

**ON THE PROBLEM  
OF  
WAR AND PEACE.**

**ON THE PROBLEM  
OF WAR AND PEACE**

**FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE  
HANOI — 1964**

## CONTENTS

### I. PROBLEM OF WAR AND PEACE

Review Tuyen Huan (Information and Education)  
№ 4-1964, p. 20-43 .....

### II. SOME VIEWPOINTS ON WAR AND PEACE

Review Hoc Tap, (Study) № 1-1964, p. 28-40 .....

### III. MAN AND WEAPONS

Review Hoc Tap, № 9 — 1963, p. 27-36 .....

### VI. THE CORRECT ROAD TO DEFEND WORLD PEACE

Review Hoc Tap, № 1-1964, p. 56-63 .....

## **PROBLEM OF WAR AND PEACE**

In over half a century of existence imperialism has plunged mankind into two great world wars and is bringing it face to face with an extremely grave danger of a world nuclear war of unparalleled devastation. The world's people have the urgent task of doing their utmost to prevent the breaking out of a new world war, and to defend world peace. Lenin has taught us : "The question of imperialist wars has been the keystone of the entire policy of all countries of the globe since 1914. It is a question of life and death for millions and millions of people."\*

Today the question of war and peace is not only the question of life and death for tens but hundreds of millions of people. It is plain that the communists cannot fail to pay serious attention to such an important question. On the contrary, they were and are being in the lead of the struggle for the defence of

---

\* LENIN: Fourth anniversary of the October Revolution. *Selected Works*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1952, p. 597.

peace, and have been doing their best resolutely to bring complete victory to this struggle. That struggle will certainly succeed because of the emergence after the Second World War of the unprecedented possibility of preventing a new world war. It is essential at present to have a correct line for the defence of peace capable of turning this possibility into reality. At present there is an acute struggle between two lines on the problem of war and peace: the Marxist-Leninist line and the modern revisionist one.

A correct line for the defence of peace must proceed from a number of objective prerequisites the first of which is the estimation of the nature of imperialism. The problem is whether the aggressive and warlike nature of imperialism remains unchanged, whether imperialism is still the source of war in our era.

#### CAN THE NATURE OF IMPERIALISM CHANGE ?

Modern revisionism holds that a qualitative change of war technique, concretely speaking, the appearance of nuclear weapons, has created so profound and revolutionary changes as to make it necessary to revise many fundamental laws of social development, and many basic Marxist-Leninist principles, among them the problem of the nature of imperialism.

According to modern revisionism, with the stocks of nuclear weapons in the possession of the big powers, with the irresistible transcontinental missiles capable of bringing nuclear war heads to any place

on earth, a new world war means the end of the world, and the annihilation of every living creature on earth. Therefore the principle defining that war is the continuation of politics is worthless. Moreover, today, the imperialist camp no longer holds the monopoly of nuclear weapons and transcontinental missiles, the socialist camp also has them and has the superiority in this domain. In such a situation, any party that madly launches an offensive against the other, will inevitably suffer reprisals. Therefore, the imperialists begin to realize that the waging of a new world war is tantamount to a suicide. And within the monopoly bourgeoisie of imperialist countries two tendencies have appeared. The first is that of peace, moderation and good sense. This is the renouncing of war, considered as a means to solve international issues, the acceptance of the peaceful economic competition with socialism, the consent to general and complete disarmament; the substitution of the "strategy of peace" for the war policy. This tendency has prevailed: the leaders of the big powers — the U.S.A., Britain, France — such as Eisenhower, Kennedy, McMillan, and De Gaulle (formerly) have it. Many representatives of this tendency are still cautious, hesitating, and not bold enough because the international atmosphere is still poisoned by suspicions accumulated in the past, because they still doubt the desire of the socialist countries for peaceful co-existence, suspect them of wanting to annihilate capitalism by the export of revolution or by a surprise attack, and because they are still under the pressure of the bellicose elements. The second is the warlike and adventurous tendency

of a number of circles or individuals : generals in the Pentagon and U.S. Congressmen, West-German revanchists and Japanese militarists. These circles and individuals have this tendency because they still hope to defeat the socialist camp in a new world war without suffering any punishment. But with the successes in economy and national defence of the socialist camp in peaceful competition, and the continuous growth of its superiority, their hopes become more and more precarious and vanish gradually and those adventurous hot heads will cool down. The time will come when the superiority of the socialist camp proves to be absolute and so evident that even the hottest heads must recognize hard facts : an attack on the socialist camp would unfailingly lead to their annihilation. They will then follow the moderate section, definitively relinquish the war policy and consent to the general and complete disarmament. In short, imperialism has been dropping the war policy for fear of death.

Therefore, according to modern revisionism the aggressive and bellicose nature of imperialism has changed owing to the appearance of nuclear weapons. Today the source of war no longer lies in imperialism, but in the lack of confidence between the countries, in a number of warlike imperialists and even in some socialist countries having an adventurous and rash political line. Some people say : Has anyone stated that the nature of imperialism has changed ? No one has made such a statement. But a question crops up : To recognize that imperialism has been relinquishing the war policy and carries on the policy of peace, that

it throws away all weapons and gives up all means of war, what else can it mean in *practice* and in *essence* if not that the nature of imperialism has changed ? There are many versions for this question. If some people conclude that facing the change in the balance of forces between the two camps in nuclear weapons, the imperialists consent to relinquish the war policy and throw away weapons, then others can hold that the monopoly bourgeoisie will never do it *of their own free will* but can be *compelled* to do it by a co-ordinated struggle of the socialist camp and the popular masses in the imperialist countries. The latter hold that only those who say that the imperialists willingly relinquish the war policy recognize that the nature of imperialism has changed, while those who claim that the imperialists are obliged to give up the war policy do not recognize it. The point at issue of the question whether or not the nature of imperialism has changed is : can imperialism relinquish the aggressive and war policy, but not whether or not it gives it up willy-nilly.

The Marxist-Leninists hold that the aggressive and bellicose nature of imperialism cannot change because it is determined by the imperialist economy. This economy gives birth to the basic policy of imperialism — the war policy. Lenin has stressed that violence is the fundamental tendency of imperialism. Nowadays, when the general crisis of capitalism has entered its third stage, when imperialism has been more and more weakened and must withdraw from one position after another before the storming offensive of the struggle and the revolutionary movement of the people of various countries and the oppressed peoples, this

tendency of imperialism to violence has not diminished but has intensified more than ever. Today imperialism considers the war policy as the most miraculous talisman to save it from extinction. When speaking of the fundamental policy of imperialism we mean the policy of a whole class—monopoly capitalism—and not that of some individuals. Today, the fundamental policy, the leading policy of monopoly capitalism, the ruling class of imperialist countries, is a policy of war and not of peace. We emphasize that this is the policy of a whole class, and not that of some imperialists. Therefore, imperialism is the source of war in the present era. And the main force of aggression and war is U.S. imperialism. Countless events in the last twenty years bear out this assertion. It is crystal clear that at present all the imperialist countries frenziedly engage in arms race; their economy is militarized to the utmost; their military budgets are the biggest never seen in peace time. It is clear enough that if after World War I and the end of the armed intervention of 14 imperialist and capitalist countries in the Soviet Union, there was a period of respite of many years before the breaking out of a relatively big-scale imperialist war of aggression, that against three North-Eastern provinces of China waged by the Japanese imperialists in 1931, immediately after World War II the imperialists' guns of aggression burst almost without cease up to now. In 18 years imperialism has waged over ten wars of aggression (limited war and "special war").

Is there, besides the war tendency, a tendency to peace within the bourgeoisie of the imperialist coun-

tries? Contradictions about the problem of war and peace, and even about that of tactics of the war policy, really exist within the bourgeoisie. We can and must take advantage of them in the struggle for world peace. The tendency to peace exists really. It is also true that this tendency is strengthened because of the appearance of nuclear weapons and the superiority of the Soviet Union in this domain. It remains to be seen whether this tendency is predominant in the policy of monopoly capitalism? No. It is only a tendency of the strata of non-monopoly capitalists and of some circles of monopoly capitalism having little interest in the arms race. These strata and circles cannot determine the policy of the imperialist countries because they are not the most influential in the economic and political fields. The fundamental, main and predominant tendency in the policy of monopoly capitalism is the war tendency. The fact that monopoly capitalism of the imperialist countries, in specified conditions and for its own interests, stands for the extending of economic relations to the socialist countries could not be considered as a tendency to peace; this is not the main and predominant tendency in the policy of this class.

After World War II the American monopoly bourgeoisie has become the ringleader of the aggressive and bellicose forces of imperialism. It is the U.S. imperialists who have been the first to indulge in the arms race and on the biggest scale, have set up thousands of military bases everywhere in the world, organized many aggressive military alliances, fostered

and backed the West German revanchists and Japanese militarists, waged a series of wars against the people of various countries... There is no ground to the assertion that the official representatives of the American monopoly bourgeoisie, such as Eisenhower, Kennedy, are eager for peace.

The 1960 Moscow Statement has clearly said: "War is a constant companion of capitalism"; "the aggressive nature of imperialism has not changed": "U.S. imperialism is the main force of aggression and war."

The appearance of nuclear weapons, and the loss of the monopoly and superiority in this domain suffered by the imperialist camp have really made many imperialists think of the untoward consequences of a world nuclear war madly kindled by them, and some of them have already recognized that a nuclear war against the socialist camp is equivalent to a suicide. But can one conclude therefrom that imperialism would relinquish the war policy? No. At the time the U.S. imperialists had the monopoly of nuclear weapons, they carried out the "brink of war" policy with the "mass retaliation", "mass suppression" military strategy, relied upon nuclear weapons feverishly to prepare for a world nuclear war aiming at annihilating the socialist camp, "repulsing communism", and quenching the revolutionary movement of the people of various countries and the oppressed peoples. However practice ever more proves that the aforesaid policy and strategy cannot serve their schemes as efficiently as they have expected. This policy and strategy cannot hinder the national-liberation movement in Asia,

Africa and Latin America successively to score great victories, the socialist camp to grow in strength, and the movement of struggle of the working class and the toiling people of the imperialist countries to develop soon after their monopoly of nuclear weapons was checked and their superiority in this sphere was lost to the Soviet Union. All these truths finally oblige them to recognize that a military strategy solely relied upon nuclear weapons in a world war would inevitably lead to an impasse. To get out of this situation the Kennedy government adopted a new military strategy, that of "flexible response", relying on both nuclear and conventional weapons, and three types of war: world war, limited war and "special war". This change of strategy does not mean that the U.S. imperialists relinquished the war policy, but proves on the contrary that they carry it on more actively. For this change proves that they try to win back the initiative from a defensive position; far from giving up their preparations for a world nuclear war because they are unable to launch it, they feverishly intensify the nuclear arms race with the foolish hope to win back superiority in these weapons in order to be able to wage a nuclear war without suffering any punishment; moreover, they prepare not only a nuclear war, but also — and actively — a world war with conventional weapons; they do not keep to a type of war only — the world war — but while actively preparing for it, they still find out means more actively to conduct the "special war" and the local war to serve their political aim.

