

PROLETARIAT ALLER LÄNDER VEREINIGT EUCH!
PROLETARIAT ALLER LÄNDER UND UNTERDRÜCKTE VÖLKER VEREINIGT EUCH!

GEGEN DIE STRÖMUNG



Organ für den Aufbau der marxistisch-leninistischen Partei Westdeutschlands

April 1986 / German edition 1979 / Price: 2 DM/14 öS/ 70 p.

On the "Proposal" of the CP of China "Concerning the General
Line of the International Communist Movement", 1963

THE REQUIREMENTS OF AN INTERNATIONAL MARXIST-LENINIST
GENERAL LINE AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE CP OF CHINA
AGAINST MODERN REVISIONISM

PART III A

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM - LENINISM IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST MODERN REVISIONISM

- A Basis For Discussion -

EXTRACTS FROM

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON PROBLEMS FROM THE JOINT
STATEMENTS REGARDING THE CRITICISM OF THE "GREAT
POLEMIC" OF THE 60'S

(Joint Statement, published in December 1982)

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE EDITORIAL BOARDS OF

ROTE FAHNE

(Central Organ of the Marxist-Leninist Party of Austria)

WESTBERLINER KOMMUNIST

(Organ for Building the Marxist-Leninist Party of West Berlin)

GEGEN DIE STRÖMUNG

(Organ for Building the Marxist-Leninist Party of West Germany)

Edition in German: ROTE FAHNE, no. 176
WESTBERLINER KOMMUNIST, no. 9
GEGEN DIE STRÖMUNG, no. 12

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A) THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST PRINCIPLES

I) THE KRUSHCHOVITE REVISIONISTS' ATTACKS AGAINST THE MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY AND PRINCIPLES

1. The Demagogy With the "Exact Analysis of the New Conditions".....p. 5
2. The Krushchovite Revisionists' Hue and Cry About the Danger of Dogmatism in General and About the "Dogmatism of the CP of China" in Particular.....p. 7

II) SOME LESSONS FROM THE WORKS OF THE CLASSICAL MARXIST-LENINIST WRITERS CONCERNING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DEFENDING THE PRINCIPLES AND THE QUESTION OF DOGMATISM

1. Marx's and Engels' Struggle Against the Falsifiers of the Theory and Principles of the "Communist Manifesto".....p. 8
2. The Speculations of the Russian "Friends of the People" With the Peculiarities of Russia to Deny the General Validity of Marxist Theory.....p.10
3. New Attacks Against Marxist-Leninist Theory and Principles By Upcoming Revisionism.....p.11
4. The Defence of the Theoretical Foundations of Marxism in Lenin's Work "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism".....p.13
 - a) The Revisionists' Attempt to Direct Friedrich Engels' Struggle Against Bourgeois Idealist "Principles" in "Anti-Dühring" Against the Principles of Marxism.....p.14
 - b) Lenin's Clarification About the Conditions Under Which the Marxist Theory and its Principles are Valid.....p.16

5. Kautsky's Revisionism and his Dogmatic Demagogy..p.18
6. The Revisionists' Denial of the International Validity of the Basic Features of the October Revolution.....p.19
7. The General Validity of Leninism For All Countries and the Danger of Dogmatically Carrying Over Specific Experiences of the October Revolution to the Revolution in Semi-Feudal and Semi-Colonial Countries.....p.21
8. Stalin's Fight Against the Emergence of Modern Revisionism After the Complete Victory of Leninism.....p.23

III) THE CP OF CHINA'S REPLY TO THE KRUSHCHOVITE REVISIONISTS' FALSIFICATION OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST PRINCIPLES

1. Correct Positions of the CP of China.....p.25
2. Principles or "Concrete Analysis" as the Main Point of Departure For the General Line ?.....p.25

IV) PRACTICAL-POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES DERIVED BY THE KRUSHCHOVITE REVISIONISTS FROM THE OSTENSIBLY NEW CONDITIONS

1. Imperialism Which Has Become "Peaceful".....p.27
2. Do the Socialist Countries Constitute "the Decisive Force" in World Revolution ?.....p.28

V) THE PRACTICAL-POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES DRAWN BY THE CP OF CHINA FROM PUTTING THE "CONCRETE ANALYSIS" BEFORE THE MARXIST-LENINIST PRINCIPLES

1. Has the General Line to Be Directed Against U.S. Imperialism or Against World Imperialism ?.....p.30
2. "Concentration of the Fundamental Contradictions" in Asia, Africa and Latin America ?.....p.31

VI) THE NECESSITY OF SYSTEMATICALLY SETTING FORTH LENIN'S
AND STALIN'S TEACHINGS IN RELATION TO THE IMPERIA-
LIST ERA AND THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAN INTERNA-
TIONALISM

Note 1 :

A Crass Example of How the Modern Revisionists Reduce
the Role of Theory : "Fidel Castro's Relationship to Re-
volutionary Theory" or " the Theory Will Bee Delivered
Subsequently".....p.34

Note 2 :

Concerning Some Sources of the Present-Day "Anti-Dog-
matic" Trend.....p.35

Note 3 :

The "Sympathetic Concrete" and the "Unsympathetic Ab-
stracts".....p.38

B) Extracts from

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON PROBLEMS FROM THE
JOINT STATEMENTS REGARDING THE CRITICISM OF
THE "GREAT POLEMIC" OF THE 60's

4. Once Again About the Relationship Between
Theory and Practice.....p.43
1. Our Criticism of the CP of China in 1963.....p.43
2. Is Not Practice Always Primary For a Marxist?.....p.44
 - a) Meaning of the Concept "Practice".....p.44
 - b) Revolutionary Theory Serves Practice.....p.47
3. The Significance of the Masses' Own Experience On
the One Hand, and the Significance of the Revolu-
tionary Theory For the Communist Vanguard Party On
the Other.....p.47
4. The Theoretical Work For Laying Down the Line For
Revolution In One's Own Country.....p.48

5. To What Respect Did Lenin Make Marx's Theory Into
the Starting Point For His Analysis of the Re-
lations of Production in Russia ?.....p.49
5. Can Dogmatism Ever Be the Main Danger ?.....p.50

All the emphases are by us, if there is no other infor-
mation given

the existing era in a new way:

"A precise analysis of changes in the world situation enabled the fraternal parties of the whole world to work out a Marxist-Leninist definition of our era."
(Ibid., p.574)

The fundamental error of this revisionist thesis consists in confusing the relationship between the Marxist-Leninist characterization of our era and an exact analysis of the changes taking place in the world. By defining an era, Marxism-Leninism delineates the most essential features and the most fundamental laws of a given historical period which govern and determine its various phenomena. By defining our era as the "era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution", Lenin and Stalin stressed precisely these general laws and facts underlying all the various phenomena and putting their stamp upon them. Precisely this is the meaning and purpose of defining an era.

It is fully clear to Marxist-Leninists that Lenin's and Stalin's definition of our era holds true as long as imperialism exists. It cannot be rescinded by any changes and developments within imperialism.

It is not possible, as asserted by the modern revisionists, to arrive at a new characterization of our era on the basis of "new phenomena" in imperialism. It is also not possible to characterize the existing era better by including all those real or supposed "new phenomena" and details in its definition. Such a thing would, at the most, confuse the concept of the era with various phases within it. The definition of the era would lose its meaning and purpose.

Isolated phenomena, developments and changes do not require a new definition of the era. On the contrary, it is possible to correctly understand and evaluate the various phenomena, developments and changes only by proceeding from a correct determination of the era, that is, by proceeding from the great general laws and fundamental facts of a given historical period.

Consequently, the revisionist approach to the question of the era is completely wrong. It confuses issues and has far-reaching and serious consequences. Basically, it amounts to denying the essential features and the basic laws of our period, to denying the Marxist-Leninist principles themselves.

By referring to the "new conditions" and "changes", this method negates and nullifies the laws and principles, which are generally

(footnote contd. from last page)

This definition of the Krushchovite revisionists, directed against Lenin and Stalin, is certainly much longer, but it is at the same time decidedly ambiguous and porous. This definition does not stress the most essential thing, the proletarian revolution. Instead, by enumerating all sorts of phenomena, it degrades the proletarian revolution to one aspect among many. In addition, certain aspects of our era are unprecisely represented by the use of questionable formulations like: "collapse of imperialism" and "abolition of the colonial system".

valid under the conditions of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. By referring to this or that "change" or "development", this method justifies and smoothes the path of most shamelessly pruning, falsifying and rejecting all the teachings of Leninism about theory, strategy and tactics of the world proletarian revolution.

2. The Krushchovite Revisionists' Hue and Cry About the Danger of Dogmatism in General and About the "Dogmatism of the C P of China" in Particular

After the 20th Congress, the Krushchovite revisionists raised a wild outcry about the danger of dogmatism. This was the incidental music to their manifold revision of the Marxist-Leninist principles.

This outcry was meant to hold in check and intimidate all those who were prepared to defend the Marxist-Leninist theory.

Even quoting basic texts and passages from the classical writers' works was vilified to be pedantic and doctrinaire. The Krushchovite revisionists wanted to create an atmosphere in which it was practically forbidden to confront their views with Marx's, Engels', Lenin's and Stalin's teachings if one did not wish to be defamed as a "Stalinist dogmatist", or as an "adherent of the cult of personality".

The C.P. of China, which opposed Krushchov's plan, was similarly disqualified with the same intent. The revisionist CC of the C.P. S.U. declared:

"The Chinese comrades are ... completely divorced from reality and approach the problems of war, peace and revolution in a dogmatic, bookish way, failing to understand the concrete conditions of our era."
("Open Letter of the CC of the C.P.S.U. to all Party Organizations, to all Communists of the Soviet Union", cited from "Polemic", p.573)

Thus, the question of dogmatism was raised by the Krushchovite revisionists. This was not new at all. Revisionists of all hues have always attempted to divert from the basic laws, the principles and the perspective of proletarian revolution by means of day-to-day events and concrete details.

At all times, revisionists of all shades have slandered Marxist-Leninists to be "dogmatists".

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin not only worked out and defended the laws and principles, the entire prospect of world communism, but they also unceasingly waged a bitter struggle against all the revisionists' attempts to attack and repudiate the fundamental perceptions and principles of their teachings under the guise of rejecting all "dogmatism".

The entire complex of questions concerning the correct relationship between theory, laws and principles on the one side, and the requirements of a concrete Marxist-Leninist analysis, which is essential for the struggle on the other, is of utmost signifi-

cance. A wrong or only superficial treatment of this complex of issues undoubtedly leads to rotten compromises or to the behaviour of giving way to the modern revisionists.

That is why we think a renewed study of the struggle of the classical Marxist-Leninist writers regarding this complex of issues is in every respect an essential pre-requisite for our ideological struggle today.

Such a study is particularly essential in order to be able to make a well-founded analysis of the C.P. of China's reply and its positions towards the Krushchovite revisionists' reproach that these positions were dogmatic.

II) SOME LESSONS FROM THE WORKS OF THE CLASSICAL MARXIST-LENINIST WRITERS CONCERNING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DEFENDING THE PRINCIPLES AND THE QUESTION OF DOGMATISM

oo

1. Marx's and Engels' Struggle Against the Falsifiers of the Theory and Principles of the "Communist Manifesto"

Their whole life, Marx and Engels defended in all areas the Communist theory developed by them against distortions and falsifications emerging in the most varied forms. To understand better the relationship between communist theory and principles, it is very important to examine Marx's and Engels' struggle for the defence of their doctrine, which they had concisely elaborated for the first time in the "Communist Manifesto". In his writing "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx", Lenin wrote :

"The Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, published in 1848, gave an integral and systematic exposition of this doctrine, an exposition which has remained the best to this day."
(Lenin, 1913, Coll. Works 18, p. 582)

In this programmatic document, which - as is well-known - carries the title "Manifesto of the Communist Party", Marx and Engels theoretically set forth the development of capitalism and the world historical role of the proletariat on the path towards communism. The paramount significance of the Communist Manifesto consists precisely in the fact that certain general principles are concluded from the Marxist theory. These principles have the character of axioms and will retain full validity up to the victory of world communism.

These principles, for example the statement that the proletariat is "the most revolutionary class", or the fundamental principle of proletarian internationalism "Workers of all Countries, Unite", or also the principle that the "working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery", but must smash it, stressed by Engels in 1888 on the basis of the experiences of the Paris Commune in one of the prefaces to the "Communist Manifesto" - all such principles were defended in an extraordinarily important and instructive struggle with exemplary consistency for a quarter of a century after the publication of the "Manifesto". In the present-day world communist movement this struggle has been underestimated in many ways.

In order to unite the two streams existing in the German working-class movement - the "Eisenachers" and the "Lassalleans" - a Unity Congress was to take place in Gotha on the basis of a draft for a common programme. In this draft programme essential principles of Marxism were distorted and violated. On the one hand, Marx and Engels were firmly for uniting the various streams in the working-class movement for the struggle against the common enemy. On the other hand, they were of the opinion that a unification which took place by slighting and violating principles, even if this seemed to assure momentary success and promised great advantages for the moment, would, in the near future, inevitably lead to defeats and failures. For this reason, they decisively opposed a unification on such a basis, and initiated an energetic struggle against the opportunist draft of the "Gotha Programme".

