

**Long Live Lenin and Stalin,
Condemn the Modern Revisionists,
Resume the Proletarian Revolution**

**By Armando Liwanag
Chairman, Central Committee
Communist Party of the Philippines
8 November 1996**

Message and Contribution of the Communist Party of the Philippines to the Conference of the International Committee for the Restoration of the Soviet Union and the International Conference for the Formation of the Modern Communist Doctrine

In the spirit of proletarian internationalism, we the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) leading the New People's Army (NPA), the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP) and other revolutionary forces of the Filipino people convey our warmest comradely greetings of solidarity to all participants of your conference on "Class Analysis in the Modern Communist Movement" on November 8 and 9 in Moscow.

We thank the joint organizers, the International Committee for the Restoration of the Soviet Union (ICRSU) and the International Conference for the Formation of the Modern Communist Doctrine (ICFMCD), for inviting us to this conference. We join you in celebrating the 79th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and in renewing our common resolve to carry forward the historic mission of the working class in waging the class struggle for socialism until imperialism is defeated on a global scale and communism is attained.

We are pleased to know that this conference is the result and continuation of the 1994 international seminar of the ICRSU on

"Stalin Today", which upheld Comrade Joseph Stalin as a great Marxist-Leninist and repudiated the modern revisionists. We are interested in getting copies of the most significant papers of the seminar in English translation.

We agree with you that the objective conditions are favorable for making revolution in Russia and other parts of the former Soviet Union. We are glad that large sections of the working class are moving towards militant positions and that you are striving to clear the path for the formation of a genuine Marxist-Leninist party.

Following the bureaucrat monopoly capitalists' thirty-five years of revisionist rule and disguised capitalist restoration, the destruction of the Soviet Union and undisguised restoration of capitalism since 1991 have brought about far more intolerable suffering to the proletariat and people in Russia and the former Soviet Union than ever before.

The undisguised bureaucrat monopoly capitalists have continued to use their public office for private gain. In combination with their private collaborators, including Western monopoly capitalists, the domestic businessmen and criminal syndicates, they have privatized public assets and entire lines of economic activity. They have drastically reduced, chopped up or closed down production in entire enterprises and have thrown out of work huge numbers of workers and thereby further worsened the oppression and exploitation of the proletariat and the people.

As a result of the ever worsening conditions of oppression and exploitation, the anticommunist slogans of bourgeois nationalism, neoliberalism, social democracy and religion, mouthed by the big bourgeoisie and by their ideological and political subalterns, have been rapidly discredited among the proletariat and people. The point now is to reaffirm Marxism-Leninism and socialism—to reassert the legacy of Lenin and Stalin and overcome four decades

of imperialist, revisionist and reactionary misrepresentation of socialism.

Defend Lenin and Stalin

The revisionist ruling cliques, from Khrushchov through the long period of Brezhnev to Gorbachov, restored capitalism by negating Stalin, his principles and his work. They stood for bureaucrat monopoly capitalism against socialism.

To account for the degradation of the Soviet Union from a socialist state to an antisocialist one under the revisionist ruling cliques, we must grasp the internal factors before we proceed to the external ones. We must grasp materialist dialectics and apply the law of contradiction. Otherwise, outward appearances in the superpower rivalry of the Soviet Union and the United States in the Cold War can lead to wrong conclusions regarding the nature of the Brezhnev regime.

The most clever forms of revisionism and opportunism persist. These are Brezhnevism and neo-Brezhnevism which pay some lip service to Lenin and Stalin but in fact continue to undermine and confuse basic Marxist-Leninist teachings in philosophy, political economy and social science. In the main and in essence, the Brezhnevites and neo-Brezhnevites misrepresent the anti-Stalin Brezhnev as a faithful descendant of Stalin.

Khrushchov, the initial chieftain of revisionism in power, and Gorbachov, the ultimate revisionist destroyer of the Soviet Union, were, of course, the most blatant anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist rulers of the Soviet Union, with their vicious and vociferous total negation of Stalin and their ill-disguised efforts at restoring capitalism. In the case of these two revisionist scoundrels, it is so clear that they used the attacks on Stalin in order to attack Marxism-Leninism and socialism.

