

# International Bulletin

Vol. 1. No 52

Special edition price sixpence

Dec 31st 1962

## KHRUSHCHOV, MAO AND TROTSKYISM

In this last issue of the Bulletin for 1962 we have given a great deal of space over to the Sino/Russian dispute and material relating to this question. This is because this dispute has now become the most important polemic since the days of the Left Opposition. Khrushchov has accused his critics of 'sliding into Trotskyist positions' and of acting the way Trotsky would if he were alive. This is not merely a question of using the most damaging swear words, but is a reflection of the deep underlying ideological differences which pose again the questions of the 1920's. The roots of these differences have been dealt with elsewhere, but we reproduce here an extensive summary of the latest statement of the Chinese case. This being the Hsinhua summary of the 13,000 article appearing in the People's Daily of 31st, Dec., entitled the "Differences between comrade Togliatti and us." We have for the purposes of accuracy stuck to the Hsinhua translation. One is struck all the way through, especially when reading the full article, by the similarity of the Chinese critique of Togliatti's position (read Khrushchov) and that of a Trotskyist critique. On one important position however we would differentiate ourselves, that of the statement of Yugoslavia being a capitalist state because of the policies of the Tito leadership. The Chinese do not make a critique of the bureaucracy and still regard Trotsky as a 'renegade' (see statement on 'letter' in Tribune). However, <sup>even</sup> if they go no further they have provided the left with an armoury of arguments against present-day Stalinism. The Summary reads:

"The People's Daily of December 31st carries an important editorial entitled: "The differences between Comrade Togliatti and us." The editorial says that it was not the desire of the Chinese Communist Party to discuss the differences in public, but at the recent 10th Congress of the Italian Communist Party, Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades in the C.P.I. rudely attacked the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties on a series of important questions of principle, and persisted in conducting a public debate. In such circumstances, the editorial says, "We cannot remain silent but must publicly answer the attacks on us by Comrade Togliatti and other comrades, nor can we remain silent about the views they expressed in contravention of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and of the revolutionary principles of the Moscow declaration and the Moscow statement but must publicly comment on these views."

"The editorial analyses the essence of the views of Togliatti and certain other C.P.I. leaders which run counter to Marxism-Leninism. "In the final analysis", the editorial states, "the stand taken by Togliatti and certain other C.P.I. leaders boils down to this --- the people of the capitalist countries should not make revolutions, the oppressed nations should not wage struggle to win liberation, and the people of the world should not fight against imperialism. Actually, all this exactly suits the needs of the imperialists and the reactionaries." The first section of the editorial deals with the differences between the two parties on the question of war and peace. It explains the consistent stand of the Chinese Communist on this question, and analyses in detail three points which are at issue.

"On the question of how to avert world war and safeguard world peace, the Chinese Communist Party has consistently stood for the resolute exposure of imperialism, for strengthening the socialist camp, for firm support of the national liberation movements and the people's revolutionary struggles, for the broadest alliance of all the peace-loving countries and the people of the world, and at the same time, for taking full advantage of the contradictions among our enemies, and for utilising the method of negotiation as well as other forms of struggle. The aim of this stand is precisely the effective prevention of world war and preservation of peace. This stand fully conforms with Marxism-Leninism and with the Moscow declaration and the Moscow statement. It is the correct policy for preventing world war and defending world peace. We persist in this correct policy precisely because we are deeply convinced that it is possible to prevent world by relying on the combined struggle of all the forces mentioned above."

