

## WAR AND PEACE

[Following is the translation of an article by Hong Chuong in the Vietnamese-language periodical Hoc Tap (Studies), Hanoi, No 1, January 1964.]

The problem of war and peace is related to the fate of hundreds of millions of people in the world. Due to the frantic war preparations of the imperialists, the peace of nations is seriously threatened. Thus, the problem of war and peace has become a burning problem of the present era.

The problem of war and peace is the daily concern of the masses. Communists cannot remain indifferent over this problem. For this reason communists in all countries have paid attention to studying and discussing this problem and to finding a solution for it. While communists in all countries are sincerely and straightforwardly discussing this burning problem of the era, the modern revisionists -- represented by the Tito group -- are trying to infiltrate communist ranks to engage in provocative activities, sow discord, throw up a smokescreen around the problem, confuse black and white, distort the truth, slander Marxism-Leninism, and propagandize for revisionism.

Thus, it is a necessary task to recall at the present time the basic views of Marxism-Leninism on the problem of war and peace, to apply these views to the present world situation, to cast more light on the problem of war and peace, and to differentiate black from white and right from wrong.

### 1--Cause and Nature of War.

War is a social event. Like any other social event war has a beginning and an end. The founders of Marxism-Leninism pointed out that war is the product of a society with classes. War is a historic event of society. Its appearance coincided with the appearance of the system of private ownership of means of production and the division of society into antagonistic classes. War is subordinate to production methods and the class structure of society. Production methods exert a decisive influence on war methods. When classes have disappeared from human society, war will also disappear. In the communist manifesto Marx and Engels said: "Let us wipe out the exploitation of man by man; then the exploitation of one nation by another will also be eliminated."

"When contradictions among classes inside a nation disappears, the adverse relations among nations also disappear" (From the communist manifesto by Marx and Engels -- Hoc Tap). To eliminate war, the path to follow is to carry out the revolution and achieve the triumph of socialism and communism throughout the world. 50

War is an organized armed struggle among social classes or among states to achieve a certain political or economic objective. Under the original communist system when there were no classes or states, there was no war. When the original communist system disintegrated due to a distribution of labor in the society, the appearance of the system of private ownership of the means of production brought about the appearance of classes and the formation of a state machinery to protect the interests of the ruling classes. With the appearance of the state, the army also appeared. War became a regular mission of the state, represented the interests of the exploiting classes, and became an instrument for the state to enlarge its ruling power and pillage the peoples of other countries.

The birth of capitalism enlarged the size of war. An important condition for capitalist development is to wage war in order to conquer other countries, turn them into colonies, exploit their raw materials and manpower, and turn them into dumping grounds for their manufactured goods. During the imperialist era, capitalism reached its climax: The rule of monopolist organizations and financial capital was consolidated, the exportation of capital played the most important role, the partition of the world war achieved by international trusts, and capitalist countries completed the partition of all the land on earth.

Monopoly capitalism made the existing contradictions of capitalism more serious. The newly emerged "backward" imperialist countries realized that almost all colonies were in the hands of the "advanced" imperialists. They had to ask for their portion. Imperialism opened the era of fierce struggle among imperialist countries, the "less developed" nations rose up and struggled against imperialism. The peoples in imperialist countries, no longer able to endure exploitation and playing the role of a shield, also rose and struggled against their rulers. Thus, the imperialist era is an era of increasingly enlarged wars, the size of which had been previously unknown in history.

The origin of war is, generally speaking, a social system with antagonistic classes and, in particular, capitalism and imperialism. What is the cause of war? The answer to this question is in Lenin's formula: "War = very advantageous act = direct and inevitable product of capitalism" (As published).

Modern revisionists refute Marxist-Leninist views on the origin of war. They endeavor to conceal the true origin of war. They hold that the origin of war is weapons, especially nuclear weapons. That is why they state that, to oppose war, it is necessary to oppose weapons and throw away all weapons and not to oppose imperialism and capitalism and eliminate the system of exploitation of man by man. They maintain that the origin of war is the arms race. In an article titled "War Is Not Inevitable," Tito said: "Past experience show that all arms races inevitably lead to war." The fact that

socialist countries strengthen their national defense forces for self-defense purposes is also regarded by revisionists as "an arms race" and the origin of war.

They propagandize that the origin of war is the creation of "blocs" in the world. In the same article Tito said: "The creation of blocs composed of many countries has prevented the implementation of the coexistence policy and threatened the peace and independence of different nations and countries." The world socialist system, composed of peace-loving countries which have escaped the capitalist yoke, is also regarded by revisionists as one of these blocs and, according to them, an origin of war.

According to revisionists, the countries that are partitioned by the imperialists, such as Vietnam, Korea, and Germany, are also an origin of war. In the article "War Is Not Inevitable," Tito said: "One of the delicate problems stemming from World War II is, first of all, the partition of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, which have become new and permanent hotbeds of international conflict." These three countries are divided into two zones: while one zone is occupied by the imperialists, the other is liberated and its people are building socialism. Revisionists put in the same bag the two zones and their different social systems and hold that socialist countries such as the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and German Democratic Republic are "permanent hotbeds of international conflict" and consequently are the origin of war.