Immediately on receiving this draft, Marx wrote in a letter that he considered it to be his duty

"not to give recognition, even by diplomatic silence, to what in my opinion is a thoroughly objectionable programme that demoralises the Party".
(Karl Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", Progress Publishers, Moscow 1978, p.9)

The draft programme contained certain passages which were directly borrowed from the "Communist Manifesto", but were re-worked in such a way that they

"contain what is either UTTERLY FALSE or PURE BOSH AND NON-SENSE."
(Ibid., p.50, emphasis by Engels)

For instance, the unity of the international proletariat was diluted into international "brotherhood". The allies of the proletariat were characterized to be one "reactionary mass" without any qualifications whatsoever etc.

Under the guiding motto of not

"haggling about principles",
(Ibid., p.10)

Marx and Engels led a sharp ideological struggle against this gross falsification of the principles of the "Manifesto of the Communist Party", as also against the falsification of the economic theory.

A more exact study of Marx's and Engels' struggle for defending the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" shows how closely and inseparably the struggle for defending their theory is connected with the struggle for defending the concentrate of this theory, that is, its conclusions, the principles.

This is true in two respects :

Firstly, Marx and Engels showed that while defending the theory, they did not lose themselves in details of secondary importance, but always sharpened the struggle for defending the theory to the decisive touchstones, that is, to the principles and the central conclusions.

Secondly, it becomes clear that Marx and Engels did not consider the principles worked out by them in isolation from their entire theory. They considered these principles to be its c o n c e n - t r a t e. They defended them as being based on this theory and as being derived from it. They considered the principles to be the fundamental guide to action, to be a decisive means for connecting theory with practice.

Precisely such a defence of principles, which draws upon the entire gamut of arguments of Marxist theory, is one of the most important lessons from Marx's and Engels' polemic against the draft of the Gotha programme. It constitutes a model in ideological struggle.

2. The Speculations of the Russian "Friends of the People" With the Peculiarities of Russia to Deny the General Validity of Marxist Theory

When Lenin, towards the end of the 19th century, took up the struggle to defend Marxism, the movement of the so-called "friends of the people" existed as a strong political and ideological current.

The "friends of the people" waged a struggle against Marxism by representing the theoretical works of Marx, particularly the "Capital", to be merely a valuable collection of "most minute details", to be full of "scrupulosity".

The "friends of the people" argued: "There are brilliant pages of history in Capital, b u t ..." (Lenin, Coll. Works, 1, p.149). Thus, while praising Marx on the one hand because of his "concrete analysis", they also asserted on the other that the "Capital" analysed "only one definite historical period". This particular period, analysed by Marx, did not have any validity or significance for the situation prevailing in Russia.

Lenin characterized this method of rejecting Marxism in the following way:

"Overwhelmed by the tremendously convincing way he states his case, they bow and scrape before Marx, laud him, and at the same time entirely lose sight of the basic content of his doctrine."

(Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are And How They Fight the Social-Democrats", 1894, Coll. Works 1, p.134)

Initially, Lenin concentrated on comprehensively showing the fundamental significance of the "Capital" for a historical-materialistic analysis of the development of capitalism as a social formation.

In relation to speculations that capitalism was not developing in Russia, that, as a result, Marxism did not hold true in Russia, Lenin declared that Marx had worked out the general laws of capitalism on the basis of his extensive studies, and that the peculiarities of the various countries could be analysed only on this basis:

"The analysis of material social relations at once made it

possible to observe recurrence and regularity and to generalise the systems of SOCIAL FORMATION. It was this generalisation alone that made it possible to proceed from the description of social phenomena (and their evaluation from the standpoint of an ideal) to their strictly scientific analysis, which isolates, let us say by way of example, that which distinguishes one capitalist country from another and investigates that which is common to all of them."

(Ibid., p.140, emphasis by capital letters from Lenin)

What was important here was the fundamental necessity of distinguishing "the important and the unimportant in the complex network of social phenomena" (Ibid., p.140), of not remaining on the surface of the phenomena, but of comprehending their deeper connections and laws.

Lenin's struggle against the "friends of the people" was in the first instance a defence of the Marxist theory, of the universal validity of the analysis of capitalism for all countries, thus also for Russia, and a defence of the principle resulting therefrom that not the peasant but the

"worker is the sole and natural representative of Russia's entire working and exploited population".
(Ibid., p.299)

At the same time, basing himself on Marx's theory and the Marxist principle of the hegemony of the proletariat, Lenin went on to illustrate with the help of Russian data and statistics that the Marxist theory was valid in Russia, too. Finally, in 1899, in his work "The Development of Capitalism in Russia", Lenin connected the peculiarities of Russia with the basic laws of social development in capitalism, which had been discovered and worked out by Marx and Engels. Thus, the attempt of the "friends of the people" to divert attention away from the basic laws of development by demanding a "concrete analysis" were exposed and these views were dealt a death blow.

In this struggle, Lenin clearly stressed the fundamental difference between

"developing the basic tenets of Marxism in accordance with the changing conditions and with the local characteristics of the different countries".

(Lenin, "Uncritical Criticism", 1900, Coll. Works 3, pp.630-31)

and denying the fundamental Marxist theses by referring to newly emerged conditions, or by referring to the peculiarities of a country which have not yet been analysed, or have been analysed only superficially.

3. New Attacks Against Marxist-Leninist Theory and Principles By Upcoming Revisionism

After the trends of "pre-Marxist socialism", the open rejection of Marxism, had been defeated internationally - and also in Russia by means of Lenin's struggle - the various opportunist trends, while apparently recognizing Marxism in general, tried to rob it of its essence and deprive it of its revolutionary content by means of certain "corrections" of its principles. Revisionism

emerged on an international scale.

Lenin wrote about this :

"Pre-Marxist socialism has been defeated. It is continuing that struggle, no longer on its own independent ground, but on the general ground of Marxism, as revisionism."
(Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism", 1908, Coll.Works 15, p.33)

In order to gain victory for their bourgeois positions, guised as "Marxist" positions, the revisionists, with Bernstein at their head, tried at first to create a certain atmosphere in which being principled, adhering to fundamental arguments and conclusions of Marxism were considered to be "old-fashioned", "ossified" and "inimical to progress".

"Dogmatism" was declared to be enemy no. 1. "Freedom of criticism" became the catch-phrase of the revisionists. It meant for them the "freedom" to treat the fundamental principles of Marxism exactly as they pleased and to launch an attack against them. In "What Is to Be Done ?", Lenin began a systematic struggle against this international revisionist trend. In the first chapter of "What Is to Be Done ?" ("Dogmatism and Freedom of Criticism"), Lenin first showed that at that point of time, in the 20th century, the revisionist trend in various countries

"has from national become international".
(Lenin, "What Is to Be Done ?", 1902, Coll.Works 5, p.352)

The revisionists of various countries

"all belong to the same family, all extol each other, learn from each other, and together take up arms against 'dogmatic' Marxism."
(Ibid., p.353)

This hue and cry was needed by the revisionists because the revolutionary principles of Marxism stood in the way of their reformist politics. Lenin briefly summed up this attitude, characteristic of the revisionists:

"Denied was the possibility of putting socialism on a scientific basis and of demonstrating its necessity and inevitability from the point of view of the materialist conception of history. Denied was the fact of growing impoverishment, the process of proletarianisation, and the intensification of capitalist contradictions ; the very concept, 'ULTIMATE AIM', was declared to be unsound, and the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat was completely rejected. Denied was the antithesis in principle between liberalism and socialism. Denied was THE THEORY OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE, on the alleged grounds that it could not be applied to a strictly democratic society governed according to the will of the majority, etc."
(Ibid., p.353, emphasis from Lenin)

Lenin unsparingly stigmatized this attitude and showed in "What Is to Be Done ?" that this kind of "freedom of criticism" means

"freedom from all integral and pondered theory; it implies eclecticism and lack of principle."
(Ibid., p.369)

Lenin recalled Marx's struggle against "haggling with principles" and stressed that every renunciation of principles must be "condemned sharply". Lenin irrefutably showed that the revisionist propaganda against "dogmatism" only represented the converse side of despising revolutionary principles and theory. Precisely to defend the revolutionary principles, Lenin coined the famous words:

"Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement."
(Ibid., p.369)

In this connection, Lenin stressed the experience of the revolutionary German workers' movement, summed up by Engels, that class struggle included not just the political and economic struggle, but also particularly the ideological struggle. The class struggle must unconditionally also be waged in the theoretical sphere to defend the Marxist theory (*).

The Communists can fulfil their tasks in the struggle against imperialism and opportunism only if they are led by the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism. For, as Stalin taught, practice becomes blind if its path is not illuminated by revolutionary theory. Revolutionary theory alone

"can give the movement confidence, the power of orientation and an understanding of the inner relation of surrounding events".
(Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism", 1924, op.cit., p.20)

The Party can really be the advanced detachment of the working class only if it is

"armed with revolutionary theory, with a knowledge of the laws of the movement, with a knowledge of the laws of revolution."
(Ibid., p.99)

4. The Defence of the Theoretical Foundations of Marxism in Lenin's Work "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism"

After the defeat of the revolution in 1905, tendencies of decay and disintegration developed in the revolutionary movement in Russia. Many revolutionaries manifested vacillations. The reaction fanned these tendencies and launched an offensive against Marxism. It became fashionable to talk about the "failure" of Marxism and to criticize Marxism. The tendency towards despondency and capitulation was sought to be cemented in the spheres of philosophy and world views, too.

In order to consolidate the certainty about the victory of the revolution in the future among the Bolsheviks, in order to consolidate the possibility of the planned and organized preparation for the revolution even under the newly emerged conditions among them, and to carry this to the working class, it became of prime importance to create clarity and certainty in relation to the fundamental theoretical questions of Marxism. Fundamental questions of Marxist philosophy, of dialectical materialism, came to the

(*) See Note 1 : A Crass Example of How the Modern Revisionists Reduce the Role of Theory : "Fidel Castro's Relationship to Revolutionary Theory", or "The Theory Will be Delivered Subsequently", p.34

fore. Particularly the question began to be raised, whether it was at all possible to know the world and its laws, as well as the question, how long and under what conditions such knowledge and the knowledge of Marxism in particular were valid.

The answer to all these questions was made all the more difficult because it certainly was "not usual" for the revolutionaries to occupy themselves with the philosophical theories of the bourgeoisie and their opportunist hangers-on.

It was to Lenin's great merit that, in this period of the Stolypin-reaction, he equipped the Bolshevik Party with a firm and unshakeable theoretical foundation by comprehensively defending dialectical materialism and by smashing the ever more refined falsifications of Marxism in his work "Materialism and Empirio-criticism".

"Resolute resistance to this disintegration, a resolute and persistent struggle, to uphold the fundamentals of Marxism, was again placed on the order of the day".

(Lenin, "Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism", 1910, Coll. Works 17, p.42)

a) The Revisionists' Attempt to Direct Friedrich Engels' Struggle Against Bourgeois Idealist "Principles" in "Anti-Dühring"
Against the Principles of Marxism. - - - - -

In their endeavour to deal a blow to Marxism, the revisionists attempted to pit the Marxist Friedrich Engels against Marxism. They did this by citing a few chosen passages from Engels' work "Anti-Dühring". They incessantly drummed around two of Engels' theses which they reproduced very superficially and also falsified in their essence. With the help of these theses they wished to prove that Marxism did not express any "objective truth", that, with every change of the conditions, its principles had similarly to be changed and therefore did not have any significance beyond the given moment of time. They even announced that Engels had waged a fundamental struggle against all principles and had rejected any eternal truth.

This rotten assertion had the purpose of denying all the Marxist principles and of rejecting the validity of Marxism as such.

In the struggle against these distortions, Lenin made clear :

Firstly, Engels was not polemicizing against principles as such, but only against a certain kind of principles and a certain conception of principles.

What Dühring proclaimed at great length to be the "principles" discovered by him were actually constructions and systems which were imposed on reality and which violated reality. They were on the pattern of bourgeois-idealist moral codes and codes of behaviour which did not have anything to do with the theoretical principles of Marxist theory. Engels naturally rejected such artificial "principles", so far-removed from reality. He proved that they were simply wrong, that they were inventions of the bourgeois class, meant to suppress the proletariat. Engels struggled against Dühring's bourgeois "principles" because they

were bourgeois, and not because they were principles.

As Engels showed, the true and correct principles in the natural sciences and in the social sciences cannot at all be the inventions of favoured creatures like Dühring. Rather, they are the product of a thorough scientific analysis of the laws of nature and society. Engels particularly stressed this by setting forth, against Dühring's jugglery with ideas, how Marx had formulated certain laws and principles only after lengthy investigations and by means of exact analyses. In this sense, Engels very unambiguously emphasized:

"the principles are not the starting-point of the investigation, but its final result ;...the principles are valid in so far as they are in conformity with nature and history."
(Engels, "Anti-Dühring", 1878, Moscow 1954, p.54)

In this way Engels clarified the character of the Marxist principles. Above all, he showed how they had arisen.