"It would simply result in a phoney peace or bring about an actual war for the people of the whole world if you prettify (as translated - Ed. note) imperialism, pin your hopes on peace on imperialism, take a passive or negative attitude towards the national liberation movements and peoples revolutionary struggles and bow down and surrender to imperialism, as advocated by those who attack the Chinese Communist Party. This policy is wrong and all Marxist-Leninists, all revolutionary people, all peace-loving people must resolutely oppose it," the editorial says,

continued over/

"The second section of the editorial deals with the differences on the question of nuclear weapons and nuclear war in three respects. The editorial states that the emergence of nuclear weapons has not changed and cannot change the fundamental Marxist-Leninist theory with regard to war and peace. Those who hold there is no longer any distinction between just and unjust wars either oppose just wars or refuse to support them, and they have lapsed into the position of bourgeois pacifism which is opposed to all wars. The editorial opposes the pessimistic and despairing tunes voiced by Togliatti and some other people. It points out that it is possible to attain a complete ban on nuclear weapons in the following circumstances: the socialist camp has a great nuclear superiority; the people's struggles in various countries against nuclear weapons and nuclear war become broader and deeper; having further forfeited their nuclear superiority, the imperialists are compelled to realise that their policy of nuclear blackmail is no longer effective and that their launching of a nuclear war would only accelerate their own extinction.

The editorial declares: "The course of history necessarily leads to the destruction of nuclear weapons by mankind, and will definitely not lead to the destruction of mankind by nuclear weapons." The editorial points out that the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail must be thoroughly exposed and that all peace-loving countries and people must be mobilised on the most extensive scale to wage an unrelenting fight against every move by the U.S. imperialists in their plans for aggression and war. "We are deeply convinced that, by relying on the united struggle of all the forces of peace, it is possible to frustrate the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail. This is the correct and effective policy of achieving a ban on nuclear weapons and preventing a nuclear war," it says.

The third section of the editorial refutes the misrepresentations and attacks levelled by Togliatti and others at the Marxist-Leninist thesis that "Imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers." The editorial says: "In comparing imperialism and all reactionaries with paper tigers, comrade Mao Tse-Tung and the Chinese Communists are looking at the problem as a whole and from a long-term point of view and are looking at the essence of the problem. What is meant is that, in the final analysis, it is the people who are really powerful, not imperialism and the reactionaries. Strategically we should despise all our enemies, but tactically we should take them all seriously. This also means that in regard to the whole we should despise the enemy but that in regard to each and every concrete question we must take them seriously.

Comrade Mao Tse-Tung's analysis of imperialism and all reactionaries is completely in accord with Lenin's analysis. In 1919 Lenin compared the "universally mighty" Anglo-French imperialism to a "Colossus with feet of clay." "In history there have been countless instances proving that imperialism and reactionaries are all paper tigers."

The editorial says: "The possession of nuclear weapons by imperialism has not changed by one iota the nature of imperialism, which is rotten to the core and declining, inwardly weak though outwardly strong; nor has it changed by one iota the basic Marxist-Leninist principle that the masses of the people are the decisive factor in the development of history. When in his talk with Anna Louise Strong, Comrade Mao Tse-Tung first put forward the proposition that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers, the imperialists already had nuclear weapons. In this talk comrade Mao Tse-Tung pointed out "The atom bomb is a paper tiger which the U.S. reactionaries use to scare people. It looks terrible, but in fact it isn't. Of course, the atom bomb is a weapon of mass slaughter, but the outcome of a war is decided by the people, not by one or two types of weapon." History has proved that even when imperialism is armed with nuclear weapons, it cannot frighten into submission a revolutionary people who dare to fight. The victory of the Chinese revolution and the great victories of the peoples of Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, Algeria and other countries in their revolutionary struggles, were all won at a time when U.S. imperialism possessed nuclear weapons. Imperialism has always been armed to the teeth and has always been out for the blood of the people. No matter what kind of teeth imperialism may have, whether guns, tanks, rocket teeth, nuclear teeth or any other kind of teeth that modern science and technology may provide, its rotten decadent and paper tiger nature cannot change. In the final analysis, neither nuclear teeth nor any other kind of teeth can save imperialism from its fate of inevitable extinction. In the end the nuclear teeth of imperialism, and whatever other teeth it may have, will be consigned by the people of the world to the museum of history, together with imperialism itself.

