

## CLASS ROOTS OF REVISIONISM IN CPSU LEADERSHIP

Our comrades tell the C.C., you do not analyse the class roots of revisionism.

We have already said that bourgeois influence is the internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source. This, of course, according to them is not going to the class roots. To say that revisionism in a socialist country is due to bourgeois influence is according to them not going to the class roots; to say that surrender to imperialism is the external source is also not a class analysis. The growth of bourgeois influence inside a socialist state is a class development; the surrender to imperialism is connected with it. But all this to them is not enough.

In passing one must note how they misrepresent things. The Moscow Declaration of 1957 stated, "The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source." How do our comrades interpret it to suit their arguments about Soviet-American collaboration? "The existence of bourgeois influence is the internal source of revisionism and *collaboration* with imperialism is its external source". Instead of surrender to imperialism they substitute collaboration with imperialism as the external source of revisionism. They hope that thereby they will be able to prove the collaboration of Soviet Union for world domination. But such misrepresentations cannot alter realities. Besides, this substitution itself shows the utter confusion in their minds. Collaboration with imperialism is a manifestation, the result of revisionism and cannot be the source. This definition of theirs is intended to eliminate all distinctions between imperialism and revisionism. Then our comrades needlessly cite a number of quotations from Lenin to show that revisionists are revisionists, that they are class collaborators, that they reject Marxism. The C.C. has declared the line of the CPSU leadership to be a revisionist line and here our comrades go on quoting passages to prove the same.

The first important thing that Lenin teaches us is that

revisionism is a trend—a hostile trend which arises from within. "But after Marxism had ousted all the more or less integral doctrines hostile to it, the tendencies expressed in those doctrines began to seek other channels... And the second half century of the existence of Marxism began (in the nineties) with the struggle of a trend hostile to Marxism within Marxism itself" (*Against Revisionism*, Page 111). That is why revisionism has to be taken seriously; it disrupts the movement from within under the garb of Marxism; therefore its assumptions and practice are to be concretely exposed, unmasked, otherwise it misleads people. It does not take an openly hostile attitude to Marxism, that is why its real content has to be analysed and uncovered. While it is true that objectively it brings grist to the interests of imperialism, it cannot be successfully fought by simply ranting that it is an agency of imperialism, by equating it with imperialism. This is the ABC of the fight against revisionism.

Lenin, therefore, took particular pains to analyse and expose its ideological foundations, its distortions of Marxism, its practice and said that it was a detachment of the bourgeoisie.

The reason was that Lenin knew that revisionists and revisionism were basing themselves on the selfish interests of certain strata, illusions created by the historical conditions of his time inside the working class. A patient struggle was required to win over the working class and unite it under the banner of revolution.

Lenin rejected any compromise to keep the revisionists in a united party; but he never gave up a patient ideological struggle against all its manifestations.

Lenin relates the inevitability of revisionism to the influx of the ruined petty bourgeois in the ranks of the proletariat, and importation of its world outlook in the proletarian movement; he traces the collapse of the Second International to its opportunism based on the privileged position of a section of the working class which got crumbs from the capitalist table during the days of "peaceful" advance, of the ripening of capitalism into imperialism.

The revisionist heresies that are dominating the CPSU policies today have their roots in the past; they were



repeatedly revealing themselves and Stalin had to fight them. Their basis was capitalist encirclement, survival of capitalism in the economy and in the minds of the people, low ideological development and bourgeois influences. In recent years the process has been accelerated, opening the floodgates to bourgeois ideology and influences and leading to bourgeois practices in production like material incentive, market competition. How far exactly this new process has gone ahead has to be studied. But what is beyond doubt is that the factors mentioned above provide sufficient sustenance for the revisionist policies.