In order to justify their revisionism, the revisionists repeatedly try to deny this unambiguous context of Engels' words and try to misuse these words as a reply to a totally different question.

This other question is : Must not the scientific principles which underly the various phenomena, and which have not been invented in an artificial way, but have been worked out in the manner described by Engels, be used as a weapon and as a point of departure for further knowledge; or must these results of an immense theoretical work be negated ?

In Anti-Dühring, Engels did not take a position on this question. It would be a harmful misunderstanding, and also an obvious misuse, to perceive the above quotation by Engels to be an answer to this question.

Lenin had to deal with the revisionist falsification of Engels' statement because the revisionists tried to pit Engels as chief witness against Marxism and its principles. As Lenin showed, there are two possibilities : Either the principles which have already been acquired and proved, that is , the Marxist theory as a whole is taken to be the starting point for further detailed investigations, or Marx's and Engels' entire work is considered to be more or less worthless, that is to say one's own analysis is considered to be the point of departure.

Lenin stressed, particularly in his polemic against Bogdanov, that the distinction between Marxists and revisionists can be seen in these two different approaches.

Secondly, as Lenin showed, Engels in no way denied that there are proven truths which retain their truthful content forever; which in so far are, so to say, "eternal truths". The issue at hand was different.

"On the most complex questions of science in general, and of historical science in particular, Dühring scattered words right and left: ultimate, final and eternal truth. Engels jeered at him. Of course there are eternal truths, Engels said, but it is unwise to use high-sounding words in connec-

tion with simple things. If we want to advance materialism, we must drop this trivial play with the words 'eternal truth'." (Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-criticism", 1909, Coll. Works 14, p.133)

Lenin expounded that precisely the most essential conclusions of Marxism are "objective truths" which have been proved through practice. No future development can change the fact that statements and scientific knowledge, emerging from practice and being proved through practice, are true and remain true. To deny this would mean to falsify dialectical materialism into mere relativism.

All these clarifications on Lenin's part were necessary, not just to defend Engels against his false friends. They were also an unconditional pre-requisite to oppose the new increasing revisionist attacks against the validity of Marxist theory and principles.

b) Lenin's Clarification About the Conditions Under Which the Marxist Theory and its Principles are Valid - - - - -

Bogdanov and the other revisionists in his wake have always tried to force the Marxist-Leninists into a corner :

In the same chorus as the bourgeois ideologues, they demand : In his time Marx proved his theory. Today, you must prove it anew, if you assert that it is still valid.

However, the entire way in which the issue is raised is demagogic and wrong. Marx and Engels did not derive their theory from phenomena existing temporarily; they did not substantiate it by conditions existing temporarily. Rather, they layed bare the causal relationships, undertook comprehensive generalizations and worked out conclusions, which retain their validity independent of the changes in the concrete phenomena. Today, the Marxists must naturally propagate these Marxist laws anew and also illustrate them with new factual material. But there is no question of attempting to develop the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and its principles anew. There is no question of once again beginning from the scratch. The outcry, raised by the revisionists asking for "new proofs" for the correctness of Marxism-Leninism is all the more demagogic because they have never succeeded in refuting the "old" Marxist line of reasoning.

Of course, social laws are conditional. For example, the laws of surplus production are valid under the conditions of capitalism, but not valid under the conditions of the socialist relations of production, the theory of surplus value in capitalism remains an objective truth, even if the laws of surplus production cannot operate in socialism.

The validity, that is, the effectivity of a particular law under certain conditions and its character of being an objective truth - these are two completely different things which should not be confused.

But that is precisely what the revisionists do. They create confusion here, as Lenin showed with the example of Bogdanov, who ,

under the banner of a struggle against ostensible "dogmatism", denied the paramount role of Marxist theory as the point of departure for further investigations.

In this connection, Lenin wrote :

"Bogdanov is prepared to recognise Marx's theory of the circulation of money as an objective truth only for 'our time', and calls it 'dogmatism' to attribute to this theory a 'super-historically objective' truth." (Ibid., p. 143)

Exposing this confusion, Lenin continued :

"The correspondence of this theory to practice cannot be altered by any future circumstances, for the same simple reason that makes it an ETERNAL truth that Napoleon died on May 5, 1821. But inasmuch as the criterion of practice, i.e., the course of development of ALL capitalist countries in the last, few decades, proves only the objective truth of Marx's WHOLE social and economic theory in general, and not merely of one or other of its parts, formulations, etc., it is clear that to talk here of the "dogmatism" of the Marxists is to make an unpardonable concession to bourgeois economics. The sole conclusion to be drawn from the opinion held by Marxists that Marx's theory is an objective truth is that by following the PATH of Marxian theory we shall draw closer and closer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it); but by following ANY OTHER PATH we shall arrive at nothing but confusion and lies."

(Ibid., emphases by capital letters in the original)

What particularly stands out in this formulation is the emphasis that all further investigations can be fruitful only if they are based on Marxist theory, if Marxist theory is taken as the point of departure. At the same time, against the real dangers of dogmatism, the necessity is stressed of proceeding further on the path of Marxist theory, thus of continually developing Marxism further.

In clarifying these philosophical questions, Lenin armed the Bolshevik Party in two respects:

By profoundly understanding the conditions under which Marxist theory and principles are valid, he clarified that the revision of the main propositions of Marxism which are valid for the entire historical period of capitalism must be repudiated and combatted , if the most essential thing in Marxism is not to be lost.

However, on the other hand, the dialectical-materialist view concerning the validity of the various theses and principles of Marxist theory enabled him to always raise the question regarding the conditions under which the conclusions and principles of Marx were valid. This dialectical-materialist view enabled him to recognize that some statements of Marxism were not valid for the entire historical era of capitalism. It enabled him to recognize that they no longer held true in the new era of imperialism, that they had to be repudiated and replaced by new conclusions, dependent on certain other conditions.

5. Kautsky's Revisionism and his Dogmatic Demagoguery

The struggle between the Marxist line, led by Lenin, and the revisionist trend, with Kautsky as its main advocate, intensified with the increasing sharpening of the contradictions of capitalism and the approach of the proletarian revolution.

In this situation, Kautsky directly called upon the workers to support the imperialist bourgeoisie. In view of this direct political betrayal by Kautsky, Lenin in no way was satisfied with just stigmatizing this political betrayal. At the same time he also comprehensively analysed Kautsky's theoretical falsification of Marxism. Particularly in the works "The State and Revolution" and "Renegade Kautsky", Lenin concentrated on repudiating the revisionist falsification of the main teachings of Marxism concerning the necessity of the armed smashing of the old state apparatus and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. (*)

This was the essence of Kautskyism. At a time when pre-monopoly capitalism was transforming itself into imperialism, the struggle against Kautsky's revisionism was impeded by one circumstance.

Kautsky attempted to "turn the tables". He tried to defend his reputation as an "orthodox" Marxist, which he had acquired in the struggle against Bernstein. He tried to represent the Bolsheviks, Lenin and Stalin, to be "revisionists".

With the transition of capitalism into its highest stage, into imperialism, the Marxists were in fact confronted with the difficult task of deciding which theses of Marxism retained their full validity in this new era and which theses were no longer applicable in this era and had to be replaced by new ones.

Lenin's struggle against philosophical relativism and for dialectical materialism enabled the Bolsheviks to analyse very exactly - while studying Marx's and Engels' teachings - the historical context presupposed by certain principles, that is, the context in which they were valid and applicable.

Under Lenin's leadership, the Bolsheviks were able to make a precise distinction between those teachings of Marx and Engels, which had been arrived at by means of a comprehensive analysis of capitalism and were valid for the entire period of the existence of capitalism, and those principles which were derived from the peculiarities of rising capitalism and could claim validity only for this period.

The principles belonging to the first category had unconditionally to be defended; the second category of principles, however, had to be rejected under the conditions of imperialism and to be replaced by new ones.

(*) When studying Lenin's method, it is extremely impressive to see how he systematically examined "the history of Kautsky's latest betrayal of Marxism", and uncovered the roots of Kautsky's revisionism also in those books and brochures which originated from the period when Lenin had still evaluated Kautsky to be an exponent of Marxism. ("The State and Revolution", 1917, Coll.Works 25, p.482)

The opportunist Kautskyites (and on the same track, but with some variations, Trotsky and Zinoviev, too) played an extremely harmful role by doing exactly the opposite of what was necessary for the revolution in two respects:

On the one hand, they rejected those principles of Marxism which continued to be valid, above all the recognition of the necessity of the armed proletarian revolution and the violent smashing of the old state apparatus. This was their revisionism. On the other hand, they adhered to conclusions of Marxism which were no longer valid - this was their dogmatism.

It became evident that precisely those who always reproached Lenin and the Bolsheviks with "dogmatism", themselves dogmatically falsified Marxism. And it was precisely Lenin and Stalin who fully conformed to Marx's statement that his theory was "not a dogma, but a guide to action."

Stalin characterized this demagogic method of the revisionist Kautsky, which, inter alia, had its roots precisely in the fact that in reality a qualitative caesura, a new era, had emerged, as follows:

"Opportunism does not always mean a direct denial of the Marxist theory or of any of its propositions and conclusions. Opportunism is sometimes expressed in the attempt to cling to certain of the propositions of Marxism that have already become antiquated and to convert them into a dogma, so as to retard the further development of Marxism, and, consequently, to retard the development of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat."
("History of the C.P.S.U.(B)", op.cit., pp.357-58)

6. The Revisionists' Denial of the International Validity of the Basic Features of the October Revolution

The victory of the socialist October revolution was an enormous triumph for Leninism - the Marxism which was developed further under the conditions of imperialism. A debate concerning the evaluation of this gigantic world historic victory broke out among the revolutionaries of the world.

In this situation naturally all opportunists and revisionists did their utmost to undermine the immense authority of the October Revolution. They did this not just by direct vilifications, but also by raising all sorts of reservations, all sorts of "ifs" and "buts", while at the same time hypocritically paying obeisance to it.

Playing upon the prevailing chauvinism, revisionist bandits like Kautsky and Turatti declared that the Russian revolution was "typically Russian" and could not be a model for the "civilized countries".

At the first World Congresses of the Communist International, Lenin unfolded a debate about this issue and explained point by point the immense international significance of the October Revolution and analysed the foundations of Bolshevik theory to be a model for all countries.

In his work "'Left-Wing' Communism, An Infantile Disorder", written for the Communists of all countries, Lenin emphasized:

"In the first months after the proletariat in Russia had won political power (October 25 (November 7), 1917), it might have seemed that the enormous difference between backward Russia and the advanced countries of Western Europe would lead to the proletarian revolution in the latter countries bearing very little resemblance to ours. We now possess quite considerable international experience, which shows very definitely that certain fundamental features of our revolution have a significance that is not local, or peculiarly national, or Russian alone, but international. I am not speaking here of international significance in the broad sense of the term: not merely several but all the primary features of our revolution, and many of its secondary features, are of international significance in the meaning of its effect on all countries. I am speaking of it in the narrowest sense of the word, taking international significance to mean the international validity or the historical inevitability of a repetition, on an international scale, of what has taken place in our country. It must be admitted that certain fundamental features of our revolution do possess that significance... At the present moment in history, however, it is the Russian model that reveals to ALL countries something - and something highly significant - of their near and inevitable future." (Lenin, "'Left-Wing' Communism - An Infantile Disorder", 1920, Coll.Works 31, pp.21-22, emphasis by Lenin)

The question concerning the international significance of the October Revolution is organically connected with Stalin's subsequent struggle to defend Leninism as the Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution.

Stalin waged an ideological struggle for Leninism's victory against people like Zinoviev, who, while defining Leninism, emphasized the predominance of the peasantry in Russia. Stalin showed that this meant :

"transforming Leninism from an international proletarian doctrine into a product of specifically Russian conditions. It means playing into the hands of Bauer and Kautsky, who deny that Leninism is suitable for other countries, for countries in which capitalism is more developed... Is not Leninism the generalisation of the experience of the revolutionary movement of ALL countries ? Are not the fundamentals of the theory and tactics of Leninism suitable, are they not obligatory, for the proletarian parties of ALL countries ? " (Stalin, "Concerning Questions of Leninism", 1926, Works 8, p.14, emphases by Stalin)

The definition of Leninism as the Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution also expresses that the danger of dogmatism presents itself in a different way as at the beginning of this era. As is well-known, imperialism is the highest and last stage of capitalism, and in the framework of capitalism, no transition to any other new era is possible anymore. So long as capitalism exists, so long as imperialism continues to exist as its highest and last stage, the Communists cannot come into such a situation anymore that they have to reject cer-

tain fundamental strategic principles and replace them by new ones in a manner comparable to Lenin's time, when pre-monopoly capitalism was making its transition to its monopoly, imperialist stage, that is, when a new era was coming into being.

That is why the danger of dogmatism as a demagogic method to revise the essence of Marxism, can no longer play the same role as in Kautsky's time.

At the same time the danger of dogmatism exists even though to a qualitatively different extent. This is evident in precisely Stalin's struggle against Trotsky's line in the Chinese revolution and in general in relation to the revolution in oppressed countries.