The fourth section of the editorial deals with the differences between the two parties on the question of peaceful co-existence. It states: "The Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government have always stood for peaceful co-



existence between countries with different social systems. China was an initiator of the well known five principles of peaceful co-existence." It points out: "It is inconceivable that peaceful co-existence can be achieved without struggle. It is still less conceivable that the establishment of peaceful co-existence can eliminate class struggles in the world arena and can abolish the antagonism between the two systems, socialism and capitalism, and the antagonism between oppressed nations and oppressor nations." The editorial adds: "Comrade Togliatti and other comrades have completely revised Lenin's principles for peaceful co-existence and discarded the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of class struggle; in reality they are substituting class collaboration for class struggle on a world scale, advocating the fusion of the socialist and capitalist systems."

The editorial says that Togliatti and certain other people extend their idea of "peaceful co-existence" to cover relations between the colonial and semi-colonial people on the one hand and the imperialists and colonialists on the other. They are really asking the oppressed nations to "co-exist peacefully" with their colonial rulers, and asking them to tolerate colonial rule rather than to resist or wage struggles for independence, much less to fight wars of national liberation. It continues: "Togliatti and certain other people extend idea of class collaboration in the international arena to cover 'joint intervention' in the underdeveloped areas." It says: "To talk like this is obviously to spread illusions in the interests of neo-colonialism."

The editorial points out: "The position taken by comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades on the Sino-Indian boundary question reflects their point of view on peaceful co-existence, which is that in carrying out this policy the socialist countries should make one concession after another to the capitalist countries, should not fight even in self-defence when subjected to armed attacks, but should surrender their territorial sovereignty." It adds that there is nothing in common between this point of view and the principle of peaceful co-existence which a socialist country ought to follow."

On the stand taken by China over the Cuban question, the editorial states: "When the heroic Cuban people and their revolutionary leader, premier Fidel Castro, resolutely rejected international inspection as an infringement on Cuba's sovereignty and advanced their five just demands, the Chinese people held gigantic mass demonstrations and parades throughout the country in accordance with their consistent stand for proletarian internationalism and firmly supported the Cuban people's struggle in defence of their independence, sovereignty and dignity. Was there anything wrong in that? Yet some people have repeatedly charged China with creating difficulties in the Caribbean situation and with wanting to plunge the world into a thermo-nuclear war. This slander against China is most malicious and most despicable.

How can one possibly interpret the resolute support which the Chinese people gave to the Cuban people in their struggle against international inspection and in defence of their sovereignty as meaning that China was opposed to peaceful co-existence or wanted to plunge others into a thermonuclear war? Does this mean that China, also, should have applied pressure on Cuba to force her to accept international inspection, and that only by so doing would China have conformed to this so-called 'peaceful co-existence'? If there are people who give verbal support to Cuba's five demands but are actually opposed to the Chinese people's support for Cuba, are they not merely exposing the hypocrisy of their own support for Cuba's five demands?

The Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people have always maintained that the course of history is decided by the great strength of the masses of their people and not by any weapons. On more than one occasion we have made it clear that we neither called for the establishment of missile bases in Cuba nor obstructed the withdrawal of the so-called offensive weapons from Cuba. We have never considered that it was a Marxist-Leninist attitude to brandish nuclear weapons as a way of settling international disputes. Nor have we ever considered that the avoidance of a thermonuclear war in the Caribbean crisis was a 'Munich'. What we did strongly oppose, still strongly oppose and will strongly oppose in the future is the sacrifice of another country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. A compromise of this sort can only be regarded as 100% appeasement, a 'Munich' pure and simple. A compromise of this sort has nothing in common with the policy of peaceful co-existence of the socialist countries.

