxist-Leninist criticism in the field of history. We hold that only scientific analysis and judgement can enable us to distinguish the gold from the dross in our historical legacy and to decide what to keep and what to discard. And it is also through Marxist-Leninist criticism that what is vital in the legacy can be turned into something scientific and valuable to us today. Historical materialism is a powerful scientific tool with which to clear away the mists of feudal and bourgeois idealism that have long veiled history, so that we can get nearer to the historical truth than those before us and draw on the useful experience and wisdom of our forefathers in their bitter and arduous struggles for the unification, prosperity and progress of our motherland and on the intellectual wealth accumulated over the generations. We do not study history for its own sake. We not only preserve what is fine in our legacy but, more important, we develop it. We respect the scholars of the past for their many achievements in studying historical sources and give weight to their incisive judgements on historical events and persons. But our new and scientific conception of history is entirely different from theirs. We study history to serve the needs of the people at present. We study the dead not to give the

dead control over the living but to free the living from the bondage of the tradition of the dead.

Thus it is clearly necessary to stimulate the critical spirit in academic circles. The re-evaluation of China's legacy has been going on for nearly half a century since the May 4th Movement in 1919. We cherish the memory of our valiant forerunners — those who dared to challenge the culture of feudalism, its ideology and its idols. Although they did not understand Marxist dialectics and were formalistic in that they either affirmed or repudiated things wholesale, their anti-feudal spirit and courage deserve undying praise. But now some people have lost this spirit and courage and seem to have relapsed into the state of mind prevailing before the May 4th Movement. Certain people again present Confucius as an idol and bow to him, but now he is clad in modern dress and the *kowtow* has become a new-style formal bow. How can this be reconciled with the revolutionary critical spirit of Marxism-Leninism? We cannot but describe it as a tendency towards idolizing the ancients and we must certainly oppose it. Confucius must be given his due as a classical Chinese thinker and teacher. But for over two thousand years feudal rulers used his teachings, as expounded by later scholars from Tung Chung-shu [179-104 B.C.] to Chu Hsi [1130-1200 A.D.], to enslave the minds of the people. The May 4th Movement rendered a great service in boldly criticizing Confucius, which represented a great emancipation of the minds of the Chinese people.

While showing respect for our history and our forefathers, we should do more to encourage those who dare to depart from the beaten track of our predecessors and to re-evaluate history, study its lessons and put forward

new themes and views from the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint — in short, to stimulate their critical spirit and to encourage them to be bold in their theoretical explorations. Without such revolutionary courage to strike out along new paths, it is impossible to score new achievements and advances in scientific work.

The unity of the profoundly revolutionary with the profoundly scientific attitude is an inherent characteristic of Marxism-Leninism. In re-evaluating history and studying its lessons, we must persist in the attitude of seeking the truth from the facts. It is no easy work to study history and sort out our legacy by means of the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint. Engels said:

The development of the materialist conception even in regard to only a single historical example was a scientific work which would have demanded years of tranquil study, for it is obvious that nothing can be done here with mere phrases, that only a mass of critically sifted, completely mastered historical material can enable one to accomplish such a task. ("Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*", *Selected Works of Marx and Engels*, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 1, p. 369.)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung points out that Marxism-Leninism is a science, that science means honest, solid knowledge and that there is no room for the playing of tricks. Time and again he has advised us that in studying a problem it is necessary to appropriate the material in detail, do systematic and thorough investigation and derive its inherent laws and not imaginary ones. Such is the scientific attitude. To use the simple method of sticking this or that label on something may seem to con-

form with historical materialism and the class viewpoint, but in fact it is subjectivism. We disapprove of it.

We should take no less serious an attitude in studying the historical legacy of other countries and should assimilate whatever is helpful through critical analysis. We know from Chinese history that in the Tang Dynasty and also in the modern period of the May 4th Movement, much stress was laid on assimilating what was good in the culture of other countries. As a result in both periods our culture flourished. Today, it is all the more necessary for us to have a picture of the whole world and to draw on the wisdom of all mankind to enrich our country's new socialist culture.