7. The General Validity of Leninism For All Countries and the Danger of Dogmatically Carrying Over Specific Experiences of the October Revolution to the Revolution in Semi-Feudal and Semi-Colonial Countries

The October Revolution initiated the era of the victory of the world proletarian revolution. The world proletarian revolution includes not only the revolution in the capitalist countries, but also, as Lenin emphasized, the revolutions in the

"more backward states and nations, in which feudal or patriarchal and patriarchal-peasant relations predominate". (Lenin, "Preliminary Draft Theses On the National and Colonial Questions", 1920, Coll.Works 31, p.149)

In the capitalist countries of Western Europe, where

"the basic forces - and the basic forms of social economy" (Lenin, as quoted in "Concerning Questions of Leninism", Stalin, op.cit., p.15)

were the same as in Russia, the main danger was that the fundamental experiences of the October Revolution were not taken as a model. In contrast, in countries with pre-capitalist relations there was the greater danger of taking over the experiences of capitalist Russia in a dogmatic way.

In these countries, too, the primary task was to defend the Marxist-Leninist principles, to defend their general validity against all revisionist attacks. Numerous fundamental teachings of the October Revolution like, for example, the necessity of the hegemony of the proletariat, the necessity of the Bolshevik Party and of the armed smashing of the old state apparatus etc. were and are similarly valid for these countries.

Even then, in these countries, the Communists were also confronted with certain additional tasks, which Lenin formulated in the following manner :

"relying upon the general theory and practice of communism, you must adapt yourselves to specific conditions such as do not exist in the European countries; you must be able to apply that theory and practice to conditions in which the bulk of the population are peasants, and in which the task is to wage a struggle against medieval survivals and not

against capitalism." (*)

(Lenin, "Address to the Second All-Russian Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East", 1919, Coll. Works 30, p.161)

Zinoviev and Trotsky acted in total contradiction to Lenin's demand. In conformity with their European chauvinism, they propagated to the oppressed peoples in a dogmatic pose precisely those experiences of the October Revolution which were not applicable to these conditions.

In the fight against imperialism and feudalism the question of possible agreements with the bourgeoisie of those countries is of particular importance. Citing the experiences of the October Revolution, Trotsky and Radek rejected any possible agreement with the bourgeoisie of the semi-feudal and semi-colonial countries. In reality, there was and is such a principle for the Russian revolution and for the revolutions in the capitalist countries. But Marxism precisely demands understanding the principles in a profound way in the context of the given conditions.

Where did this principle of rejecting any agreement with the bourgeoisie originate? Under what conditions was it applicable?

Trotsky showed his anti-Marxist method by not asking himself these questions at all. He simply carried over this principle to the Chinese revolution.

Being a Marxist, Stalin did proceed from such a question. In the interest of the Chinese revolution and for the purpose of elucidating Marxism-Leninism, he struggled against these methods and theses of Trotsky.

Stalin said:

"What is the basic premise of the Comintern and the Communist Parties generally in their approach to the questions of the revolutionary movement in colonial and dependent countries?

It consists in a strict DISTINCTION between revolution in imperialist countries, in countries that oppress other nations, and revolution in colonial and dependent countries, in countries that suffer from imperialist oppression by other states. Revolution in imperialist countries is one thing: there the bourgeoisie is the oppressor of other nations; there it is counter-revolutionary at all stages of the revolution...

Revolution in colonial and dependent countries is another thing: there the imperialist oppression by other states is one of the factors of the revolution; there this oppression cannot but affect the national bourgeoisie also; there the national bourgeoisie, at a certain stage and for a certain period, may support the revolutionary movement of its coun-

(*) As it emerges from the context, Lenin, of course, did not mean that there was to be no struggle against imperialist capital which has penetrated in these countries. He only said that in these countries by and large no indigenous national capital had developed and therefore the struggle against such a capital was not primary.

try against imperialism..."

(Stalin, "Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the C.P.S.U.(B)", 1927, Works 10, p.11, emphasis by Stalin)

Leninism not only takes the experiences of the October Revolution into consideration, but also the experiences of the revolutions of all countries. It is necessary to have clarity in every single case about the conditions substantiating certain guidelines and principles of Leninism, that is, about the conditions under which these principles and guidelines are valid.

This is one of the big lessons from Stalin's struggle for the victory of Leninism against the Trotskyite-Zinovievite opposition and their falsification of Leninism's principles.

8. Stalin's Fight Against the Emergence of Modern Revisionism After the Complete Victory of Leninism

On the eve of World War II, Stalin and the CC of the C.P.S.U.(B), as well as the E.C.C.I. of the Comintern had attained the victory of Leninism in the struggle against Trotskyite deviations to the extent that the exponents of anti-Marxist deviations were no longer able to come out openly against Leninism.

The world-historical victory of the socialist Soviet Union over Hitlerite-fascism further elevated the authority of Leninism and its consequent exponent, Stalin. However, this did not mean that in the ideological sphere renewed revisionist attacks - now demagogically referring to Leninism - were no longer possible. On the contrary!

The necessary concentration on the military victory and the immense loss of qualified cadres favoured the possibility of renewed revisionist attacks and deviations.

Stalin and the CC of the C.P.S.U. took measures against this danger in opening the debates on several fields, in philosophy, art and literature, in political economy etc., in bringing to light and combating the revisionist deviations.

Internationally magnificent victories had been gained. Clear changes had taken place. The Cominform Bureau uncovered and criticized right-opportunist deviations within the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries emerging under the pretext of a "particular path". It specially initiated the struggle against Titoite-revisionism. In his work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.", Stalin dealt a heavy blow to revisionist attempts within the Soviet Union which declared various principles of Leninism to be outdated and did not consider the laws of imperialism to be valid any longer.

In this work, Stalin first explained once again the existence of objective laws within the framework of certain objective conditions. He explained that these laws could be recognized and utilized but not abolished.

He explained that the scientific recognition of the existence of such laws of society was a pre-condition for the Communist Party to be able to lead in a planned and fore-sighted manner,

and for the socialist state to be able to take action. He warned against the mood of those who were "dizzy with success" because of the extraordinary successes of the Soviet Union and demanded a comprehensive education in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism:

"I think that systematic reiteration and patient explanation of so-called 'generally-known' truths is one of the best methods of educating these comrades in Marxism."
(Stalin, "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.", 1952, p.9, Peking 1976)

In the 6th chapter of his work, in relation to the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries, Stalin himself set forth the extraordinary political significance in international questions of his struggle against the upcoming tendencies to disregard the laws of society and consequently the guidelines and principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Against those who referred to diverse "new international conditions" and demanded that the "concrete analysis of new phenomena" should be made the starting point, Stalin emphasized the necessity of recognizing the continuing validity of the laws of imperialism, particularly the law concerning the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries.

This struggle shows that revisionist deviations came up in the C.P.S.U. and in the world communist movement in Stalin's time, too. The crucial point, however, is that Stalin resolutely opposed the revisionist chatter about the "new conditions" and energetically combated and repudiated its main exponent of that time - the Titoite revisionists - as well as the main ideological theses of the revisionists of this period.

III. THE C P OF CHINA'S REPLY TO THE KRUSHCHOVITE REVISIONISTS' FALSIFICATION OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST PRINCIPLES

oo

In their attacks against the Marxist-Leninist theory and principles, the Krushchovite revisionists did not by chance direct the spearhead against Stalin, who, in his writings had defended Lenin's comprehensive work and had particularly emphasized his general principles.

This attack against Stalin, and thus against Leninism, was waged, as already shown, under the banner of the struggle against "dogmatism" and of the "new conclusions" and principles corresponding to the alleged "new conditions". (*)

In our opinion, it would have been necessary to oppose these attacks with the extensive arsenal worked out by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. It would have been necessary to continue and develop further their resolute and principled struggle against revisionism of every sort.

In the light of this necessity, let us investigate whether and to what extent the C.P. of China did this and correctly replied to the Krushchovite revisionists' demagoguery.

(*) See Note 2: "Concerning Some Sources of the Present-Day 'Anti-Dogmatic' Trend", p.35

1. Correct Positions of the C P of China

Right at the beginning, the C P of China's "Proposal" concerning the General Line stressed fully correctly:

"The general line of the international communist movement must take as its guiding principle the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory concerning the historical mission of the proletariat and must not depart from it."
("A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement", The Letter of the CC of the C P of China in Reply to the Letter of the CC of the C.P.S.U. of March 30, 1963, in the "Polemic", p.5) (*)

Elsewhere, the C P of China similarly fully correctly emphasized against the Krushchovite-revisionists:

"Firm Marxist-Leninists and genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties must put principles first."
(Ibid., p.47)

We stress that this attitude of the C P of China towards the Marxist-Leninist theory and principles undeniably conforms to Marx's, Engels', Lenin's and Stalin's teachings.

A more exact analysis of the "Proposal", however, shows that the C P of China in its "Proposal" in no way adhered in a consequent way to these theses formulated by it. It did not make them the basis of all its proceedings at the time of the polemic against the Krushchovite revisionists.

2. Principles or "Concrete Analysis" as the Main Point of Departure For the General Line ?

A few pages after correctly emphasizing the necessity of taking the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, and only this theory, as the guideline, the "Proposal" suddenly takes another position and puts forward another thesis :

"In defining the general line of the international communist movement, the starting point is the concrete class analysis of world politics and economics as a whole and of actual world conditions, that is to say, of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world."
(Ibid., p.6)

Here it becomes clear that the C P of China, while attempting to refute the modern revisionists, remains completely within the framework of the typical reasoning of the Krushchovite revisionists. The Krushchovite revisionists said: We must determine the general line proceeding from the new situation, by means of new "concrete analyses". The C P of China does not uncover and clear up what it means to put the so-called "concrete analyses" before the principles, i.e., before the entire revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism. Instead, on its part, it underlines this same point of departure and this same approach. Basically, it reproaches the C.P.S.U. only with the fact that it

(*) From now on cited simply as "Proposal".

has not analysed correctly and concretely enough, instead of denouncing the renunciation of the primacy of theory. Thus, in the face of this decisive question, the C.P. of China gives way. (*)

Let us once again call to mind Lenin's argument against Bogdanov, which has great fundamental significance for this question:

"by following the PATH of Marxist theory we shall draw closer and closer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it); but by following ANY OTHER PATH we shall arrive at nothing but confusion and lies."

(Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", 1908, Coll. Works 14, p.143, emphases by Lenin)

Lenin answered the question concerning the point of departure in such an unambiguous way. The Krushchovite revisionists should have had to be opposed in this way, and only in this way.

It can be objected that in this way or that it is a question of using both the Marxist-Leninist principles as well as the concrete analysis for laying down the general line. This objection remains superficial. It is true that both are necessary and essential, but both components do not carry equal weight.

Marxist-Leninist theory is not arrived at by "concretely analyzing" today's conditions. Its principles are not the result of evaluating the analysis of the laws of the whole of social development and their inter-connections by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. As Lenin said, to make the "concrete analysis" of the present-day conditions the point of departure, instead of Marxist-Leninist theory, could only give rise to confusion. True, one may find enough to quarrel about with the modern revisionists concerning the results, but in this or that way, anyone who does not proceed from the Marxist-Leninist theory and principles will not really be able to grasp reality in a profound way, that is, in the way of proceeding from its laws, and grasping its inter-connections.

The C F of China's thesis to take the "concrete analysis", and not the principles as the point of departure is a serious attack against the Marxist-Leninist approach of understanding reality, set forward particularly by Lenin in "Materialism and Empirio-criticism". It is a revisionist concept of laying down the general line.

Therefore, this central thesis of the C P of China must be rejected to be fundamentally wrong. We must wage a determined struggle to take the Marxist-Leninist theory and its basic principles - the concentrate of this theory- as the main point of departure for laying down the general line of the world communist movement as well as explaining some new phenomena.

(*) See Note 3 : The "Sympathetic Concrete" and the "Unsympathetic Abstract", p.38

IV. PRACTICAL-POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES DERIVED BY THE KRUSHCHOVITE REVISIONISTS FROM THE OSTENSIBLY NEW CONDITIONS

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

The revision of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. was no end in itself. It served certain political aims. The Krushchovite leadership of the C.P.S.U. was inimical to Marxism-Leninism because this stood directly in the way of its counter-revolutionary plans.

The following two examples in the sphere of international politics, namely the thesis of imperialism which has allegedly become "peaceful" and the assertion regarding the "decisive role" of the socialist countries for world revolution, show how they used the supposedly new conditions to throw overboard the Marxist-Leninist principles.

1. Imperialism Which Has Become "Peaceful"

The Krushchovite revisionists directly attacked the thesis, put forward by Lenin, that wars are inevitable between capitalist countries so long as imperialism continues to exist.

