Every passing day brings to light new facts which show that the modern revisionists, the Khrushchev group and its followers, have utterly betrayed and have turned into enemies of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, of socialism and the revolutionary and liberation movement of the working class and the enslaved peoples, enemies of the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. They have joined in a «holy alliance» with the American imperialists and the reactionaries of different countries, with all the anti-communist forces against the peoples and socialism. All their struggle is spearheaded against Marxism-Leninism, against all the fraternal parties and revolutionary communists loyal to it, against the anti-imperialist, liberation and revolutionary movement of the peoples. All their utterances about «loyalty» to Marxism-Leninism, to the cause of socialism, to the revolution and proletarian internationalism are sheer bluff and demagogy from start to finish.

In order to carry through their anti-Marxist, anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary course, they are in need
of allies. And where could they find better allies than among the revisionist elements in the various parties and among the Titoite clique in Yugoslavia? Therefore Khrushchev and his group succeeded, through putsches and plots, in deceiving some and compromising others, under the guise of fighting the «cult of the individual», in bringing to power and placing at the head of certain communist and workers’ parties revisionist elements while, on the other hand, they rehabilitated the renegade Tito clique and united with it completely. Thus, the united revisionist front came into being. This was the first step.

In addition to this, the modern revisionists have never given up their efforts to find other allies, too. And who could these be? It is quite natural for them to turn to, and they could not fail to turn to their «brothers» in treachery — the right-wing social-democrat leaders, for present-day revisionism and social-democracy are two manifestations of the same ideology — bourgeois ideology. Social-democracy is the manifestation of bourgeois ideology in the workers’ movement, while revisionism is the manifestation of bourgeois ideology in the communist movement.

This is the common ideological basis that draws the revisionists closer to and unites them with the social-democrats and creates the premises for their complete fusion not only ideologically and politically, but also organizationally. Therefore, it is completely natural and logical that the attempts of the revisionists to cause the degeneration of the communist parties they lead into social-democratic parties, and their tendency to fully fuse with social-democracy, are becoming ever more clear today.

The trend to rapprochement and unity with social-democracy, like the whole treacherous line of the modern revisionists, has its beginnings in the 20th Congress of the CPSU. This trend was re-emphasized at the 21st
and 22nd Congresses and was sanctioned in the new program of the CPSU. Speaking of this course of rapprochement and unity with social-democracy at the 22nd Congress, Khrushchev said: «This is not a temporary tactical slogan but the general line of the communist movement dictated by the basic interests of the working class.» Khrushchev has also said: «If we are to speak of the role and position of the non-communist parties, we should stress, first of all, that in the present situation, in order to achieve the socialist transformation of society, collaboration of the communist party with the other parties is not only possible but also indispensable» (Khrushchev’s reply to John Waters, editor of the Australian newspaper «Herald», published in «Pravda», June 25, 1958).

The course of rapprochement and unity with the social-democrats began to be put into effect immediately after the 20th Congress. The CC of the CPSU sent letters to the social-democratic parties of Western Europe, calling for unity. Beginning from 1956, the Soviet Union has been visited by many social-democratic leaders and by whole delegations of social-democratic parties that had meetings and held talks with the Khrushchev group.

The campaign for unity with the social-democrats has been greatly stepped up, especially in recent times. Evidence of this can be seen in the last year’s visits to Moscow of such leaders of social-democracy as P.H. Spaak, Secretary-general of the Belgian Socialist Party, Harold Wilson, the present Chairman of the British Labour Party, and Guy Mollet, Secretary-General of the French Socialist Party, who conducted talks with Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders. In connection with these talks, in an interview with foreign journalists in Moscow, Guy Mollet said that he had discussed with Khrushchev «a number of questions which included all the problems of theory and doctrine of a permanent character and which characterize the relations be-
tween social-democratic and communist parties.» While, in an interview granted to the newspaper «Unità» (February 22, 1964), Guy Mollet stated: «The talks which the delegation of SFIO conducted with the leaders of the CPSU, and in particular with Nikita Khrushchev, gave us sure satisfaction on many points.»

Under the dictate of the «conductor's baton», the leaderships of communist and workers' parties in certain other countries are also following the line of amalgamation with present-day social-democracy. This is evident in many of their acts, in various articles and statements, in the columns of the Khrushchevite review «Problems of Peace and Socialism», in the «Document of the CC of the Italian CP for the National Conference on Organization» published in the newspaper «Unità», January 9, 1964, in the draft-resolution for the 17th Congress of the French CP which will be held in May this year, and so on.

In all these attempts, documents and materials of the modern revisionists, regardless of the phrases they use to camouflage their designs, the prevailing idea is unity and fusion with the social-democrats «on whatever basis» and «at all costs», renouncing anything that might prejudice this union, be it in the field of ideology or in that of organization.

The attempts of the modern revisionists for rapprochement and unity with the social-democrats are a logical consequence of their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, a component part of their grand strategic plan of «world integration» clearly formulated by Tito in his well-known interview granted to Drew Pearson on August 7, 1962. To realize this objective the revisionists make extensive use of demagogical slogans. They are trying to justify their rapprochement and unity with the imperialists and reactionaries in the name of «peaceful coexistence» and of «saving the world from a nuclear war of extermination», their ap-
proach to and union with the Tito clique, in the name of «socialism», with the Pope in Rome, in the name of «humanity», with the social-democrats, in the name of «unity of the working class».

THE MODERN REVISIONISTS ARE FOLLOWING IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF TREACHEROUS SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

The modern revisionists try to justify their rapprochement and unity with the social-democrats under the pretext that «positive trends» are allegedly being observed, especially in recent times, among the ranks of social-democracy, that they have allegedly expressed themselves in favour of peace, peaceful coexistence, disarmament, that they have modified their attitude towards the USSR in a positive direction, that they have expressed themselves in favour of some kind of approach to the communists, that they have expressed some sort of willingness to fulfil the demands of the working class, to preserve and strengthen democratic institutions, have stated that they are in favour of the socialist transformation of society, and so forth. Thus, in order to justify their course of approach to the right-wing leaders of social-democracy, the revisionists try to create the illusion that it is not the revisionist train which is speeding its way to the social-democratic station, but the social-democratic station is coming up to meet the revisionist train. This is no new tactic for revisionists. Khrushchev's traitor group and those who follow them have used precisely this manoeuvre to justify their rapprochement and complete union with the Titoite clique, pretending that the Yugoslav leaders have allegedly corrected many of their errors and have adopted «Marxist-Leninist» positions. In the same way, in order to justify their treacherous course of reconciliation and rapprochement with imperialism, American imperialism in particular, they have spread and con-
tinue to spread the illusion that the leaders of imperialism have now become «wise», «realistic», «peace-loving», «reasonable», and what not.

But facts prove that the present social-democratic leaders have changed as little in their nature and in their attitude as the Titoite clique and imperialism. If we may speak of any kind of change of views and stands of the social-democratic leaders, the only change apparent is their ever growing inclination to the right.

**WHAT DOES PRESENT-DAY SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY REPRESENT?**

Present-day social-democracy is a direct successor to the traitorous 2nd International. It has inherited all the ideological, organizational and tactical baggage of the parties of the 2nd International. The social-democrats began their betrayal with their deviation from the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism, which they proclaimed as outdated and unsuitable, by renouncing the class struggle and replacing it with the «theory» of class harmony and class conciliation, by negating the revolution and replacing it with reforms within the capitalist order, by abandoning the revolutionary road and replacing it with the «peaceful», «democratic», parliamentary road, by denying the indispensable need to smash the old bourgeois state apparatus and accepting the capitalist state as a means of transition to socialism, by negating the dictatorship of the proletariat and replacing it with «pure, universal democracy», by deviating from proletarian internationalism, and going so far as to slide completely into the positions of national chauvinism, to open unity with the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Unmasking the betrayal of the old social-democrats Lenin wrote in his book «What Is to Be Done?»:
«Social-democracy must change from a party of social revolution into a democratic party of social reforms. Bernstein has surrounded this political demand with a whole battery of well-attuned 'new' arguments and reasonings. 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 proletarianization, 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.»