Addressing the 17th Congress of the CPSU (B), Stalin said: "But can we say that we have already overcome all the survivals of capitalism in economic life? Still less can we say that we have overcome survivals of capitalism in the minds of people. We cannot say that, not only because in development the minds of people lag behind their economic position, but also because the capitalist encirclement still exists, which endeavours to revive and sustain the survivals of capitalism in the economic life and in the minds of the people of the USSR... Naturally, these survivals cannot but be a favourable ground for a revival of the ideology of the defeated anti-Leninist groups in the minds of individual members of our Party. Add to this the not very high theoretical level of the majority of our party members, the inadequate ideological work of the party bodies, ... and you will understand the origin of the confusion on a number of questions of Leninism that exists in the minds of individual party members, ... Take, for example, the question of building a *classless socialist society*. The Seventeenth Party Conference declared that we are advancing towards the formation of a classless socialist society. And yet, who does not know that the enunciation of this clear and elementary thesis of Leninism has given rise to not a little confusion in the minds of a section of party members. ... And they began to reason in this way: If it is a classless society we can relax the class struggle, we can relax the dictatorship of the proletariat and get rid of the state altogether, since it is fated to wither away soon in any case. ... Naturally, if this confusion of views and these non-Bolshevik sentiments obtained a hold over the major-

ity of our Party, the Party would find itself demoralised and disarmed." (Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 13, Pp. 356-58)

At the 18th Congress of the Party also Stalin had to deal with the same deviation—regarding the proletarian state: "The exploiting classes have already been abolished in our country... why then do we not help our socialist state to die away? These questions... show that these comrades have failed to understand the essential meaning of the doctrine... that they do not understand present-day international conditions, have overlooked capitalist encirclement and the danger it entails for the socialist country. These questions not only betray an underestimation of the capitalist encirclement, but also an underestimation of the role and significance of the bourgeois states and their organs which send spies, assassins and wreckers in our country and are waiting for a favourable opportunity to attack it by armed force." (*Problems of Leninism*, Page 632)

It is also known that immediately after the anti-fascist war bourgeois tendencies were found in several spheres of ideology, philosophy, economic theory, and they had to be fought. Outside the USSR, in the shape of rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it threatened to become an international phenomenon and had to be fought by Stalin.

This is the class background to the revisionism of the present day. It is not necessary, it is totally wrong, to invent restoration of capitalism or imperialism in the Soviet Union to explain the menace of modern revisionism in the first socialist state.

Khrushchov and his successors have tremendously accelerated the revisionist onslaught. Till Stalin's death revisionist tendencies could be contained because the Party was officially committed to fight them. But after his death revisionist policies began to be sponsored by the party leadership leading to the resort to capitalist incentives, ideas of personal profit, appeasement of imperialism in international affairs, opposition to revolutionary struggles, etc. That is why the C.C. says, in the final analysis this paves the way for restoration of a new type of capitalism.

Externally the same process of revisionism is leading the



CPSU leadership to compromise with American imperialism in the name of peace. In reality it is a surrender to imperialist blackmail ; it is an attempt to purchase temporary peace by stifling struggles. This is how the line of revisionists in socialist society works.

The critics resort to equivocation and double-talk on the question of "the Soviet leaders' collaboration with American imperialism for world domination and spheres of influence". They all the while refer to the Soviet leaders in this connection ; but suggest tactics, advance arguments, take positions which have only one meaning: the Soviet Union has become an imperialist power, an ally of American imperialism for sharing world domination, for spheres of influence. They may loudly protest that this is all distortion, but such protests will not save them, for they have given the show away.

The C.C. says, "However, our criticism of the compromising and collaborationist policies pursued by the revisionist leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet state does in no way imply the totally erroneous idea that the Soviet Union has become an ally of imperialism and is working for sharing world hegemony with American imperialism and for the division of spheres of influence in the world, as this is tantamount to nothing short of placing\* the Soviet Union outside the socialist camp."