Recently, U.S. imperialists have carried out the so-called "peace strategy", an ultra-Machiavellian scheme with a view to weakening and sabotaging the national-liberation movement and the anti-imperialist movement of the people of various countries, pushing forward neo-colonialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and creating a "peaceful evolution" aimed at restoring capitalism in the socialist countries. Is it a proof that the imperialists have relinquished the war policy in favour of the peace policy? No. The "peace policy" only aims at completing the war policy and at screening it. This is a double-faced scheme often applied by the imperialists. While they carry out the "peace strategy", the war policy remains their main policy. Representatives of imperialism such as Eisenhower and Kennedy, more often dilated on peace, peaceful co-existence, and disarmament. They declared that obstruction to peaceful co-existence and general and total disarmament comes from the socialist countries and not from theirs. They doubt the sincerity of the socialist countries concerning peaceful co-existence because, according to them, the latter do not "liberalize" national life (that is to abolish proletarian dictatorship), do not yet relinquish the "export of revolution", and "subversive activities", still have a plan for a surprise attack on imperialist countries, certain socialist countries are still adventurous and warlike, etc. These are only Machiavellian schemes aimed at supporting their war policy, paralysing the vigilance of the peoples, hoping to create favourable

conditions for the realization of their scheme to restore capitalism in the socialist countries, make the latter give up their international duty of helping the revolutionary struggle of the peoples, and sow discord among the socialist countries. It is crystal clear that while speaking of peace they actually push forward the war policy more than ever before.

It is also a groundless estimation to hold that in the future, when the socialist camp has huge superiority in material potential over the imperialist camp, the latter will relinquish its war policy. For if there is no revolution to annihilate imperialism, and if imperialism still maintains its rule on a scale similar to that of today, then despite the huge superiority of the socialist camp over the imperialist camp in material potential, the superiority acquired in fact by the realization of its construction, who can assure that the imperialists — subjective by nature — will not make a wrong estimation of their forces and a wrong expectation of the outcome of a war between the two camps, and will not venture to kindle a war? And, still another aspect of the problem: as long as they have a war potential which they consider as redoubtable, what guarantee is there that they will not use it in certain situations instead of willingly withdrawing from the arena of history? Let us not forget this either: who can fully assure that the imperialists consent to participate in the economic competition between the two camps until the end without using the war with a view to annihilating the socialist camp?

## POSSIBILITY OF PREVENTING A WORLD WAR

Is there contradiction to assert on the one hand that the nature of imperialism remains unchanged, and imperialism never relinquishes its aggressive and war policy, and on the other to say that it is possible to prevent a world war? Here we deal with the second prerequisite: the possibility of preventing a world war?

The Marxist-Leninists hold that the nature of imperialism remains unchanged, imperialism cannot relinquish its war policy, but today there is possibility of preventing a new world war because of the emergence of forces strong enough to smash the imperialists' war schemes, create countless difficulties for them in the carrying out of their war policy, and ultimately frustrate it. In other words, if it is possible to prevent a world war, it is not because imperialism has renounced its war policy, but because this policy is thwarted and cannot be applied. Imperialism's will of war is an obdurate will, an extremely powerful will inherent in the imperialist economy; to prevent war, we must have a strong force capable of smashing all schemes and plans of war born of this will. This force can be the force of the popular masses only. From time immemorial, the forces of war are always those of the ruling exploiting class; the forces opposing war are always those of the popular masses, and the latter while speaking of the peace they actually push forward, are always the biggest. When capitalism enters the imperialist stage, the forces of the popular masses

opposing imperialist wars grow with every passing day. But until World War II, being not sufficiently organized and having not struggled with all the required ardour, they were not powerful enough to smash the war plans of the old ruling exploiting class and imperialism; that is why in the end aggressive and unjust wars broke out, as was the case of the two world wars waged by the imperialists. The present situation is different: factors unknown until then have appeared on the international arena. Today the forces opposing imperialist wars, are still the forces of the masses but now they are organized and rise to struggle; and become powerful enough to smash the war plans of imperialism, hindering it from kindling a new world war.

What are these forces and how can they thwart the war plans of imperialism? They are the united forces of the socialist camp, the working class and the labouring people in the imperialist countries, the national-liberation movement and the peace and democratic movement in general. They have gathered for the sake of peace in a vast anti-imperialist front taking as its core the socialist camp, the working class and the labouring people in the imperialist countries and the national-liberation movement.

The forces of the socialist camp are also the forces of the masses, but they are entirely new in nature, having been made up by 1,000 million people who, from their position of subjugated individuals, have risen to the role of rulers. Besides the political strength which is the basic strength — that of the masses when they were subjugated individuals, but

now developed to a higher degree and renovated when they become the masters of society — the socialist camp still has the strength of its economy and national defence — built on the basis of political and economic strength — which were not in their possession when they were ruled. The effect of the socialist camp in the smashing of the imperialists' war plans is making itself felt mainly on the following aspects :

— The socialist camp has not only become a force capable of successfully coping with a new war madly kindled by the imperialists, but also to deal the imperialist camp decisive blows which will bury capitalism for ever. This makes the imperialists feel their preparations for a world war still unfit to protect them, and dare not wage a war against the socialist camp so far.

— With its correct line for the defence of peace, the socialist camp has become a centre of rally, inspiration and support for the working class, the toiling people and the peace-loving people all over the world, who are struggling resolutely and powerfully against the aggressive and war policy of imperialism.

With the two aforesaid effects, the socialist camp is the bulwark of world peace.

But we cannot proceed from the above-mentioned remark to conclude that only the might of the socialist camp suffices to break the war plans of imperialism. Although this might is a factor of prime importance for the defence of peace, it cannot, by itself, prevent the imperialists from intensifying their preparations for war, and, if they can strengthen their latent potential, they may kindle a war should they estimate out

of subjectivism or for other reasons that they can defeat the socialist camp. To directly thwart the war plans of imperialism and weaken their war potential, thus decreasing their possibility to kindle a war, can be successfully made only by the forces which lie in the very heart of the economy giving birth to their war policy. These forces must be the working class and the labouring people of the imperialist countries, the oppressed peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the peace-loving people throughout the world. By what means can they directly smash the imperialists' war plans ?

— By struggling against their war preparations, and by creating difficulties and obstacles for these preparations. For instance : struggles against the arms race, the increase of war budget, the production of nuclear weapons, the establishment and maintenance of military bases in foreign countries, etc.

— By daily struggling for economic interests and political rights, sowing confusion in the imperialists' rears, compelling them to face these struggles there, not leaving them a free hand to wage a world war ; at the same time to wear out their forces, put obstacles in their war preparations, and weaken their war potential, thus diminishing their possibility to provoke a war.

— By undertaking revolutions to wipe out imperialist domination wherever conditions permit. These revolutions foil the imperialists' war plans most efficaciously because they wipe out the economy giving birth to the war policy, weaken the imperialist system as a whole, and rapidly weaken its war potential, thus

restricting its possibilities to wage war. These last 20 years, Asia, Africa and Latin America are places where the revolutionary movement is the most seething and the most powerful and has won the greatest victories. Therefore, in this lapse of time the national-liberation movement is an extremely big and effective force for the defence of peace. The victories of the revolutions in China, Vietnam, Cuba, etc. have made great contributions to the failure of many war plans of the imperialists and their lackeys. That is why, in the struggle against a new world war and for the defence of peace, if it wants to play a decisive role in the development of human society, the socialist camp, while endeavouring to strengthen its forces in all domains, must have a correct political line, and a correct line for the defence of peace aimed at inspiring, mobilizing, organizing and supporting the people of various countries and the oppressed peoples in their struggle against imperialism, and its policy of aggression and war, and ultimately making revolution to wipe out imperialist domination wherever conditions permit.

#### LINE FOR THE DEFENCE OF PEACE

From the aforesaid analysis, one can draw the following conclusions regarding the correct line for the defence of peace :

1. As the aggressive and bellicose nature of imperialism cannot change and imperialism cannot

relinquish its war policy, as the danger of war originates from imperialism, first of all U.S. imperialism, it is necessary, for the defence of peace, resolutely and persistently to struggle against imperialism, against its aggressive and war policy. We must direct the spearhead of our struggle at the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys, ceaselessly unmask them and find every means to isolate them.

2. As the forces capable of foiling the war plans, and defeating the war policy of imperialism are the united forces of the socialist camp, the working class and the labouring people of the imperialist countries, of the national-liberation movement and the general movement for peace and democracy, it is necessary, for the defence of peace, to develop them and mainly to rely upon them, first of all on the key forces — the socialist camp, the working class and the labouring people of the imperialist countries and the national-liberation movement. Only in this way can we unite with other forces to set up a broad and powerful front against the aggressive and bellicose imperialists, chiefly the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys, with a view to defending world peace. We must also rely upon this basis to take advantage of the contradictions between the imperialist countries and the imperialist cliques for the benefit of peace.

3. As the forces of peace exert each a different effect on the smashing of the war plans of imperialism, it is of primary importance, for the defence of peace, to strengthen the forces of the socialist camp, to have a correct political line, and to bring it to the popular masses outside the socialist camp. To strengthen the

restricting its possibilities to wage war. These last 20 years, Asia, Africa and Latin America are places where the revolutionary movement is the most seething and the most powerful and has won the greatest victories. Therefore, in this lapse of time the national-liberation movement is an extremely big and effective force for the defence of peace. The victories of the revolutions in China, Vietnam, Cuba, etc. have made great contributions to the failure of many war plans of the imperialists and their lackeys. That is why, in the struggle against a new world war and for the defence of peace, if it wants to play a decisive role in the development of human society, the socialist camp, while endeavouring to strengthen its forces in all domains, must have a correct political line, and a correct line for the defence of peace aimed at inspiring, mobilizing, organizing and supporting the people of various countries and the oppressed peoples in their struggle against imperialism, and its policy of aggression and war, and ultimately making revolution to wipe out imperialist domination wherever conditions permit.