By embarking on this road, social-democracy turned into a loyal supporter of the capitalist order, into a servant of the bourgeoisie, into the most important ideological and political support of bourgeois policy within the workers' movement. It has aided the bourgeoisie to oppress and exploit the workers of its own country and the peoples of other countries to suppress their revolutionary and liberation movement.

«It has been shown in practice,» says V.I. Lenin, «that working-class activists who follow the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeoisie themselves. Without their leadership of the workers, the bourgeoisie could not remain in power.»

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 5, pp. 414-415 (Alb. ed.).
** V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 31, p. 254 (Alb. ed.).
But present-day social-democracy has gone even further in its betrayal when compared with the time of the 2nd International. In the present era it is characterized by an ever greater leaning to the right.

Beginning from 1955, the social-democratic parties in West Europe, like the British Labour Party, the social-democratic parties in France, Austria, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, West Germany and in the Scandinavian countries have changed their programs, or have been engaged in elaborating new programmatic stands. What characterizes these programs and new programmatic stands? They are characterized by the eclectic blending of old opportunist theories with the «modern» bourgeois theories, by their final renunciation of all the principles and ideals of socialism, by their open support for the capitalist order of exploitation and by their frenzied anti-communism.

If the former reformists avowed, even in words alone, that the establishment of socialism was their ultimate goal, the present-day social-democrats have openly rejected this aim. They preach that they are in favour of the so-called «democratic socialism», which has nothing in common with genuine scientific socialism. It is its negation, its replacement with some bourgeois liberal reforms which do not threaten the foundations of capitalist society in any way. Of what socialism can we speak when many of the social-democratic programs have discarded the elementary demand of socialism for the abolition of private ownership of the means of production?

Following the well-known statement of the socialist International on «The Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism» (1951), the new programs direct the working class not against capitalism but against «uncontrolled» capitalism. The nationalization of some enterprises by the bourgeois state, the establishment of state monopoly capital-
ism, the intervention of the capitalist state in the economic life of the country, the implementation of some bourgeois-democratic reforms in the new programs and statements of the social-democrats — all these are regarded as facts which show that the foundations of socialism have allegedly been laid in certain capitalist countries. At the same time, they deny the socialist character of transformations in the socialist countries. In this way, directly or indirectly, they repeat the bourgeois theories in vogue on «people's capitalism», «controlled capitalism», «organized capitalism», «democratic capitalism», and so on.

The bourgeois reactionary press has more than once hailed this departure of the social-democrats from the principles of socialism and their defence of capitalism. In a leading article under the title «The Burial of Marxism», the newspaper «Washington Post and Times Herald» wrote: «Eighty-four years after its establishment at the historic Congress at Gotha, the German Social-Democratic Party at its Congress at Bad-Godesberg renounced Marxist ideology and, in fact, ceased to be socialist in the true sense of that word. It reconciled itself to the principle of 'free individual enterprise, wherever that is possible' in economic life.»

The new programs of the social-democratic parties have left out all mention of contradictions, antagonism and class struggle, have wiped out the dividing lines between the oppressed and oppressors, between the exploited and exploiters. In place of the class struggle they preach «the sense of responsibility» of man «in general». Thus the program of the German Social-Democratic Party has it: «Freedom and democracy in industrial society are possible of attainment only if the maximum number of individuals raise their social conscience and express their willingness to share responsibility. The social-democrats uphold the solidarity and harmony of all mankind,» in
the attainment of their «supra-class» objective — «democratic socialism».

Since «democratic socialism» does not encroach upon the bases of the capitalist order in any way, but is a sort of «reformed» capitalism, it naturally follows that there is no need for any kind of socialist revolution. «Democratic socialism», according to them, will come about through «spontaneous economic evolution», through limitation of the prerogatives and power of monopoly combines and through the aid of the capitalist state itself. Nevertheless, in order to attain this ideal, it is necessary that the social-democrats come to power, and the only way to achieve this is through electoral campaigns to win the majority of votes in the bourgeois parliament. Eulogizing the declaration of the socialist International on «The Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism», one of its leaders, Braunthal, has said that this declaration «puts an end to the discussion of the dictatorship of the proletariat», «rules out the revolutionary class struggle as a method to achieve socialism», and «rejects adherence to any socialist theory».

The social-democratic parties have severed any connection with Marxism-Leninism, with the theory of scientific socialism and with the materialist world outlook. The program of the Austrian Socialist Party has it: «Socialism is an international movement which does not at all demand an obligatory identity of views. Regardless of from what source the socialists draw their views, from a Marxist or any other social analysis, from religious or humanitarian principles — they all aim at a common goal.» Speaking at the Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party at Bad-Godesberg, its former chairman E. Ollenhauer said that «the demand to make the political program of K. Marx and F. Engels the substance of the social-democratic program for 1959 is so anti-Marxist that it is unimaginable.» and he added, «We cannot be understood if we
speak in the language of the past, we cannot solve problems of today with our old concepts."

Social-democracy has not only long ago slipped into positions of philosophical idealism and today it not only defends idealism, but is also trying to find support in and even fuse entirely with its most extreme form – religion. Thus, for instance, the programs of German, Austrian, Swiss and other social-democratic parties maintain that «democratic socialism» has its roots in the Christian ethic and doctrine, that socialism and religion, far from being mutually exclusive, are completely at one with each other. Speaking at the Congress of the Austrian Socialist Party in 1958, the author of the new program, B. Kautsky, said: «We wanted to draw up a program, which could be fully endorsed by both Marxists and non-Marxists, by both atheists and socialist believers.» A similar attempt to reconcile Christianity with socialism, the religious idealist world outlook with the scientific materialist world outlook, is made also in the interview given to the correspondent of the Italian newspaper «Unità» by Guy Mollet, which was published in that paper on February 22 of this year.

Such, in general, are the ideological views of present-day social-democracy. What must be stressed here is that its programs, as a rule, are more leftist than its acts. If the right socialists still try, in words, to pose as socialists in order to deceive the workers, in deeds they have long become staunch defenders of the capitalist order. Both when they are in opposition and when they are at the head of bourgeois governments, or take part in them, the chiefs of social-democracy serve to preserve and strengthen the bourgeois order with all their views and acts. All the socialist demagogy of present-day social-democracy has been refuted by life itself. Socialists have more than once been at the head of bourgeois governments both in Britain, France and elsewhere. To this day they are at the head
of or take part in the governments of many capitalist countries. And what have they done for the workers; for socialism? They have done nothing but follow the instruction of Leon Blum that, being in power, the socialists must be «loyal directors of capitalist society».

Let us dwell briefly on the activity of the French Socialist Party and its leader Guy Mollet, who has more than once taken part in and even headed the French government, and whom the revisionists present as a left-wing element and hold cordial talks with him. When at the head of the government, the French socialists set the dogs on striking workers, incited the outbreak of the dirty war in Indochina, undertook police repression against the peoples of other colonies, carried on the fighting against the Algerian people with more ferocity, approved the North Atlantic Treaty and the rearming of West Germany. Guy Mollet's government signed the agreement for the «European Common Market» and «Euratom» and was one of the organizers of the military aggression against Egypt; Guy Mollet's betrayal paved the way for personal rule in France, and so on and so forth. Speaking of Guy Mollet's government activity, even the Labourite weekly «Tribune» wrote at the beginning of 1957 that «Mollet is a disgrace both to France and to socialism».