Modern revisionists also maintain that, because the oppressed rise up and struggle fiercely against the imperialists, this has increased the danger of war. Thus, according to them, the origin of war is the oppressed.

All these arguments of the modern revisionists are aimed at one goal: to divert the attention of the people of the world from the true origin of war. Only by discovering the true origin of war can people take the correct steps to oppose war and protect peace. If people cannot find the true origin of war, they will surely take the wrong measures, thus causing failure in the task of opposing war and protecting peace. It is clear that by using these arguments on the origin of war, modern revisionists are playing the role of a crooked lawyer in defending the imperialists, who have waged many wars to massacre the people of various countries and who are actively preparing for a new world war with mass destruction means.

A number of persons seek the origin of war in the social system, but in the minds of the leaders of bourgeois governments. If there is "good will" in the mind of the leader of a certain imperialist country, there will be peace; on the other hand, if there is "bad will" in his mind, there will be war. Long ago Lenin rejected the argument of finding the origin of war and peace in so-called "good will" and "bad will." In his book "On the Duties of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution," Lenin wrote as follows about World War I: "The war did not originate in the bad will of the greedy capitalists, although it is certain that war was waged to promote their interests and actually enriched them. The war that was waged was the result of the development of world capitalism for half a century and of its numerous relationships and ties."

In the same book Lenin pointed out: "What is necessary for us to do is to enlighten the masses, thus helping them to understand that the political and social nature of war is not decided by the 'good will' of individuals, communities, or even the people of different countries; it is decided by the position of the class that has waged the war, by the policies that this class is implementing--that is, the policies leading directly to war--and by the connections of capitalism--that is the ruling economic force of the present society, the imperialist character of international capitalism, and so forth."

Marxists use dialectical materialism and historic materialism to find the origin and analyze the nature of war. Marxists oppose the use of idealism in analyzing the origin and nature of war. In order to understand the origin and nature of a war, it is necessary to study the policies--internal and external--that the classes or states implemented before the war and that led to war. The ruling class and its government have a definite political line to follow to protect their interests. In peacetime they resort to political, economic, ideological, diplomatic, and other measures to carry out this political line. If these measures do not help them reach the set goals, they will resort to violence and war, thus, war is a violent measure that a certain class used to carry out its political line in peacetime.

In all societies with antagonistic classes there is class struggle. The relentless struggle of these classes leads to all sorts of wars. War is a form of class struggle: a struggle with weapons. All class struggles have a political character. War also has a political character. Marxism-Leninism points out the relationship between politics and war. All wars are closely connected with the political system that has launched the wars.

In his book "War and Revolution," Lenin pointed out: "War is a continuation of politics with other means. All wars are closely connected with the political system that has waged the war, that is, with the policies that a certain country and a certain class in this country implemented before the war and that this class will necessarily continue to implement during the war by changing the methods of application."

To understand a war, it is necessary to point out the concrete conditions that led to the war, the classes that prepared for and launched the war, and the goals pursued by these classes. One cannot analyze the nature of a war without pointing out the relations closely binding the war to the past political line of the countries participating in the war and their ruling classes. There are no wars without political goals. Since there are no classless politics, there are no classless wars. Politics determine the nature of war. Politics determine the concrete goals of military strategy and tactics. In wartime military strategy has political strategy as a base and depends on political strategy. Thus, Lenin's view that "War is a continuation of politics by other means" is completely correct.

Modern revisionists are of the opinion that, at present, this famous view of Lenin is outmoded. In a speech delivered toward the end of 1960

at the 15th session of the U.N. General Assembly, top revisionists Tito declared: "As of now, it is not sufficient to define war as the continuation of politics by other means." In setting forth this view, Tito tried to deny the political and class nature of war. He wanted to erase the lines between wars--just and unjust wars, wars of aggression and pillage and wars of self-defense and national liberation.

It is, however, regrettable that this view of Tito has influenced a number of comrades in a number of communist and worker parties. A number of communist and workers papers in a number of foreign countries have published articles rejecting the view that "War is the continuation of politics." In order to reject this view easily, they pretend to forget Lenin and spoke only of Clausewitz. They attributed this view to the Prussian military theoretician Clausewitz and said that the view is no longer correct. It is true that Clausewitz wrote such a sentence and that Lenin repeated Clausewitz's sentence. But Lenin added a completely new class content.

In his book "War and Revolution," Lenin said: "People know this view of Clausewitz, one of the famous authors who have studied the philosophy of war and military history: 'War is the continuation of politics by other means.' This is a saying by a writer who studied the history of wars and drew philosophic lessons from his study at a time after Napoleon's wars."

In his book "Socialism and War," Lenin said, after repeating Clausewitz's statement: "This famous sentence is from Clausewitz, one of the men who understood military science best. Marxists always regard this view as the theoretical base in analyzing each particular war. They are right. Marx and Engels had this view in mind when analyzing different wars."