The fifth section of the editorial deals with the "structural reform" theory of Togliatti and certain other comrades in the Italian Communist Party.

continued over/

The editorial says: "The fundamental problem in every revolution is that of state power. In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels declared: "The first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class." This idea runs through the entire works of Lenin. In "The State and Revolution", Lenin laid stress on the need to break up and smash the bourgeois state machine and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat."

However, the editorial continues, "Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades in the Italian Communist Party maintain that Lenin's analysis in "The State and Revolution" is no longer sufficient, and that (the content of) proletarian dictatorship is now different. According to their theory of 'structural reform' there is no need for present-day Italy to have a proletarian revolution; they can arrive at socialism 'progressively' and 'peacefully' merely through a 'succession of transformations', through the nationalisation of the big enterprises through economic planning and through the extension of democracy within the framework of the Italian constitution. In fact, they take the state to be an instrument above class and believe that the bourgeois state, too, can carry out socialist policies, they take bourgeois democracy to be democracy above class and believe that the proletariat can rise to be the 'leading class' in the state by relying on such democracy. This theory of 'structural reform' is a complete betrayal of the Marxist-Leninist theories on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship."

The editorial then deals with the possibility of realising socialist revolution through peaceful or non-peaceful means. (ED NOTE: we have at this point quoted more fully from the editorial than the Hsinhua summary because of the importance of the views expressed). It says: "From the Marxist-Leninist point of view, it would naturally be in the interests of the proletariat and the entire people if peaceful transition could be realised. Whenever the possibility for peaceful transition appears in a given country, the communists should strive for its realisation. After all, possibility and reality, the wish and its fulfillment are two different things. Hitherto, history has not witnessed a single example of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. Communists should not pin all their hopes for the victory of the revolution on peaceful transition. The bourgeoisie will never step down from the stage of history of its own accord. This is a universal law of class struggle. Communists must not in the slightest degree relax their preparedness for revolution. They must be prepared to repel the assaults of counter-revolution and to overthrow the bourgeoisie by armed force at the critical juncture of the revolution when the proletariat is seizing state power and the bourgeoisie resorts to armed force to suppress the revolution. That is to say, communists should be prepared to employ dual tactics, namely, while preparing for the peaceful development of the revolution, they should be fully prepared for its non-peaceful development. Only in this way can they avoid being caught unawares when a situation favourable to the revolution emerges, and when the bourgeoisie resorts to violence in order to suppress the revolution. Even when it is possible to secure state power through peaceful means, one must be prepared to deal immediately with armed intervention by foreign imperialists and with counter-revolutionary armed rebellions supported by the imperialists."

The sixth section of the editorial deals with the question of Yugoslav revisionism. The editorial says: "A representative of the Tito group, who are renegades from Marxism-Leninism, was invited to the recent Congress of the Italian Communist Party and was given a platform from which to denounce China. At the same Congress, Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades publicly defended the Tito group and lavishly praised them for 'the value of what they have done and are doing.'

"We wish to ask of Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades: 'Do you still recognise the Moscow Statement as binding on you?' the 1960 Moscow statement state unequivocally: 'The Communist Parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist 'theories' in concentrated form. After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist programme to the declaration of 1957; they set the League of Communists of Yugoslavia against the International Communist Movement as a whole.' Can it be that this condemnation of the Tito group is a mistake?" The editorial asks. Far from giving up their thoroughly revisionist programme, the Titoites have stuck to it in the draft Yugoslav Constitution which they published not long ago, the editorial points out. It continues: "The Tito group have not changed their 'unique road' of building 'socialism' through selling themselves to imperialism. On the contrary, they are working harder and harder in the service of the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war.

continued over/



"With the development of the Tito group's revisionist line and their increasing dependence upon U.S. imperialism, Yugoslavia has long ceased to be a socialist country and the gradual restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia began long ago. The restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia has occurred not through any counter-revolutionary coup d'etat by the bourgeoisie, nor through any invasion by imperialism but gradually, through the degeneration of the Tito group. In Yugoslavia today the state power is in the hands of the Tito group, a group who have betrayed ~~Marxism-Leninism~~ and the cause of communism, betrayed the fundamental interests of the Yugoslav working <sup>class</sup> and the Yugoslav people, and who are enforcing a whole set of out-and-out revisionist policies. The Yugoslav example makes it clear that the struggle between the socialist and the capitalist roads is still going on and that the danger of the restoration of capitalism continues to exist even in a country which has embarked on the road of socialism."