Such is the real traitor face of social-democracy today. It is not for nothing that many representatives of the bourgeoisie have stressed the great role of the social-democratic parties in suppressing the revolutionary movement of workers and in defending the capitalist order, and have sung their praises. For instance, T. Junilla, director of a capitalist bank in Finland, has declared: «In the struggle to win over industrial workers spiritually only the social-democrats can serve as a powerful force against the communists. If social-democracy loses this battle, it may very well be the end of democracy in Finland. This is why I,
a conservative bourgeois, feel obliged to state that we need a united, militant social-democratic party which firmly upholds northern democracy.» The British bourgeois newspaper «Financial Times» wrote in the same vein on June 28, 1963: «...the industrialists are less afraid of the Labourites, and some of them are of the opinion that a Labour government will open up better prospects for development than the Tories.»

Precisely because the social-democrats are agents of the bourgeoisie in the workers' movement the Marxist-Leninists have always been clear that without a determined struggle to unmask and smash social-democracy ideologically and politically, the working class cannot wage its struggle successfully and carry it on to victory.

«The fact is,» V. I. Lenin wrote, «that 'bourgeois labour parties', as a political phenomenon, have already been formed in all the foremost capitalist countries, and that unless a determined and relentless struggle is waged all along the line against these parties — or groups, trends, etc., it is all the same — there can be no question of a struggle against imperialism, or of Marxism, or of a socialist labour movement.»*

J. V. Stalin, too, as a revolutionary and consistent Marxist, stressed:

«Present-day Social-Democracy is an ideological support of capitalism. Lenin was a thousand times right when he said that the present-day Social-Democratic politicians are 'real agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement, the labour lieutenants of the capitalist class', that in the 'civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie' they would inevitably

range themselves on the side of the 'Versaillese' against the 'Communards'.

«It is impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to Social-Democracy in the labour movement. That is why the era of dying capitalism is also the era of dying Social-Democracy in the labour movement.»*

The 1960 Moscow Declaration, too, stressing the fact that «the right-wing leaders of social-democracy have gone over completely to the positions of imperialism, uphold the capitalist system, split the working class» and are «enemies of communism», called upon the communists to continue the struggle to expose them.

But the modern revisionists, headed by the Khrushchev group, as renegades from and enemies to Marxism, act in complete opposition to the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, to the instructions of the Moscow Declaration: they pursue the line of unity and amalgamation with the right-wing leaders of social-democracy. And this is not accidental: present-day social-democracy and the modern revisionists have many things in common which link them together, they proceed in the same direction or towards a common counter-revolutionary objective.

THE MODERN REVISIONISTS HAVE SLIPPED INTO THE POSITIONS OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

Just as the old opportunists and reformists betrayed Marxism-Leninism, the cause of the working class, of the revolution and socialism in the past, so the modern revisionists have betrayed these ideals and are pursuing the same road as their predecessors who are at the same time their

* J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 10, p. 242 (Alb. ed.).
spiritual inspirers. Those who have changed are not the social-democrats but the modern revisionists, who have fallen into the treacherous positions of social-democracy.

Rejecting Marxism-Leninism, the social-democrats claim that «the problems of today cannot be solved with the old concepts». Following in their footsteps, the revisionists, too, misrepresent the new conditions and phenomena, and under the guise of fighting «dogmatism» and upholding «the creative development of Marxism», claim that today many things should be looked at with a critical eye, that what was right 30 years ago cannot be right today, that atomic weapons and the danger of a thermo-nuclear war make it indispensable to revise our views and stands on many questions of strategy and tactics, that he who adheres to the basic theses of Marx and Lenin in the sixties of the 20th century is a dogmatist who takes no account of the great changes that have come about in the world, and he who consults the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism in order to analyse and explain the present historical process is afflicted with «quotation-mania», and so on and so forth. Hence, for the revisionists, too, Marxism-Leninism is outdated, is no longer appropriate in the new conditions and must be «enriched» with new ideas and new conclusions. Just like all the opportunists and reformists, old and new, the revisionists, too, are stripping Marxism of its critical and revolutionary spirit and are attempting to turn it from a weapon in the hands of the working class to be used against the bourgeoisie into a weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie to be used against the working class.

«Not the class struggle, but the solidarity and harmony of all men who possess the sense of responsibility towards society» — this is the motive force of present-day society, say the social-democrats. The revisionists, too, have erased the class struggle from their books, and in fact have replaced it with the idea of class conciliation in the name of
«preserving peace» in the world, they have renounced this struggle in the name of «saving the world from the danger of thermo-nuclear war», and instead of the class struggle they preach «peaceful coexistence» as the only means to solve all the vital problems facing human society. «Peace at any price and on any condition, peace with all and above all», «Christian love for everybody», «abstract humanism above classes», these are the ideas that the modern revisionists preach far and wide. In the name of this ideal the revisionists make common cause with the class enemies, with the imperialists and reactionaries of various countries and their agents and lackeys — the right-wing social-democratic leaders and the Titoite clique, while, on the other hand, they fight furiously against all those who remain loyal to the interests of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist ideology — the communist parties and all the revolutionary communists.

The social-democrats long ago rejected the revolution and preach that socialism will come about through reforms within the framework of the bourgeois order, democracy and legality. Following in their footsteps, the revisionists, too, have abandoned the revolutionary road, saying that the road to socialism is the road to an ever broader democracy, the road of respecting and implementing bourgeois constitutions, the road of «structural reforms». Just like the social-democrats, the revisionists, too, identify the struggle for democracy with that for socialism, confine the struggle for socialism to that for democracy. Exhuming the theories of Kautsky and Bernstein, they express themselves in favour of the «peaceful», «parliamentary» road which they present as a strategic principle world-wide and have concentrated all their efforts on the struggle for votes in order to win the majority of seats in bourgeois parliaments.

The social-democrats consider the capitalist state as a state above classes, which expresses and defends the inter-
ests of society as a whole, they are opposed to breaking up the old bourgeois state machine, they are opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat, which, according to them, is the negation of democracy, is a totalitarian state, and so on and so forth. The revisionists also spread illusions that the capitalist state can change its class nature, that it can become a state that will express not only the interests of the bourgeoisie but also those of the proletariat and the labouring masses; they say that Lenin's thesis on the indispensability of smashing the bourgeois state apparatus must be modified, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is an outdated idea, or, at most, suitable only for backward countries, that it may not only have various forms but can also assume quite a different content. Both the social-democrats and the revisionists slander the dictatorship of the proletariat and describe the entire period of its rule as a period of mass terror and despotism, as a period of brutal violation of socialist legality and democracy, and so on and so forth.

In their practical political activity, too, the modern revisionists are proceeding in the footsteps of the traitorous leaders of social-democracy. In fact, they have united with the enemies of socialism and the peoples — with the imperialists, especially the US imperialists, and with the reactionaries of various countries. For the sake of rapprochement with imperialism, for the sake of achieving Soviet-American collaboration, which is the highest aspiration and ideal of Khrushchev and his group, the revisionists do not hesitate even to betray the true friends and allies of the Soviet people, the vital interests of the socialist countries, the working class, the peoples and nations oppressed and exploited by imperialism. Evidence of this can be seen in such activities of the revisionists, headed by the Khrushchev group, as their adventurous and capitulationist attitude in the Caribbean crisis, in their
pressure exerted on Cuba to capitulate to American imperialism, sacrificing its dignity and its sovereignty, in their unity with the Indian reactionaries against the PR of China, with the Titoite clique and with Venizelos against the PR of Albania, in the infamous Moscow Treaty for a partial ban on nuclear tests, which is a major betrayal of the interests of the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and peace and in favour of American imperialism, as well as in many other facts.

