

A Great Victory for Leninism

— In Commemoration of the 95th anniversary of
the birth of Lenin

Following is a translation of an editorial published in the April issue (No. 4) of "Hongqi." Boldface emphases are ours.—Ed.

APRIL 22 this year was the 95th anniversary of the birth of the great Lenin.

Speaking at a ceremony in commemoration of a revolutionary, Lenin said that, in honouring the memory of revolutionaries, Marxists explained the tasks lying ahead, unlike those persons who, with ulterior motives, used flowery words and vulgar eulogies to tell lies and deceive the people. **In honouring the memory of Lenin today, our principal task is to defend firmly the revolutionary theses of Leninism, oppose the distortion of Leninism by the modern revisionists, and link the struggle against modern revisionism closely with the struggle against imperialism, particularly U.S. imperialism.**

In commemorating the 90th anniversary in 1960 of Lenin's birth, we raised aloft the banner of Leninism, directed our attention to the ideological chaos created by the modern revisionists in the international communist movement, and published three articles, one of which was entitled "Long Live Leninism." In these articles we laid stress on elucidating the problems of imperialism, war and peace, the national-liberation movement, proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, all in the light of the fundamental theses of Leninism and the actual situation in the modern world, and we proved that Leninism, far from becoming "outmoded" as the modern revisionists ranted, had shown ever more clearly its enormous vitality. Although at that time we did not yet openly criticize Khrushchov and the leadership of the C.P.S.U., the views expressed in the three articles were diametrically opposed to the tissue of absurdities spread by the Khrushchov revisionists.

Our three articles roused the livid hatred of the Khrushchov revisionists and scared the living daylights out of them. They launched unbridled attacks on our points of view by publishing many articles and speeches and using all manner of sordid and shameless tricks. The upshot of all this, however, was that the true face of the Khrushchov revisionists was still more clearly exposed to the world. Together with the revolutionary

Marxist-Leninists in other countries, we naturally had to carry further the resolute struggle against these renegades from Marxism-Leninism, against this adverse current in the international communist movement.

Khrushchov fell.

The new leadership of the C.P.S.U. declared again and again that they would faithfully continue to implement Khrushchov's fully developed revisionist line and practise Khrushchovism without Khrushchov. They have continued to stand in opposition to all revolutionary Marxist-Leninists and to this day have not stopped using every available means to slander and attack the fundamental Leninist theses we expounded in "Long Live Leninism" and the two other articles.

It is five years now since those three articles were published. What have these five years proved? Time has given a verdict which is absolutely just. These five years have proved conclusively that our views were completely correct.

It would take much space to deal with all the problems expounded in the three articles; we shall therefore take up just a few of them.

First, the problem of the nature of imperialism.

In the name of "creative development," the Khrushchov revisionists completely distorted Lenin's theory of imperialism. They maintained that the nature of imperialism had changed and denied that imperialism was the source of war in modern times. They spread the notion that the ruling clique of U.S. imperialism and its chieftains "do not hope for war" and "worry about ensuring peace just as we do." They gave great publicity to the point that "already in our time, the practical possibility is being created of banishing war from the life of society finally and for ever" and predicted that 1960 would be the year in which the world would become "a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars."

In opposition to the Khrushchov revisionists, we pointed out in "Long Live Leninism" that "the nature of imperialism cannot change" and that "so long as capitalist imperialism exists in the world, the sources and possibility of war will remain." We also declared that U.S. imperialism was the main force of aggression

and war in the present era and the most ferocious enemy of the people all over the world.

The past five years have proved that the statements of the modern revisionists headed by Khrushchov alleging that the nature of imperialism could change and had changed had the sole purpose of serving U.S. imperialism and paralysing the will of the revolutionary people.

Though they have roused resolute opposition from the world's people and suffered defeat everywhere, the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war have not in the least changed; instead, they are being intensively applied. In Asia, Africa and Latin America, U.S. imperialism is using every means to step up its suppression of the national-liberation movements and massacring great numbers of people. In south Viet Nam, in particular, U.S. imperialism has launched its utterly inhuman "special warfare," shipped in its own troops and those of its flunkies, used all kinds of new weapons and recklessly spread the flames of war to north Viet Nam.