Brezhnev had the longest record of revisionism and capitalist restoration. His "new economic system" entrenched, empowered and enriched the bureaucrat monopoly capitalists and the criminal syndicates and restored capitalism far more than Khrushchov had done. With a genuine Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method, we should be able to cut through the phrasemongering of Brezhnev, Suslov and Kosygin and their current descendants.

In addition to allowing the new bourgeoisie to loot the social wealth, Brezhnev was responsible for wasting tremendous amounts of the surplus product by rushing headlong into the arms race and foreign adventures. In the pursuit of social-imperialism, his regime competed and colluded with US imperialism in the practice of neocolonialism.

In the past, only the steadfast Marxist-Leninists and loyal followers of Lenin and Stalin could promptly see through the shallow phrasemongering of the Brezhnev ruling clique. When the stagnation and corruption, which had been brought about by bureaucrat monopoly capitalism, came to the fore in the late '70s, the new bourgeoisie could capitalize on these as the "sins of socialism" because the bourgeois ideology of modern revisionism had succeeded in misrepresenting itself as Marxism-Leninism and had been able to misrepresent bureaucrat monopoly capitalism as socialism.

Today, the full track record and consequences of the Brezhnevite line are exposed as inimical to the interest of the proletariat and the people. But the imperialists and the revisionists ceaselessly help each other out in falsely claiming that the Brezhnev regime was socialist. Thus, the genuine communists of today are required to clarify both the real antisocialist record of Brezhnev and the misuse of the term socialism.

With the support of the multilayered new bourgeoisie in the state, party, economy and culture, the bureaucrat monopoly capitalists overthrew the proletariat from state power in 1956 and,

from one revisionist regime to another, proceeded to further subordinate the proletariat. They obscured their counterrevolutionary policies and acts by usurping the name of Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the name of socialism as well as by retaining the formal public ownership of the principal means of production and some vestigial social and cultural provisions.

Internationally, Soviet contention with the stronger superpower, US imperialism, obscured the social-imperialist character of the Soviet modern revisionists. Such contention obliged the Soviet Union from time to time to put itself on the side of revolutionary movements abroad as well as on the side of counterrevolutionary movements and regimes. Originally, the US launched the Cold War against socialism and the national liberation movements. But from 1956 onward, the Cold War became increasingly characterized by the contention and collusion of US monopoly capitalism and Soviet bureaucrat monopoly capitalism at the expense of the world proletariat and people.

Before Gorbachov could disorganize and destroy the Soviet Union, Brezhnev in his own extended period of time had already severely damaged the social well-being of the Soviet proletariat and people, unwittingly undermined the base of Soviet social-imperialism and prepared the way for Gorbachovite treason in the following manner:

1. The new bourgeoisie (the bureaucrat monopoly capitalists, the bourgeoisie in military production and armed forces and the criminal syndicates) were engaged in unofficial private appropriation of a large part of the social wealth created by the working people, and developed a strong appetite for high-grade consumer goods from the West and the hard currency for acquiring these.

2. In science and technology, research and development in the Soviet Union were directed towards military production, the arms race and space exploration at the expense of civil production. Thus the renovation and expansion of civil production were neglected.

The military expenditures gobbled up a great part of the Soviet state budget.

3. The Soviet Union became dependent on the export of weapons, oil and other raw materials to earn hard currency from the world capitalist market for the importation of high-grade consumer goods for the new bourgeoisie and necessities like wheat. Foreign trade transactions involved corruption and private stashing away of foreign exchange earnings. The US-led alliance of traditional capitalist powers assigned West Germany the task of getting the revisionist regimes of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe hooked to Western foreign loans and manufactured supplies.

4. The US tightened the noose around the neck of Soviet social-imperialism by promoting a global overproduction of oil and other raw materials since the '70s and by instigating "people's wars in reverse" driven by nationalist, tribalist and religious motivations in the neocolonies of Soviet social-imperialism, as in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia and so on. The neocolonies lost the means to pay for Soviet supplies and became unprofitable.

It is fine that by upholding, defending and promoting the proletarian-socialist line of Stalin the papers of the seminar "Stalin Today" have inspired the formation of a number of organizations that advocate Marxist-Leninist principles in theory and practice and expose revisionism, especially in the form of Brezhnevism and neo-Brezhnevism. It is also fine that the papers have been widely disseminated in Russia and other parts of the former Soviet Union, if such papers can promote the criticism and repudiation of Brezhnevism and Neo-Brezhnevism. The papers should be translated into other major languages for study by dedicated Marxist-Leninists and the working class in various countries.