#### LINE FOR THE DEFENCE OF PEACE

From the aforesaid analysis, one can draw the following conclusions regarding the correct line for the defence of peace :

1. As the aggressive and bellicose nature of imperialism cannot change and imperialism cannot

relinquish its war policy, as the danger of war originates from imperialism, first of all U.S. imperialism, it is necessary, for the defence of peace, resolutely and persistently to struggle against imperialism, against its aggressive and war policy. We must direct the spearhead of our struggle at the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys, ceaselessly unmask them and find every means to isolate them.

2. As the forces capable of foiling the war plans, and defeating the war policy of imperialism are the united forces of the socialist camp, the working class and the labouring people of the imperialist countries, of the national-liberation movement and the general movement for peace and democracy, it is necessary, for the defence of peace, to develop them and mainly to rely upon them, first of all on the key forces — the socialist camp, the working class and the labouring people of the imperialist countries and the national-liberation movement. Only in this way can we unite with other forces to set up a broad and powerful front against the aggressive and bellicose imperialists, chiefly the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys, with a view to defending world peace. We must also rely upon this basis to take advantage of the contradictions between the imperialist countries and the imperialist cliques for the benefit of peace.

3. As the forces of peace exert each a different effect on the smashing of the war plans of imperialism, it is of primary importance, for the defence of peace, to strengthen the forces of the socialist camp, to have a correct political line, and to bring it to the popular masses outside the socialist camp. To strengthen the

forces of the socialist camp is first of all to consolidate and intensify the spiritual and political unity of the people in every socialist country, ceaselessly to raise their political consciousness, patriotism and proletarian internationalism, their profound hatred for imperialism and their readiness to combat, and make every sacrifice in order to defend the Fatherland when it is attacked by bellicose imperialists, unceasingly to raise the economic potential of each socialist country, ceaselessly intensify its national defence. And the possession of nuclear weapons by the two biggest socialist countries is a necessity as long as imperialism embarks on the arms race concerning these weapons. To strengthen the forces of the socialist camp is also to intensify the solidarity between the 13 brother socialist countries on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism and common task prescribed by the struggle against the common enemy.

Simultaneously with the strengthening of the forces of the socialist camp, we must attach a capital significance to the eagerness of the popular masses outside the socialist camp who actively struggle against the aggressive and bellicose policy of imperialism, and actively make revolution to wipe out imperialist domination, and win national liberation, democracy and socialism.

The line for the defence of peace that we have just pointed out is a line of class struggle, because the defence of peace against a world war is a class struggle against a given class — imperialist capitalism, first of all against U.S. imperialists and their puppet reactionary forces, and to win success in this

struggle we must mainly rely upon the forces of the masses. Stalin rightly said that peace would be maintained and consolidated if the people of various countries took up the safeguard of peace and defended it without cease. Such a line for the defence of peace is pointed out in the two Moscow Statements. The 1960 Moscow Statement wrote: "To fight for peace today means to maintain the greatest vigilance, indefatigably to lay bare the policy of the imperialists, to keep a watchful eye on the intrigues and manœuvres of the warmongers, arouse the righteous indignation of the peoples against those who are heading for war, organize the peace forces still better, continuously intensify mass actions for peace..." It also wrote: "... World war can be prevented by the joint efforts of the world socialist camp, the international working class, the national-liberation movement, all the countries opposing war and all peace-loving forces."

There is another line for the defence of peace, completely different from the aforesaid correct line. It has the following concrete contents:

1. Because the nature of imperialists has changed, the imperialists have relinquished and are relinquishing their war policy, and they will throw off their weapons, the main obstacle on their way is the distrust between them and the socialist countries, therefore the line for the defence of peace must centre round the creation of a reciprocal confidence and an all-round co-operation between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, chiefly between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. — the two big nuclear powers at the top of the two camps.

The creation of this confidence and all-round co-operation, will very likely bring about peaceful co-existence for a certain time, and thanks to it the socialist camp could, by its successes scored in the economic competition, absolutely surpass the imperialist camp. As a result, the most inveterate warmongers will renounce their war policy, thus will be suppressed the last obstacles on the path leading to a world without war.

2. To create a reciprocal confidence and an all-round co-operation between the two camps and the two big powers and consequently to defend world peace, a most efficient means would be to conduct negotiations, especially between the heads of the big powers. Only by so doing can we solve the international issues deciding the fate of mankind. In the era of nuclear weapons, the masses no longer play the decisive role for these weapons can annihilate them. Today a war is a one-man press button war. It can break out from an extremely fortuitous and trifling cause: for today it would be carried out by automatic weapons, and would no longer be the work of the army.

Another important means would be to compromise, make mutual concessions and even great sacrifices if necessary. Lenin said that to have peace, one must be ready to make concessions and the greatest sacrifices; and today more than ever this line has got a practical significance.

3. It would not be necessary nor advisable to oppose imperialism any longer, first of all U.S. imperialism.

The struggle against weapons, the general and complete disarmament would be the path leading to a lasting peace. For war and peace would have no longer a class character, and become a problem concerning mankind as a whole. Facing the threat of a nuclear war capable of annihilating the whole mankind, all men living on earth feel that they partake of it. The struggle against a nuclear war would be a problem capable of uniting all the classes in all countries.

With the appearance of nuclear weapons, the source of war no longer lies in imperialism, but in weapons, and war means. Consequently, at present the best means to prevent war is to deprive war of the means to carry it on.

Before the extreme seriousness of the danger of nuclear war, a conflagration would break out at any moment, which would annihilate the whole mankind, and to struggle against imperialism in these conditions would only worsen the situation, aggravate the cold war and the atmosphere of distrust; this would be a real danger, for it could lead to a hot war.

For imperialism has to be opposed not by curses but by concrete acts, by selfless labour. When the socialist camp already has its rockets and nuclear bombs in position of combat, the wisest means to struggle against imperialism would be to use sweet words to win over an ever greater number of people; to shout against imperialism would terrify, upset, keep the people away, and weaken the front for peace.

For to strive to extol the words of peace uttered by the imperialist ringleaders, would be a means to

encourage them firmly to advance on the path of peace, at the same time a tactics to drive them into an impasse, forcing them to live up to their good words, etc.

4. It would be necessary to oppose all kinds of war. A revolutionary civil war would be also a danger to be avoided for all wars would make the situation tense, and contribute to aggravate the cold war. A little spark could also lead to a world nuclear war. Just wars existed only when there were no other means to bring about social progress ; but in our era they exist no more as there have appeared other means which are more efficient and more human, such as the ideological struggle on the basis of economic competition.

Today a war would completely annihilate mankind, entirely wipe out the people of the countries attacked as well as the country which would attack first, therefore there would be no more distinction between just war and unjust one.

5. It would not be necessary and advisable to make revolution, first of all revolution by violence. For, when the atomic war threatens as gravely as at present, when human life is hanging by a hair, the problem to be solved first would be the liquidation of nuclear weapons. Only by liquidating them could mankind subsist. Life is the most precious thing to man. When there is not yet a definitive solution to the question whether human existence is ensured or not, such other questions as to whether the peoples live under the capitalist regime or accede to socialism

would be insignificant. If mankind was annihilated what would be the use of principles, what sense would there be in socialism and communism? For should one consider that the liquidation of imperialism by the revolution is the sine qua non condition to defend peace, one would recognize, in fact, that war is fatal, and would deny the possibility to prevent a world war, for this would mean there cannot be peace so long as imperialism is still in existence. And at one time one would show oneself negative, passive, powerless, and inclined to capitulate before imperialism in the question of war and peace. This is tantamount to recognizing that for lack of conditions to carry on the revolution, there would be no other means than to fold one's arms waiting for war ! Now the conditions to make revolution do not occur at any moment. To speak of revolution when there is not a revolutionary situation in the world would be adventurous and utopian.

6. The superiority in nuclear weapons enjoyed by one socialist country and its efforts to develop it would be a sufficient condition to discourage the imperialists, make them relinquish the war policy, accept the complete and general disarmament, a condition which would create a possibility for a co-operation between the two camps, and the two big powers at their top. That is why the solidarity of the socialist camp would be no longer an important factor. On the contrary, the disunion in the socialist camp, the rupture between a socialist country and another, and the fact that one tries to isolate the other, would be sometimes advantageous to peace, for such acts

would create confidence and possibilities for an all-round co-operation between the big states, owners of the most powerful nuclear weapons.

7. To carry out the aforesaid contents would be to realize peaceful co-existence. Today peaceful co-existence has an entirely new content as for its nature. The absence of war between countries is not yet peaceful co-existence, a state in which the countries would be determined to relinquish the war policy for ever, renounce violence, throw away weapons, use economic competition and ideological struggle to solve the fundamental problems of the era, enter into negotiations to settle the international issues, and carry out a close all-round co-operation between countries with a view to the progress of human society such as co-operation aimed at liquidating colonialism in all forms, helping the under-developed countries economically, etc.

Thus, this fundamental line to defend peace could be summed up as follows: peaceful co-existence, or in other words peaceful co-existence consolidated by complete and general disarmament.

#### IMPROVEMENT OF RELATIONS BETWEEN COUNTRIES OF THE TWO CAMPS

Can there be Marxist-Leninists opposing the improvement of relations between the socialist and capitalist countries, especially between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. ? Actually they are whole-heartedly longing

and unremittingly struggling for this improvement, regarding it as one of the aspects of the struggle for world peace. The difficulties to solve this problem do not rest with the socialist countries. If the relations between a number of socialist countries and many capitalist countries cannot be so far improved and normalized, for example between the U.S.A. and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, between the U.S.A. and People's China, between the U.S.A. and Cuba, etc. it is mainly due to the aggressive and bellicose policies toward to the socialist countries, pursued by the capitalist countries. Concerning the relations between the socialist and capitalist countries, especially between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A., the Marxist-Leninists are opposed only to the following viewpoints :

First, that co-operation would be possible between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union for the defence of peace, and that if that co-operation were realized, the danger of war could be removed because anyone who wants to start war would recoil immediately at the least warning of these two powers. This viewpoint is obviously erroneous because it regards the U.S.A., the enemy No. 1 of peace, as the champion No. 1 of peace, a pursuer of the common goal of defending peace like the socialist countries and the peace-loving peoples the world over while holding in contempt the role of the world people in the defence of peace.