Anti-communism pervades the entire ideology and practical activity of modern social-democracy: it slanders the socialist countries and communist parties, splits the workers' movement, opposes scientific socialism with «democratic socialism», which is nothing but reformed capitalism; tries its utmost to preserve the capitalist order where it prevails and to re-establish it where it has been overthrown. The modern revisionists also carry on anti-socialist and anti-communist activities on a wide scale. The Khrushchev group and its revisionist followers have split the socialist camp and the international communist movement and are pressing on towards making the socialist countries degenerate into <<docile bourgeois republics>>, and the communist and workers' parties from parties of social revolution into «parties of social reforms». Khrushchev and his group deny the proletarian class nature of the socialist state and the communist party, they are liquidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and the communist party in the Soviet Union under the pretext of turning them into the state and party of «the entire people». The revisionists are organizing and reorganizing their economy with a view to changing its forms of management after the pattern of Titoite Yugoslavia, violating the Marxist principles of the construction and management of the socialist economy, they denigrate the experience of many years of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and in other socialist coun-
tries, and call on all to learn from the experience of the capitalist countries, especially from the American experience. They express themselves in favour of all-round collaboration with the capitalist countries, going as far as to hold out their hands to the imperialists for aid, credits and capital investments «to build socialism and communism», as Khrushchev himself did of late. Under the guise of fighting «the cult of the individual and its consequences», they have done away with the sound Marxist-Leninist cadres and have rehabilitated the traitors to and enemies of socialism, living and dead. They have flung open the doors of the socialist countries to the unhindered penetration of bourgeois ideology, of all kinds of alien anti-socialist trends and manifestations in art, literature and the whole life of the country, in the name of «freedom of thought» and of an abstract «humanism» that overrides classes. This «liberal» and «humane» socialism of the modern revisionists is getting closer and closer to the so-called «democratic socialism», which the leaders of present-day social-democracy preach.

Thus, all the facts show clearly that the modern revisionists are following in the footsteps of treacherous social-democracy. This is very clear to the socialist leaders who have openly expressed their approval, their joy and hopes regarding the traitorous course followed by the Khrushchev group and its followers. Here are some of their statements:

In a speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations at its last session P.H. Spaak said: «Khrushchev is trying an experiment of peaceful coexistence and the West should not make this experiment more difficult for him. It would be a terrible and inexcusable mistake to discour-age him. At this moment the future line of demarcation will no longer be between communists and non-communists, between the colonized and colonizers, between ideologies and races. We are witnesses of the struggle between those who wait the opportune time and inhuman doctrinarians.
on the one hand, and those who have had faith in progress and have never ceased to hope, on the other. We must not let this great occasion slip from our hands.»

In his interview of February 24, 1964, the leader of the British Labour Party, H. Wilson, pointed out that he was the first of the Western politicians who visited Russia after the death of Stalin, and on his return from Russia, reported to W. Churchill, who was prime minister at that time, that «a great change is taking place in Soviet policy» and that «this is of major importance as regards relations between East and West». He has every right to be proud of his long-term predictions which, today, have become reality.

Before going to Moscow with the socialist delegation to talk with Khrushchev and the other Soviet leaders, Gérard Jacquet, director of the newspaper of the French Socialist Party, stated: «We have long given up engaging in polemics with the Soviet Union and accept that this country is in the full phase of evolution... The problems raised are those of democracy and the democratic guarantee of the single party, the role of the socialist party in socialist society, the nature of the socialist regime and its structure. The stand taken by the CPSU in the differences between Moscow and Peking provides a positive clarification of the attitude of this party towards dogmatism and political sectarianism.»

After his return to Paris from the talks with Khrushchev, the General Secretary of the French Socialist Party Guy Mollet, stated that he had been convinced that «a positive evolution is taking place in the Soviet Union», and in his words, it was summed up in these points: «the recognition of many roads to the construction of socialism», «the end of the dictatorship of the proletariat», «internal evolution», and so on. Whereas in an interview given to the newspaper «Unità» (February 22, 1964), Guy Mollet declared: «I am convinced that the communist world is on the road to transformation.»
These statements of leaders of social-democracy are at one with the statements made by leaders of imperialism and their spokesmen who also express their support for Khrushchev's revisionist course and consider him «the best friend of the West in Moscow». They say that «the Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev acts like an American politician» and affirm that leading officials in the State Department in the USA are of the opinion that «the United States should make Khrushchev's task easier to a certain extent», etc., etc.

TOWARDS A COMPLETE AMALGAMATION OF THE MODERN REVISIONISTS WITH THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

The falling of the modern revisionists into the ideological positions of the social-democrats on the major issues constitutes the basis for the complete amalgamation of revisionists with the social-democrats. By pursuing this course and recommending it to the communist and workers' parties of different countries, the modern revisionists, headed by the Khrushchev group, aim to cause the degeneration of the communist parties into reformist parties of the social-democratic type, to strengthen the influence of bourgeois ideology and reformist illusions among the working masses, to weaken the revolutionary fighting spirit of the working class movement and alienate it from the only correct course against the capitalist order of oppression and exploitation.

The revisionists, of course, do not, as a rule, proclaim their hostile intentions openly. They accompany every step they take to the detriment of the cause of the revolution and of communism, with demagogic slogans and cloak it with all kinds of justifications. They even try to justify
their anti-Marxist action of amalgamation with social-democracy with the pretext that the social-democratic parties, too, are allegedly workers' parties and that the unity of the working class is essential in the struggle against capital. Let us dwell briefly on this.

**WORKERS' PARTIES OR «BOURGEOIS PARTIES OF THE WORKING CLASS»?**

Are the social-democratic parties truly parties of the working class?

To judge whether a party is a party of the working class one cannot proceed from the name it attaches to itself. Even Hitler's party called itself «national-socialist»! The only correct criterion is whether or not it defends and expresses the interests of the working class, whether or not it fights for the cause of the working class. And in order to elucidate this matter one should see to whose advantage are the ideology, policy and all practical activities of this or that party.

«*Put not trust in catch-cries,*» V. I. Lenin teaches us, «*but rather see who benefits from this!*»

And if we examine the question from this standpoint, the class standpoint, which is the only correct, Marxist-Leninist criterion, then it becomes clear to every true communist that the social-democratic parties are not working class parties, but are, as Lenin has dubbed them, «bourgeois parties of the working class». We showed above with numerous facts, that from both the ideological and the political viewpoints and in all its activity social-democracy today is nothing but, as Lenin describes it, a «political detachment of the bour-
geoisie», a «promoter of its influence», a «true agency of the bourgeoisie in the workers’ movement».

Even from the point of view of their social composition the social-democratic parties have undergone and are undergoing obvious changes. The number of workers in their ranks is steadily diminishing and the elements of the petty bourgeoisie and the workers’ bureaucracy are increasing. The present-day reformists have themselves launched the slogan of the «deproletarianization» of the social-democratic parties. And this has been expressed in the new programs of many social-democratic parties. Thus, the program of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party, for example, says: «At first socialism was the cause solely of the working class which was exploited by capitalism... Now socialism has become the concern of all mankind. It affects every person with a sense of responsibility for the well-being of society.»

So much for the rank-and-file, the masses of the social-democratic parties, whereas as far as the leading cadres are concerned, the higher up you go in the hierarchy of the social-democratic parties, the fewer workers you find in them. In fact many social-democratic leaders have long ago turned into real capitalists: many of them take part in the administrative councils of the biggest banks and own solid portfolios of shares, drawing millions upon millions in income each year. Thus, according to recent figures, 410 principal functionaries of the German Social-Democratic Party, for example, occupied 929 highly paid posts in the major banks and corporations of West Germany, 62 prominent social-democrats were directors of firms of Mannesman, Kleckner, Krupp, Flick and others. The same situation prevails in the other social-democratic parties of the West, as in France, Britain, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, etc.