"What is particularly surprising, the editorial notes, is that "certain people, while loudly boasting of their intimate relations with the renegade Tito group, vigorously attack the Chinese Communist Party asserting that our unity with the Albanian Party of Labour, which is based upon Marxism-Leninism, is 'impermissible'. These people stop at nothing in their attempt to eject the Albanian Party of Labour, a Marxist-Leninist party, from the international communist movement, and at the same time, they are seeking ways to inject the renegade Tito group into the international communist movement. What are they really after? As the old Chinese saying has it: 'Like goes to Like and Unlikes pull asunder.' Should not those who treat the Tito group like brothers and who cherish such bitter hatred for a fraternal Marxist-Leninist party stop and think for a moment where they now stand?"

The seventh section of the editorial emphasizes that in the final analysis "Our differences on a whole series of problems with comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades who hold similar views involve the fundamental question of whether basic principles of Marxism-Leninism are out-moded, and whether the Moscow declaration and the Moscow statement are out-of-date. At a certain stage in the development of a communist party, dogmatism and sectarianism may become the main dangers. The Moscow declaration and the Moscow statement are fully correct in pointing out the necessity of opposing dogmatism and sectarianism. Nevertheless, under present conditions modern revisionism is the main danger to the international communist movement as a whole, just as the Moscow declaration and the Moscow statement point out. Modern revisionism 'mirrors the bourgeois ideology in theory and practice, distorts Marxism-Leninism, emasculates its revolutionary essence, and thereby paralyzes the revolutionary will of the working class, disarms and demobilizes the workers, the masses of the working people, in their struggle against oppression by imperialists and exploiters, for peace, democracy and national liberation, for the triumph of socialism.' At present, the modern revisionists are opposing Marxism-Leninism under the pretext of opposing dogmatism, are renouncing under the pretext of opposing "left" opportunism, and are advocating unprincipled compromise and capitulationism under the pretext of flexibility in tactics. If a resolute struggle is not waged against modern revisionism, the international communist movement will be seriously harmed."

The editorial declares: "We still sincerely hope it will be possible to eliminate our differences through comradely discussion. We desire to look ahead. On several occasions, we have suggested the holding of a representative conference of the communist and workers' parties of all countries to settle the current differences in the international communist movement. We hold that communists of all countries should take to heart the common interests of the struggle against the enemy and the cause of proletarian revolution, should abide by the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as set forth in the Moscow declaration and the Moscow statement, and should eliminate their differences and strengthen their unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. This is the hope of the working class and of the people throughout the world."

The revisionist and new social-democratic trends which have now appeared in the international communist movement and which now suit the needs of monopoly capitalism and U.S. imperialism, are substantially the products of the policies of monopoly capital and U.S. imperialism. But the various kinds of revisionism can neither block the victorious advance of the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples, nor can they save imperialism from its final doom. Marxism-Leninism is at a new and important historical juncture. The struggle between the Marxist-Leninist trend and the anti-Marxist-Leninist trend is once again being placed on the communist agenda in all countries in an acute form. Concluding the editorial says: "Let imperialism and the reactionaries tremble before the great revolutionary tide of the working class and of all oppressed nations and peoples of the world! Marxism-Leninism will finally triumph! The revolutionary cause of the working class and of the people the world over will finally triumph!"