Lenin approved of this view of Clausewitz. But this does not mean that, on this point, Lenin's view and Clausewitz's view are completely identical. In fact Lenin adopted a class standpoint which is completely different from that of Clausewitz, an aristocratic Prussian ideologist. Clausewitz detached politics from economics, thus depriving politics of its class content. Clausewitz was unable to classify wars according to their class content.

Here is Lenin's theory on war: War is the continuation of politics with violent means based on a determination of the class nature of politics; one must then base oneself on this analysis to determine the class nature of war, to classify wars into different categories according to their nature, and to determine the attitude to be adopted before wars of different natures.

Lenin's view that "War is the continuation of politics" is thoroughly correct. This view helps us analyze different wars. If politics has an imperialist character--that is, if politics defends the interests of the imperialists when pillaging and oppressing the peoples of less developed countries--war having this politics as its origin will be an imperialist war. If the politics have a national liberation character--that is, if they defend the interests of the oppressed against the exploitation and

oppression of foreign imperialists, a war having these politics as its origin will be a national liberation war.

Lenin's above-mentioned view is applicable as long as there are opposing classes in human society and class struggle--that is, there is the possibility of war breaking out. In "The Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution," Lenin said: "Theoretically it will be a grave error if we forget that any war is only a continuation of politics by other means." This view of Lenin's retains its value until the present. To say that this view of Lenin's is now outmoded is to reject Leninism.

## 2--Just and Unjust War, Democratic and Antidemocratic Peace

Communists are not opposed to all wars. They do not approve of every peace. In the article "War and Revolution," Lenin said: "There is war and war. It is necessary to determine the historic conditions that give rise to war, the classes that participate in war, and the goals pursued by these classes." In his report to the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist--Bolshevik--Party held in March 1919, Lenin said: "We always declare, "there is war and war." We condemn imperialist wars. We do not oppose war in general."

The communist attitude toward a war or a peace depends on the nature of this war or this peace and on the fact to whom or to what class this war or this peace is advantageous. Communists use the class viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism to study the problem of war and peace. "The proletarian viewpoint demands that the class nature of war be clearly analyzed..." (From Lenin's Complete Works published in French in Paris--Hoc Tap)

Marxism-Leninism supplies us with the key with which we can analyze all cases of trouble and disorder in society. This key is the theory on classes and class struggle. Lenin taught us that, as long as we are unable to distinguish the interests of one class from those of another class through statements or promises having a religious, moral, political or social character, we are forever innocent people who are deceived politically or who deceive themselves politically.

When studying and discussing the problem of war and peace, we must not detach ourselves from the class viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism. If we detach ourselves from the class viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism, we will fall into errors denounced by Lenin almost half a century ago. In his book "War and Revolution," in dealing with the debates on war and peace of his time, Lenin said: "In my opinion it seems that the most important points, the points that people usually forget in dealing with the problem of war, the points which people pay improper attention to, and the reasons why so many debates--which I regard as useless, empty, and objectiveless--have been launched have to do with the fundamental problem of the class nature of war, the causes of war, the classes' participation in war, and the historic and historico-economic conditions of war."

It is regrettable that, until now, a number of foreign communists still commit the errors denounced by Lenin almost 50 years ago. In the above-mentioned book, Lenin added: "According to the viewpoint of Marxism--that is, modern scientific socialism--the primary problems for socialists when evaluating a war and discussing an attitude toward the war are finding the objectives of the war and what classes have prepared for and guided it." In his book "Proletarian Revolution and the Traitor Kautsky," Lenin regarded the role of class viewpoint in the evaluation of war as a "fundamental problem," and the following as a guide for a socialist: "What is the class nature of war? This is the fundamental problems for all socialists, if they are not traitors...(Hoc Tap Ellipsis). Those who stray away from this viewpoint on war are not socialists."

Basing itself on the class content of war, Marxism-Leninism clearly distinguishes two kinds of wars with completely different natures--just and unjust wars. A just war is a war that has a character of liberation and does not have a character of pillage. It is a war waged by the working class, the peasantry, and other laboring people in a country against the ruling capitalists and landlords of the country. It is a war waged by an oppressed nation against foreign imperialists. It is a war of self-defense waged by one or several socialist countries against the armed aggression of one or several imperialist countries or other reactionary aggressors. Unjust war is a war having the character of pillage. It is a war waged by imperialists and other reactionaries to repress the uprisings of their people in their countries, to invade and enslave other nations, or to invade socialist countries.

The problem of distinguishing between just and unjust wars is a problem of Marxist-Leninist principle. Lenin said: "It is absolutely necessary to clearly distinguish the different imperialist wars which are aimed at dividing capitalist profits and at choking the revolutionary wars of small and weak nations which are aimed at liberating themselves from the yoke of the counter-revolutionary capitalists and overthrowing their rule." At the 23 August 1918 meeting when dealing with the communist attitude toward war, Lenin said: "According to us, all wars having their origin in the ambition, greediness, and cruelty of kings and capitalists are criminal because these wars are disastrous to the working class and bring huge profits to the ruling bourgeoisie. But there are wars that the working class must call the only just wars: These are the wars for self-liberation from the slavery and oppression of the capitalists. These wars are necessary because we cannot liberate ourselves without struggling."