Prosecuting its war policy with ever greater vigour, U.S. imperialism has not carried out general and complete disarmament as the illusions of the modern revisionists led them to expect, but has intensified its general and complete arms expansion. U.S. military expenditure has reached a peace-time peak and greatly exceeds the level reached during the Korean war. Although the modern revisionists have tried almost to the point of nausea to present them in an attractive light, the representatives of U.S. imperialism — whether Eisenhower, Kennedy or Johnson — have themselves repeatedly proclaimed that the United States "has the courage to risk war" and that it is ready to fight any war, total or limited, nuclear or conventional, big or small.

Can these facts be taken to show that the aggressive nature of imperialism has changed even one iota? Is this the way the chieftains of imperialism "worry about ensuring peace" and "do not wish war"? Can it be said we are entering that ideal world, "a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars?"

Now, under the pressure of circumstances and in order to continue to deceive the people, Khrushchov's successors, the new leadership of the C.P.S.U., have to put on a show and hypocritically shout a few anti-imperialist slogans. But, again playing the old Khrushchov tunes, they keep on lavishing praises on U.S. imperialism, with many kind tributes to Johnson to whom they apply such words as "sensible," "reasonable," "restrained" and "sober." They also vigorously spread the idea that the Soviet Union and U.S. imperialism can set "examples for each other" on the question of reducing military expenditures.

Worthy of special attention is the fact that now, even when the U.S. gangsters have thrown off all pretence on the Viet Nam question and fully exposed their imperialist nature, the modern revisionists are doing all they can to cover up for the United States. The slight difference between them and Khrushchov is that Khrushchov was much too stupid while they are a bit

more subtle. Khrushchov openly talked nonsense, saying that the Bac Bo Gulf incident was not aggression by U.S. imperialism but had been provoked by China and Viet Nam. These words of an accomplice were so similar to those of the master that they were of no value at all and no one believed them. The present leadership of the C.P.S.U. have apparently learnt the lesson and now use another refrain. They spread rumours and slanders everywhere that the United States has been encouraged in its aggression against Viet Nam because the Chinese Communist Party has undermined the unity of the socialist camp and the unity between China and the Soviet Union. In the first place, such assertions turn the facts upside down. It is indisputably the Khrushchov revisionists who have undermined the unity of the socialist camp and unity between China and the Soviet Union. Moreover, it is indisputably the Khrushchov revisionists who have encouraged U.S. imperialist aggression. In substance, their assertions are still attempts to absolve the U.S. gangsters and make it appear that the U.S. aggression against Viet Nam arises not from the nature of imperialism but from some other cause. Those who spread such ideas are still apologists for U.S. imperialism. They are the ones who are really encouraging U.S. aggression.

Second, on the question of so-called "peaceful coexistence."

In the name of "creative development," the Khrushchov revisionists have gone the whole hog in tampering with Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence. They maintain that peaceful coexistence means reaching "mutual understanding" with imperialism, "adapting to one another," "compromising with one another" and "accommodating one another." They say that peaceful coexistence is "the categorical imperative of modern times" and "the best and the sole acceptable way to solve the vitally important problems confronting society." They particularly yearn for agreements between the heads of state of the Soviet Union and the United States "on which mankind's destinies depend," which means Soviet-U.S. collaboration for the domination of the world. They not only take this kind of "peaceful coexistence" as the general line of their foreign policy, but demand that all Communists in the world should "make the struggle for peaceful coexistence the general principle of their policy."

In opposition to the Khrushchov revisionists, we pointed out in "Long Live Leninism" and the other two articles that the obstacles to the realization of peaceful coexistence lay on the side of the imperialists. It is only through struggle that the socialist countries are able to coexist peacefully with the imperialist countries at a particular time and, what is more, sharp and complex struggles continue under conditions of peaceful coexistence. We pointed out emphatically that "peaceful coexistence refers to relations between nations; revolution means the overthrow of the oppressors as a class by the oppressed people within a given country, while in the case of the colonial and semi-colonial countries it is first and foremost a question of overthrowing alien

oppressors, namely the imperialists" and that these two things must not in any case be taken as one and the same.

The past five years have proved that the modern revisionists headed by Khrushchov have made Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence a fig-leaf to cover up their capitulation to U.S. imperialism and the peaceful evolution to capitalism which they are practising in their own countries.