The co-operation of the Soviet Union with the U.S.A. to fight the fascists in World War II cannot be taken as a proof of the possibility of concrete co-operation between them for peace at the present time. In World

War II, the contradictions between the imperialist countries, in practice more acute than those between the Soviet Union and the imperialist countries, pitted the imperialist countries against one another, hence the alliance of the U.S.A. and other imperialist countries with the Soviet Union to fight the German-Italian-Japanese fascist imperialist clique. While allying with the Soviet Union, the U.S.A. did not cease to pursue its own scheme, leaving no stone unturned to weaken the Soviet Union and eventually annihilate it. At present the situation is not the same ; moreover the U.S.A. has become the topmost imperialist, the centre of international reaction, the main bulwark of the aggressive and warlike forces, the enemy No. 1 of world peace. Hence there can be no peace through the co-operation with U.S. imperialism. Peace can become true only by means of joining all forces to oppose U.S. imperialism.

Second, that agreements between the heads of various countries, especially between the great powers, would solve the international issues determining the destiny of mankind. It is clear that this viewpoint stems from subjective idealism, because according to the tenets of historical materialism, the problems determining the destiny of mankind can be solved only through class struggles and revolutionary struggles waged by the masses of people and not through the agreements between individuals. If the peoples in all countries were to believe in it, they would renounce class struggles and revolutionary struggles and remain in passive expectation. More, this viewpoint decks U.S. imperialism with ideals and a historic role

which it has not, because, far from having a historic role in speeding up the development of society, U.S. imperialism is the main object of the struggle waged by the world people to solve the issues determining the destiny of mankind.

Third, that it would be possible to create a confidence between the socialist and capitalist camps by means of prettifying and extolling U.S. imperialism instead of opposing it and laying bare its face.

Some allege that however strongly we lay bare the face of imperialism, it cannot be wiped out and does not renounce its bellicose policy. They say that to enjoy peace, to oppose imperialism and finally wipe it out, we must have real forces, economic forces and modern weapons ; and these real forces cannot be created by means of cursing imperialism, but by working hard.

Here the problem is not that whether or not the socialist countries must endeavour to develop their economy and build up their national defence potential, and equip their armies with weapons, including nuclear weapons, in accordance with the requirements of modern military technique. The problem to be made clear is how imperialism should be exterminated, and what is to be done to smash its warlike schemes.

Is it true that the socialist camp needs only to have many and powerful nuclear weapons to make imperialism give up its warlike policies and weapons, and withdraw from the historical arena. To pin one's hope on this is a mere illusion.

It is true that the socialist camp needs only to surpass the capitalist camp in overall industrial and

agricultural production and in per capita output to make imperialism give up its warlike policies and weapons and withdraw of its own free will from the historical arena? This viewpoint is also an illusion, and in practice it denies revolution.

To have peace, the main thing is to rely on the struggle of the masses against imperialism and its aggressive and bellicose policies in order to frustrate the latter. Imperialism will be eliminated not by nuclear weapons but by the revolution put up by the masses. And this revolution does not wait until the socialist camp surpasses the capitalist camp in overall production and per capita output, to break out. The October Revolution has ushered in the period of collapse of imperialism. Since then conditions have been created for the peoples of various countries successively to make revolution, especially since World War II, these conditions have multiplied with every passing day for revolutions to break out and triumph.

To help the masses of people resolutely struggle against imperialism and its aggressive and warlike policies, and rise up to make revolution and eliminate it, we must lay bare its true face, especially that of U.S. imperialism, stir up the world people's hatred for its aggressive and warlike policies, and its domination in general.

Some people have gone so far as to say that the struggle against the imperialist bellicose policies consists mainly in always keeping ready for combat the socialist camp's rockets and nuclear weapons and that this is a condition sufficient to discourage imperialism. In their opinion once this is done, the wisest policy is

to use mild words in dealing with imperialism. This viewpoint is also entirely erroneous. Naturally the socialist camp is the bulwark of world peace but the might of the socialist camp alone is not sufficient to frustrate the warlike policies of imperialism. To this end, there must be a struggle put up by the broad masses of people outside the socialist camp. It is clear that the extolling of the U.S. imperialists' "good will for peace" only weakens that struggle because it makes the masses of people in all countries groundlessly pin their hopes on the imperialists' good will for peace. To weaken this struggle is tantamount to encourage the imperialists to intensify their preparations for war. Regarding the socialist countries, the national defence potential consists not only of rockets and nuclear weapons, but its determining factor is the morale of the people and army. The blustering propaganda for the U.S. imperialists' "good will for peace" only weakens the opposition to imperialism, and the revolutionary militancy of the people and army, and is tantamount to fundamentally weakening the national defence of the socialist camp, thus encouraging imperialism in its aggressive and bellicose schemes.

#### NEGOTIATIONS, COMPROMISES, CONCESSIONS, SACRIFICES

So far in the course of its struggle, the proletariat is used to negotiate with the bourgeoisie and other enemy classes to reach definite goals. However it

never regards negotiation as a unique or highest method of struggle, but only as the outcome of real struggle. To what extent this outcome can reach is a question resting with the state of real struggle. What cannot be reached in real struggle cannot be hoped for in negotiation.

Today in their struggle for peace, the Marxist-Leninists never refuse to negotiate with imperialism, but they do not regard negotiation as the highest and most effective method which by itself can solve various issues. They hold that only by relying on the struggle of the masses can negotiation come out successful, hence, the struggle of the masses should not be weakened for the sake of negotiation. It will be harmful to peace and negotiation will come to no success if the masses are made to believe too much in the effectiveness of the negotiation between the heads of states to the extent that they have illusions on it, passively wait for its outcome, and slacken their struggle against the imperialists' aggressive and warlike policies.

Some hold the view that today negotiation has become a method of decisive importance because there are only two roads to solve international issues: either to negotiate or to kindle a nuclear war. But such is not the reality. Since World War II imperialism has prepared for a nuclear war and simultaneously held negotiations, but have not used these means to solve the issues between them and the peoples in all countries for which purpose they have used local wars or "special wars" instead. On the people's side, they have had to wage a revolutionary struggle

to solve the issues between them and imperialism, some of which were solved through struggle and not negotiation, for example the Chinese people drove the U.S. imperialists out of the Chinese continent, others had gone through long-term struggles before being solved through negotiation, such as the withdrawal of French imperialism from Vietnam.

Some others say that today negotiation has become a method of decisive importance because it now relies on the balance of forces advantageous to the socialist camp, and that in conditions of the latter having supremacy in nuclear weapons, it is very possible that imperialism will accept negotiation for fear of being destroyed. The Marxist-Leninists esteem that in leading negotiation with the imperialists, it cannot be hoped that our menace of a nuclear war will compel them to make concessions because they are well aware that the socialist camp will never be the first to use nuclear weapons, and will never use nuclear war to force them into making concessions if they refuse to do so in negotiation. Therefore, to use the nuclear menace and on this pretext, to raise negotiation to the level of a solely Leninist method in our era, and to hold in contempt the struggle of the masses, thereby weakening this struggle, is in practice, not only an illusion but also a dangerous line.

In class struggles, compromises and mutual concessions are unavoidable. It is likewise in the struggle for peace. But Marxism-Leninism requires that a difference must be made between principled and unprincipled compromises.

If the danger of a nuclear war which would destroy all mankind is taken as a pretext to regard the preservation of life as the highest principle, and hence, any concession to imperialism is regarded as a principled compromise provided it helps check a nuclear war because it satisfies the highest principle which is to preserve the life of mankind, and is only a capitulation of life to death and not to anyone else..., in practice such a viewpoint has gone beyond the limit of principled compromises. This viewpoint is harmful to the fundamental and durable interests of revolution and in practice only encourages the imperialists "to take an ell once they see that they are given an inch" and to become ever more arrogant. In essence this is a viewpoint leading to class capitulation. Is it possible to invoke a number of Lenin's policies when he had to sign the Brest-Litovsk treaty, in order to plead for this viewpoint of unprincipled compromise? At that time the Soviet Union had just completed the October Revolution, its forces were very weak, the Soviet power not yet consolidated, hence it had to take advantage of the contradictions between the imperialist countries, sought ways and means at all costs to win time for the consolidation of the Soviet power, and preparation of forces to cope with the coming imperialist attacks. At that time Lenin's policy of exchanging a great concession for a temporary peace was the only correct principled policy because only by so doing could he then defend the fundamental and durable interests of revolution. The present situation

is altogether different. The socialist camp alone is powerful enough to cope victoriously with and return deadly blows to the imperialists if they frenziedly attack it. The movement of struggle of the peoples outside the socialist camp, is deep-going and more powerful than ever before. In this situation, it is wrong to copy exactly the policy Lenin had to apply when signing the Brest-Litovsk treaty. Is it possible to recall the directives Lenin gave afterwards to plead for the viewpoint of unprincipled compromise? It is true that in 1921, after defeating the foreign invaders and the traitors at home, Lenin said, "To maintain peace for which we had to pay such a high price, we are ready to make the greatest concession and sacrifices".\*

But for whose sake did Lenin make these concessions and sacrifices? For the sake of the peoples who had been dominated by the Tsar, and were given back independence by the Soviet power, and not for imperialism; Lenin also said that we are ready to make the greatest concessions and sacrifices, but not whatever concessions and sacrifices, and not indefinitely.

To say that Lenin's aforesaid directives mean that he advised the communists to be always ready to make the greatest concessions and sacrifices to imperialism for the sake of peace, is to distort his ideas.

---

\* LENIN : Ninth Congress of the Russian Soviet.

## NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND DISARMAMENT

Nuclear weapons have an unheard-of destructive force. If the imperialists were adventurous enough to kindle a nuclear war, it would cause untold sufferings to the world people.

The appearance of nuclear weapons and inter-continental ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear war heads, has brought about deep changes in military strategy and tactics. But has it deprived the most fundamental laws of war and peace of their effectiveness? It has not. Today the masses of people remain the determining factor in war. The more complex the military art, and the more destructive the weapons, the greater, and not the lesser, the role of man in war. For in the direction and use of various war means, however high the degree of mechanization and automation, etc., man remains in the end the maker and user of these means. For today it is not that man ceases to be a support in the preparation for, conducting of and gaining war; on the contrary he must be relied upon, manpower and wealth must be mobilized not in small quantity but to a degree higher than ever before, and the mobilization involves not only tens but hundreds of millions of people. Hence the view holding that today the masses play a negative or secondary role in the opposition to imperialist war and the frustration of imperialist schemes, is a wrong view contrary to reality.

For this reason, it is absurd and idealistic to hold that today an individual can start a war to eliminate all mankind. It is still more so as a class

will never give the right of its physical annihilation to a man when it knows that to start a nuclear war means to commit suicide.