If the critics consider that the Soviet Union is not an ally of American imperialism, that it is a socialist country, could they have objected to this formulation? Mark, the C.C. specifically says, "the Soviet Union has not become an ally of American imperialism," etc. Here the revisionist leadership is not mentioned. If they really distinguish between the revisionist leaders and the Soviet Union, they would have said they agreed that the Soviet Union was not an ally and could have asserted that still the revisionist leaders were allies. They draw no such distinction ; they do not endorse the statement the Soviet Union is not an ally ; on the other hand, they protest against it. They say, "But the C.C. has rushed to add that this collaboration is not for sharing world hegemony with American imperialism and for the division of

spheres of influence in the world". They ask "Then what is this collaboration for" ?

Here we get our critics in their true colours and we also see their methods of double-talk. They do not accept or endorse the C.C. statement that the Soviet Union is not an ally of American imperialism striving for world hegemony. But they dare not openly say that it is an ally. Therefore, what they do is to drop all reference to *the Soviet Union* and assert that the revisionist leaders are collaborating for world domination. But the point here is, is the Soviet Union an ally? They evade an answer but by protesting against the C.C. statement, by asserting that there is collaboration of revisionist leaders for world domination, by refusing here to distinguish between the Soviet Union and the leaders, they make their meaning plain—they consider the Soviet Union to be an accomplice of American imperialism. No subterfuge can save them. When the C.C. makes a positive statement about the Soviet Union they oppose it. And their other arguments—on united action, etc.—further show that they consider the Soviet Union itself to be an ally of imperialism.

Otherwise, can anyone in his senses argue that because a revisionist leadership heads one of the socialist states or socialist countries, there should be no talk of common action between the two countries and the two peoples?

All this talk about collaboration, no compromise, is based on the unspoken premise that the world has to face two imperialisms, the Soviet and the USA. Hence the impatience with any analysis of revisionist outlook, any reference to illusions about imperialism—for the revisionists and the Soviet Union are identified with imperialism. If they are honest and sincere about this then our critics should say openly that no socialist camp exists, it is liquidated, since the Soviet Union is an imperialist power, and all other People's Democracies which follow the Soviet Union can be called colonies or whatever you want. Then you must make a new analysis of the epoch—not so much as an epoch of revolution, but as an epoch in which the revolutionary movement has got its biggest setback since imperialism has triumphed in nearly one-half of the socia-



list world. This is of such tremendous importance to the world revolutionary movement, that it must be openly stated and correspondingly conclusions drawn. Separate theses explaining the triumph of this counter-revolution and a new analysis based on it is essential if they believe in what they say. Then this should be the basis of their line and all pretence that they are fighting only revisionism should be dropped.

The critics say the CPSU collaborates with the USA to put down revolutions and seize the intermediate zone; it is demoralising national liberation struggles; it is helping the U.S. to use the U.N. as an instrument of suppression of peoples' struggles; with its teachings of peaceful transition it is sapping the fighting will of the proletariat; it has come to an agreement with the U.S. to maintain their monopoly of nuclear weapons; it has disrupted the socialist camp and is ganging up with all reactionary powers to malign and isolate China—how can you deny in face of these facts that the CPSU leadership is not collaborating with U.S. imperialism for world domination? We then ask them, why then call the fight a fight against revisionism? Our comrades do not see the difference between revisionism and imperialism which they should know are not synonymous terms.

The C.C. has denounced in the most unmistakable terms the manifestations of revisionist betrayal. It is not necessary to quote from the document again. It charges the CPSU leaders with pursuing a policy which appeases American imperialism, distorts the revolutionary movement, practises perfidy against China. Anyone who honestly reads the document will find the revisionists mercilessly exposed.

With all that the document categorically states that the Soviet Union is not collaborating for world domination; that it is not an ally of American imperialism; it does not say also that the revisionist leaders are collaborating to 'redivide the world' or that they are just agents of American imperialism in the literal sense of the word.