The communist attitude toward war is completely different from that of bourgeois pacifists. Communists clearly realize the intimate relations between war and the class struggle in a country. Communists maintain that it is impossible to eliminate war without eliminating classes and achieving socialism. That is why communists recognize the just, progressive, and necessary character of revolutionary wars. Communists do not put all wars in the same bag, but undertake a concrete and historic analysis of each war and determine their attitude toward this war. Communists condemn unjust wars, wars of pillage, and imperialist wars. But communists approve, support, and wage--when need be and when the necessary conditions are fulfilled--revolutionary wars.

Lenin often reminded us "Not to forget that, under certain conditions, we do not avoid a revolutionary war." Lenin held that no revolutionary class can refuse to participate in a revolutionary war without falling into ridiculous pacifism." Lenin severely criticized those who raise the problem of war in a general and abstract manner in order to protest all wars. Lenin said: "Communists must not oppose all wars, unless they are no longer socialists."

Lenin also severely criticized people who oppose civil wars. Lenin said: "Civil wars are also wars. Those who recognize the class struggle cannot refuse to recognize civil wars, because in a society with classes, civil wars are a continuation, a development, and a fierce and, naturally, unavoidable form--under certain definite conditions--of the class struggle. This has been proved by all major revolutions. To reject or forget civil wars is to fall into extremist opportunism and reject socialist revolution."

In foreign countries at present, a number of comrades maintain that the classification of wars according to their class content, as Lenin did it, is outmoded. They do not classify wars as just or unjust wars. They say: "In our era it is necessary to divide wars into three groups: world war, regional war, and people's liberation war." On what principle do they base their viewpoint in making this classification of wars? In making this classification some people base their stand on the size of the wars--world war or regional--while others base their stand on the nature of the people's liberation movement and only see [that the way] to classify wars is to reject the class standpoint --on war.

In a war, no matter what its size, there are two camps. According to the interests of their class. One of these camps may be progressive and the other reactionary, or both may be reactionary (the case of two progressive parties fighting each other is rare. If they actually fight each other, it is easy to reconcile them through peaceful negotiations because between them there are no antagonistic contradictions--brackets as published). If both camps are reactionary, we will oppose this war. On the contrary, if one camp is progressive and the other reactionary, we will side with the progressive camp and oppose the reactionary camp.

A future world war [possibly] provoked by the activities of the war-like imperialists against the aspirations of the progressive mankind-- may occur between the imperialist and socialist camps. It may occur between imperialist countries. In the latter case, communists must oppose such a war. In the former case, on the other hand, they must join this war on the side of the socialist camp in order to defeat and exterminate the imperialist camp.

It is the same with regional wars. Thus, during the recent war in the Congo, the neocolonialists--the Americans--used the U.N. label to send troops to the Congo to fight the old colonialists--Belgians, Englishmen, and Frenchmen. This was an imperialist war on a small scale. Communists could not support such a war, but should oppose it. On the other hand, during the recent Korean war, the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys invaded the

Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Communists could not oppose this war, but had to support the Korean people in struggling against the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys.

In a war, if both camps are reactionary, communists will oppose both camps. On the other hand, if one camp is progressive and the other reactionary, communists will side with the progressive camp and oppose the reactionary camp. One must not say at random that "communists are resolute enemies of world wars and regional wars." It is a serious error, contrary to Marxist-Leninist Theory on war, not to base oneself on the class content and nature of war but, instead, to base oneself on the size of war to analyze war.

Some people assert that the nature of war has now changed. What sorts of war are they talking about? Lenin criticized those who speak of war in a general and abstract manner. We do not approve of the method of raising the problem of war in an abstract manner. But let us patiently listen to them to see how they explain that the nature of war has changed today. They say that the cause of war is the appearance of nuclear weapons. They say: "Nuclear weapons are a kind of weapon with completely new qualities. They are different from all the old weapons, thus making any future war a war of completely new qualities. Those who do not understand this point do not see the evolution that is taking place in the world."

If we must go back to the day nuclear weapons appeared we must go back to 1945. But since then there have been many wars--over ten wars. Let us speak only of a few recent wars. Did the appearance of nuclear weapons change the nature of the Cuban people's just war against the dictatorial Batista clique, lackeys of the Americans, and turn it into an unjust war? Did the appearance of nuclear weapons change the nature of the U.S. imperialists' unjust war of pillage in South Vietnam and turn it into a just war? It did not. People may argue that nuclear weapons were not used in these wars and that, because of this, the nature of these wars did not change. These wars were actually wars, even if nuclear weapons were not used. The above-mentioned comrades did not speak only about wars where nuclear weapons were used.

Now let us examine the case of war where nuclear weapons are used. Let us suppose that such a war actually broke out and that it broke out between two countries with nuclear weapons--because a country without nuclear weapons could not wage a nuclear war--for instance, between the USSR and the United States. Is it true in such a case the appearance of nuclear weapons would change the nature of the unjust war waged by the U.S. imperialists against the USSR and turn it into a just war, or that this would change the nature of the just war that the USSR should undertake in self-defense and turn it into an unjust war? It would not. The belief that the appearance of nuclear weapons has changed the nature of war is completely erroneous.