On the pretext of the changed correlation of forces after World War II, the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. directly propagated that this thesis of Lenin was wrong:

"At the present stage of history, the question of whether war is inevitable must be treated differently than it was treated before the first and second world wars. For today, the correlation of forces on the world scene has changed radically(*)... there is now no fatal (?) inevitability of war."
(M.A.Suslov, "Speech at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.", Feb.16, 1956, p.11, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1956)

This open revision of Lenin's teaching had the aim of prettifying U.S. imperialism and the other imperialist powers. After they had thrown Lenin's teachings overboard, the Krushchovite revisionists propagated in relation to U.S. imperialism:

"We (the Soviet Union and the United States) are the strongest countries in the world and if we unite for peace there can be no war. Then if any madman wanted war, we would but have to shake 'our fingers to warn him off'." (cited in the "Polemic", p.245)

(*) Though not related to this question, the C P of China, however, formulated in a very ambiguous way in its 4th Comment that the situation after World War II was "fundamentally different" ("Polemic", p.187) from earlier. Above all, in connection with the false thesis that "concrete analysis" is the "point of departure", such a formulation must be seen to be a capitulation before similar assertions by the Krushchovite revisionists. It would have been correct and necessary to have stressed, precisely in the struggle against Krushchovite revisionism, that, in spite of great changes, the situation after World War II was not fundamentally different from earlier, that the Leninist principles were still fully valid.

This was one main manoeuvre of the Krushchovite revisionists with which they veiled their reconciliation with world imperialism. Its climax was to represent U.S. imperialism in a totally wrong light. On the one hand, they acted as if this was the only potent imperialism left after World War II. On the other hand, they propagated that because of these new circumstances, it had become so "reasonable" that it was possible and necessary to cooperate with it in the interest of world peace and security.

The Krushchovite revisionists speculated with the circumstance that U.S. imperialism was the only imperialism to have emerged strengthened from World War II, while all other imperialist powers had either been defeated in the war or had been more or less weakened because of its consequences. The Krushchovite revisionists posed the question in such a way as if the entire question of world imperialism had been reduced to the problem of U.S. imperialism. Now what was needed was to come to an understanding with it, to cooperate with it and in this way to solve all the issues of that time. They thus denied all the laws of imperialism. Taking the superiority of U.S. imperialism as a pretext, they especially denied that inter-imperialist contradictions had to intensify, particularly because the other big imperialist powers, which had temporarily been defeated, would inevitably regain strength.

If U.S. imperialism had become "reasonable" and "peaceful", if the other imperialists had become more or less insignificant and "powerless", then, in effect, all the imperialist powers would have been converted into peaceful forces, which were not at all interested in a war. At the most, there would be the problem of some "incorrigible" lone-wolves, some "obsessed individuals", who unfortunately had learned nothing from history and it would be necessary to "shake a warning finger" at them. In effect, it amounted to the fact that U.S. imperialism was to keep its few incorrigible elements in harness, while the Krushchovite revisionists promised to put a stop to the activities of the revolutionaries, who, in spite of all exhortations to the contrary, adhered to revolutionary struggle and to the liberation war against imperialism.

2. Do the Socialist Countries Constitute "the Decisive Force" in World Revolution ?

The Krushchovite revisionists took the fact that, after the Second World War, there was no longer only one socialist country, but that a series of countries had taken to the path of socialism, as a pretext to declare:

"The contradiction between capitalism and socialism is the chief contradiction of our epoch. On the outcome of the struggle of the two world systems the destinies of peace, democracy and socialism depend to a decisive extent."
(The Letter of the CC of the C.P.S.U. to the CC of the CPC", in "Polemic", p.502)

To correctly evaluate this standpoint, it is essential to take note of the fact that the leaders of the C.P.S.U. by the "world socialist system" in no way understood all the forces of the camp of the world proletarian revolution, but only the countries of the "world socialist system". They declared these countries to be the "decisive force in the battle against imperia-

lism". ("Open Letter of the CC of the C.P.S.U...", in "Polemic", p.571)

Similarly, referring only to the countries, the Krushchovite revisionists propagated that "the decisive role... belongs to... the socialist world system, which exerts its main influence on the development of the world socialist revolution..." (Ibid., p.574). That is, they declared all other forces of the world proletarian revolution to be secondary in relation to the socialist countries. Indeed, they went so far as to declare that "it would be immeasurably harder, if not altogether impossible" for the peoples of the other countries to accomplish their tasks and realize their aims "without assistance from the socialist countries" (Ibid., p.571).

This served for them the purpose of absolutizing the role of the socialist countries, to declare them to be the "decisive factor for the development of human society". Thus, they declared the contradiction between the socialist states and the states of world imperialism, which is only one of the various fundamental contradictions of our time, to be its most central fundamental contradiction.

In effect, this contradiction is put in the place of all the fundamental contradictions. The struggle between the camp of world imperialism and the camp of the world proletarian revolution is reduced to the struggle between the states of socialism and those of world imperialism.

It is obvious that if the essential problem is the contradiction between the states of socialism and those of imperialism, the other fundamental contradictions, in which the contradiction between the camp of the world proletarian revolution and the camp of world imperialism are manifested, obtain only a subsidiary and derived significance, namely: the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the imperialist countries as well as the contradiction between the oppressed peoples and imperialism in the semi-feudal and semi-colonial countries.

The struggle of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples obtains only the function of an aid. It is no longer a fundamental political factor. Only the conflict between the socialist states and the states of world imperialism is now of fundamental importance. For the Krushchovite revisionists, this was nothing but the general line of "peaceful competition" and "peaceful co-existence". Allegedly this line would drive away imperialism from the world and in this way bring the peoples joy and bliss.

V. THE PRACTICAL-POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES DRAWN BY THE C P OF CHINA FROM PUTTING THE "CONCRETE ANALYSIS" BEFORE THE MARXIST-LENINIST PRINCIPLES

oo

In the "Proposal" and the entire "Polemic" of the C.P. of China it becomes clear that it accepts neither the thesis of "imperialism that has become peaceful" nor that of the "decisive role of the socialist countries". Rather, it tries to oppose both of them.

But, because of its wrong approach to the general line and to Krushchovite revisionism, it does not see where the deviations of the Krushchovite revisionists mainly lie, but looks for and finds them elsewhere. It considers them to be errors in the "concrete analysis", and not to be the consequences of its revisionist betrayal of principles.

The C.P. of China does not try to fundamentally and in a principled manner repudiate the views of the Krushchovite revisionists proceeding from the theory of Marxism-Leninism. It merely counterposes its "concrete analyses" which unfortunately are similarly not based on the Marxist-Leninist principles to those of the Krushchovite revisionists.

If the leadership of the C.P.S.U. propagates that U.S. imperialism is peaceful, the C.P. of China counters this by saying: Our "concrete analysis" shows that U.S. imperialism is the main enemy on the international level.

If the leadership of the C.P.S.U. propagates that the contradiction between the socialist states and the states of the imperialist camp has become the main contradiction, the C.P. of China counters this by saying: Our "concrete analysis" shows that the contradictions are "concentrated" in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is similar in other areas. Such an "anti-revisionism", which, on the ideological level, is based on a similar setting aside of principles, is in no position to really oppose Krushchovite revisionism. For this reason, it becomes necessary to examine these mistakes of the C.P. of China a little more closely.

1. Has the General Line to Be Directed Against U.S. Imperialism or Against World Imperialism ?

If the "Proposal" declares that the general line must be directed "against the counter-revolutionary global strategy of U.S. imperialism" ("Proposal", p.5), and that world-wide the "united front against the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys" (p.12) must be formed, then this means that U.S. imperialism, along with its immediate hangers-on and lackeys, is the main target of the world-wide struggle. If it is further said that the general line of the international communist movement "should point out the basic direction for the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and people of all countries" (p.6), then it is unmistakably stressed that on a world scale the struggle must be concentrated against one big imperialist power, that is U.S. imperialism.

In our opinion, here as elsewhere in the "Polemic", a narrow and limited concept of the general line of the world communist movement in our era is expressed.

Naturally, it was and is unconditionally necessary to direct the struggle against the counter-revolutionary global strategy of U.S. imperialism. However, the question here is not of one important task among others, but it is the question of the general line as such. Instead of the struggle against world imperialism, the struggle is directed against only one particularly powerful imperialist country. The struggle against all the other imperialist

powers also, i.e., against world imperialism as such, which also must be simultaneously carried out, is practically left out from the general line. This error was continued in the theory of the "superpowers" and in the conceptions of the "three-world-theory".

The modern revisionists are above all criticized because they support a particular imperialism. They are then opposed with a counter-strategy which restricts the general line above all to the struggle against this particular imperialism, which is considered to be the "main one". The entire question of the attitude towards world imperialism as a whole and to those other imperialist great powers is left uncontradicted. Such an approach is worse than a half-truth. It is basically only replacing one revisionism by another.

2. "Concentration of the Fundamental Contradictions" in Asia, Africa and Latin America ?

The false thesis that the "socialist countries play the decisive role" was opposed by the C.P. of China since it betrayed the revolution of the peoples in the camp of imperialism and was nothing but the harbinger of social-imperialism. On its part, the C.P. of China put forward the thesis:

"The various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America".
("Proposal", p.13)

The absolutization of the contradiction between the socialist states and the states of the imperialist camp by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. was opposed by the C.P. of China by absolutizing another contradiction, namely, the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed peoples.

That the C.P. of China laid down this concept for a "present era" which was not defined more closely, made the matter all the more serious. Thus it was suggested that evidently in the era up to then things had been different.

In Part III B (*), we shall deal with all these questions in greater detail. But we are focussing our attention now itself on this thesis of the C.P. of China for two reasons.

Firstly, we see that in reality the C.P. of China did not oppose Krushchovite revisionism by setting forth the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism about the fundamental contradictions and their mutual relations in a firmly principled way.

Secondly, we see that this was not by chance, but the logical consequence of their giving primacy to the "concrete analysis" before the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist theory.

(*) This part was finally published as part IV; it has not yet been translated in English until now (1986), translator's note.

VI. THE NECESSITY OF SYSTEMATICALLY SETTING FORTH LENIN'S AND
STALIN'S TEACHINGS IN RELATION TO THE IMPERIALIST ERA AND
THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

oo

In the preceeding chapters, we have evaluated some aspects of Marx's, Engels', Lenin's and Stalin's struggle concerning the significance of theory and the Marxist, or Marxist-Leninist principles based on it. We have roughly sketched the Krushchovite revisionists' and the C.P. of China's attitude towards the principles and the practical-political consequences of this attitude. In our opinion, all this conclusively shows that it is unconditionally necessary to comprehensively set forward Lenin's and Stalin's teachings about the imperialist era and the tasks of proletarian internationalism in order to be able to work out the Marxist-Leninist position as clearly as possible.

As we have shown above, today "dogmatism", that is, a d h e r - i n g to guidelines made obsolete by a new era cannot be the decisive or the main danger since we are still living in the same era as defined by Lenin and Stalin and we shall continue to do so till the end of world imperialism. As we have already described, imperialism is the highest and last stage of capitalism. In the course of struggling against it, and till its total destruction, no epochal further development of Marxism-Leninism is possible or necessary. That is why the main principles of Marxism-Leninism, as L e n i n and S t a l i n have represented and developed them, cannot be outdated.

This doesn't mean that no further development of Marxism-Leninism has taken place w i t h i n our era, for example, after Lenin's death. Stalin and the best disciples of Lenin and Stalin of course enriched and developed Marxism-Leninism further by applying this theory to certain new questions, problems and situations which arose.

But they could do this only while retaining and using the Leninist principles. They could not and did not have to reject any single basic guiding principle of Marxism-Leninism and replace it by another.

In other words: Fundamentally and for our entire era it is true :

Modern revisionism is and remains the main danger in the international communist movement.

The modern revisionists, too, use certain dogmatic antics and tricks. Certainly, there will continue to be dogmatic deviations, which, of course, have to be combated. Such deviations consist above all in generalizing some of Lenin's and Stalin's statements which referred to only very specific conditions and situations, in schematically applying these statements to completely different conditions etc. For example, in this sense, it could be called "dogmatism" , if the "Three-World" theoreticians put forward the policy carried out by Stalin during World War II of a socialist country allying with imperialist ones as a strategy for today, when the conditions are completely different.

But this is not the central, primary problem of class struggle on the ideological front. In our opinion, the central by far domina-

ting and really decisive task in the ideological struggle of today is to fight the disregard and revisionist falsification of the integral theory of Marxism-Leninism. It is to mercilessly criticize the lack of principles , that is, above all to declare war against modern revisionism in all its manifestations and to wage this battle up to the last.

Today, in a l l fundamental questions, we find ourselves in a situation as described by Lenin in 1917 in "The State and Revolution" in relation to the "question of the state". His conclusion at that time in relation to setting forth the Marxist theory very accurately targets the tasks of the Marxist-Leninists today in the theoretical field, in order to be able to consequently oppose the wide-spread falsification of Marx's, Engels', Lenin's and Stalin's teachings. Lenin wrote:

"In these circumstances, in view of the unprecedentedly wide-spread distortion of Marxism, our prime task is to RE-ESTABLISH what Marx really taught on the subject of the state. This will necessitate a number of long quotations from the works of Marx and Engels themselves. Of course, long quotations will render the text cumbersome and not help at all to make it popular reading, but we cannot possibly dispense with them. All, or at any rate all the most essential passages in the works of Marx and Engels on the subject of the state must by all means be quoted as fully as possible so that the reader may form an independent opinion of the totality of the views of the founders of scientific socialism, and of the evolution of those views, and so that their distortion by the 'Kautskyism' now prevailing may be documentarily proved and clearly demonstrated."
(Lenin, "The State and Revolution", 1917, Coll.Works 25, p.391, emphasis by Lenin)

It is not necessary to especially stress that today it is not merely the question of the theory of the state; also, that today we have at our disposal the rich treasury of Marx's, Engels', Lenin's and Stalin's works and that the Kautskyites of our time carry other names.