The implications of considering the Soviet Union as an ally of imperialism have already been mentioned. Our comrades will not have the courage to accept them and

liquidate the socialist camp. What about the revisionist leaders? In the first place when Marxist-Leninists discuss a phenomenon like the rise of revisionism in the international communist movement, they do not concentrate on the individuals and their motives—Lenin warned against such crude petty bourgeois tendency—but the deep social causes of the phenomenon, its class origin. This is the main thing that has to be located to fight revisionism because without it the illusions which it nourishes, and on which it bases itself, the class prejudices it utilises cannot be successfully exposed. The Moscow Declaration of 1957 correctly stated, "The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism; while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source." This is not challenged by any Party. This not only correctly describes the source of revisionism, it also shows that revisionism and imperialism are not identical. It is in the light of this correct understanding that the C.C. exposes the revisionist tactics as surrender to imperialism, as creating illusions, as a poisonous current inside the working class movement.

It is quite correct to say that objectively the revisionists only bring grist to the mill of the imperialists. But from this to conclude that every revisionist leader is just a paid agent of imperialist agencies like the CIA, that he does everything at the bidding of the imperialists and that in the present conditions they are out to divide the world at the behest of American imperialists is just foolishness.

In the battle against reformism and revisionism it is not necessary to allege that the revisionists are in direct collusion with the imperialists. Criticising Radek and others for making unwarranted concessions to the leaders of the Second International during the course of talks for united front in 1922 Lenin said, "Whether the various representatives of the Second and Two-and-a-half Internationals are in direct or indirect collusion with the bourgeoisie is a matter of tenth rate importance in the present case. We do not accuse them of being in direct collusion. The only point that has anything to do with it is that as a result of the pressure of the representatives of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals, the Communist Inter-



national has made a political concession to the international bourgeoisie." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 32, Page 332)

What about the revisionist leaders of the CPSU? It may be argued they are leading a socialist state and their collaboration is leading to sharing world domination or redivision of the world. Any Marxist-Leninist must again go to the class roots. Individual leaders must reflect the interests of some class in the global policies. Which are the interests that Leninism associates with world domination, redivision of the world, world hegemony, etc. The striving for domination and redivision of the world is represented by the capitalist monopolies and trusts, by the domination of finance capital. Lenin teaches us "Monopolist-capitalist associations, cartels, syndicates and trusts first divided the home market among themselves and obtained more or less complete possession of the industry of their own country. But under capitalism the home market is inevitably bound up with the foreign market. Capitalism long ago created a world market. As the export of capital increased, and as the foreign and colonial connections and 'spheres of influence' of the big monopolist associations expanded in all ways, things 'naturally' gravitated towards an international agreement among the associations, and towards the formation of international cartels. . . . The principal feature of the latest stage of capitalism is the domination of monopolist associations of big employers. These monopolies are most firmly established when *all* the sources of raw materials are captured by one group, and we have seen with what zeal the international capitalist associations exert every effort to deprive their rivals of all opportunity of competing, to buy up, for example, iron-fields, oil-fields, etc. Colonial possession alone gives the monopolies complete guarantee against all contingencies in the struggle against competitors, including the adversary wanting to be protected by a law establishing a state monopoly. The more capitalism is developed, the more strongly the shortage of raw materials is felt, the more intense the competition and the hunt for sources of raw materials throughout the world, the more desperate the struggle for the acquisition of colonies." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 22, Pp. 244 and 260)

Rise of monopoly, of monopolist associations of big employers is the basis of striving for world domination, for redivision of the world, for spheres of influence. When our comrades irresponsibly urge that the revisionists are trying to share world domination, redivide the world, they must first show that the monopolies today rule the Soviet society, that all socialist relations have disappeared, that monopoly capitalism has been established and the revisionists are the spokesmen of these economic interests. In short they must prove that a counter-revolution has taken place and capitalism has been fully restored.