It is precisely the modern revisionists' friend, U.S. imperialism, with whom they are determined to establish "all-round co-operation," that constantly and in every way opposes and undermines the socialist countries, carries out subversion and military provocations, and threatens war and even launches aggressive war. It is precisely U.S. imperialism, too, that encroaches upon the territory and sovereignty of other countries all over the world, interferes in their internal affairs, damages their interests and suppresses their people's revolution. The present criminal activities of U.S. imperialism in extending the war of aggression in Viet Nam and the whole of Indo-China are an important integral part of its counter-revolutionary "global strategy."

In these circumstances, should the people of these countries resolutely struggle against U.S. imperialism or should they "adapt to" it, in accordance with the Khrushchov revisionists' "categorical imperative," and "compromise" with it? Should they oppose counter-revolutionary armed aggression with revolutionary armed struggle or should they embark on "the best and sole acceptable way" of "peaceful coexistence" and leave themselves at the mercy of the imperialists? Against the wishes of the Khrushchov revisionists, the people of these countries have given a clear-cut answer by their actions in the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle. From their own experience they have drawn the conclusion that there can be no peaceful coexistence at all between the revolutionary people and U.S. imperialism.

The new leadership of the C.P.S.U. still cling to Khrushchov's so-called "peaceful coexistence" and continue to regard it as "the general line of foreign policy of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government." They have assiduously spread the idea that "sufficiently broad areas for co-operation exist" between the Soviet Union and the United States and have engaged in secret diplomacy with U.S. imperialism in a big way. Although they have uttered a few high-sounding words on the Viet Nam question and made some gestures of support, all of this is done only after the sympathetic understanding of the bandit chiefs of U.S. imperialism has been sought, and is kept within the bounds of not impairing their line of Soviet-U.S. co-operation. The be all and end all of this is that they want to join hands with the United States and engage in the fraud of "peace talks." They are doing all they can in a vain attempt to bring the Vietnamese people's patriotic and just struggle against U.S. aggression into the orbit of "solving problems" through Soviet-U.S. talks in order to attain their criminal objective of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for

the domination of the world. Like Khrushchov, the new leadership of the C.P.S.U. are, in the name of "peaceful coexistence," plainly substituting class collaboration for class struggle in the international sphere. This "peaceful coexistence" of theirs can only be capitulationist coexistence.

Third, on the question of the national-liberation movement.

In the name of "creative development," the Khrushchov revisionists have completely departed from Lenin's theories on the national-liberation struggle. They hold that "colonialism has been uprooted," that the national-liberation struggle has entered its "final phase," that the oppressed nations "can be liberated from the shackles of imperialism and colonialism by peaceful means of struggle," and therefore that "the funeral of the colonial system will be a quiet one." They negate the Marxist-Leninist view that in all countries the liberation of the people must be undertaken by the people themselves and they espouse with special vigour the notion of the United Nations' "obligations" to national liberation; they say: "Who, if not the United Nations Organization, should champion the abolition of the colonial system of government?" They firmly believe that the colonialist policies of imperialism have changed and that "the more prudent of the colonialists are getting out, so to say, five minutes before they are given 'a kick in the pants'"; therefore they ardently hope to "agree on measures for the abolition of the colonial system of government" with the imperialists.

In opposition to the Khrushchov revisionists, we pointed out in "Long Live Leninism" and the other two articles that the contradiction between the oppressed nations and the imperialists was one of the fundamental contradictions in the world today and that U.S. imperialism was the main bastion of modern colonialism and the most vicious and cunning enemy of the rising national-liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Undoubtedly, imperialist aggression, oppression and plunder of necessity arouse resistance on the part of the oppressed nations, and the storm of the national-liberation movement is sweeping across Asia, Africa and Latin America on a mounting scale. We also pointed out that the oppressed nations must not pin their hopes of liberation on the "benevolence" of the old or new colonialists or on "bestowal" from the United Nations which is manipulated by U.S. imperialism, and that they must rely on themselves to wage resolute revolutionary struggle. We said, "Without revolutionary violence it would be impossible to wipe out counter-revolutionary violence."

The past five years have proved that the modern revisionists headed by Khrushchov have degenerated into apologists for new colonialism and that, working hand in glove with the imperialists, they attempt to strangle the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations.

The self-appointed gendarme of the world, U.S. imperialism, has not only sent its own troops to massacre

the people of oppressed nations but has also acted through the agency of the United Nations to send troops to suppress the people in one place and to proffer so-called development plans in another, all in the vain attempt to stamp out the anti-colonialist, revolutionary movements. In Viet Nam, in particular, it has openly wrecked the Geneva agreements, obstructed the peaceful reunification of the Vietnamese people, wantonly trampled on their independence and sovereignty and arrogantly demanded that the 30 million people of Viet Nam surrender unconditionally before its butcher's knife. This has exposed even more clearly the bestial features of the U.S. aggressors.