This is the kind of «working class» the social-democratic parties represent! The modern revisionists, who are
themselves nothing but traitors to the working class, have every reason to stick the label «workers’ party» not only on themselves, not only on the social-democrats, but also on some bourgeois conservative party if such a thing is dictated by their anti-Marxist, anti-revolutionary plan of action.

Thus it is obvious that the argument of the modern revisionists, alleging that the social-democratic parties are parties of the working class, is utterly false. Hence their slogan about «the need for unity of the working class» is demagogical, a pretext to justify their union with the «bourgeois parties of the working class».

The workers’ movement in almost all the advanced capitalist countries has been split. Who is to blame for this split? Who hinders the achievement of unity of action in the workers’ movement? The 1960 Moscow Declaration points out that the originators and promoters of this split on a national and international scale are «the ruling classes, the right-wing leaders of social-democracy and the reactionary leaders of the trade unions». Under these circumstances, in order to realize unity of action in the workers’ movement, the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists are guided by the following considerations:

a) that unity of action can be attained only in struggle with splitters, therefore they wage a relentless and persistent struggle of principle against the splitters — the treacherous social-democratic leaders;

b) that all their efforts must be concentrated on the achievement of unity of workers’ action at the base with the worker masses of the socialist parties, that the watchword of the Marxist-Leninists for unity of the working class can and must be reliance on the rank and file, alliance with the leftists, uncompromising struggle against the traitors and splitters, the right-wing leaders, in order to expose and isolate them;
c) that, while seeking unity of action with the socialists, the communist parties should consider this not collaboration between two political parties of the working class, but collaboration between a proletarian and a non-proletarian party in order to achieve certain specified objectives. In connection with this, it is essential to always keep in mind and strictly observe the teachings of Lenin, who more than once stressed with force that it is essential that, when concluding an alliance or agreement with other movements on this or that question or objective, the revolutionary party of the working class must maintain its political independence at every moment and in every situation, and clearly differentiate itself ideologically and politically from all other classes and parties so that it does not lose sight for one moment of the fundamental interests of the working class and its fight to achieve its final objective — the triumph of socialism and communism.

Any deviation from these Marxist-Leninist positions brings as a consequence the deviation of the working class from the revolutionary road and its fall into the mire of opportunism. Such is the stand of the Marxist-Leninists on the question of the unity of the workers' movement.

But what stand do the modern revisionists maintain in connection with this? Not only have they given up the struggle against the splitters of the workers' movement — the right-wing leaders of social-democracy but, what is more, they advocate unity «at any price» and «on any condition» with these splitters and traitors. Indeed the revisionists rise against all those who struggle against the right-wing leaders of social-democracy and who expose their betrayal, and describe this struggle as a «sectarian» and «dogmatic» stand, «abuse», «insults», «harmful attacks», and so on.

But everybody knows that social-democratic leaders like Spaak, Guy Mollet and others, with whom Khrushchev and his followers conduct «cordial talks» and try to
achieve unity «on any condition», are lackeys and agents of the bourgeoisie, who have been and still are at the head of bourgeois governments in many capitalist countries. Therefore unity with these traitors is by no means unity of the workers' movement, but an attempt at «unity» of the working class with the bourgeoisie, for subjection of the working class to the bourgeoisie, unity and collaboration with the reactionary, allegedly «socialist», bourgeois governments.

Formerly, when they had not yet revealed their treacherous features so openly, the modern revisionists used to claim they were opposed to the right-wing leaders of social-democracy, that no unity was possible with them, and so on, and they even said a word or two against them. None other than Khrushchev said at the 21st Congress of the CPSU that the cause of unity of the working class was hindered by «imperialist reaction and its lackeys in the workers' movement such as the anti-communist leaders of social-democracy — Guy Mollet and Spaak. We know these leaders of anti-communism by name and we do not rely on them when we speak of the unity of action of the working class.» Whereas now it is the same Khrushchev who is holding «cordial talks» with such anti-communist leaders as Guy Mollet, Spaak, H. Wilson and their ilk and begging them for collaboration in order to achieve the «unity of the working class»! One of two things must have happened: either Guy Mollet, Spaak and company have ceased to be anti-communists or Khrushchev himself has ceased to be a communist and made common cause with the leaders of anti-communism, the lackeys of imperialist reaction. So far there is no sign to prove the former, while all the facts point to the latter.

Regardless of the demagogic slogans they employ to deceive the masses, the modern revisionists in fact are not only in favour of «unity at all costs» with the social-demo-
crats, including their traitorous leaders, but have gone even further, expressing themselves for unity and collaboration with them «on any basis». Thus, an article in the magazine «Kommunist» of the CPSU, issue 3, 1960, says: «Unity of action with the reformists, even the most inveterate ones, on this or that issue, is always possible, provided they are really trying to achieve some sort of reforms, however minor, for the benefit of the working class and the toilers.» Whereas the leaders of the French Communist Party, on the basis of a resolution of the plenum of the Central Committee of September 27-28, 1961, regarding collaboration with the socialist and other parties, have stated: «For our part, we are ready to collaborate on any basis.»*

Thus, speculating on the slogan of «unity», the revisionists sacrifice the principles, erase the distinction between communists and social-democrats, trample upon and sacrifice the fundamental interests of the working class. This is a sham unity, a unity in favour of the bourgeoisie and its agency in the workers' movement the aim of which is to subjugate the workers' movement completely to bourgeois and reformist influence, to liquidate the revolutionary spirit and the revolutionary party of the working class. This is a major betrayal of the cause of the working class and of socialism.

An important conclusion can be drawn from all this: the genuine unity of the workers' movement on a sound basis can and will be achieved in stern struggle not only with the right-wing leaders of social-democracy but also with the modern revisionists, against their dangerous attempts to subject the workers' movement completely to the poisonous, counter-revolutionary influence of social-democracy and its treacherous right-wing leaders.

* Taken from the magazine «Kommunist», issue 3, p. 95, 1962.
THE LIQUIDATION OF COMMUNIST PARTIES — THE GOAL OF THE MODERN REVISIONISTS

The facts prove that the hue and cry the modern revisionists are raising about «unity» of the workers' movement is nothing but a bluff, a demagogic manoeuvre to cover up their tracks. Whereas their true objective is to cause the degeneration of the communist parties into parties of the social-democratic type, to unite with the social-democrats «on any condition» and «on any basis» and, finally, to liquidate the communist parties, to amalgamate them completely with the social-democratic parties.

The social-democratic leaders, who cannot fail to see these attempts and intentions of the revisionists and agree with them, have defined their stand and their tactics towards them. Like the American imperialists and the Titoite clique, the social-democratic leaders pursue a two-pronged tactic towards the revisionists:

On the one hand, they eulogize their revisionist course, give them support and encourage them as allies in their betrayal, incite them against Marxism-Leninism and all those who stand loyal to it. To keep ahead of the revisionists and to mislead the masses, certain social-democratic leaders, especially of late, have begun to speak in terms similar to those of the revisionists and to make statements in favour of peace, peaceful coexistence and disarmament, and moreover, have somewhat changed their attitude towards the Soviet Union and towards the communists in their own countries, and so on. This, of course, has nothing to do with any real, basic change of the position of the social-democrats, but is merely a change in their attitude towards the revisionists for the above reasons. It is exactly this kind of «change» that the revisionists try, in a demagogic way, to present as «an inclination to the left»
of the social-democrats, in order to justify their own move to the right, to justify their own line of rapprochement and collaboration with them.

On the other hand, the social-democratic leaders maintain a «stern» and «haughty» attitude towards the servile requests and appeals of the revisionists for rapprochement and collaboration, put pressure on them and demand new, ever greater concessions. And what do the social-democrats demand?

In the ideological field, they demand that the revisionists finally renounce the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the leading role of the communist party, proletarian internationalism, and so on, not only in essence but also formally.