Note 1 : A CRASS EXAMPLE OF HOW THE MODERN REVISIONISTS REDUCE THE ROLE OF THEORY: "FIDEL CASTRO'S RELATIONSHIP TO REVOLUTIONARY THEORY" OR "THE THEORY WILL BE DELIVERED SUBSEQUENTLY".

With Fidel Castro's example we want to illustrate here how revolutionary theory is transformed by the modern revisionists into being only a justification for their revisionist practice. Fidel Castro's example is worthy of note in many respects. The Cuban revolution did not take place under the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist Party. Still, it was proclaimed that socialism was being built. The entire world communist movement in that period also unreservedly propagated that socialism was being constructed in Cuba. Indeed, Fidel Castro and the Cuban Party temporarily even attained a certain standing amongst the forces emerging in opposition to the Krushchovite betrayal. They aroused tremendous hopes because in the beginning they did not yet subordinate themselves completely to the Krushchev-Brezhnev revisionists. Here we do not wish to resolve even approximately the question of evaluating Cuba - though this would be an extremely important task in view of the pseudo-left, pseudo-revolutionary demagoguery, and in part also because of the particular dangerousness of the revisionists around Fidel Castro. Here we shall show the extreme pragmatism preached by the revisionist Fidel Castro. Citing the example of the revolution in Cuba, Castro very openly, as if this was to his credit, exhibited his extremely demeaning attitude towards theory.

In an interview in the journal "Cuba Si" of December 1978, Castro gave himself airs about the fact that it had been particularly adroit to have carried out the revolution and to have arrived at socialism without having mentioned it to the people, without having carried out revolutionary propaganda for it. This is substantiated with the anti-Communism prevailing at that time in Cuba. According to him various measures were taken without being guided by Marxist-Leninist theory and these led Cuba towards socialism:

"People began to say : If this is socialism, then it is welcome. First socialism is accepted, then the acceptance of Marxism-Leninism begins. In other words, the facts preceded the theoretical explanations. And then, the time for theoretical explanations came. Lessons and conclusions were drawn from every fact and from every event. Finally, the problem was analysed theoretically. The theory thus formulated the opinion which had emerged. It explained the event." ("Cuba Si", December 1978, Journal of the Austrian-Cuban Society, p.3, Transl. from the German edition)

First the revolution is made and then "finally" the theory for this revolution is created. Very evidently this is an original further development of Lenin's teaching that "without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary practice". This teaching is transformed into its opposite: "Practice will finally bring in its wake a suitable theory, too!"

Fidel Castro, as a great "theoretician", could not but generalize on a world scale his revisionist rubbish:

"It seems to me that evidently in all revolutionary processes the factual transformations of the political culture precedes the political consciousness of the masses. And therein lies the tremendous significance of revolutionary programmes." (Ibid.)

The "tremendous significance of revolutionary programmes" thus evidently lies in the fact that they are not needed at all for revolutionary transformations...

To justify his own unprincipled practice, Castro even had the effrontery to assert that this had also been the case "in the Soviet Union" in 1917. "There too, a similar process took place". Truly, Lenin and the Bolsheviks could not have been slandered worse.

Note 2 : CONCERNING SOME SOURCES OF THE PRESENT-DAY "ANTI-DOGMATIC" TREND

The lack of principles prevailing on a large scale among the forces considering themselves to be "anti-revisionist", the disregard for the great significance of Marxist-Leninist theory, the catastrophic under-estimation of the necessity to defend the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the more or less open propagation of the view that the "main danger is dogmatism" - all this certainly has its ideological root in the betrayal of the Krushchovite revisionists and the degeneration of nearly all the erstwhile Communist Parties.

On the basis of this recognition, we want to go into some sources and fertile hotbeds responsible for the present-day "anti-dogmatic" trend manifesting itself today in various forms.

The students' movement of the 60's swayed through many imperialist countries with greater or lesser intensity. In many respects it was also a declaration of war against the betrayal of the modern revisionists who sabotaged any real struggle against imperialism and fascism as well as the support for the war of liberation against U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. This movement was also greatly influenced by the Cultural Revolution in China.

Ideologically, this youth and students' movement was largely characterized by confusion and by the prevalence of anti-Leninist ideas. In essence, this movement made no distinction between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. The modern revisionists were variously attacked to be "Stalinists". The students' movement considered itself to be "anti-dogmatic" and did not fight against the betrayal of the Marxist-Leninist principles. This happened because the betrayal of the modern revisionists was traced back to the "dogmatization" of these principles and not to their revision. Unconsciously this movement fell in with the world-wide chorus that dogmatism represented the main danger. It tagged more or less directly behind the footsteps of the modern revisionists, even though it attacked them in many ways in relation to their counter-revolutionary political practice.

In such an ideological situation, it was not very difficult for

bourgeois ideologues in a "Marxist" garb to misuse the best endeavours of the youth and students' movement, to ideologically skillfully spread among the people extreme revisionist views. Bourgeois professors like Habermas, Adorno, Marcuse, Horkheimer etc. devoted themselves to this "task". But also older renegades and extreme revisionists like Fischer, Marek, Bloch, Lukács, Djilas etc. played a significant role. They were all, from the very beginning, sworn enemies of Marxism-Leninism which they combated as being "Stalinism" or "dogmatism".

They utilized the betrayal of the Krushchovite revisionists to represent the entire Marxist-Leninist theory to be "questionable", to have "failed" etc.

The bourgeois ideologues in the youth and students' movement had the task of fully denuding Marxism-Leninism of its revolutionary essence. At the same time, they had to disguise themselves as "Marxists" in order to present themselves as friends before the rebellious youth. In order to blunt the revolutionary edge of Marxism, they polished up anew an old idea : Marxism is in the last analysis only a scientific method. It is a method of analysis. The progenitor of these views was Georg Lukács, who already in 1923, had propagated amongst the ranks of the Communist International:

"Orthodox Marxism does not mean an uncritical recognition of the results of Marx's research. It does not mean the 'belief' in this or that thesis. It is not the exegesis of a holy book. Rather, orthodoxy is related exclusively to the method." (Lukács, "Ideological and Political Writings", Neuwied 1967, p.41, Translated from the Ger. edition)

This view was then taken up by such leaders of the students' movement like Rabehl who asserted : we "reject any revision" only in relation "to the Marxist method of class analysis". (Rabehl, "Lenin, Revolution and Politics", Frankfurt 1970, p.63)

It was thus thoroughly possible to criticize and reject the results, that is, the conclusions of Marx, the conclusions of Marxism-Leninism. The main thing was to recognize the "Marxist method". By this Marxism is reduced to its torso; the most important thing in Marxism is denied - its results. Its theory and strategy are rejected. Marxism is rejected as a guide to action. Lenin's statement that only he is a Marxist who recognizes the dictatorship of the proletariat etc.etc. is rejected.

This was a direct justification of the betrayal of all revisionists, particularly the betrayal of modern revisionists in relation to the dictatorship of the proletariat, in relation to the violent proletarian revolution.

Further it was asserted that it was possible that Marx etc., in spite of the correct method, could certainly have arrived at wrong results, which in itself is something quite inexplicable. The most decisive conclusions of Marxism, or of Marxism-Leninism, were defamed to be "dogmas". Their objective truth was thus denied. Finally, the method itself degenerated into a mere method of research in the style of bourgeois sociology. The proletarian class-stand, taking sides and taking the Marxist-Leninist principles, the science of the proletariat, as the point of departure did not have any significance any longer. The method was not above

all considered to be the method of realizing the aims of communism.

It is logical that such views were ideologically totally in line with modern revisionism. They supported and tried to "scientifically" substantiate the betrayal of the Marxist-Leninist principles.

The Cultural Revolution in China exerted a tremendous influence, particularly among those forces of the youth and students' movement who turned to Marxism-Leninism. In general, the ideological and political development in China had great significance for the forces emerging against the betrayal of the Krushchovite revisionists.

However, this also meant that wrong views of the C.P. of China were taken over by the movement very quickly and with very little resistance. Thereby, it was decisive that already a receptive fertile soil was existing for this.

As an example, we wish to only go into the study campaign against apriorism which was carried out in China in 1972/1973. This study campaign was followed closely in other countries, inter alia, in Austria, West Germany and West Berlin. This can be seen from the many reprints and discussions of the "Peking Review" articles on this subject.

As is well-known, the focal point in this campaign against apriorism was the study of Engels' "Anti-Dühring". In the course of this campaign not only the "cult of genius", false methods of quotation, and the false glorification of "Mao Tse-tung Thought" were repudiated. These were correct tendencies, worthy of support. But pre-eminence was also given to the fact that it was possible, merely by means of a "concrete analysis", that is, based solely on the Marxist-Leninist method (or, more correctly, whatever one understood by that), to perceive the truth. This is precisely what all pseudo-Marxists want us to believe today. But this also opened up the floodgates for revisionism. The basic mistake of the entire campaign consisted in not clearing up how to correctly proceed from the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin as a pre-requisite for the "concrete analysis" of the big and small issues and problems - something which is absolutely necessary, and has to be carried out consequently. The Marxist-Leninist theory and its principles were completely left out in this campaign.

It is not difficult to imagine that this propaganda campaign was understood by the various opportunists of other countries to be the direct confirmation for their own unprincipled actions, for their own disregard for the Marxist-Leninist principles and added fuel to their own false views.

In a situation, where such wrong views prevailed, it was also no wonder that the "Theory of the Three Worlds" quite rapidly acquired increasing influence. With regard to the attitude towards theory and the Marxist-Leninist principles, the "Three World Scheme" and Krushchovite revisionism are like two peas in a pod. The Three World Theory rose directly from the soil of Krushchovite revisionists' betrayal and was its direct continuation.

The "Three World" revisionists similarly have done all manner of things to combat the trend of proceeding from Marxist-Leninist theory, of proceeding from the defence and application of its principles.

This endeavour was carried so far in the "Peking Review" of Nos. 28 and 29/ 1978 that it was straightforwardly declared, the question "whether a line is correct or not is not a theoretical question but a question of practice". ("Peking Review", No. 28/1978 p.12). With this the role of Marxist-Leninist theory was, in effect, declared to be null and void and an unrestricted opportunism propagated.

At the same time, it should not be overlooked that lately this revisionism, as it is particularly characteristic of the Krushchovite and the Teng-Hua revisionists, is also being spread in a totally "innocuous" form, which preaches political abstinence. This is, in short, the garb of academics. For example, what has been uttered by the group H. Karuscheit and Co. in West Germany - citing only one voice from this corner - seems to have been copied verbatim from the article in the "Peking Review" of 28/29/ 1978:

"Whether the experiences/principles to date will once again be confirmed must primarily be shown by means of the concrete analysis of the concrete situation. Only in this way it will be shown within what limitations they are valid, whether they have to be complemented and modified, or whether they will eventually have to even be overthrown."
(H. Karuscheit, "History of the West-German Marxist-Leninist Movement", 1978, p.37, transl. from the German edition)

It is not possible to declare in a more unashamed way that the entire Marxist-Leninist theory and its principles are basically superfluous, since, in any case, one does not know whether they can be a revolutionary guide to action or not. What remains here is nothing but a scrap of the Marxist-Leninist method, the "concrete analysis of the concrete situation". This is a snooty mockery of all the experiences and their Marxist-Leninist generalization of the international working class movement, paid for with much blood. With professorial superiority they are practically declared to be worthless.

Here we have tried to show up only a few connecting elements in relation to the attitude of various opportunist trends towards the Marxist-Leninist theory and its principles. It is particularly important to recognize that all these various varieties of revisionist views have a common essence and a common root: modern revisionism with Krushchovite revisionism as its base. Though different in form and manifestation, they are, in essence, nothing but ramifications of this revisionism.

Note 3 : THE "SYMPATHETIC CONCRETE" AND THE "UNSYMPATHETIC ABSTRACT".

One main catch-word of the modern revisionists, which, in a certain form, was also propagated by the C.P. of China and which, in general, enjoys great popularity is the word "concrete".

All quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, in which this particular word occurs, are cited in order to drum into the "sticklers for principles" and the "dogmatists" the necessity of at long last being "concrete".

Therefore, in this connection, it is appropriate to recall some aspects of the concepts "concrete" and "abstract" and to throw some light upon the background of the speculation with the word "concrete".

The modern revisionists refer to the "concrete analysis" not so much because of the analysis, but more because of the "concrete". To prove their false revisionist theses, they pick out certain isolated phenomena which they do not put into the correct framework and which they do not really analyse. They remain at the surface level of the phenomena and do not at all look for the essential thing, for the laws underlying these phenomena.