In assimilating outstanding academic and cultural achievements from abroad, we must critically examine them from the proletarian class stand and viewpoint and in the light of our own national and socialist needs before we decide what to take or what to discard. Things introduced from abroad must be digested and transformed so that they become our own and bear our own national style and characteristics. Blind worship of the West, contempt for one's own country and belief in the superiority of everything foreign are ugly manifestations of the comprador-capitalist ideology and the most sterile academic dogmatism, and we must oppose them.

In the sphere of philosophy and social science, the policy of "let a hundred schools of thought contend" must be pursued under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, whether we are dealing with practical or theoretical questions or with our historical legacy.

Philosophy and social science bear the strong imprint of class character and party spirit. In this realm, the guidance of Marxist-Leninist teaching must be con-

sistently followed. In the absence of a Marxist-Leninist orientation, the policy of "let a hundred schools of thought contend" would become the kind of liberalizing policy the modern revisionists desire and follow. If, on the contrary, the policy of "let a hundred schools of thought contend" is not carried out in the academic field, if free exploration and debate and independent thinking are discouraged, and if the method of simply issuing administrative decrees to solve complicated questions in the intellectual field is employed instead, then the result will be ossification of thought in the academic world. As Marx said in an article criticizing the censorship in Prussia, since one does not require roses to smell the same as violets, how can one demand that the mind, the richest of all forms of matter, should have only one form of existence? To oppose and prevent bourgeois liberalization on the one hand and ossification of thought on the other — such is the struggle on two fronts we must wage in the realm of learning and ideology.

In order to know and change the world, revolutionary workers in philosophy and social science need to break new ground in the study of many practical and theoretical questions. In the course of such exploration, mistakes of one kind or another are hardly avoidable. But can we abandon our duty to know and change the world for fear of making mistakes?

In scientific investigation, error often leads to truth. It is by drawing lessons from mistakes and correcting them that sound knowledge is gradually acquired. Therefore, only those who are not afraid of making mistakes and have the courage to correct them can contribute to the great cause of changing the world and at the same time change themselves. Lenin said that "only he who

never does anything never commits errors". In what contempt and ridicule Lenin held the philistines who "pride themselves on the infallibility of their revolutionary inaction"! Everyone in our academic circles who commits a mistake on a theoretical or academic question can and should correct it through discussion and practice, provided he does not deliberately oppose the socialist road and the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, and provided he has the desire and zeal to seek the truth. Our workers in the field of philosophy and social science must have the courage to break new ground untouched by any predecessors, and explore problems they were not aware of. As Marx stated, "There is no royal road to science, and only those who do not dread the fatiguing climb of its steep paths have a chance of gaining its luminous summits." ("Preface to the French Edition of *Capital*", *Capital*, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 1, p. 21.)

IV. BUILDING AND STRENGTHENING THE RANKS OF MARXIST-LENINIST THEORISTS

Forming a powerful contingent of Marxist-Leninist theorists capable of weathering any storm is a task having both urgency and long-term strategic significance.

It is an arduous task to develop Marxist-Leninist philosophy and social science through the criticism of modern revisionism, the summing up of the lessons of contemporary revolutionary struggles and the sorting out of our historical legacy. For a few people to continue at their present level will not be sufficient for this task. We must strive to train more theorists and constantly raise their level.

Workers in philosophy and social science are spokesmen of the ideology of a class; they are an important force in creating intellectual values and influencing the minds of the people. Proletarian workers in philosophy and social science serve the interests of the proletariat, and bourgeois workers in these fields serve those of the bourgeoisie. Their different class stands make them play opposite roles. Hence the great importance of the question of how to educate the ranks of our philosophers and social scientists.

What should be the orientation and method of training for our theorists? There are two fundamentally different lines on this question. One is to train them in the proletarian orientation, that is, train them to serve the people whole-heartedly and to strive to be both "red and expert", so that they will take an active part in practical struggle and manual labour and become proletarian fighters closely linked with the working people. This is the correct proletarian line. Its application will make it possible to produce good Marxist-Leninist theorists. The other line is to train them in a bourgeois orientation, that is, train them to seek personal fame and fortune and to become experts devoid of socialist consciousness, so that they will divorce themselves from reality and the working people and lord it over the people as intellectual aristocrats. This is a wrong line, the bourgeois line. Its application can only result in producing revisionists and new reactionary bourgeois experts, or the degeneration of revolutionary specialists into revisionists and bourgeois philistines. The lessons of certain socialist countries in this respect are a warning to us all.