Today the principle that war is the continuation of politics, and the principle on the just and unjust war still hold true. For these last twenty years the local or "special" aggressive wars kindled by the imperialists and the revolutionary wars and liberation wars carried on by the peoples of various countries have proved this reality. Theoretically speaking those who deny these principles have made at least one mistake which lies in their failure to realize that though there exist possibilities of preventing a world war, so long as imperialism exists, certainly there can break out aggressive and counter-revolutionary wars kindled by the imperialists, and liberation wars and revolutionary wars put up by the people.

For nearly 20 years now, the U.S. imperialists and their clique have brought into full play their propaganda machinery to sow among the peoples of various countries a psychology of terror with regard to nuclear weapons. Their perfidious scheme is to use the nuclear blackmail in an attempt to suppress the revolutionary militancy of the oppressed peoples and nations, and make the peoples of the socialist countries abandon their task of giving assistance to that struggle. The task of the Marxist-Leninists is to lay bare the nature of this nuclear blackmail, not to fear it and play into the imperialists' hand. It is true that the destructive power of nuclear weapons is appalling. But it is not that these weapons have no reverse, hence though the imperialists always brandish them

to menace other people, they cannot use them of their free will, and unleash them at any time. For, first they must think of the seething indignation of the world people against their abominable crime; second, they are not the only ones to have these weapons, they must think that they will be also attacked by these weapons; if they want to annihilate others, they will be annihilated too; third, their objective when kindling a war is to oppress and exploit other people, plunder the resources of other countries; if a nuclear war is kindled, the destructive power of nuclear weapons will prevent them from attaining their objectives.

The reality of the past 20 years has proved this truth. Even at the time when the U.S. imperialists had the monopoly and supremacy in nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them, though they did everything in their power to reel back communism, they were pushed back successively in China, Korea, Vietnam, they had to swallow their defeat without daring to use nuclear weapons. The factor which stays their hands is not as yet their fear of reprisals by the socialist camp's nuclear weapons but of the indignation of the world people which they had experienced when they dropped the first two nuclear bombs on Japan in World War II. It is precisely due to these reasons and afterwards due to the fact that the Soviet Union has beaten down their monopoly and supremacy in nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery, that as aforesaid the U.S. imperialists had to change their strategy. Also due to the above-mentioned reason, we believe that if the world people

continue their resolute and consistent struggle, they will be able to compel the imperialists to sign a pact completely banning the nuclear weapons. The road leading to this goal is still hard because at present the imperialist countries, instead of destroying nuclear weapons, are intensifying their production; however the complete ban of nuclear weapons is a real possibility.

Nevertheless, the serious danger of a nuclear war still persists; moreover, the peoples of various countries must think of another possibility: what would the situation be if the imperialists defying everything, adventurously start a nuclear war? It is clear that to avoid the havoc of a nuclear war, the world people have only one road: to make any sacrifices and resolutely to rise up and make revolution in order timely to eliminate imperialism. And in order to react timely in this eventuality, right now they must be ready; the struggle against the danger of a nuclear war must be carried on in a correct spirit so that the people may translate their hatred for the aggressive and bellicose imperialists into a firm determination to rise up and eliminate it when necessary.

The 1960 Moscow Statement pointed out clearly: "Should the imperialist maniacs start war, the peoples will sweep capitalism out of existence and bury it."

Obviously today the world peoples have all possibilities to destroy—and will certainly destroy—nuclear weapons. The allegations holding that today the masses are helpless because nuclear weapons will

destroy them, that mankind can be annihilated by nuclear weapons, are idealistic, extremely pessimistic and groundless ones. The allegations that no one would come out victorious of a modern war, are extremely dangerous defeatist ones. Can the allegations of that type raise the determination and militancy of the peoples of various countries, and of the armies and peoples of the socialist countries? And do they not in practice encourage the warlike ideas of the imperialists?

We are determined in our struggle to compel the imperialists to carry out disarmament and sign a pact completely banning nuclear weapons. Today as in the past, the Marxist-Leninists regard the disarmament slogan (in the sense of armament reduction) as a militant slogan against the aggressive and bellicose policies of the imperialists. The 1960 Moscow Statement wrote that it is necessary to carry on a struggle against the bellicose and aggressive forces for ever larger-scale disarmament, "strive perseveringly to achieve tangible results — the banning of the testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons, the abolition of military blocs and war bases on foreign soil and a substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments, all of which should pave the way to general disarmament. Through an active, determined struggle by the socialist and other peace-loving countries, by the international working class and the large masses in all countries, it is possible to isolate the aggressive circles, foil the arms race and war preparations, and force the imperialists into an agreement on general

disarmament." This deals with the struggle for disarmament, or in other terms, for general disarmament (also in the sense of armament reduction) which the Marxist-Leninists are carrying on together with the world people.

As for general disarmament, that is the problem of a world without weapons and army, it can be carried out only when imperialism is wiped out of the life of human society. As armies and weapons are tools essentially to maintain imperialist domination, especially in the present stage of general capitalist crisis, imperialism will never of its free will throw away all its weapons and disband its armies because it will never willingly withdraw from the historical arena. How should we understand the view holding that the world people will compel imperialism to throw away all its weapons and disband its armies? But let us pose the question: if the world people are strong enough to compel imperialism to do this, are they not strong enough to eliminate imperialism? And if they are already strong enough to eliminate imperialism, why don't they do this instead of only compelling imperialism to throw away weapons? Therefore, it is a groundless viewpoint to hold that there is no need of eliminating imperialism by revolution and that even while imperialism exists, complete and general disarmament can be carried out and a world without weapons and armies will come into existence. Moreover to make the world people pin all their hopes of peace, national independence, build-up of a national economy and socialism, etc., on the realization of complete and general disarmament is to lead them

onto a wrong path harmful to the struggle against aggressive and bellicose imperialism, and to the defence of peace.

It is also a wrong viewpoint when asking why the conventional weapons which are not so dangerous as nuclear weapons cannot be done away with if imperialism can be made to destroy nuclear weapons. As we have said, compared with conventional weapons, nuclear weapons are more effective in one respect: their destructive power; but at the same time they are less effective in the other: their utilization cannot serve the imperialist goal as effectively as conventional weapons. Therefore we have clearly pointed out the reason why the imperialists might be compelled to agree with the banning of the nuclear weapons while they refuse to destroy the conventional weapons.

While the imperialists are feverishly stepping up arms race — and arms race in nuclear weapons — the intensification by the socialist camp of its defence potential, including the conquest at all costs of the supremacy in nuclear weapons, is most necessary for its self-defence and the defence of world peace. The production of nuclear weapons by the socialist countries and their conquest at all costs of the supremacy in these weapons are a most necessary action which is however done reluctantly. For when the imperialist countries with the nuclear weapons in their possession, are threatening to destroy the socialist countries with these weapons, if the socialist camp does not have nuclear weapons and the supremacy in these weapons, the imperialists might adventurously kindle a war against the socialist camp. For this reason, our

Party has time and again declared that our Party and people are profoundly grateful to the Soviet Union people who have endured many sacrifices, to develop their wisdom and talent to deprive the capitalist camp of its monopoly and supremacy in nuclear weapons.

If the socialist countries are compelled to have nuclear weapons, it is to defend themselves and world peace, and to make the imperialists more heedful so that they dare not adventurously attack the socialist camp. Nuclear weapons in the hands of the socialist countries are for self-defence, the socialist countries will never be the first to use nuclear weapons. They use them only in absolute necessity to offer a counter-offensive against the imperialists if the latter frenziedly attack the socialist countries with nuclear weapons.

The Marxist-Leninists in the socialist countries never fear the imperialist nuclear blackmail, never carry out a line of unprincipled compromise with the imperialists for fear of that blackmail, and abandon their international tasks. At the same time they never allow themselves to resort to the nuclear blackmail, as the imperialists have done, not only is it impermissible for them to use the nuclear blackmail adventurously in order to bargain with the imperialists, but also they cannot allow themselves to tune with the allegation of the imperialists who use the nuclear blackmail to prevent the oppressed peoples in various countries and nations from waging a revolution against imperialism, and the peoples of the socialist countries from supporting this revolution.

It cannot be said that only the possession by the socialist camp of the supremacy in nuclear weapons is sufficient to discourage the bellicose imperialists, smash their war plan, and compel them to give up their warlike policy. Moreover, it is impossible to say that the possession by one socialist country alone, of nuclear weapons, is already a shield strong enough to protect the whole socialist camp against the attack of imperialists. It is still more so to say that the possession by one socialist country, of the nuclear weapons is sufficient to win peace without the necessity of the unity of the socialist camp.

With regard to a nuclear war, it is clear that the possession of nuclear weapons by two biggest countries of the socialist camp, will be effective in making the imperialist maniacs more heedful than when only one of them has these weapons. At present, there is not only the danger of a nuclear war, but also the danger of a big war between the two camps with conventional weapons. We must take into consideration this possibility: the imperialists will start a war with conventional weapons, and use nuclear weapons only as a blackmail, and if they do not use nuclear weapons, is there a reason for the socialist camp to use them? And in this eventuality, it is clear that the nuclear shield of a socialist country alone is not sufficient to stay the imperialists' hands. What make them thoughtful and cautious and prevents them from adventurously starting a war with conventional weapons against the socialist camp, is precisely the unity of the peoples and armies of the socialist camp as a whole. If this unity does not exist, the imperial-

ists feel that they are more encouraged. Therefore any action sabotaging the unity of the socialist camp will increase the danger of war.

## REVOLUTION AND PEACE

Here we do not deal with the whole problem of relation between revolutionary struggle and the struggle for peace; we only speak of the influence of the former on the latter. The Marxist-Leninists hold that revolutionary struggle and the struggle for peace are closely interrelated. This relation can be summed up in three aspects:

1. The struggle for peace is an anti-imperialist struggle in many respects, but on the upshot the problem whether peace can be maintained, whether it is possible to prevent imperialism from unleashing a new world war is basically decided by the balance of force in the world arena. Unceasingly to weaken the imperialist force of aggression and war and to strengthen the force of peace, is the most basic way to defend peace. That is why the *revolutionary movements* for national liberation in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the revolutionary struggles of peoples of other countries are the huge forces to weaken imperialism, hence *the huge forces to defend world peace*.