The conclusions, which the revisionists thereby arrive at, if examined more precisely, are certainly not scientific reflexions of the "concrete", but are "violent abstractions", as Marx in the "Capital" called those false abstractions which did not really reflect reality. To make it still clearer, let us take a simple example: If the revisionists draw the conclusion from temporary real successes in elections that socialism could be attained by means of the ballot box, are they then being particularly true to reality and "concrete"? Of course, not! Though proceeding from a "concrete phenomena", they draw a completely wrong conclusion from this and make an arbitrary generalization, a "violent abstraction", which is diametrically opposed to reality.

"Concrete analysis" in the Marxist-Leninist sense means recognizing the forces working deep under the surface. It means recognizing the causal connections, the laws behind accidental and isolated phenomena. It means comprehending the essence and the manifestation of a process in its totality by proceeding from the Marxist knowledge of these laws.

The Marxist-Leninist analysis of the concrete phenomena consists in investigating the phenomena in the light of the Marxist-Leninist principles, taking them as the point of departure. It consists in competently applying them to the respective concrete conditions. It means advancing from the external appearance to the essence of the phenomena.

This is far more than merely being "concrete" because the external manifestations, which keep occurring, are also concrete. However, what is important is to understand the internal connections, to evaluate the manifestations in a correct way and to relate them correctly to one another, to correctly understand them in their total context. The "concreteness" of the modern revisionists relates to the surface of the phenomena. It is centred on details which are arbitrarily and demagogically picked out. They are evaluated wrongly and related wrongly to one another. As opposed to this, the concreteness of the Marxist-Leninist investigation is profound. More precisely :

The revisionists are content with the demand for concreteness. But, for Marxist-Leninists concreteness is only one of several criteria.

Already Lenin had pointed out this aspect:

"In view of the extreme complexity of the phenomena of social life it is always possible to select any number of examples or separate data to prove any proposition..."
(Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", 1917, Coll.Works 22, p.190)

The reverse side of the revisionist predilection for the "concrete" so misused by them, is their horror towards everything that is "abstract", is their aversion and mistrust which derives its obstinacy from many sources.

The "abstract" is something that cannot be grasped. One is confronted with it often enough as a deceptive manoeuvre, as an empty promise, a ruse on the part of the ruling classes. Often enough the abstraction is a means of diverting from reality, of veiling reality. It is the lullaby from the heavens to lull the people to sleep. This kind of an "abstract", towards which every mistrust is justified, must, of course, be exposed, combated and rejected. Not because it is "abstract", but because these are "abstractions" which do not reflect reality correctly but wrongly and thus serve to mislead and stultify the masses.

It is correct and necessary to reject the theories of the bourgeoisie and those of the revisionists to be incorrect abstractions. But it is impermissible to extend the rejection of such abstractions to the rejection and mistrust of every theory, of theory and principles in general. A multitude of bourgeois, social-democratic and revisionist demagogues attempt to drive the working class and all the working people precisely in this direction.

There are, however, other sources, too, of rejecting the "abstract":

The enemies of Marxism very consciously unfold a campaign that Marxism is "abstract", that it does not yield anything because it gives primacy to "abstract aims" like communism and not to "concrete needs" of the masses. Here it is a question of the relationship of immediate "tangible results" and of the fundamental long-term interests. It becomes clear that the rejection of "abstract" demands in general is equivalent to the most primitive opportunism.

It must also be taken into consideration that rejecting abstractions as such and insisting on the "concrete", above all on "one's own concrete experience", makes it impossible to learn from either the history of one's own working class movement, or from the experience of the working class movement of other countries.

According to Marx, abstract means "apart from the circumstances". If the peculiarities and details of the revolutions in various countries are not left aside, if they are not abstracted from, if the common essence, the experiences that are also relevant for one's own revolution, is not crystallized from them, then it becomes impossible to learn at all.

In this sense, to abstract and to learn mean one and the same thing. That is, only if we analyse both the differences, which are concrete, as well as that which is common by means of

abstraction, it becomes possible to take over the experiences of other countries or those of history.

Every generalization is an abstraction. Every principle is "abstract". Every law disregards a series of concrete phenomena. But precisely this circumstance enables much further-reaching "concrete guides to action" than any detailed description of a concrete event.

In this sense, Engels, who dealt with this problem, wrote:

"The general law of the change of form of motion is much more concrete than any single 'concrete' example of it."
(Engels, "Dialectics of Nature", 1883, Moscow 1954, p.295)

A further difficulty, used by the bourgeoisie and the revisionists to vilify Marxism, consists in the fact that the exposition of Marxist-Leninist theory does not necessarily directly coincide with the immediate and concrete experiences. For, the Marxist theory has to illuminate the future beyond the given moment and in this direction it has to explain the present and learn from the past.

As a further aspect against demagogic arguments by the revisionists, we can quote in conclusion one passage from the postface of the second edition of Marx's "Capital".

"Of course the method of presentation must differ in form from that of inquiry. The latter has to appropriate the material in detail, to analyse its different forms of development and to track down their inner connection. Only after this work has been done can the real movement be appropriately presented. If this is done successfully, if the life of the subject-matter is now reflected back in the ideas, then it may appear as if we have before us an A PRIORI construction."
(K.Marx, "Capital", Vol I., 1873, Penguin ed., p.102, emphases by capital letters in the original)

The revisionists make full use of precisely this circumstance. They always impute to the classical writers of Marxism-Leninism that they had "invented" the principles. They represent things in such a way as if it was "inexplicable" how they arrived at their conclusions.

The opposite is true. The conclusions of Marxism are abstractions from an immense range of exactly investigated concrete material. On their part, these conclusions are the point of departure for the analysis of new phenomena and new concrete facts.

EXTRACTS FROM

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON PROBLEMS FROM THE JOINT STATEMENTS REGARDING THE CRITICISM OF THE "GREAT POLEMIC" OF THE 60's

(Joint Statement of the Editorial Boards of ROTE FAHNE,
WESTBERLINER KOMMUNIST, GEGEN DIE STRÖMUNG , December 1982)

4. ONCE AGAIN ABOUT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN T H E O R Y AND P R A C T I C E

oo

A series of discussions were carried out about the issue "The Significance of the Marxist-Leninist Principles in the Struggle Against Modern Revisionism" (Rote Fahne No. 176, GDS No.12, WBK No. 9). Most of these discussions were centred around the theme : What is the significance of practice if the principles come first ?

In this discussion those who are criticizing our position do so above all by pointing out the primacy given to practice in dialectical materialism. In addition, the question was raised : While lying down the line for the Russian revolution, did not Lenin first and foremost investigate the social, socio-economic reality. "What the 'Friends of the People' Are ?" was cited in this context.

At the very outset we must declare that none of these criticisms - unfortunately, none of which were brought forward in a written form - convinced us. We only see the necessity of once again setting forth our own position, of deepening it and emphasizing it more clearly.

1. Our Criticism of the C P of China in 1963

Our criticism of the 1963 Proposal of the C P of China on the General Line said that the "point of departure" laid down there for determining the General Line of the international communist movement was wrong.

While fighting the catch-phrases of the modern revisionists regarding the "new conditions", which allegedly made the "old principles" invalid, the C P of China did not lay down the Marxist-Leninist theory and principles as being the point of departure when concretely analysing world economy and world politics. Rather, the C P of China basically took one big decisive step back from its own very correct statement that "principles must come first" when it declared that the "concrete analysis" of the current situation must be the point of departure while determining the general line. (See our issue "The Significance of the Principles...", p.25 of this issue, or "Proposal Concerning the General Line", p.5)

We tried to prove that naturally the Marxist-Leninist theory and principles must unconditionally be combined with the concrete practice in the world. But, at the same time, the "concrete analysis" can only then be a true analysis if it really penetrates from the surface to the essential, if it is carried out with the help of Marxism-Leninism.

To substantiate our standpoint, we had given a summary - admittedly very brief - about the significance given to defending Marxist-Leninist theory and principles in Marx's, Engels', Lenin's and Stalin's writings.

Thereby we specially emphasized Lenin's writing: "Materialism and Empiriocriticism". In this writing, Lenin clearly worked out, in opposition to the rotten reference to "new conditions" and "new experiences" and in opposition to every rotten absolutization of

one's own practice :

Karl Marx's theory was not first "invented" by him and then sought to be proved. It was not as if first there were the "principles" which were then imposed on practice, on history and society. Rather, in reality, while working out the Marxist theory, the exact concrete analysis of the historical as well as of the current practice was the point of departure.

This is one question. This question is related to the origin of Marx's theory.

But today, after Marx's theory exists, (which originated in practice and has been confirmed in practice) a totally different question arises: Do we undertake the necessary further concrete analyses proceeding from the results of Marx's theoretical work, that is do we take the path of the Marxist theory. Or, under the pretext - Marx also proceeded from practice - do we negate the results of Marx's theoretical work, declare it to be "outdated", throw it overboard and thus leaving Marx's theory, take the path of confusion, the path of revisionism. (See for this "Materialism and Empirio-criticism", 1909, Lenin Coll. Works 14, p. 143).

The analysis of various writings by Lenin and Stalin showed that also and precisely in those writings in which Lenin carried out very exact "concrete analyses", he still always first comprehensively defended Marxist theory, and proceeding from this theory, he concretely laid down the line of the revolution.

Against such a presentation of a very specific question, namely, the place of Marxist-Leninist theory while laying down the general line, the critics mentioned earlier argue in such a way that the original issue, which is the issue at stake, is pushed aside and it is asked in a very general way:

2. Is Not Practice Always Primary For a Marxist ?

In our opinion, such a question is raised in too general a way. It cannot be very simply, without any qualifications whatsoever, answered with "yes". Of course, it also cannot in any way be answered with a simple "no".

It is necessary to differentiate, to sub-divide the question and to ask:

In what sense and in what respect is practice primary ? In what sense and in what respect is it not the point of departure.

To make this differentiation more precise, it must first of all be clarified that hardly any concept has so many different meanings as the word "practice". A lot of debates about the question of the relationship between theory and practice are completely useless and the opponents are talking at cross-purposes because each one understands something quite different by "practice".

a) Meaning of the Concept "Practice"

In the fundamental ideological struggles between idealism and ma-

terialism, the concept of "practice" is opposed to the concepts of "theory", "idea". Dialectical materialism makes it very clear that first there was matter, being, the practice of human beings, and then, derived from this the ideas and thinking of human beings, theory emerged. Marxist theory is for the first time a really correct reflection of practice in the philosophical and social spheres.

In this fundamental and general sense there is no doubt that practice is primary and theory is secondary. Even in a specific question of dialectical materialism, in the question concerning the criterion of truth, the criterion of practice stands foremost. It is the touch-stone for the correctness of the ideas and the theories of human beings. (*)

(*) It would be a task in itself to clarify this question more precisely. The criterion of practice also means that the scope of the theoretical question must be the same as the scope of the criterion of practice. The thesis concerning the world-historical superiority of socialism over capitalism can be decided only by world-historical practice and not in the course of 20-30 years. That a correct line (for instance, that of Lenin) unconditionally leads to the victory of the revolution, can similarly only be examined in the course of the entire development of Russia and is not refuted by a wrong and narrow interpretation of the criterion of practice, as for example: "Lenin's line in 1905 was wrong. This is shown by the defeat of the revolution of 1905". In so far, we think it is very important to understand that the criterion of practice is not absolute.

Lenin's formulation of the criterion of practice is directed both against the stagnation of thought, complacency and ossification, as well as against scepticism, relativism and agnosticism.

Lenin said:

"The standpoint of life, of practice, should be first and fundamental in the theory of knowledge. And it inevitably leads to materialism, brushing aside the endless fabrications of professorial scholasticism. Of course, we must not forget that the criterion of practice can never, in the nature of things, either confirm or refute any human idea COMPLETELY. This criterion also is sufficiently 'indefinite' not to allow human knowledge to become 'absolute', but at the same time it is sufficiently definite to wage a ruthless fight on all varieties of idealism and agnosticism."
(Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", 1909, Foreign Languages Press Peking, 1972, p. 161, emphasis by capital letters by Lenin)

Further on, Lenin expounded it followed from this that Marxist science, which had been won from practice and had been confirmed by practice, is not the end point, but must be the point of departure for further research. This is necessary precisely because practice has confirmed Marx's theory and also because not taking this theory as a starting-point would only lead to confusion.

There is no doubt that in the debate about the "criterion of practice", Mao Tse-tung's philosophical writings, above all the writing "On Practice", play a big role. Without being able to go (Footnote contd. on next page)

For the theory of scientific socialism it is essential that it is "The experience of the working-class movement of all countries taken in its general aspect". (Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism", 1924, op.cit., p.20)

Stalin showed here that the revolutionary theory comes from the revolutionary practice. But it does not originate either from the revolutionary practice of a single country or from the revolutionary practice of a given moment.

The revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism is the summing up of the revolutionary historical and international practice of the working-class movement.

In short, here, in this connection, the scope of revolutionary practice talked about is much greater.

From this must be distinguished the narrower concept of "revolutionary practice": this narrower concept is often used if it is a matter of applying the revolutionary theory in one's own country and in a given moment. Of course, this concept of practice is narrower and encompasses only the practice of a particular country in a given moment.

It is also very important to make another distinction. The revolutionary practice of the masses is something quite different and much more comprehensive than the practice of the revolutionaries and the communists. "To learn from practice" in this context means in the case of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin precisely to learn from the practice of the revolutionary mass movement.