In his article "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People", Comrade Mao Tse-tung calls

on Chinese intellectuals to "gradually acquire a communist world outlook, get a better grasp of Marxism-Leninism and identify themselves with the workers and peasants". In other words, it is necessary for intellectuals to effect a fundamental change in their world outlook, the key to which lies in linking themselves closely with the workers and peasants.

Twenty-one years have passed since the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art where Comrade Mao Tse-tung advanced the view that literary and artistic workers must go among and identify themselves with the workers, peasants and soldiers. And now a goodly number of comrades have accepted this view and put it into practice. It is a fundamental matter of principle for the orientation of workers in philosophy and social science, too.

Although social science and literature and art are different ideological forms, both are unquestionably reflections in people's minds of social life and are instruments for understanding and remoulding society. Writers and artists epitomize the lessons of the people's struggle in artistic form, whereas social scientists sum them up in theoretical form. Therefore, like workers in literature and art, those in philosophy and social science must go into the midst of the workers and peasants, participate in their labour and struggle, do practical work in organizations at the lower level, learn and study the lessons of the workers' and peasants' struggles, and study the complex phenomena of social life so as to discover its laws and its new problems and provide theoretical explanations for them. To do so is our bounden duty and the only way we can ensure ourselves against separation from the masses and reality and against atrophy in our thinking; hence it is the only way to avoid revision-

ism and dogmatism. No one can contribute to the revolutionary cause in the field of science if he does not link himself with the workers and peasants but belittles the lessons of their revolutionary struggles and immerses himself in books behind closed doors. No one aspiring to be a Marxist-Leninist will ever become one so long as he feels out of his element among the workers and peasants.

While engaged in the practice of class struggle and production, the masses of workers, peasants and cadres raise all kinds of theoretical questions for solution, and they advance many original views. But they lack the requisite book knowledge and theoretical equipment while many of the professional workers in philosophy and social science lack the steeling and experience acquired in practical struggles. In 1942 in his speech "Rectify the Party's Style of Work", Comrade Mao Tse-tung asked the people with book-learning to combine with those experienced in work.

Those with book-learning must develop in the direction of practice; only so will they not rest content with books, only so will they not commit dogmatist errors. Those experienced in work must take up the study of theory and must read seriously; only then will they be able to systematize and synthesize their experience and raise it to the level of theory, only then will they not mistake their partial experience for universal truth and not commit empiricist errors.

The combination of these two kinds of people, so that they can make up for each other's deficiencies and raise each other's level, will prove very helpful not only to theoretical work but to the revolutionary cause as a whole.

Man's correct ideas come only from social practice. Man's social being determines his consciousness. Once grasped by the masses, the correct ideas which a progressive class represents become a material force capable of changing society and the world. The movement from the material to the mental and then back from the mental to the material, i.e., the movement from practice to knowledge and from knowledge back to practice, has to be repeated many times before correct knowledge takes shape. The dialectical process of the transformation of the material into the mental and the mental into the material in the course of social struggle will be more consciously grasped and will give rise to still greater achievements in the revolutionary cause as a result of the combination of professional theoretical workers with those engaged in practical work. Promising theorists will emerge from among the practical workers. A powerful contingent of theorists, with the professional theorists as its centre but comprising large numbers of practical workers too, will grow relatively rapidly.

In stressing the need for workers in philosophy and social science to link themselves with the workers and peasants and to keep in contact with and understand reality, we do not in the least minimize the importance of book knowledge. Workers in philosophy and science must be proficient in their own fields as well as being well versed in the Marxist-Leninist classics; they must acquire knowledge of a wide range of subjects and become truly learned.

Marx's theories are revolutionary and critical because he had the courage not only to make a thorough criticism of the old world but also to assimilate critically the whole range of human knowledge, past and present, thus enrich-

ing and fortifying his theories. Speaking of Marx, Lenin said:

He critically reshaped everything that had been created by human society, not ignoring a single point. Everything that had been created by human thought he reshaped, criticized, tested on the working-class movement, and drew conclusions which people restricted by bourgeois limits or bound by bourgeois prejudices could not draw. ("The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", *Selected Works*, FLPH, Moscow, Vol. 2, Part 2, p. 478.)