This has precisely been substantiated by the revolutionary struggle of our compatriots in South Vietnam. Since long the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen have frenziedly built South Vietnam into a military base to attack the socialist camp. They even

elaborated a plan to "march to the North", made their troops ready to attack the North of our country and threatened to bring the war to South-East Asia. However, from the time the revolutionary movement developed strongly in the South, their plan to "march to the North" was upset and they have been compelled to disperse their forces in order to cope with the situation in the South, and the revolutionary struggle of our compatriots there is directly effective in smashing the U.S. imperialists' plan of bringing the war to North Vietnam and South-East Asia and in defending peace in this region. Of course the imperialists and their henchmen have not relinquished their plan of carrying the war to the North, therefore our northern people must constantly heighten their vigilance.

If we recognize that the recent appearance of the possibility of preventing a new world war is due to the radical change in the balance of force in the world and this change is the outcome of anti-imperialist revolutions, it is clear that the triumph of these revolutions (including the revolutions leading to the establishment of the socialist camp) has created the possibility to defend world peace in our era. Today, the revolutions remain the most important factor to maintain and strengthen this possibility.

Naturally, to secure peace it is necessary to have a skilful tactics. But this tactics will be beneficial to peace only when it relies on the ever increasing strength of the forces fighting against imperialism and for peace and on the gradual decline of the force of aggression and war.

2. No possibility of preventing world war existed prior to World War II; the revolutionary movement of peoples of various countries was not so strong as it is today. That is why the watchword of Marxist-Leninists was to turn the unavoidable imperialist war into revolutionary civil war and in case the imperialists kindled war, to rouse the peoples of imperialist countries to turn their guns against the ruling class, seize power for the people and abolish the imperialists' rule, thereby putting an end to the war.

Today owing to the high tide of the revolutionary movement of peoples of various countries, the problem is different. Today there is great possibility to *make the revolution to overthrow imperialism and prevent in time a new world war* if ever it is unleashed by imperialism.

To say that today it is possible to prevent a new world war does not mean that the possibility of kindling a new world war and the threat of this war exists no more. Of course, with the intensification of the struggle for peace it is possible to reduce the threat of war and to consolidate peace; however, so long as imperialism exists on a certain scale, and still has a certain war potentiality, there cannot be complete guarantee that it will not provoke a new world war. That is why in case the ruling class of certain imperialist countries, riding roughshod over everything, is so daring as to ignite war, the only way to prevent war is that the peoples of these countries should not flinch from any sacrifice and should stand up resolutely and make the revolution to overthrow the imperialist ruling class before they would kindle

this war. Otherwise there is no other way to stop war. Such a situation requires of course, a preparation in normal time; the struggle for peace at present should be waged with a very resolute anti-imperialist revolutionary spirit.

3. The possibility to prevent a world war does not mean that the threat of this war can be definitely averted. Should the present struggle for peace not be developed to the extent that the threat of a world war can be definitely removed there will not be full guarantee that a new world war will not flare up and at present world peace cannot be regarded as a lasting one. Therefore, the path to defend peace at all costs is the path toward the definitive suppression of the threat of world war. Today conditions are available to attain this goal. This situation is different from that prior to World War II. What condition is required to ban definitively the threat of a world war? This condition was clearly mentioned in the Moscow Statement. We think that the condition to avert definitely world war cannot be the general and complete disarmament carried out by imperialism — because its nature cannot be changed and the imperialists are never willing to withdraw from the historical arena — but the non-existence of imperialist domination at least in the leading imperialist countries at present. This condition may be created only by the revolution overthrowing imperialism. This condition, formerly non-existent, has become now a real possibility precisely because since the end of World War II, the world has been witnessing a continuous high revolutionary upsurge of various peoples, especially of the

peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America. This movement has hammered and is hammering at imperialism from all sides; it has shattered great parts of the imperialists' rule; it has repelled imperialism gradually, defeated it piecemeal and is on the way to eliminate it once for all. For this reason, *the revolutionary struggle to overthrow imperialism is the only way leading to a lasting peace*. Therefore though the struggle for peace waged at present is mainly a democratic struggle, yet it is necessary and possible to develop it into the revolutions to overthrow imperialism where conditions are available.

As for suppressing definitively the social cause of all kinds of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism completely as pointed out in the Moscow Statement in 1960.

In a word, the triumph of the anti-imperialist revolutions has changed the balance of force in the world arena, thereby creating the possibility to prevent a new world war, and to defend world peace. The anti-imperialist revolution will be effective in increasing the possibility to defend peace and will be the huge force to defend peace. These revolutions will stop short the new world wars in time, if ever the imperialists attempt to unleash them. The revolutions continue to suppress the imperialist rule step by step, and will, *at a certain time*, create a new world situation free from the threat of world war. When imperialism is entirely wiped out by the revolution, all kinds of war will disappear from social life.

## PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE BETWEEN COUNTRIES WITH DIFFERENT POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SYSTEMS

The policy of peaceful co-existence was put forth by Lenin. The policy of peaceful co-existence of the socialist countries lies on two bases.

The *first basis* is co-existence, the inevitable co-existence between the socialist and the capitalist countries throughout a historical period, the period of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world-wide scale. Owing to the law of uneven development of proletarian revolution in different countries — the law discovered by Lenin — the proletarian revolution cannot triumph simultaneously in all countries at a time, but, at the beginning only in a few countries or in one country and continues to triumph in others; in the meantime the remaining countries are either capitalist or pre-capitalist. These remaining capitalist countries are not capable of annihilating the newly born socialist countries. Hence this co-existence appears as an indispensable objective reality, inevitable between countries with different political and social systems.

The *second basis* of the peaceful co-existence policy is the nature of the socialist system, which engenders the peaceful foreign policy of the socialist countries.

The imperialists are never willing to co-exist peacefully with the socialist countries. They seek every way and means to annihilate the socialist countries and only when all their means are exhausted without

yielding any positive result are they compelled to co-exist with the socialist countries. For this reason, in the course of history, the relation between the socialist and the capitalist countries bears in itself many states — from the state of total war to that of peaceful co-existence — and between these two states, there exist a great many intermediate states such as the states in which the imperialist countries ignite local armed conflicts, unleash commando raids to sabotage the socialist countries, indulge in subversive activities, run economic blockades and pursue a policy of non-recognition of the socialist countries. Formerly the Soviet Union faced the same state. It was the same with other socialist countries born after World War II.

The peaceful co-existence policy of the socialist countries is precisely to seek means to discard all other states and to create the state of peaceful co-existence between the socialist and the imperialist countries.

This policy is applied not only to the imperialist countries but also to the nationalist and the capitalist countries in general. Its content has been gradually developed in the practical conditions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries according to the change in the balance of force on the international arena. In the present world situation it is possible to co-exist peacefully under the following conditions :

— Implementation of the five principles of peaceful co-existence and the ten principles of the Bandung conference.

— Development of trade, cultural and scientific relations.

— Settlement of conflicts between nations through negotiations.

Only by a resolute and persevering struggle of the socialist camp, the working class and toiling people of imperialist countries, the national-liberation movement and other forces of peace against imperialism, to thwart all its schemes of annihilation and destruction of the socialist countries, are the imperialists compelled to agree to co-exist peacefully, which they never accept of their free will. Once peaceful co-existence was secured, a tireless struggle should be continued to smash all the imperialists' attempts and acts of sabotage in order to maintain the state of peaceful co-existence.

It is clear that the struggle for peaceful co-existence is but a part of the struggle for peace; it is clear that we cannot consider the whole policy on the defence of peace as only one part of the policy of peaceful co-existence, nor ascribe the whole foreign policy of the socialist countries to the peaceful co-existence policy because apart from peaceful co-existence with countries having differing political and social systems, the foreign policy of the socialist countries involves the mutual co-operation with and assistance to other socialist countries in a comradely spirit and the wholehearted support and help afforded to the movement for revolutionary struggle of the peoples and nations outside the socialist camp.

While grudgingly accepting the policy of peaceful co-existence of the socialist camp, the imperialists

never give up their policy of oppression, exploitation, aggression and war. That is why the policy of peaceful co-existence will turn into an impracticable policy if it contains such provisions as : both sides shall be resolved to give up all attempts at making war, and to throw away their weapons ; they shall carry out only economic competition and ideological struggle in a spirit of mutual confidence and all-round co-operation, and entirely suppress the cold war and world tension, etc. Moreover, it would be a greater illusion to think that a peaceful co-existence with such a content would possibly be reached through negotiations, and a much greater illusion still if peaceful co-existence is regarded as the fundamental road leading to a world without army, weapon and war or to socialism on a world-wide scale. As we have analysed it, such a peaceful co-existence policy stems from the erroneous prerequisites that imperialism has changed in nature and that, due to the emergence of nuclear weapon, it has relinquished its policy of war and aggression and adopted of its free will the peaceful co-existence policy.

Peaceful co-existence among the nations with differing systems and revolutionary struggles are related to one another. The role of revolutionary struggles is to weaken imperialism and compel it to scatter its forces to face the situation everywhere and not to concentrate them to oppose the socialist countries ; by their victories, revolutionary struggles strengthen the force of the socialist camp and, consequently create more favourable conditions for the struggle for peaceful co-existence. Conversely, the peaceful co-existence policy of the socialist countries paves the

way for the development of their force, contributes to expose the aggressive and warlike policy of imperialism, musters a great force against this policy, isolates imperialism further, thereby it is advantageous to the revolutionary struggle of the world's people. Therefore, parallel with the struggle for peaceful co-existence between the countries with differing political and social systems it is necessary to step up the revolutionary struggles of the world's people and oppressed nations. This is advantageous to the defence of world peace.

A correct policy on peaceful co-existence is a part of the struggle for peace. Conversely, an incorrect policy on peaceful co-existence not only fails to contribute actively to the struggle for peace but is harmful to it. This policy will not serve peace if it is given an unpractical content because it makes the masses forsake their correct goal to run after an illusion.

The "peaceful co-existence" policy will be harmful to peace if one believes that it can be materialized through negotiations and concessions between the heads of big powers without waging an anti-imperialist struggle, because this is to paralyse the people's will to carry out this struggle.

The "peaceful co-existence" policy will be harmful to peace if one thinks that peaceful co-existence does not imply political struggles but is a state in which economic competition and ideological struggle will become the decisive factor of class struggle on the international arena; if peaceful co-existence is understood as mutual confidence and all-round co-operation

between the big powers and considered as the unique and best means to solve every problem deciding the destiny of mankind, and as the highest form of class struggle in the world; if peaceful co-existence is considered as the foundation of the common line of the international communist movement; if it is furthermore considered as a policy imposed on the oppressed nations and classes in their relationship with imperialism; if all the successes scored by the world's people in their revolutionary struggle after World War II are groundlessly ascribed to one cause: peaceful co-existence; if it is considered as an opposition to all kinds of wars, etc.; this is because, in essence, the above-mentioned viewpoints aim at suppressing and opposing revolutionary struggle under the cloak of "peaceful co-existence".