In the field of politics, they demand further «democratic guarantees», toleration of many parties, consequently of bourgeois parties as well, and the sharing of power among them in the socialist countries, changes in the electoral system to allow the inclusion of anti-socialist elements in the lists of candidates, etc. In other words, they demand the «liberalization» of the socialist regime and its transformation into an ordinary bourgeois democracy.

In the economic field, they demand the abandonment of the cooperative system in the countryside, of the «old forms» of organization and management of the economy, in order to proceed towards rapprochement and «extensive and all-round collaboration» of the socialist countries with the capitalist countries, and so on.

In the field of international relations, they demand new and bigger concessions towards imperialism in the name of «preserving peace», renunciation of support for the revolutionary and national-liberation movements and even the sacrifice of the German Democratic Republic as a condition for the establishment of peace in Europe.

Such are the demands put forward, for instance, by
Spaak, Guy Mollet and other social-democratic leaders. These demands are identical with those made to the revisionists by the imperialists, particularly the American imperialists, through Eisenhower, Dulles, Kennedy, Johnson, and others.

The social-democratic leaders are convinced that the revisionists will continue to make further concessions, for this is an inevitable consequence of the traitorous line which the revisionists pursue. And the facts are proving ever more clearly as the days go by that their hopes are not misplaced. In fact, having gone a long way in the social-democratic degeneration of the communist parties they head, the revisionists are now attempting to make the next move — that of complete fusion with the social-democratic parties.

At the head of these efforts stand the revisionist «troyka» — the Khrushchev group, the Tito clique and the revisionist leadership of the Italian Communist Party headed by Togliatti. The clearest example of how to proceed along this treacherous road is that of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party. Togliatti and other revisionist leaders have imposed on the Italian Communist Party a line which is opportunist and reformist from start to finish, a line that flagrantly deviates from the teachings and basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, a line which has replaced the class struggle, the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat with the so-called «Italian road to socialism» through «structural reforms» within the framework of «bourgeois democracy», of the bourgeois state «above classes», of the bourgeois Constitution. And this is not all. Proceeding along their anti-Marxist road, Togliatti and other revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party have long been loudly trumpeting the necessity of changing the «character, functions and organizational structure» of their party, allegedly to adapt it to deal with the great political problems it is faced with, and the «transformations that have taken and
are taking place in the economic, social and political structure of the country», «with the problems of the struggle for socialism in the advanced capitalist countries», etc., etc. Just in what direction these changes will be made and what their objective is, is made clear by the «Document of the CC of the Italian CP for the National Conference on Organization», published in the newspaper «Unità» dated January 9, 1964. This document says: «The essential exigency is that a system of new contacts and connections among all forces which accept a socialist policy and future must be sought for and applied», with the prospect that «the division which exists among the various organizations of the working class will be organically overcome while laying the basis for a single organization». Indeed, it says that in the light of the struggle against the monopolist development of the country and in order to set it on the road of socialist development, we should look into the «problem of the relation and dialogue with the democratic catholic political movement, which is the other major force, the support of which is essential in building a new society in Italy».

These theses of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party are the continuation and further concretization of opportunist views expressed long ago by Togliatti. At the meeting of the CC of the Italian CP on June 24, 1956, Togliatti said: «In fact, we can see an impulse towards socialism, a more or less clear trend towards economic reforms and transformations of the socialist type even in countries where the communist parties, far from taking part in the government, are sometimes not even a major force... This situation is apparent today and assumes special significance in those regions of the world which have been emancipated from colonialism only recently. But even in very advanced capitalist countries it may happen that the working class, in its majority, may follow a non-
communist party and it cannot be excluded that, in such countries, even non-communist parties based on the working class may express the urge which comes from the working class for a move towards socialism. Even where there are strong communist parties, other parties, which have their basis in the working class and a socialist program, may exist along with them. The tendency to bring about radical economic changes in a direction which, in general, is that of socialism, may come in the end from organizations and movements which do not call themselves socialist.»

What is new about the latest document of the CC of the Italian Communist Party for the conference on the organization of the party, is the fact that now attempts are being made to pass from pseudo-theoretical considerations to practical steps to set up the so-called «single organization of the working class», in other words, the liquidation of the communist party as the independent revolutionary vanguard of the working class.

We have already had the occasion to point out that these views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party are not at all original, but completely identical with those of the Titoite renegades, sanctioned in the program of the LCY and long condemned by the whole international communist movement as profoundly anti-Marxist. This revisionist program says: «The view that communist parties have a monopoly in every aspect of the development towards socialism, and that socialism is expressed by them and through them, is theoretically incorrect and very harmful in practice.» It says also: «...the LCY considers it dogmatic to claim the absolute monopoly of the communist party over the political power as a universal and perpetual principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of socialist construction.»

The unity of views of the leadership of the Italian CP
with those of the Titoite clique is not confined to these questions alone, but extends over to their entire line. This revisionist unity was clearly expressed in the joint Tito-Togliatti communique signed in Belgrade on January 21 of this year, as well as in a leading article by Togliatti published in «Rinascita» on his return from his visit to Yugoslavia.

During this visit Togliatti and Tito did not conceal that they discussed the co-ordination of their activity for the spreading and triumph of the «new positive course» in the communist movement, especially in Europe, and for overcoming the obstacles in the way of the «unity» of the workers' and communist movement on the basis of this course. The talks again highlighted the «special role» which the leaders of the Italian CP have assigned themselves in the communist and workers' movement in Western Europe (let us recall the theory of «polycentrism», implying, of course, that one of the principal and most «attractive» centres of leadership would certainly be the Italian Communist Party with Togliatti at the head!).

To achieve their end — the triumph of the «new course», the degeneration of the communist parties, it was necessary for the revisionists with the Khrushchev group at the head, first and foremost, to smash, completely subdue and set moving towards degeneration not only the Italian CP, which Togliatti himself is zealously trying to do, but also the French CP, as two major parties in Western Europe. Precisely for this reason the «Trojan Troyka» — the Khrushchev group, the Tito clique and the revisionist leadership of the Italian Communist Party, are exerting strong and all-round pressure on the French CP to compel it to completely renounce the Leninist revolutionary principles. At the same time daily pressure in this direction is also being exerted on the French CP by the right-wing socialist leaders under Guy Mollet as well as by the various
revisionist elements in the ranks of the French Communist Party itself like Raymond Guyot and others.

The French CP is a party with revolutionary traditions. In the past it has made a valuable contribution to the struggle against various anti-Marxist trends, ranging from the right-wing socialists like Leon Blum and Guy Mollet to the renegade Tito clique. Now this criticism seems to have been suppressed, as a result either of obedience to the «conductor's baton» or of the pressure from revisionist elements who are bent on leading the French CP on the inglorious road towards anti-Marxist degeneration, to the line against which it fought.

Let us take, for instance, the latest document of the leadership of the French CP — the draft-resolution for the 17th Congress of the party which will be held in May this year. It says there that for the sake of unity and collaboration with the socialist party, the French CP has done much and is willing to do more to eliminate the «obstacles» in the way of this collaboration, that «it has given up the idea that the existence of a single party is an essential condition for the transition to socialism. This idea, which was defended by Stalin, constituted an unwarranted generalization of the specific circumstances under which the October Revolution was carried out. Subsequent experience proves that common objectives of the parties representing the working classes of the town and the countryside lead to an ever more profound unity for transition to socialism, for building socialist society.»