In the face of these facts, how can anyone believe that "colonialism has been uprooted"? If the task of national liberation has entered the "final phase," how can anyone explain the present tempestuous upsurge of the national-liberation movement? If the services which the United Nations is in every way rendering U.S. imperialism are "contributions" to the "abolition of colonialism," are the struggles waged by the people of the Congo (Leopoldville) and Indonesia against colonialism, neo-colonialism and the United Nations to be viewed as obstacles to the "abolition of colonialism"? U.S. imperialism has been given quite a number of "kicks in the pants" in south Viet Nam. Why, then, instead of getting out "five minutes before," is it continuing to dispatch officers and men and arrogantly hanging on there and refusing to get out? In these conditions, how can the south Vietnamese people achieve their liberation "by peaceful means of struggle" and "quietly" bury colonialism?

The new leadership of the C.P.S.U. have never given serious answers to these questions, though time and again they have voiced "support for the national-liberation movement." Why is it so? The clearest answer is provided by their deeds. Before the fall of Khrushchov, they supported the suppression of the national-liberation movement in the Congo (L) by the U.S. imperialists under the cloak of the United Nations; and this resulted in the murder of the Congolese national hero Patrice Lumumba. Now Khrushchov's successors have willingly agreed to share the expenses of the U.S. armed intervention in the Congo (L) undertaken in the name of the United Nations, and in the U.N. Security Council they are supporting the U.S. hoax of "a national reconciliation" in the Congo (L) which is an attempt to strangle the revolutionary forces of the Congolese people. Particularly grave is their active support for the setting up of a permanent armed force of the United Nations. This means becoming a partner in organizing an international gendarmerie in the service of U.S. imperialism for the suppression of the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the world. All this is concrete action by them in their so-called "support for the national-liberation movement." One could well ask the new leadership of the C.P.S.U.: Are you making these efforts in order to "support the national-liberation movement" or in order the better to "agree on measures" with U.S. imperialism to op-

pose, disrupt and suppress the national-liberation movement? It is absolutely clear that their so-called "support for the national-liberation movement" is false while their collusion with U.S. imperialism to strangle the national-liberation movement is genuine.

Thus, the facts of the past five years have mercilessly shattered the absurd arguments of the modern revisionists.

After the fall of Khrushchov, after the public proclamation of the bankruptcy of modern revisionism, we hoped and advised that the new leadership of the C.P.S.U. should honestly and openly admit their mistakes and renounce the revisionist line and policies pursued when Khrushchov was in power. However, running counter to the aspirations of the Soviet people and the revolutionary peoples of the world, the new leadership of the C.P.S.U. have taken over Khrushchov revisionism as a priceless heritage and have continued to brandish it. During the celebrations this year of the 95th anniversary of Lenin's birth, they still had the effrontery to brag that "the general line drafted in the 20th and 22nd Congresses of our Party and embodied in the Programme of the C.P.S.U." was a "vivid indication" of a "creative approach" to theory. It was precisely in the name of a so-called "creative approach" to Leninism that Khrushchov actually renounced every fundamental thesis of Leninism, became the greatest revisionist in history and finally ended up in total bankruptcy. Can his successors come to any better end?

Leninism is the invincible weapon of the proletariat and the other working people of the whole world. Its radiance can in no way be dimmed, however much the enemy attacks it from without or "revises" it from within. On the contrary, it is through repeated struggle against all enemies within and without that the forces of Leninism continuously grow and become stronger. As a result of the struggle of Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism in the past five years, Leninism has spread more widely than ever throughout the world, the political consciousness of the peoples of the world has greatly heightened and the ranks of Marxist-Leninists have rapidly grown. At the same time, Marxist-Leninists have enriched Leninism in all respects as they have, in the fight against modern revisionism, unceasingly studied and summed up the new experience and new problems of the present-day revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the world. The past five years have witnessed the complete bankruptcy of modern revisionism and new, great victories for Leninism. Unfolding before us today is the excellent situation of a vigorous development of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary cause of the peoples all over the world. We must continue to hold aloft the banner of Leninism, carry the fight against modern revisionism to a finish, and advance the revolutionary cause of the proletariat to new and still greater victories.

Long live Leninism!