It is of crucial importance for the Marxist-Leninists and the working class movement not only in Russia or the former Soviet Union but also throughout the world to make a comprehensive and

profound criticism and condemnation of the full range of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union, from 1956 onwards.

The imperialist ideologues and publicists have falsely described the long Brezhnev period as neo-Stalinist simply because it recentralized the planning ministries and the industries that Khrushchov had decentralized to breach and fracture the socialist work of Stalin. To this day, they continue to sum up all the revisionist regimes in the Soviet Union as Stalinist.

But the worst of the misinterpreters of Soviet history in the world today are some neorevisionists who seek to mislead the working class movement by proclaiming themselves as staunch defenders of Stalin but self-contradictorily defending Brezhnev as a Marxist-Leninist and builder of real socialism. They obscure the fact that he was the longest-reigning, most clever and most effective anti-Stalin destroyer of socialism in Soviet history. They also get out of the track of Soviet history to collide Stalin and Mao, misrepresent Mao as the complete opposite of Stalin and defend the anti-Stalin Brezhnev.

It is completely absurd to contrapose and collide Stalin and Mao, each of whom made great contributions to the communist cause and fought to advance socialism on the scale of their respective countries; and fail to contrapose the entire Lenin-Stalin period to the entire period of modern revisionism in Soviet history for the purpose of passing off Brezhnev as a Marxist-Leninist and as a real socialist. Mao had the advantage of learning from the theory and practice of Lenin and Stalin in building socialism and understanding the origins and development of modern revisionism. He was therefore in a position to defend Lenin and Stalin and combat modern revisionism.

Soviet modern revisionism started to exert strong influence on the Communist Party of China (CPC) and the Chinese revolution as soon as Khrushchov succeeded in overthrowing the proletariat in the Soviet Union in 1956. The initial response of the Political

Bureau of the CPC in April 1956 to Khrushchov's February 1956 speech, which totally negated Stalin, was to concede that the Soviet Party knew best its own history and situation and concur partially with the anti-Stalin charge of "personality cult" and at the same time opposed the total negation of Stalin and regarded him on the whole as a great Marxist-Leninist, with his merits weighing 70 percent and his demerits 30 percent.

Subsequently, within the same year and outside the Politburo which included such elements as Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping, Mao increasingly defended Stalin, warned that throwing away the sword of Stalin was also doing away with the sword of Lenin and strongly condemned those who were throwing away these two swords, not only in the Soviet Union but also in Eastern Europe. Mao saw through the scheme of the revisionists to destroy socialism and attack Leninism by attacking Stalin.

The CPC had a high regard for the CPSU. The two parties had close comradely relations and cooperation, involving the exchange of many Chinese students and trainees on the one hand and Soviet experts and other personnel on the other. The Right opportunists and revisionists in the CPC whipped up an uncritical acceptance of the latest from the Soviet Union, especially modern revisionism.

Since 1956, Mao had to begin fighting difficult battles against the Right opportunists and revisionists within the CPC. Driven by their erroneous view of the concrete circumstances within China and by the influence of Soviet modern revisionism, they attacked him from behind in the same way that Khrushchov and other revisionists in the CPSU attacked Stalin. Khrushchov and his Chinese revisionist followers denigrated Mao as a Stalinist, especially for launching the Great Leap Forward and for standing his ground against modern revisionism.

To uphold Marxism-Leninism and advance the cause of socialism, Mao fought his way from one high point to another high

point, in the sequence of the Great Leap Forward, the international debate against modern revisionism and the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism.

Had Mao not fought to defend Marxism-Leninism and socialism brilliantly and effectively, he and his line could have been completely overthrown earlier than 1960. The revisionist reversal of Mao's line and capitalist restoration after his death do not impeach but unwittingly vindicate his great theoretical and practical achievements in the same way that the great achievements of Stalin cannot be invalidated and cannot but be vindicated by his revisionist betrayers.