Here we have to do with a new major concession of principle which the leadership of the French Communist Party is making to the social-democrats. With this very serious step the French revisionists are jeopardizing the very existence of the communist party, proceeding towards its liquidation, towards its complete fusion with Guy Mollet's Socialist Party. This is another clear proof of whither the
modern revisionists are leading the communist parties. No wonder the big bourgeois newspaper «Le Monde» greets this statement with these words: «The Communist Party most firmly rejects the theory of the 'single party'.» However much they try to justify this step, or slander Stalin, the revisionists of the French Communist Party will not succeed in covering up their betrayal, the plot they are hatching up to cause the social-democratic degeneration of the French Communist Party.

Stalin, like all consistent Marxist-Leninists, never denied the possibility of collaboration with other parties for the seizure of power and the construction of socialism. He never absolutized the specific historical circumstances which determined the existence of a single party in the Soviet Union. It is an indisputable fact that it was precisely in Stalin's time that the communist parties in various countries of Europe and Asia collaborated successfully for the first time with other parties, both during the revolution for the seizure of power, and after the seizure of power, during the construction of socialism. But it is clear both in documents of the leadership of the Italian CP and in those of the French CP that the question is not whether the communist party may or may not collaborate with other parties during the socialist revolution and during the construction of socialism. The question here is that for the sake of this collaboration these documents erase all distinction between the communist parties and other parties, and deny, in fact, the necessity for the leading role of the communist party armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

J.V. Stalin, however, upheld precisely this idea, the idea of the leading role of the communist party, an idea which is not Stalin's alone, but a basic teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin, emanating from the historic mission of the working class and from its Marxist-Leninist ideology, which is
the only ideology of scientific socialism. This is clearly emphasized also in the 1957 Moscow Declaration which says that «the leadership of the masses by the working class, the nucleus of which is the Marxist-Leninist party, during the accomplishment of the proletarian revolution in this or other form, during the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in this or that form» is a universal law of the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Time was when the leadership of the French CP sternly criticized the leadership of the Italian CP because the latter placed the communist party on an equal footing with the other so-called «workers'» parties, advocated the existence of many parties under socialism as essential and denied the indispensability of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party. Debating these views of Togliatti and company, the theoretical organ of the CC of the French CP «Cahiers du communisme» published in its January 1957 issue an article under the title: «Concerning the Italian Road to Socialism», pointed out that to deny the radical distinction between the communist party and other so-called «workers'» parties which are permeated with the ideology of other classes, and therefore, cannot fully represent the present and future true interests of the working class, means, in fact, to place the communist party on the same level as the non-proletarian parties, to deny that «there is only one scientific socialism which clearly determines the historic role of the working class, the tactics and the strategy, which enables it to carry out its mission», and «to admit the possibility of a reformist 'road' to socialism, which is given equal importance with the revolutionary road». «Cahiers du communisme» at the time likewise stressed that this means to slip into the positions of Kardelj and other Yugoslav leaders, who have proclaimed the Scandinavian social-democratic road as one of the possible forms of advance towards socialism, thus erasing the radical
distinction between scientific socialist ideology and social-democratic ideology, which preaches conciliation, class collaboration and peaceful integration, in other words, renunciation of the aims of socialism.

To renounce the thesis on the leading role of the communist party as an essential condition for the transition to socialism, to place the communist party on the same footing as other «workers'» and «socialist» parties, as the modern revisionists do, means to sever all connections with true scientific socialism and true socialist ideology, means to renounce the principles and program of the communist party and to unite and amalgamate with the social-democratic parties on the basis of their anti-Marxist program. And that is exactly what the revisionists are doing.

There was a time when the French Communist Party did not agree with the treacherous, utterly revisionist line of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party headed by Togliatti. But does the French Communist Party have any differences with the revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party now? If it has, why does it remain silent? Why did the French Communist Party find it so easy to attack the CP of China and the PL of Albania and keep silent towards the Italian revisionists? If it has no differences, then why does it not say openly that it is in agreement with them and that it was wrong before? Or is it because «the conductor’s baton» beats that tune?

To keep silent, to shut your eyes to the treacherous line and activities of the revisionists — such an attitude is not only anti-Marxist, but also dangerous. It causes serious damage not only to the Italian Communist Party, which must be helped to see where Togliatti’s revisionism is leading it, but also to the French Communist Party itself, and the entire communist movement. The revolutionary Marxist-Leninists are seriously concerned about the catastrophe which is threatening the communist and workers’ parties.
They cannot and must not remain silent when a group of traitors is trying to lead the communist parties, like the CPSU, the Italian Communist Party, the French Communist Party, etc., to disaster, but should raise their voice to help the genuine communists, members of these parties to see the danger clearly, to understand where their present revisionist leadership is taking them before it is too late.

There was a time when the communist parties of France and Italy were set up, at the Congresses of Tours and Leghorn, as revolutionary proletarian parties of the new type, breaking away from the socialist parties of that time which had betrayed the interests of the working class and socialism, severing all connections with the opportunism and reformism of the treacherous 2nd International and adopting the conditions and the Marxist-Leninist program of the Communist International. Now we are witnessing a reverse process. The line of demarcation, which was established at the Tours and Leghorn Congresses is being wiped out. The attempts of the modern revisionists to unite and amalgamate with those they had earlier detached themselves from — the treacherous social-democratic leaders, by making to them repeated concessions, by renouncing the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, are daily becoming more and more evident. That is why the revolutionary communists of Italy and France, as well as those of other countries, who are being threatened by the danger of revisionism, should rise in struggle against these renegades. This is the only correct course. The attacks which the revisionist troyka led by Khrushchev are making on the communist and workers' parties are very similar to the treacherous acts of the social-democrats of the 2nd International. Therefore, the Marxists should draw lessons from history, should follow the revolutionary traditions of earlier times to defend the party, Marxism-Leninism and the revolution.

On the eve of its 17th Congress, the French Communist
Party is more than ever on the horns of a dilemma: will it continue to give blind obedience to the conductors' baton and allow the revisionist group in the leadership to set it definitely on the road of betrayal, or will it break the conductor's baton, correct its mistakes, and return to the heroic revolutionary road of Marxism-Leninism?

Many leaders of the French Communist Party have hurled insults and made disgraceful attacks on the PLA and its leadership. This we will not forget. The time will come, if not today, tomorrow, when everything will be put in order in a Marxist way. We are convinced that those who have acted in this manner will eventually blush with shame... We owe the French Communist Party nothing, its leaders owe the PLA an apology. Nevertheless, we sincerely call on the French Communist Party to return to the road of the revolution, to the true Marxist-Leninist road before it is too late, for the good of the French people, the French proletariat and the international proletariat. Its place is on that road. Those who correct their mistakes command the respect of others and enjoy the support of the communists and all the progressive people of the world, while the traitors are loathed by all. Everyone despises them and fights them mercilessly, as they are doing with the Khrushchev, Tito and Togliatti groups and their loyal henchmen—all the modern revisionists.

A STOP MUST BE PUT TO THE TREACHEROUS ACTIVITIES OF THE REVOLUTIONISTS, THE COMMUNIST PARTIES MUST BE DEFENDED!

With their political course and all their practical activity, the modern revisionists, with traitor Khrushchev at the head, have created a grave situation in many communist parties and in the international communist and workers'
movement. They have undermined the internal unity of individual parties and the movement as a whole, and are proceeding posthaste on the course of the social-democratic degeneration of the communist parties, trying to set the whole world communist movement on an opportunist and traitorous road. This reminds one of that period when, as a result of the betrayal of their leaders, the parties of the 2nd International deviated from the revolutionary road, renounced Marxism, plunged completely into the mire of opportunism and reformism, and degenerated into «bourgeois parties of the working class».

The betrayal of the parties of the 2nd International which was expressed clearly especially during the First World War, when they crossed over openly to the positions of social-chauvinism, encountered, and could not but encounter, the resolute resistance of the revolutionary communists with Lenin at the head. The latter, though in the minority, but expressing the true, fundamental interests of the working class and the working masses, waged a stern struggle of principle for years on end to unmask the traitorous leaders of the 2nd International, to expose the opportunism and reformism of the parties of this International, in defence of Marxism and proletarian internationalism and to create new revolutionary parties of the working class.