(Footnote from last page)

into the questions raised by this writing, which are still under discussion, we must point out here that in another very brief writing (which in the Volume "4 Philosophical Monographs" is assigned to the writing "On Practice") Mao Tse-tung very clearly and unambiguously states (and surely with another emphasis as "On Practice"):

"Generally speaking, those that succeed are correct and those that fail are incorrect, and this is especially true of man's struggle with nature. In social struggle, the forces representing the advanced class sometimes suffer defeat not because their ideas are incorrect but because, in the balance of forces engaged in struggle, they are not as powerful for the time being as the forces of reaction; they are therefore temporarily defeated, but they are bound to triumph sooner or later."

(Mao Tse-tung, "Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?", 1963, in: "Five Essays on Philosophy", Peking 1977, p.156)

Here it becomes evident: If the question to be decided covers a large complex, then the concept of practice should not be defined narrowly. It is also unconditionally necessary to emphasize the scope of the respective practice in order to prove - against narrow pragmatism and opportunism - the dangerousness of those practical "momentary successes" which undermine the fundamental revolutionary practice of the proletariat instead of advancing it.

And not lastly: it is necessary to distinguish in the above a revolutionary practice from a "practice of simple day-to-day struggles." This distinction is very often suppressed by the opportunists and economists, who swear by "practice" in order to forswear revolution!

These distinctions made above already show that if somebody proclaims that "practice" is always primary, it must be examined very carefully exactly what he actually means by this term.

b) Revolutionary Theory Serves Practice

In his writing "What the 'Friends of the People' Are", Lenin emphasizes that practice is in so far always primary as theory must reply to the questions of the workers, must serve the practice of Party building and the practice of the revolutionary mass movement in general. In our view, in this sense theory is always secondary and has the function of performing a service.

3. The Significance of the Masses' Own Experience On the One Hand, and the Significance of the Revolutionary Theory For the Communist Vanguard Party On the Other

In our view, there is still another question in which revolutionary practice is clearly primary, namely, while educating the working class and the other working masses to carry out the revolution. It is a fundamental tactical Marxist-Leninist principle that the masses can learn to understand the antagonism between counter-revolution and the revolutionary forces only on the basis of their own experiences. Only by their own revolutionary struggle, they can learn to understand the line of the Communist Party. Only on this basis they will accept the leadership of the Communist Party.

Of course, the Communist Party must correctly connect the masses' own experience with its propaganda and agitation, with its organization of the masses. Of course, both "one's own experience" as well as the "carrying in of socialist consciousness from the outside" are necessary. If the question is considered from the angle of the task of the Communist Party, then carrying in the revolutionary theory is primary in order to really be able to educate and organize the masses.

Considered from the angle of, when and how the Communist Party can really carry its line into the revolutionary mass movement, it must be emphasized in answer to this question that the masses' own revolutionary experience of struggle is primary.

The question, however, poses itself differently for the advanced detachment of the working class. Revolutionary experience gained by its own struggle is, of course, very important and a central means of educating the cadres on the basis of the own mistakes. It is essential for criticism and self-criticism. But the theoretical and self-critical evaluation of one's own practice can always take place only later. However, the Communist Party has the task not only to evaluate its own experience and the experiences of the mass movement in its own country. Above all, as the vanguard, it has the task of leading these struggles. Precisely against all theses of tailing, it is of central importance to understand that only by means of

the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism the Communist Party will be able to foresee the laws and the basic course of the revolution and revolutionary practice in order to prepare the revolutionary masses for it.

This revolutionary theory, though it also originates from practice, does not in the main originate from the own practice of the concerned Party. It originates first and foremost from the past revolutionary practice of the international working class movement.

In so far, and in this sense, theory, that is in particular the Marxist-Leninist principles, are the point of departure while fulfilling the role of the vanguard and while working out the correct line.

4. The Theoretical Work For Laying Down the Line For Revolution In One's Own Country

Let us now come to the question, which is of paramount significance precisely while starting the building of the Bolshevik Party, namely, the question of working out the programme and the strategy of revolution in one's own country, determining the line of revolution in the own area of work of the respective Party.

Just as while laying down the international general line by all the Communist Parties of the world, here, too, the "concrete analysis" of the social practice and the reality in one's own country cannot be primary. What is important and essential in this reality? What is secondary? How should the Communist Party find its way through the unending multitude of phenomena and events, figures and statistics? Where is the guideline which shows up the inner connections, the development of things, their laws and separates the essential from the unessential? Undoubtedly, the guideline is not only the Marxist-Leninist method, but precisely also the theoretical results of the work of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the theory of Marxism-Leninism, which has emerged from the past practice of all countries and history. This, and only this, gives the necessary orientation and certainty to the Communist Party also in the big and difficult task of theoretically working on the line of its own revolution. This unmistakably also means that the Marxist-Leninist theory in this sense stands first and foremost, before the concrete investigations, and must be mastered in order to enable oneself to successfully undertake the concrete investigations.

We also remark in passing that, of course, working out the international general line and the unity of the world communist movement is the necessary and the primary framework in order to really subordinate the revolution in one's own country to the world proletarian revolution and to be able to march shoulder-to-shoulder with the international proletariat. We emphasize this in conclusion because to "take practice as the starting point" is not seldom an expression of nationalism, which sees the practice in one's own country to be the most important thing, to be even more important than the practice of the world proletarian revolution as a whole.

5. To What Respect Did Lenin Make Marx's Theory Into the Starting Point For His Analysis of the Relations of Production in Russia?

On p. 11 of our issue "The Significance of the Marxist-Leninist Principles..." it is said in the last passage:

"Lenin's struggle against the 'friends of the people' was in the first instance a defence of the Marxist theory, of the universal validity of the analysis of capitalism for all countries, thus also (!) for Russia..."

This presentation does not cover the essence of the problem.

Marx never said that his analysis of capitalism was "valid for all countries".

And thus it was also not the case that Lenin could only defend such a thesis and in so far could only proceed from something which had already been proved by Marx, namely, that Russia had capitalist relations of production and that capitalism was in the process of developing.

Lenin did not say that Marx had already for all countries, or even only for Russia, taken a position on the concrete question under discussion, whether capitalist relations of production existed in Russia. The opposite is true. Lenin cited a letter of Marx in which he consciously did not reply to this question. He did not commit himself about the level reached in Russia, but simultaneously he emphasized:

"If Russia...is tending to becoming a capitalist nation on the pattern of the West European countries...she will not succeed without having first transformed a good part of her peasants into proletarians."
(quoted from: Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", 1894, Coll. Works 1, p. 266)

Here it becomes very clear that Marx did not say: Capitalist relations of production already exist in all countries, thus also in Russia. The meaning of his statements was rather: If Russia is becoming a capitalist country, then all the laws of capitalism are also valid for Russia, then, among other things, wage workers will be needed who will necessarily have to be recruited from the peasantry.

Marx had not yet resolved the question being debated.

From what did one have to proceed in order to decide the question?

It was clear that the question could not be answered without investigating the concrete reality in Russia. Had Marx's theory not achieved anything at all for the task at hand of analysing Russia? The pseudo-Marxists in Russia said point blank: No, Marx's theory is true only for countries like Western Europe. He made an exact analysis of England. He did not analyse a country like Russia. Therefore, his theory is not applicable to Russia!

In all his writings against the "Narodniks" and against the legal Marxists, Lenin refuted these attacks against Marx's "Capital" and

explained that Marx had investigated the laws of capitalism in general. Though he had worked out the criteria and features of capitalism above all from material from England, he had determined them for capitalism in general. If capitalism is spreading and developing in a country, then this can be ascertained provided that one proceeds from this theory worked out by Marx, and takes the criteria worked out by him as the measuring rod !

In his writing "What the 'Friends of the People' Are..." , Lenin dealt a twofold blow to the Narodniks. He firstly refuted the sophistic and empiricistic demagogy of the Narodniks that Marx had merely gathered together interesting material about England, that he had not developed the laws of the social formation of his time, that is, the capitalist social formation. Secondly, he concretely dealt with the question of what the situation was like in Russia. Did capitalism exist there or not ? To decide this question, he used the criteria developed in general by Marx. However, he arrived at the decision itself by concretely analysing the Russian reality.

When, in the discussion about Lenin's writing "What the 'Friends of the People' Are" , we raise the question: What exactly was Lenin's point of departure, the principles of the concrete situation, then a study of this writing shows that an exact knowledge of Marxist theory was, of course, the starting point for Lenin. But he also emphasized that no concrete answer could be given to concrete questions by means of this general point of departure.

5. CAN DOGMATISM EVER BE THE MAIN DANGER ?

oo

In the "Joint Statement" about "The Significance of the Marxist-Leninist Principles in the Fight Against Modern Revisionism" a certain kind of understanding of dogmatism is presented which is defined as

"adhering to guidelines made obsolete by a new era".

In conclusion it is stated that this dogmatism cannot be

"the decisive or the main danger"
(p. 32, also p. 21)

in the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution.

In our issue we pre-supposed only a certain kind of understanding of dogmatism, namely dogmatism in the sense of taking over certain guidelines and conclusions which were true in the era of pre-monopoly capitalism, which, however, had to be rejected in the era of imperialism and replaced by new ones.

If we have in view only this particular concept of dogmatism, then we were fully right in taking the stand that in our era the danger of this kind of dogmatism, as a demagogic method to revise the essence of Marxism, can no longer be the main one.

However, after making an exact study of the writings of the clas-

sical writers, we have to state that this is too narrow a representation of what is encompassed by the concept of dogmatism. It is one, but not the only method of dogmatic revision of fundamental guidelines of Marxism-Leninism. It is only one form of the dogmatic attack against the principles of the theory and the tactics of proletarian revolution.

When we try to systematize, how the term dogmatism was used by the classical writers, then we can work out the following rather different characteristic features :

- ★ Insufficient application of the principles to the practice of revolution leading to mere theoretization and interpretation. In opposition to this we have the sentence that Marxism is not a dogma, but a guide to action.
(See, for example, Lenin "Certain Feature of the Historical Development of Marxism", 1910, Coll. Works 17, pp.39/40)
- ★ Insufficient further development of the Marxist-Leninist theory and principles in connection with evaluating the revolutionary experiences made while applying it.
(See, for example, Stalin "Report to the 18th Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B) On the Work of the Central Committee", 1939, pp.927 ff, in: "Problems of Leninism", op.cit.)
- ★ The method of false historical analogy. This is basically a schematism which expresses itself above all in carrying over slogans from an earlier situation to a new, changed situation.
(See, for example, Lenin "The Student Movement and the Present Political Situation", 1906, Coll. Works 15, p.215 and Lenin "The National Question In Our Programme", 1903, Coll. Works 6, p.458)
- ★ In the theoretical field and while studying, dogmatism means not to see the theory and principles of Marxism-Leninism as the summing up of historical revolutionary experiences, but to only "learn by rote instead of grasping the origin of the conclusions, instead of knowing the material from which they have emerged."
(See, for example, Lenin "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", 1920, Coll. Works 31, pp.284-285)

These dogmatist or schematist views, as we could characterize them, show that these forms of dogmatism can certainly at times represent the main danger. We must also take into consideration that though generally "dogmatism" is considered to be a left deviation, dogmatism, particularly in the form of the lack of application and the false historical analogy, can certainly be only the device of right opportunism.

Precisely the danger of insufficiently applying the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles, both in theoretical work as well as in propagandistic activity, and in the actions of the Party, can increasingly become a danger if the Party is already in the situation to lead the masses in their millions into the struggle. In such a situation, dogmatically not to take into account the peculiarities, as well as the consciousness of the masses and their own experience can lead to a sure defeat and can also represent the main danger.

At the same time, we also wish to reiterate the fact that the en-

tire history of the struggle against opportunism shows that the biggest inroad into the ranks of the communists were caused by the revision of principles and by the betrayal of the revolution by the leaders of the working class movement under the pressure of the imperialists and the entire atmosphere of bourgeois society.

It was certainly **w r o n g** not to have stressed and differentiated all this.

The entire question of dogmatism shows itself to be much more complicated than represented in our issue. The justified criticism against our very limited and too narrow a definition of the concept of "dogmatism" once again shows us the danger arising from the simplification of really complex issues.

On the "Proposal" of the C.P. of China's "General Line of the International Communist Movement", 1963

THE REQUIREMENTS OF AN INTERNATIONAL MARXIST-LENINIST GENERAL LINE

P a r t VI

The Scheme of the "Peaceful and Non-peaceful Path" Contradicts Marxism-Leninism

Basis for Discussion

Joint Statement of the Editorial Boards of
ROTE FAHNE (Central Organ of the Marxist-Leninist Party
of Austria)

WESTBERLINER KOMMUNIST (Organ for the Building of the
Marxist-Leninist Party in West-Berlin)

GEGEN DIE STRÖMUNG (Organ for the Building of the Marxist-
Leninist Party in West-Germany)

Drucker, Herausgeber und verantwortlicher Redakteur:
Walter Hofmann, Homburger Landstraße 52, 6 Frankfurt/Main
Eigendruck im Selbstvertrieb