The nature of war is determined by the class content of the war. Only by changing the class content of a war can one change the nature of a war.

One cannot change the nature of a war without changing the class that directs this war. In a talk at a congress of the Petrograd chapter of the Russian Social Democratic Workers--Bolshevik--Party, Lenin said: "War is the continuation of the politics of a class. To change the nature of war, it is necessary to replace the ruling class with another class." In April 1917 in his article "Draft Ideas for Articles and Talks on the April Program," Lenin said: "The people can end a war or change the nature of a war only by changing the class nature of their government."

A number of communists in foreign countries hold that the theory of war based on class struggle is now outmoded. They advocate the necessity of basing Marxist-Leninist theory on the means of waging war, that is, on the weapons. They say: "Produced in our era, missiles and nuclear weapons have changed the old theories of war." They add: "Lenin's view that war is a continuation of politics by other means was correct when there were no nuclear weapons. With the appearance of the one-megaton nuclear bomb and intercontinental missiles it is no longer correct because nuclear war cannot be a means for achieving political objectives and because the price which would be paid is too high compared to the objectives which would be achieved." They also say: "Nuclear bombs do not respect any principle about classes. They kill everyone within the scope of their destructive power." Therefore, they ask for "A change in the concept of war," that is for an abandonment of Marxist-Leninist theory on war. They demand that the study of war be based on an analysis of weapons development and not of classes or class struggles.

When a bomb explodes, it will kill or wound everyone within the area of its destructive power. This is true of nuclear bombs as well as ordinary bombs. But why does a bomb explode? Who explodes it? Whose interests does this explosion serve? This is the main problem. It is not because a nuclear bomb replaces an ordinary bomb that the class nature and political objectives of war disappear. It is not because of the existence of nuclear bombs that, by nature, an aggressive war waged by the United States against the USSR-- if such a war broke out -- would be similar to a war by the USSR in self-defense against U. S. aggression.

The view that because of the existence of nuclear weapons it is unnecessary, when analyzing a war, to "respect the principles about classes" is erroneous. All wars waged by the reactionary imperialists, no matter whether they use nuclear or ordinary bombs, are unjust wars. Lenin said that imperialist war is neither more nor less than the continuation of bourgeois politics: "The ruling classes also decide politics in wartime. War is only politics from beginning to end. War is the pursuance of the same objectives by these classes with other means."

Communists use the class viewpoint to study the problem of war. Communists also use the class viewpoint to study the problem of peace. A peace which is a continuation of a war and which ends a war means only the drawing up of a statistical statement on this war and the witnessing of the change in the balance of forces actually resulting from this war. As war is the continuation of the politics of the ruling classes of the countries

participating in a war during the long prewar period, peace is also the continuation of the same politics with a new balance of forces brought about by the military activities of the war.

In a speech delivered at the first Russian Soviet Congress held in June 1917, Lenin unmasked the reactionaries' hypocritical views about a general and classless peace. Lenin said: "When you spoke of peace, you did not specify what kind of peace you wanted." Lenin opposed the kind of peace based on "maintaining the status quo." Lenin opposed "capitalist peace" and imperialist peace."

If the base of capitalist production relations does not change, an imperialist war can be ended only with an imperialist peace, a peace in which the imperialists are free to pillage and exploit the people within the countries and also colonial peoples. Such a peace was achieved by the Versailles Treaty ending World War I. Lenin called this peace the "peace of usurers, of pitiless exploiters, and of hangmen." Lenin wrote about this "peace": "What is the peace brought about by the Versailles Treaty? This is a strange peace, a peace of bandits. It turns tens of millions of persons, including a number of very civilized persons, into slaves. The Versailles Treaty is not a peace treaty. It is the conditions which the bandits, knives in hand, impose on their unarmed victims."

Communists oppose imperialist "peace" because this "peace" is harmful to the people, who do not want this "peace." Only bourgeois pacifists approve of this peace. Lenin said: "Ending a war in the pacifist way is utopian. People may end a war with an imperialist peace. But this peace is not wanted by the people."

The peace desired by the people is a democratic peace, a peace in which there is no partition of colonies and no enormous profits for the capitalist sharks. In his article "Is There A Path Leading to A Just Peace?" published in 1917, Lenin raised the question: Is there a path leading to peace in which there is no annexation or dividing of booty by the capitalist bandits? And Lenin answered: Yes, there is one, which is the revolution carried out by the workers against capitalists in all countries. Lenin pointed out: To maintain that a democratic peace may be achieved through an imperialist war is to deceive the people and paralyze their political awareness. Lenin said: "There cannot be a democratic peace without a series of revolutions."

Basing themselves on the Marxist-Leninist class viewpoint, communists distinguish two kinds of peace: democratic peace in which the laboring people's interests are guaranteed, and antidemocratic "peace" or imperialist "peace" in which the imperialists share interests and assign spheres of influence among themselves in order to exploit and oppress the laboring people and oppressed nations. Communists oppose antidemocratic "peace" and support democratic peace. This distinction between these two kinds of peace is an elementary and basic condition in the study of the problem of peace.