«It is impossible,» V. I. Lenin wrote at that time, «to carry out the tasks of socialism at present, it is impossible to-achieve true internationalist unity of workers, without a thorough break with opportunism, and without explaining to the masses the inevitability of the fiasco it will suffer.»*

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol 21, p. 19 (Alb. ed.).
Speaking of this struggle of Lenin, Stalin has written:

"Every bolshevik, if he is a real bolshevik, knows that long ago, as early as about 1903-1904, when the bolshevik group was formed in Russia and the leftists appeared for the first time in German social-democracy – Lenin pursued the line of separation, of breaking with the opportunists, both amongst us, in the Social-Democratic Party of Russia, as well as there, in the 2nd International, and especially in German social-democracy."

This resolute and principled struggle by Lenin and other revolutionary communists to completely smash the opportunism and betrayal of the 2nd International ideologically and politically, led to further major victories of Marxism-Leninism and the world revolutionary movement. It was crowned with the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, with the setting up of new revolutionary parties of the new type, and with the bankruptcy of the 2nd International and its replacement by the Communist 3rd International.

Today, too, the betrayal of the modern revisionists, who have totally deviated from Marxism-Leninism, from the principles of the revolutionary proletarian party and from the vital interests of the revolutionary proletariat and the broad masses of workers, has encountered, and could not but encounter, the firm resistance and principled struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties and all revolutionary communists. This is a struggle of major historic significance, which concerns the future of the world revolutionary and liberation movement, a struggle in defence of Marxism-Leninism against revisionism, in defence of proletarian

* J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 13, p. 83 (Alb. ed.).
internationalism against nationalism and chauvinism, in
defence of the socialist order against liberal bourgeois de-
generation, in defence of the revolutionary communist par-
ties against social-democratic degeneration, in defence of
the Marxist-Leninist unity of the communist parties, the
international communist movement and socialism against
revisionist splitters.

Just as the classics of Marxism-Leninism and all the
experience of the communist movement teach us, the only
right way to respond to the challenge of the revisionists
is to unite all the Marxist-Leninist forces for a deter-
mined, uncompromising struggle against the revisionist
renegades. The attacks and pressures of the revi-
sionists, foreign and internal, cannot be withstood by pursu-
ing a vacillating centrist line, nor by being solely concerned
to preserve a false and formal unity. The party cannot be
saved by sighs of regret, nor should it be sacrificed for the
sake of preserving the «prestige» of any one, at a time
when this «prestige» is being unscrupulously exploited to
bury the great cause of the working class and socialism.

The Khrushchev group has led the leaders of many
communist parties into a blind alley. He has impelled them
to deny the revolutionary past of the CPSU and their
own parties, with his false slanders against Stalin he has
put the old revolutionary leaders who have had a brilliant
past in a difficult position. Many of them were deceived by
the Khrushchevite line of peace and coexistence, which has
now been clearly shown to be an anti-Leninist line, a line of
rapprochement and collaboration with the enemies of peace
and of socialism — the imperialists. The tragic thing about
some of them is precisely that, although they have now got
wise to a number of things, although they see that the line
of the Khrushchev group is a revisionist line with colossal
effects, nevertheless they do not find the Marxist courage
to say to themselves: stop! They do not behave towards
this matter as it befits them as revolutionary Marxist-
Leninists. They try to protect the party on the revisionist
road which is fatal to it. They try, to varying extents, to
«justify» this road, about which they nurture doubts and
are not in complete agreement, sometimes they even say, in
narrow circles, that they have differences with Khrushchev.
But that's all they do. They go no further. They do not
take the courage to bring these matters up for discussion
in their parties in a Marxist-Leninist way. They agree that
the materials sent to them by Khrushchev should be discus-
sed within their parties, but they are afraid to discuss
within their parties the documents and written materials of
other parties as well. A big struggle is going on in their
conscience. But the Khrushchev group is at work, too. It has
won over many adherents in the leaderships of many other
parties, who exert pressure, blackmail with various manoeu-
vres to make their parties obey the conductor's baton. Fol-
lowing in Khrushchev's footsteps, some communist party
leaders have entered into a blind alley with their political
stand. Of course, it is correct to struggle against the threat
to world peace from West-German militarism and from the
imperialist Bonn-Paris axis, but it is altogether incorrect
and anti-Marxist to give up the struggle against American
imperialism, which is the main force of war and aggression;
the bastion of world reaction, the international gendarme
and the biggest exploiter, the most ferocious enemy of the
peoples of the whole world, as the 1960 Moscow Declaration
has called it, under this pretext. It is correct and Marxist to
fight against «personal power» and its consequences, but it is
altogether anti-Marxist to blindly follow Khrushchev's pro-
American policy and not to take advantage of the split that
is becoming ever deeper in the imperialist camp. We know
why this attitude is maintained. Of course, this is what the
«conductor of the orchestra» has ordered. But tomorrow, if
this «conductor» flirts with «personal power» for adven-
turous anti-Marxist purposes, how are they going to swallow that? Or is the conductor training other musicians to open the way to new adventures?

The revisionist camp is in great difficulties. Its ship has been holed, water is gushing in and it is foundering. The Khrushchev group is striving in every way to avert the catastrophe. To escape further exposure, it is raising a hue and cry about ceasing the polemics which it itself started and which it formerly described as fully justifiable, necessary and Leninist. But under present conditions, to cease the polemics means to every true Marxist and revolutionary to unite with the traitors, to create possibilities for them to corrupt and destroy Marxism-Leninism. In his attempt to mislead people, Khrushchev swears by unity. But the true revolutionaries and consistent communists cannot be deceived by adventurers, demagogues and splitters. The revolutionary communists loyally follow the teachings of the great Lenin, who said:

"Unity is a great issue and a major slogan! But the cause of the workers demands unity of Marxists not unity of Marxists with opponents and distorters of Marxism."*

Already it is clear that Khrushchev and his group represent just these opponents and distorters of Marxism in the communist movement today. On the other hand, the Khrushchev group continues its hostile, disruptive work in diverse forms, through regional meetings, or bilateral talks, dictating new instructions and tasks with a view to compromising and leading the other parties and their leaders further down the road of revisionism and betrayal. The time has come for all to stop and think, to cease obeying the

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 20, p. 256 (Alb. ed.).
«conductor's baton», to begin to resist the traitors in order to defend Marxism-Leninism and socialism, in order to defend the great revolutionary cause of the working class.

It is the duty of all communists to fight imperialism, headed by American imperialism, with all their strength. And the struggle against modern revisionism is a component part of the struggle against imperialism, for it is the offspring and ally of imperialism, the manifestation in theory and practice of bourgeois ideology, imperialism's «Trojan horse» in the socialist camp and the international communist movement. The words of the great Lenin, when he said that without waging a firm and consistent struggle through to the end against opportunism and revisionism, no successful struggle can be waged against imperialism, ring truer than ever today. Without exposing and smashing revisionism, the revolution cannot triumph and socialism and communism cannot be built and defended successfully.

We are firmly convinced that, just as in the past, the present fight against modern revisionists, headed by the Khrushchev group, will be crowned with new victories for Marxism-Leninism, socialism and the international revolutionary movement. The revisionists cannot succeed in turning the historical revolutionary process backwards. We are witnesses to the fact that the revisionists are being more and more exposed and discredited in their own countries, as well as in the international communist movement. They are suffering defeat after defeat, while the ranks of the parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism and of the revolutionary communists are increasing and becoming stronger, their struggle against modern revisionism is rising to an ever higher level. The total defeat of revisionism and the triumph of Marxism-Leninism are inevitable.