But they themselves say that this has not taken place. On the other hand, they themselves assert with great confidence that the attempts to restore capitalism will not succeed. Listen to them, "Because the present CPSU leadership is the privileged bourgeois stratum representing the new capitalist elements in the Soviet Union, it doggedly pursues its line of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination. . . . of course, this does not mean that the cycle of restoration of capitalism is already complete, or *the efforts of the CPSU leadership in this direction are going to succeed.* (Oh, even the efforts are not going to succeed.) It is our firm conviction that the great Soviet people, the great Soviet Communists, who have long traditions of revolutionary struggles, will before long, see through the vile attempts of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU at restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, discard their revisionist theories and practices and *preserve socialism in the Soviet Union*" (Emphasis added). Can you beat this? The cycle of restoration is not complete. Even the attempt to restore will not succeed. The Soviet people will be able to preserve socialism. And yet they talk of the revisionist leaders collaborating with imperialism to divide the world? Which class, which elements have arisen? Which class needs world domination? Don't ask them. Their class analysis does not include a reply to such questions. The mere fact that bourgeois elements have arisen or are arising does not prove the class need for world domination. They must show that the "privileged strata", the "capitalist elements", do not simply consist of bureaucrats and degenerates, but of monopolists, who having cap-



tured the home market, require foreign markets and colonies for their very existence.

According to Lenin such domination is associated with monopolies' hunt for foreign markets. But our comrades insist that though socialism continues to exist—this is what they seem to imply when they say revisionists will not succeed—the Soviet Union is an ally of American imperialism and the revisionist leaders represent class interests which demand world domination. They make wild generalisations but are afraid to face the logical conclusions of their formulations. Face to face with them they retreat and begin to say capitalist restoration cannot take place in the Soviet Union.

No doubt our comrades will protest and say, but have we not repeatedly said that there is a privileged stratum. What is this stratum supposed to be? It is composed of degenerate elements from among the leading cadres of party and government organisations, enterprises and farmers as well as bourgeois intellectuals. According to the advocates of this view, under Khrushchov, their activities became unrestricted and they also occupied ruling positions; they have converted the functions of serving the masses into the privilege of dominating them. "They are abusing their powers over the means of production and of livelihood for the private benefit of their small clique". Money-grabbers, degenerate elements, those who abuse their authority, are bourgeois elements all right. But even our critics nowhere suggest that these elements have anywhere succeeded in altering the relations of production—a question which every Marxist-Leninist must answer before deciding whether a fundamental social change has taken place. And we are asked to believe that these speculators, money-grabbers, and degenerates represent an economic system which needs foreign conquest for its very existence. This beats everything. This is a new contribution to Marxism-Leninism. The basis of imperialism, of world domination, is certain degenerate elements in socialist society.

## WORLD CENTRE

They assert that People's China is gloriously carrying on its shoulders *the world liberating mission*. We do not know since when these critics of ours have allotted the mission exclusively to the PRC, excluding the world proletariat and the world socialist camp.

They reprimand the C.C. for its total failure to understand that People's China as *actually acting as the base of world revolution*.

They demand of our C.C. to bow before the "*CPC as the leading detachment of the world communist movement*" and without question accept its attacks and denunciations as fraternal criticism to help correct our mistakes. They demand this because they believe that the "*CPC is essentially correct on all these points and it has discharged its international duty*".

What is the sum total of these assertions and statements of our critics?

First, the crucial point of the global struggle between the forces of world socialism and world capitalism centres round the struggle between People's China on the one hand, and the U.S. imperialists and their Soviet revisionist allies on the other.

Second, it follows from their arguments that the contradiction between People's China on the one hand and the U.S.-Soviet alliance on the other is the principal contradiction of our times and everything else should be subordinated to this.

Third, there exists a global strategy of the U.S. and its Soviet allies, and against it there is another counter-global strategy presented by the CPC which we should accept and follow, if we wish to be in the camp of Marxist-Leninists.

Fourth, People's China is the world base of liberation, and is discharging this glorious mission of world liberation, hence if we are interested in our liberation we must depend upon it and join hands with it in that mission.

Fifth, it is the leading world communist detachment, with Mao Tse-tung's thought which is Marxism-Leninism of the present epoch, and we should owe allegiance and loyalty to it.