Communists oppose those who raise the problem of peace in a general and abstract manner and who do not specify to what classes this peace is advantageous. Lenin once criticized the socialists in the second international who propagandized for a "general peace" in order to serve as lackeys for the imperialists.

In his article "The Problem of Peace," Lenin said: "The slogan of peace may be put forth either with definite peace conditions or without any conditions, as is the case of a struggle carried out not for a definite peace but for a general peace. It is clear that in the latter case we are faced with a slogan which has no content, no significance, and is contrary to socialism. Everyone, without exception and including even the bloodthirsty Kitchener, Joffre, Hindenburg, and Nicholas, supported a general peace because each of them wanted to end the war: The main problem was in the fact that each of them put forth imperialistic peace conditions--that is, pillage and oppression of other peoples--that were advantageous to "their" peoples. The slogans which must be raised are aimed at explaining to the masses, through propaganda, the insolvable difference between socialism and capitalism--imperialism--and are not aimed at reconciling the two opposing classes and two opposing political systems by an appeal to unify things which are highly different."

If there is war within a country--that is, civil war--if there is war between one country and another--that is, "external war", according to Lenin in his article titled "Prophecy"--if there is war between many countries in the world--that is, World War--then there is also peace within each country, peace between one country and another, and world peace. It is due to the fact that aggressive war can only be waged by imperialist countries and that the socialist countries do not use war to "export revolutions" that a communist, in principle, oppose the provocation of war between one country and another as well as the waging of a world war. Basing himself upon the principle that the people have the right to determine their own affairs, a communist, in general, approves of peace between various countries and world peace. At the same time a communist admits that peoples subjected to aggression and oppression have the right to carry out war to drive the imperialist aggressors from their countries. With regard to the peace in each country, a communist considers that the nature of the peace in each country cannot be separated from the social system of that country. If a country is a capitalist or precapitalist country, the peace in that country is advantageous only to the ruling and exploiting clique and is disadvantageous to the laboring people. A communist admits that the laboring people in such a country have the right to carry out revolutionary war, including armed revolution--that is to carry out civil war--in order to destroy the capitalistic or precapitalistic peace, to overthrow the ruling and exploiting class, to seize power, and to establish a democratic peace or a socialistic peace that is advantageous to the people.

Lenin clearly pointed out that propaganda for peace not carried out simultaneously with an appeal to the masses to carry out revolution to topple the ruling and exploiting class only has the effect of sowing illusions and impairing the thinking of the workers class by causing it to be confident

in the "humanitarian" spirit of the bourgeoisie. Lenin wrote: "One of the forms which fool the workers class is pacifism and abstract propaganda about peace." Under the capitalist system, particularly in its imperialist phase, war is inevitable. But that does not mean that democratic socialists can deny the positive value of revolutionary wars... (Hoc Tap Ellipsis) or wars which are aimed at safeguarding the successes of the proletariat in its struggle against the bourgeoisie."

Lenin pointed out that anyone who desires a stable and democratic peace must approve of civil war against bourgeois governments and the bourgeoisie. Lenin also pointed out that those who are actually struggling for democratic peace are not those who repeat pacifist wishes but, instead, are those who are enthusiastically struggling against imperialist wars and imperialistic "peace" and who are appealing to the peoples to carry out revolutions to overthrow reactionary governments.

The modern revisionists raise the problem of peace in a general, abstract manner and without class content; they approve of all kinds of peace, including antidemocratic "peace" in which the imperialistic "peace"; the kinds of "peace" in which the imperialists share among themselves the blood and bones of the laboring people. They also raise the problem of war in a general and abstract manner. They oppose any kind of war, including revolutionary wars and national liberation wars.

The modern revisionists use metaphysical methods to put peace and war in opposition. They want to cover up the class nature of war and of peace. Any war whatsoever, as well as any peace, serves a definite class. War and peace are merely different tricks to carry out the politics of a class. Between war and peace, there exists not only a contradiction--they are different in the tricks used--but also a unanimity--they both serve the interests of a class. In the "Report on War and Peace" Lenin said: "History shows us that peace is a kind of repose for war, and war is a trick to achieve a peace which is a little better or worse."

In his article "For Bread and Peace," Lenin wrote: "If socialism is not successful, peace between capitalist countries is merely a cease-fire, a repose, a preparation for new mutual killings between peoples."

One does not know when the word peace came into existence in the languages of various peoples, but surely it did not appear until after the appearance of war in society. During the period of primitive communes there was no class, no war, and although people lived in peace, they did not know that it was peace. It was only after war occurred that there was a word indicating war and a word indicating peace, which is a social situation in which there is no war. In the future, when communism is totally successful in the world, when classes no longer exist, and, as a result, wars no longer occur and the nightmare of war gradually fades away in the memory of everyone, then the word peace will also disappear from the spoken language of peoples. Peace will become the daily way of living of everyone, and no one will mention the word peace any longer. Like war, peace is merely a historical category.