The same is true of Lenin himself, of Engels and of Stalin. It is also true of Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

When discussing party spirit in philosophy in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Lenin pointed out:

The task of Marxists in both cases [i.e., in economics and philosophy] is to be able to master and refashion the achievements of these "salesmen" (for instance, you will not make the slightest progress in the investigation of new economic phenomena without making use of the works of these salesmen) and *to be able to* lop off their reactionary tendency, to pursue your *own* line and to combat the *whole line* of the forces and classes hostile to us.

His statement tells us how to study modern bourgeois academic theories.

There are Communists as well as non-Communists among our workers in philosophy and social science; some are Marxists and some have not yet become Marxists. Party and non-Party Marxist-Leninists should form the strong backbone and nucleus of our ranks in philosophy and social science. Marxist workers in philosophy and

social science should unite with all non-Marxist scholars who can be united with, help them to come over to Marxism gradually and consciously and, at the same time, modestly learn from them. In study it is harmful to show even the slightest self-complacency or conceit.

Just as the great socialist era has produced a host of people's heroes, it should also produce a galaxy of brilliant scholars. Both bourgeois and feudal societies had their flourishing periods in the intellectual field, periods which gave birth to many outstanding thinkers and writers. In Germany before Marx, there were Kant and Hegel in philosophy and Lessing and Goethe in literature. In Russia before Lenin, there were such outstanding revolutionary thinkers and men of letters as Pushkin, Herzen, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Tolstoy. In the past hundred years and more, China produced such figures as Kung Ting-an, Kang Yu-wei, Tan Sze-tung, Tsou Jung, Chang Tai-yen and Li Ta-chao, the great revolutionary Sun Yat-sen and the great writer Lu Hsun. Historical figures have generally emerged in the course of radical social changes and acute class struggles. In the period of the Spring and Autumn Annals and of the Warring States, in the classical age of ancient Greece and in the period of the European Renaissance, radical social changes and fierce class struggles pushed many outstanding thinkers, writers and artists to the foreground on the historical stage. Their splendid activities and magnificent achievements still command our admiration. Engels said in praise of the Renaissance:

It was the greatest progressive revolution that mankind had so far experienced, a time which called for giants and produced giants — giants in power of

thought, passion, and character, in universality and learning. (*Dialectics of Nature*, FLPH, Moscow, 1954, p. 30.)

We are now in the midst of a new, great socialist era which calls for new giants, not by the scores but by the thousands. With their heroic labour and struggle and their boundless strength, the great liberated Chinese people have created the necessary conditions for our work, stimulated our intellectual capacities and inspired us to advance. We have also before us the great example of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's creative development of Marxism-Leninism. Should we not achieve results in the academic field far surpassing those of our predecessors? In the early days of liberation, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said, "The great, victorious Chinese People's War of Liberation and the great people's revolution have rejuvenated and are rejuvenating the great culture of the Chinese people." ("The Bankruptcy of the Idealist Conception of History", *Selected Works*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 458.) A new great Renaissance, a socialist Renaissance, is approaching. We should live up to the challenge of our era, and greet it with new efforts, new achievements and new creations. Let us work and march forward together!

thought, passion, and character, in universality and learning. (Dialectics of Nature, FLPH, Moscow, 1954, p. 30.)

We are now in the midst of a new, great socialist era which calls for new giants, not by the scores but by the thousands. With their heroic labour and struggle and their boundless strength, the great liberated Chinese people have created the necessary conditions for our work, stimulated our intellectual capacities and inspired us to advance. We have also before us the great example of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's creative development of Marxism-Leninism. Should we not achieve results in the academic field far surpassing those of our predecessors? In the early days of liberation, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said, "The great, victorious Chinese People's War of Liberation and the great people's revolution have rejuvenated and are rejuvenating the great culture of the Chinese people." ("The Bankruptcy of the Idealist Conception of History", Selected Works, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 458.) A new great Renaissance, a socialist Renaissance, is approaching. We should live up to the challenge of our era, and greet it with new efforts, new achievements and new creations. Let us work and march forward together!

周 揚

哲学社会科学工作者的战斗任务

一九六三年十月二十六日在中国科学院
哲学社会科学部委员会第四次扩大会议上的讲话

*

外文出版社出版(北京)

1963年第一版

编号: (英)3050—829

00050

3—E—589p