The Norwegian Communist Party journal Friheten on December 20th, carried a long editorial giving the party's views on relations between Communist Parties. A delegation of the party recently returned from a visit to China, and two resolutions were passed, one, thanking the Chinese for their hospitality and expressing the wishes that relations would grow stronger, the other, on the communes, said that these were a big contribution to socialism. Thus it appears that the party is by no means in the 'Khrushchov camp', and this is confirmed by the operative part of the editorial which reads:

".....This discussion in which the two biggest parties are strongly engaged is threatening the unity of our movement and at the same time weakens the fight for the fulfilment of the common task: the fight against imperialism and the preservation of world peace." It continued: "To the Communist Parties, it is important to work out clear and correct standpoints on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, but not to take part in a strife which can only bring irreparable loss and damage. On the contrary, one ought to make it one's task to work, as far as possible, to prevent the divergence from developing still further."

"Especially damaging would be the transfer of an ideological or political discussion between Communist Parties in countries where they are in power, to state basis, thus involving the fraternal relations between countries. The harmful results of such a development would not only affect the parties and countries directly concerned, but would inevitably cause loss and damage to the other Communist Parties; therefore, in the interest of all Communist Parties the discussion must be pacified and brought back to the basis where it belongs — a basis of honest and real exchange of opinions."

N.B. All major Chinese papers carried the editorial in full on December 24th.

#### SHOSTAKOVICH UNDER FIRE AGAIN

Russian intellectuals are beginning to rebel against the C.P.S.U. control of all art life. Notable among them is Shostakovich, the world famous composer who has been under fire before in the time of Stalin, he signed the letter which was criticised by Ilyichov, Party boss of cultural affairs. This letter virtually called for the right of conflicting tendencies in art forms and was signed by a host of intellectuals including: Constantin Simonov, Kornei Chukovsky and Ilya Ehrenburg (all writers), artist Vladimir Favosky, sculptor Sergei Konnenkov, and Nobel Prize-winning chemist Nikolai Simyonov.

The Party got its own back by attacking Shostakovich's latest work — his 13th symphony — in the newspaper Soviet Culture. This said: "Under the banner of struggle against the personality cult, some creative artists have started rummaging through the garbage pit in our backyard and do not wish to see what is happening on the main lines of development of our life." The symphony was performed twice the week before Xmas, but the television broadcast of the second performance was cancelled. There was a rush for tickets and the audience gave Shostakovich and Yevtushenko, on whose poems the symphonies five movements are based, a 25 minute ovation. Thus we see that Khrushchov's liberalisation is rather skin-deep and, more important, that there is a spirit of revolt which has been encouraged by 'destalinsation'. The latter point made have a significance which is not so obvious just now — all great intellectuals movements of political revolt, and especially those which eventually bring the masses into action in a authoritarian states, start in literary and artistic circles.

#### JEHOVAH WITNESSES JAILED IN THE UKRAINE

The Daily Worker of December 27th carried the following report:

"Six Jehovah Witnesses have been sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment for printing and distributing anti-State literature by a court at Uzhgorod in the Ukraine. They had established illegal presses in Transcarpathia and Central Siberia, where they printed in Ukrainian, Russian and Rumania the literature they received from America, including "Watch Tower." One of the accused, Potashov, after completing a previous jail sentence in 1958, had by 1960 become leader of the secret sect's activities throughout the Soviet Union."

#### ALBANIANS STAND FOR BANNING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT!!

Both the capitalist press and the Khrushchovites have tried by all means to create the impression that the Albanians (road China) stand for war, are opposed to "peaceful co-existence" and generally underestimate the dangers of nuclear war. The actual position is very different and, indeed, the extent to which they still retain "peaceful co-existence" illusions whilst criticising the Soviet leaders is yet another demonstration of how far the latter have gone to the right. Speaking at the 2nd Session of the 5th People's Assembly of Albania, Aleks Verli, Minister of Finance (who made the main report), said Albania "stood for the immediate conclusion of a German peace treaty, the banning of highly destructive weapons, and strove for complete disarmament"