"Peaceful co-existence" will be harmful to peace if it is regarded as the common line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries; if it is alleged that peaceful co-existence will enable the socialist countries to influence the evolution of the society, mainly by economic construction; if the most important conditions for peaceful co-existence is absolutely to forbid the assistance given to peoples of various countries to make the revolution, because this is to "export the revolution". The essence of these viewpoints is to demand the socialist countries to relinquish their international duty of helping correctly the movement for revolutionary struggle of the world's people in the name of peaceful co-existence.

## CONCLUSION

The peace policy of Marxism-Leninism is a positive policy which attacks unremittingly and weakens the aggressive and bellicose imperialists, first the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen and constantly strengthens the forces of peace. This is a sound policy to maintain peace, prevent a new world war and advance toward the complete suppression of the threat of a new world war.

The peace policy of modern revisionism weakens the forces fighting against aggressive and warlike imperialism, it encourages imperialism to step up war preparation. The modern revisionists are much afraid of war and long for peace, but objectively their policy will yield a result contrary to their expectation; this policy will not lead to peace but increase the threat of war.

Therefore, those who cherish peace and are interested in stepping up the struggle for peace, cannot take apart this struggle from the struggle against the dangerous peace policy upheld by modern revisionism.

## SOME VIEWPOINTS ON WAR AND PEACE

The problem of war and peace affects the fate of billions of people the world over. As the imperialists are frenziedly preparing for war, the peace of nations is now seriously threatened. Therefore the problem of war and peace becomes a burning topic of our time.

The communists cannot remain indifferent to this daily concern of the broad masses; in all countries they are keen on studying and discussing it to find it a solution. While they seriously and frankly exchange views on this subject, the modern revisionists seek to worm their way in to indulge in provocation and division, to lay a smokescreen around this problem, mingle black and white, turn the truth upside down, distort Marxism-Leninism and carry out propaganda in favour of revisionism. That is why it is necessary for the time being to recall the fundamental viewpoints of Marxism-Leninism on the problem of war and peace, apply them to the present world situation, clarify this problem and distinguish between black and white, and right and wrong.

## SOURCE AND CHARACTER OF WAR

War is a social phenomenon. Like other phenomena it has a beginning and an end. The founders of Marxism-Leninism clearly pointed out that war is a product of a society divided into classes. It is a historical phenomenon of society; it appears concurrently with the system of private ownership of means of production and the division of society into antagonistic classes. War depends on the mode of production and the class structure of society. The mode of production exerts a decisive influence on the method of conducting war. Only when antagonistic classes disappear from society will war disappear altogether. In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Marx and Engels said, "In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end.\*" The path of eradicating war is to wage revolution for the triumph of socialism and communism throughout the world.

War is an organized armed conflict between various social classes or various states to attain a certain political or economic aim. Having no class, no state, the primitive communist regime experienced no war. When it had disintegrated, the system of private ownership of means of production made its appearance

\*K. MARX and F. ENGELS, *Selected Works*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, Vol. I, p. 51.

as the result of division of labour in society and brought about the emergence of classes and the formation of a State apparatus to defend the interests of the ruling class. Together with the State, the army came into being. War became a regular function of the State which represented the interests of the exploiting class, and a means for the State to extend its sway and plunder the peoples of other countries.

With the emergence of capitalism, wars have expanded in size. The launching of aggressive wars against other countries to rob them of their raw materials and dirt-cheap manpower and turn them into consumption market is indispensable for the development of capitalism. In the period of imperialism, capitalism reaches its highest stage: the rule of the monopoly organizations and of finance capital is established, the export of capital is of utmost importance, the world is partitioned by international trusts, the capitalist powers have finished parcelling the world. Monopoly capitalism has sharpened the contradictions inherent in capitalism. The «young» imperialist countries which had just come to the fore, realized that most of the colonies had been taken up by the «old» imperialist countries. They could not refrain from claiming their share. Imperialism ushered in an era of fierce struggle between the imperialist countries to redivide the world. The «under-developed» nations torn by these countries were compelled to rise against imperialism. The peoples of imperialist countries who could no longer let themselves exploited and used as cannon fodder, also stood up and struggled against their rulers. That is why the period of

imperialism is the period in which wars take an ever larger scale unknown in history.

Wars draw their source from the social system having antagonistic classes in general, and capitalism and imperialism in particular. Where does war stem from? The following formula worked out by Lenin is quite clear on this subject: "War = a tremendously profitable thing = immediate and inevitable product of capitalism." The modern revisionists repudiate these Marxist-Leninist viewpoints and seek by all means to conceal the real source of war. They hold that it lies in weapons, especially nuclear weapons. Hence for them, to combat war, it is necessary to oppose the use of weapons, to throw away all kinds of weapons, and not to oppose imperialism and capitalism, and abolish the regime of exploitation of man by man. They maintain that the source of war is arms race. In the article "*War is not inevitable*", Tito wrote, "Experiences of the past show that all arms races inevitably lead to war."\* The strengthening of national defence by the socialist countries to defend themselves is also considered by the revisionists as "arms race", and therefore, as a source of war. They claim that the source of war is the formation of "blocs" in the world. In the same article, Tito wrote, "Blocs comprising many countries have been set up, hindering the implementation of the policy of co-existence and threatening the peace and independence of the peoples of various countries." The world

\* TITO: "War is not inevitable", Review *Current Problems of Socialism* published by the Yugoslav News Agency, № 52, 1959, p. 22.

socialist system comprising the peace-loving countries which have cast off the capitalist yoke is considered by the revisionists as one of these "blocs" and is thus a source of war. The nations which are divided by imperialism such as Vietnam, Korea and Germany, are also considered by the revisionists a source of war. In the above-mentioned article Tito said, "Among the delicate questions resulting from World War II, one must enumerate first of all the division of the peoples of Germany, Korea and Vietnam, which has created new permanent hotbeds of international conflicts." Each of these three countries is divided into two zones: one is occupied by the imperialists and the other, liberated, is now under socialist construction. The revisionists lump together the different social systems of these two zones and hold that the socialist countries such as the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, and the German Democratic Republic, are also "permanent hotbeds of international conflicts" and consequently a source of war. They also maintain that the fierce struggle put up by the oppressed peoples against the imperialists increases the danger of war. This is tantamount to saying that the source of war is the oppressed peoples. All these assertions of the modern revisionists are aimed at misleading the world's people in their search of the real source of war. Only by finding this source can correct measures be decided to oppose war and defend peace. If not, only erroneous measures would certainly come out and spoil this struggle. It is obvious that by advancing the above-mentioned arguments, the modern revisionists are playing the

role of clumsy advocates of the imperialists who are the instigators of so many murderous wars against the peoples of the world and are frantically preparing for a new world war with mass destruction means.

There are people who search the source of war not in the social system but in the brain of the leaders of bourgeois governments. They pretend that there would be peace if the government leaders of a given imperialist country were animated with a "good will", and war if they had an "ill will". Since long Lenin had dismissed the allegation to find the source of war and peace in these "ill will" and "good will". In his work *On the tasks of the proletariat in the present Revolution*, he wrote on World War I as follows: "The war is not a product of the evil will of rapacious capitalists although it is undoubtedly being fought only in their interests and they alone are being enriched by it. The war is a product of half a century of development of world capital and of its billions of threads and connections."\* Lenin pointed out in the same work, "What is required of us is the *ability* to explain to the masses that the social and political character of the war is determined not by the "good will" of individuals or groups, or even of nations, but by the position of the *class* which conducts the war, by the *class policy* of which the war is a continuation, by the *ties* of capital which is the dominant economic force in modern society, by the *imperialist character* of international capital."\*\*

---

\* LENIN, *Selected Works*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, Vol. II, part I.

\*\* LENIN, *Ibid*, Vol. II, part I, p. 34.

The Marxists resort to dialectical materialism and historical materialism to find out the source of war and to analyse its character, and reject the idealist method in this analysis. To find out the source and character of a war, it is necessary to study the (home and foreign) policies pursued by a ruling class or state before the war and leading to war. This ruling class with its state has its own political line to defend its interests. In peace time, it employs political, economic, ideological and diplomatic means to realize this line. Should these means be insufficient to reach its goal, it would resort to violence, to war. Therefore war is a violent means used by a class to pursue the political line it has followed in peace time. Class struggle exists in all society divided into antagonistic classes; the irreconcilable struggle between classes will lead to various kinds of war. War is a form of class struggle waged by force of arms. All class struggle has a political character. War, too. Marxism-Leninism has clearly pointed out the relation between politics and war. All war is closely linked to the political system which has started it.

In his *War and Revolution* Lenin pointed out, "War is the continuation of politics by other means. Any war is inseparably linked to the political system it stems from. It is the policy carried out long before the war by a given state, a given class within that state, which that class inevitably and unfailingly pursues in the course of war, by altering only the form of its action".\* In the study of a war, it is necessary to find

---

\* LENIN, *Collected Works*, Les Editions sociales, Paris, Vol. 24.

the specific conditions which have led to it, the classes which have prepared and waged it and the objective they want to attain. It is impossible to analyse the character of a war without establishing the relations which closely link this war to the political line followed in the past by the belligerent countries and their ruling class. No war is waged without a political goal. As there is no politics which stands above class, there is no supra-class war. Politics determines the character of a war; it fixes the concrete objective of military strategy. In a war, military strategy is based on political strategy and subordinated to it. Therefore, Lenin's thesis that "war is but the continuation of politics by other means" is perfectly correct.

The modern revisionists claim that today this famous view is superannuated. In a speech delivered at the U.N. 15th plenary session at the end of 1960, Tito said, "From now on the definition that war is the continuation of politics by other means is not complete". In this argument Tito's aim is to reject the political character, the class character of war. He wanted to mingle all kinds of war — just war with unjust war, aggressive and predatory war with war for self-defence, for national liberation.