The struggle against war and for peace is only one facet of the class struggle in a society having classes. Lenin pointed out that the struggle against imperialist war can exist only if it is a struggle of the revolutionary classes against the ruling classes on a world scale. And eternal peace on earth can only be achieved simultaneously with the victory of socialism. "Socialism, and only socialism, can save mankind from wars and famine, which is the new grave of millions of people." (Lenin's Works: 1958, Volume 24, page 27--Hoc Tap Footnote)

But the path leading to socialism is a path full of difficulties and dangers, demanding great sacrifices and endurance. It is not a smooth path as dreamed by the pacifists. In the "Military Platform of the Proletarian Revolution," Lenin said: "The 'social' monks and opportunists are always ready to dream of achieving peaceful socialism in the future. But it is precisely this which distinguishes them from the revolutionary social democrats. They do not want to pay attention to and ponder the fierce class struggle and the class war for achieving this brilliant future."

It was Marx himself who inspired workers with the determination to engage in the fierce revolutionary struggle, including civil wars and protracted revolutionary wars, to advance toward socialism. In the article "Denunciation of the Trial of Communists in Cologne," Marx told workers: "You must endure 15, 20, or 50 years of civil wars and national wars in order not only to change the present relations, but also to change yourselves and make yourselves able to assume power."

Modern revisionists continually speak of horrible scenes of destruction caused by wars to frighten people and prevent them from rising up and struggling against imperialism. As far as destruction and horror are concerned, as long as imperialism exists, destruction and horror are caused by it. To weep before the scenes of horror and destruction caused by imperialism is but to admit one's lack of power. The problem raised is that it is necessary to wipe out imperialism in order to put an end to these scenes of destruction and horror. Revisionists also advise people of the world not to participate in revolutions and revolutionary wars so as not to create scenes of destruction and horror.

Long ago, Lenin rejected this view. In his "Letter to American Workers" published in August 1918, Lenin said: "During the revolutionary era, the class struggle in all countries usually takes the form of a civil war, and it is impossible to imagine a civil war without wicked destruction, terror, and restrictions on democratic forms in the interests of war." Lenin added: "The international imperialist bourgeoisie has killed 10 million persons and crippled 20 million others in its war which was launched to see, between the British and German sharks, who will rule the world. If our war--a war between the oppressed and exploited persons and their exploiters and oppressors--brings death to half a million or a million people, the bourgeoisie will say that the former sacrifice is just and the latter sacrifice is criminal."

In the article "Phophecy" written in 1918, Lenin said that there cannot be a great revolution without a civil war and that no true Marxist can conceive of the transition from capitalism to socialism without civil war and there cannot be civil war without destruction and horror. In the same article, Lenin said: "There is no arduous war without destruction. Civil war--a necessary and compatible condition of socialist revolution--cannot occur without destruction. To depart from revolution and socialism for fear of destruction is to admit one's lack of principles and is actually with the bourgeoisie."

Modern revisionists speak much about "the destruction of mankind" in case of nuclear war. A nuclear war, if it breaks out, will cause terrible damage to the people of the world. But it cannot exterminate mankind. The theory of the "destruction of mankind" is legendary and unscientific. It is thoroughly inconsistent with Marxism-Leninism. Human society develops according to objective rules. These rules do not depend on the subjective desires of men. According to the rules on the development of society, capitalism must give the way to socialism. Nuclear weapons cannot change this rule.

Some 80 years ago, in a foreword written in 1887 for a book by (Sigmund Boorhem-phonetic), Engels wrote on the results of a future world war after citing the horrors and destruction caused by this war: "A unique and absolutely certain result is general exhaustion and the creation of the necessary conditions for the final victory of the working class." In this foreword Engels bluntly said to bourgeois politicians: "War may temporarily drive us backward. It may seize a number of our positions, but if you free all your forces, which you later will be unable to control, you will finally face destruction--no matter what happens--and the victory of the proletariat will be achieved or be unavoidable."

Modern revisionists speak much of the horrors of war. But revolutionaries are not discouraged. In his article "European War and Socialism," Lenin said "What makes a socialist suffer the most is not the horrors of war...(Hoc Tap Ellipsis) but the horror of betrayal by socialist leaders...(Hoc Tap Ellipsis)."

More than anyone else, a communist suffers before the scenes of killing and destruction brought to the laboring people by imperialist war. A communist longs for peace so that the people will suffer less and less and not die. But the problem that is raised here is not the problem of the rules on the objective development of society. Destruction and death are not caused by us, but by capitalism. Faced with these scenes of destruction and death, we do not advise the people to cross their arms and wait for death or to beg for peace from the imperialists; we urge them to rise up and engage in revolutionary struggle and, when need be and when the conditions are fulfilled, to engage in revolutionary war against capitalism in order to save themselves.

Naturally, during revolutionary struggle in general and revolutionary war in particular, destruction and death are unavoidable.

But only by making these sacrifices can the people eliminate capitalism and liberate themselves forever from death and destruction caused by capitalism. We bluntly tell the people these things. We do not deceive them as the modern revisionists are doing.

### 3--We Advocate the Necessity of Protecting World Peace

The Vietnamese people love peace. For hundreds of years we were oppressed by the imperialists, but we did not wage any aggressive war against any country. Under French domination, we lived for years in peace, but this was a colonialist "peace," a "peace" of the patenotre treaty. Under this "peace" the imperialists oppressed our people, and our people were slaves to the imperialists. Under this "peace" the colonialists were free to massacre the unarmed Vietnamese people savagely.

Under French domination our people were dragged into war several times. During World War I, 100,000 Vietnamese men--51,000 were sent to the front to serve as shields and 49,000 worked in factories to produce weapons--were sent to France to participate in the war against the Germans. The French imperialists confiscated our people's money and wealth in enormous quantities to finance the anti-German war. During World War II hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese men were sent to France to serve as shields. Enormous quantities of the Vietnamese people's money and wealth were seized to finance the second war against the Germans. Moreover, during World War II our people also suffered damage caused by the wars between France and Thailand, between France and Japan, and between Japan and the United States.

Under French domination our people had "peace" and had war. But they were advantageous to the imperialists and harmful to our people. This "peace" was a colonialist peace. This war was an imperialist war. This was not our peace. This was not our war. This "peace" was an imperialist "peace." This was an imperialist war. Only after the success of the August Revolution--that is, after the seizure of power by our people--could we have our peace and war.

The peace that was established in our country after the August Revolution is a just and democratic peace. Under this peace our country is independent and our people free and happy. We are eager for this peace. Thus, to maintain this peace, we have entered into negotiations with the imperialists several times: the 6 March 1946 preliminary accord, the Dalat Conference, the Fontainebleau Conference, and the 14 September 1946 temporary accord. We have made major concessions with the view of maintaining peace.

As President Ho correctly declared on 20 December 1946 in "Appeal to the entire nation to participate in the Resistance": "We want peace. We have made concessions. But the more concessions we made, the farther the French have advanced because they are determined to conquer our country once more." The imperialist were stubborn. They never changed their

aggressive nature. Thus, we did not have means other than to resort to the national liberation war to oppose the aggressive war of the imperialists. All our people rose up and fought against the imperialists according to President Ho's appeal: "We would rather sacrifice everything than lose our country and become slaves."

The nationwide resistance began. Thanks to the August Revolution, we seized the right to protect our fatherland. Our resistance to save the country was our sacred war. It was a great revolutionary war. Many of our armymen sacrificed themselves in this war to protect the fatherland and the people. During this war we correctly carried out Lenin's instructions: "We are the protectors of the socialist fatherland," and "if they continue to stop us from engaging in peaceful labor, we will undertake war to save the country, and those who engage in adventures and pillaging will be exterminated to the last man."

Through our resistance to save our country we made a great contribution to the task of protecting world peace. During this resistance we positively carried out Lenin's policy on disarmament, which is to take weapons from the imperialists to equip our people. That is why we scored successes.

Revolutionary war is the locomotive of history. Those who take advantage of "peace" labor to curse revolutionary war--as the revisionists are doing--only reveal their betrayal of the revolution.

After gallantly undertaking the revolutionary war for years, we triumphed over the French imperialists and reestablished peace in our country. Peace was reestablished in our country after the Dien Bien Phu victory. The peace in our country since the Geneva Accords is a democratic peace under which national sovereignty, unity, territorial integrity, and our people's democratic freedoms are internationally recognized.

In the northern part of our country there is a socialist peace. In the southern part of our country, peace has created new conditions for our people to carry out the political struggle by peaceful means in order to complete the national democratic revolution. Frightened by the strong struggle movement of the South Vietnamese people, the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys have waged a "special war" in South Vietnam with the view of destroying this peace.

Our southern compatriots have had to resort to revolutionary war to oppose the counterrevolutionary war and have had to undertake a just war to oppose the unjust war of the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys. Meanwhile the southern people have continued to use fully the possibilities of carrying out political struggle through peaceful means when these possibilities appeared. The present liberation war of the southern people is aimed at establishing a democratic peace in South Vietnam under which national sovereignty is guaranteed, our people's democratic freedoms are respected, and our people can achieve national unification on the basis of independence and democracy.

Since its founding--1945--the DRV has lived for years encircled by imperialism; only after the success of the Chinese revolution and the birth of the CPR has our country gradually liberated itself from this encirclement. Since its birth, the DRV has been repeatedly attacked by the imperialists. Only after these attacks to destroy our country failed were the imperialists forced to let the DRV live.

Although our country has continually advocated the necessity of achieving peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems, so far the imperialist countries have refused to recognize our country and establish normal relations with us. In fact, between the DRV and imperialist countries, especially the United States, there is no peaceful coexistence. On the contrary, the U.S. imperialists are invading the southern part of our country and continually threatening the northern part of our country.

Socialist construction in North Vietnam and the present revolutionary struggle by our southern compatriots are two aspects of the great struggle of our people throughout the country, a struggle aimed at achieving and maintaining a lasting peace in our country and at contributing to achieving and maintaining a lasting peace in our country and at contributing to achieving and maintaining a lasting peace in Indochina, Southeast Asia, and the entire world.

- END -

CSO: 3520-D