It is regrettable that the above-mentioned argument advanced by Tito has exerted some influence over a number of comrades in some communist and workers' parties. Here and there, the communist and workers' press has carried articles dismissing the view that "war is the continuation of politics". To easily reject this viewpoint, Clausewitz's and not Lenin's name has been mentioned. The view is said to be advanced by

the Prussian military theorist, Clausewitz, and is no longer correct. It is true that this sentence was Clausewitz's and was repeated by Lenin who, at the same time, gave it a completely new class content. In his *War and Revolution* Lenin wrote, "People know the thought of Clausewitz, one of the famous authors who have studied the philosophy of the war and military history: 'War is the continuation of politics by other means'. This is the saying of a writer who had studied the history of wars and drawn philosophical lessons from it some time after the Napoleonic wars." In his book *Socialism and War*, after quoting Clausewitz, Lenin wrote, "That famous sentence is from Clausewitz, one of the authors who have the keenest knowledge of military science. The Marxists always take this thesis for their theoretical foundation to analyse a war; it is quite correct. It is precisely on the basis of this viewpoint that Marx and Engels studied various kinds of war"\* Lenin's approval of Clausewitz's viewpoint does not mean that the former entirely agreed with the latter on this point. In truth Lenin had a class standpoint which differed entirely from that of Clausewitz, a Prussian aristocratic thinker who separated politics from economics, thereby depriving politics of its class content. Clausewitz was not able to distinguish wars according to their class character. Lenin's conception that war is the continuation of politics by means of violence, is based on the analysis of the class character of politics; hence he analyses the class character of war, distinguishes the

---

\* LENIN, *Collected Works*, Les Editions sociales, Paris, Vol. 21.

wars according to their character and on this basis, takes a definite stand with regard to the different kinds of war. Lenin's view that "war is the continuation of politics" is entirely correct. It helps us analyse wars. If politics has an imperialistic character, that is if it upholds the interests of the imperialists who plunder and oppress the peoples of under-developed countries, then the war ignited by this politics is an imperialist war. If this politics has national liberation as objective that is if it champions the interests of the oppressed peoples, opposes the exploitation and oppression by the foreign imperialists, then the war waged as the consequence of this politics is a war for national liberation. So long as the society is divided into antagonistic classes and gives rise to class struggles, the possibility of war still exists and the above-mentioned view advanced by Lenin retains its value. In the *Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution* Lenin wrote, "From the theoretical point of view, it is a serious mistake to forget that any war is only the continuation of politics by other means." \* Up to now this view holds water. To say that it is now superannuated is to forsake Leninism.

#### JUST WAR AND UNJUST WAR, DEMOCRATIC PEACE AND ANTI-DEMOCRATIC PEACE

The communists do not oppose all kinds of war; nor do they approve all kinds of peace. In his article

---

\* LENIN, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, part 2.

*War and Revolution* Lenin said, "There are wars and wars... It is necessary to point out the historic conditions which lead to war, the classes which make it and the goal they pursue." In his report at the 8th Congress of the Russian Communist (Bolshevik) Party in March 1919, Lenin said: "We always say 'there are wars and wars'. We condemn *imperialist wars*, we do not oppose *wars in general*. The communists' attitude toward a war (or peace) depends on the nature of that war (or that peace). Whom does this war (or peace) benefit and what class' interests does it serve?" The communists study the question of war and peace from the class viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin said: "The proletarian outlook requires a clear analysis of the class content of war..." \* Marxism-Leninism hands out to us a guiding thread to analyse the chaotic phenomena in society; this thread is the theory on classes and class struggle. Lenin taught us that as long as we cannot distinguish the *interests* of one class from those of another through a word, a statement or a promise having a moral, religious, political or social character, we are but naive people who are deceived by ourselves or by others in matter of politics.

When studying and discussing the problem of war and peace, we cannot depart from the Marxist-Leninist class standpoint; otherwise we will commit the errors pointed out by Lenin nearly half a century ago. In his work *War and Revolution*, dealing with discussions on

---

\* LENIN, *Collected Works*, Les Editions sociales, Paris, Vol. 24.

war and peace at that time, he wrote, "It seems to me that the main thing that is usually forgotten in the question of war, which receives inadequate attention, the main reason why there is so much controversy and, I would say, futile, hopeless and aimless controversy, is that people forget the fundamental question of the class character of war ; why war breaks out ; the classes that wage it ; the historical and historico-economic conditions that gave rise to it". It is to be regretted that at present a number of communists still commit the mistakes pointed out by Lenin nearly fifty years ago. In the same work, Lenin wrote, "According to the Marxist viewpoint that is modern scientific socialism, the foremost problem for the socialists when discussing on how to assess a war and the necessary attitude toward it is to find out the purposes of the war and the classes that have prepared and conducted it." In the *Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* Lenin raised the class standpoint in the assessment of war as a "basic problem" and regarded it as the criterion of every socialist. He wrote : "The class character of the war, that is the fundamental question which confronts a socialist (if he is not a renegade)... Whoever departs from this view of war is not a socialist." \*

Basing itself on the class character of war, Marxism-Leninism draws a clear line between two kinds of war bearing diametrically opposed characters : *Just war and unjust war*. A just war is a war of liberation,

---

\* LENIN, *Selected Works*, English edition, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, Vol. II, part 2, p. 97.

not predatory in character. This war is waged by the working class, the peasantry and other sections of the toiling people of a country against the capitalists and landlords who rule this country. It is the war of an oppressed people against the foreign imperialists, the war for self-defence of one or many socialist countries against the armed invasion by one or many imperialist countries or other reactionary aggressors. An unjust war is a war having a predatory character. It is unleashed by the imperialists and other reactionaries to repress the uprisings of the people of their countries, to invade and enslave other nations and to invade the socialist countries. The differentiation between these two kinds of war is a problem of principle of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin wrote, "It is absolutely necessary to distinguish clearly imperialist wars which are aimed at disputing capitalist interests and strangling the smaller and weaker nations, from revolutionary wars for self-salvation against the counter-revolutionary capitalists and to overthrow their domination." \* At the meeting held on August 23, 1918, dealing with the attitude of the communists towards war, Lenin said, "All the wars that stem from the barbarous ambition of the kings, princes and capitalists are, in our view, criminal because they are detrimental to the labouring classes and amass huge profits for the ruling bourgeoisie. However there are

---

\* LENIN, *Collected Works*, Les Editions sociales, Paris, Vol. 33.

wars which must only be called just wars by the working class, that is wars for self-liberation from enslavement and oppression of the bourgeoisie. And these wars are necessary because we cannot liberate ourselves without struggling\*.

The attitude of the communists towards war differs completely from that of the bourgeois pacifists. The communists clearly see the close relations between war and the class struggle in their country. They maintain that if classes are not abolished to establish socialism it will be impossible to eliminate war. It is precisely in this meaning that they recognize the just and progressive character of revolutionary wars and the necessity to wage them. They do not lump all kinds of war together, but make a historical analysis of each war and show a clear-cut attitude toward it; they condemn all unjust, predatory and imperialist wars, they approve, support and, when necessary and when conditions permit, wage revolutionary wars. Lenin reminded us not to forget that in certain conditions, we do not avoid a revolutionary war. He wrote, "No revolutionary class can refuse a revolutionary war without tying itself to ridiculous pacifism."\*\* He trenchantly criticized those who oppose all kinds of war by raising the war question in general and abstract terms. He wrote, "Socialists cannot, without

---

\* LENIN, *Collected Works*, Les Editions sociales, Paris, Vol. 28.

\*\* LENIN, *Collected Works*, Les Editions sociales, Paris, Vol. 25.

ceasing to be socialists, be opposed to all war"\*.

He sharply criticized those who oppose civil wars, saying, "Civil wars are also wars. Whoever recognizes the class struggle cannot fail to recognize civil wars, which in every class society are the natural, and under certain conditions, inevitable continuation, development and intensification of the class struggle. All the great revolutions prove this. To repudiate civil war, or to forget about it, would mean sinking into extreme opportunism, and renouncing the socialist revolution."\*\*

At present there are comrades who think that the division of wars according to their class content as Lenin did is outmoded; they make no difference between just war and unjust war. "In our era," they say, "it is necessary to distinguish three kinds of war: world war, limited war and insurrectionary liberation war by the people". On what principle is this classification based? In this classification there are points which take into consideration the size of wars (world war, limited war), or the character of wars (insurrectionary liberation war by the people). To take the size of wars as principle to classify them and to take a stand toward the war is to divorce from the class viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism in the war problem. In a war of any size there are always two parties. In

---

\* LENIN, *Selected Works*, English edition, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, Vol. I, part. 2, p. 569.

\*\* LENIN, *Selected Works*, English edition, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, Vol. I, part. 2.

a war in which the two belligerents are reactionary, the communists must oppose them both. On the contrary, if one of them is progressive and the other reactionary, the communists must side with the progressive party and oppose the reactionary party. We cannot say indiscriminately that "the communists oppose energetically all world wars and limited wars". To examine a war without basing ourselves on its class content and its character, but on its size, is a serious mistake incompatible with the Marxist-Leninist outlook on wars.

Some one asserts that "today the character of war has changed". We don't know what kind of war is referred to here. Lenin criticized those who spoke of war in general and abstract terms. We do not agree with this abstract notion of war, but we listen patiently to their explanation as to why today war has changed its character. The reason given is the emergence of nuclear weapons. "Nuclear weapon", as someone says, "is a kind of weapon having an entirely new qualitative character and differing completely from all the previous kinds, and is capable of giving future wars an entirely new 'qualitative' character, and with the new character of the war, the principle that war is the continuation of politics no longer holds water and the differentiation between just war and unjust war has no more meaning."

Nuclear weapons appeared as early as 1945. But since then many wars have been kindled in the world (more than ten). Let us speak of some wars of recent date only. Is it possible that the appearance of

nuclear weapons blots out the difference between the just war waged by the Cuban people against the Batista dictatorial clique, a U.S. agent, and the unjust and predatory war unleashed by U.S. imperialism in South Vietnam?

The character of any war is determined by its class content. Only by changing it can the character of the war be changed. It is impossible to change the character of the war without changing the class which directs this war. In a talk at the Congress of the Petrograd branch of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour (Bolshevik) Party, Lenin said, "War is the continuation of the politics of a class. In order to alter the character of a war, it is necessary to replace the then ruling class by another." In April 1917, in his article entitled *Draft notes for written articles or Speeches on April thesis*, Lenin wrote, "The people can put an end to war or change its character by altering the *class character* of the government."\*

Some people hold that the war viewpoint based on class struggle is today superannuated. They advocate taking the means of waging war, that is weapons, as basis for the war theory of Marxism-Leninism, saying, "Rockets and nuclear weapons created in the midst of our century have changed our former viewpoint on war," and "Lenin's sentence that war is the continuation of politics by other means is correct only in the days prior to the appearance of atomic bombs ;

---

\* LENIN, *Collected Works*, Les Editions sociales Paris, Vol. 24.