A year before his death, Stalin realized fully that the power and influence of the Right opportunists had grown in Soviet society but unfortunately he had no more opportunity to launch a successful counteroffensive. In the case of Mao, he had the opportunity to look over fully the transition of socialism under Stalin to the revisionism of Khrushchov and the more clever anti-Stalin and antisocialist line of Brezhnev, to fight battles against the modern revisionists in the Soviet Union, in China and on a world scale and to strive to advance the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism.

The Soviet modern revisionists banned Mao's works, especially the antirevisionist ones. We must study and read these. His critique of modern revisionism and his theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship are certainly important to the study and understanding of the entire Soviet history. Such study and understanding are necessary to answer the question of whether Marxist-Leninists and the proletariat can build and consolidate socialism and prevent capitalist subversion and

restoration in the forthcoming great battles between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Because the dictatorship of the proletariat has been overthrown in the Soviet Union since 1956, revolutionary violence is required to overthrow capitalism and restore socialism. To bring about proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, the basic principles taught by Lenin and Stalin are adequate. But it is also necessary to study how to consolidate socialism, combat revisionism and prevent the restoration of capitalism in order to answer the recurrent jibe that socialism is destined to revert to capitalism and also in order to anticipate scientifically the problems of the future. So far, no figure has surpassed Mao in criticizing modern revisionism and in striving to overcome it in accordance with Marxist-Leninist principles.

Of course, new theoretical and practical advances will have to be made under new conditions in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution and in the context of the world proletarian-socialist revolution. To stay within that context, we cannot deviate from the basic Marxist-Leninist teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao.

Class Analysis in the Modern Communist Movement

In consonance with the topic of your conference, "Class analysis in the modern communist movement", allow us to state our views. We appreciate the position that the definition of the class concept of the proletariat as a revolutionary class is crucial to the formation of the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party, in the face of the unceasing attempts of the Brezhnevites and neo-Brezhnevites to revise the concept.

It is our view that the definition first put forward by Marx and further developed by Lenin in "A Great Beginning" remains valid, historically and currently. It is a definition that is grounded on

the mode of production in accordance with historical materialism. Upon the material conditions of large-scale industrial production, the working class arises and grows in contradiction with the dominant capitalist class in capitalist society. Consequently, it becomes the dominant class in socialist society after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and continues to wage class struggle until classes are abolished.

Lenin taught us, "Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organization of labor, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it." He said further that classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labor of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy.

He pointed out, "Clearly, in order to abolish classes completely, it is not enough to overthrow the exploiters, the landowners and capitalists, not enough to abolish their rights of ownership; it is necessary also to abolish all private ownership of the means of production, it is necessary to abolish the distinction between town and country, as well as the distinction between manual and mental workers. This requires a very long period of time."

He added, "In order to achieve this, an enormous step must be taken in developing the productive forces; it is necessary to overcome the resistance (frequently passive, which is particularly stubborn and particularly difficult to overcome) of the numerous survivals of small scale production; it is necessary to overcome the enormous force of habit and conservatism which are connected with these survivals."

As a dialectical materialist, Lenin recognized first that the classes and class struggle arise in the mode of production and he

proceeded to look at the interaction of the superstructure and the mode of production in the course of class struggle. He did not confine classes and class struggle to the mode of production and the development of the productive forces.

He combated the attempts to expand and vulgarize the meaning of proletariat as to include all toilers and the petty bourgeoisie. He also combated the confabulations of the petty bourgeois (Kautsky, Martov and the like) about liberty, equality, democracy in general, equality of labor democracy, etc., as the supposed way to solve the problems in the transition from capitalism to socialism. At the same time, he called for the alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry and other revolutionary forces.

The proletariat cannot build socialism by confining itself to economic struggle in the mode of production and without developing its revolutionary theory as guide to its revolutionary movement, without smashing the bourgeois class dictatorship and replacing it with the proletarian class dictatorship and without supplanting the bourgeois and other antiquated culture with the proletarian-socialist culture.

In the course of socialist revolution and construction, the exploiting classes can be abolished in the economic and legal spheres. Although basically required, socialist economic construction alone cannot automatically create a proletarian-socialist superstructure that can extirpate the vestiges or new shoots of the bourgeoisie in the superstructure. The revolutionary proletariat must make a conscious and deliberate effort to extend and win the class struggle in the superstructure.

In the historical experience of both the Soviet Union and China, the old bourgeoisie and the landlord class took their last line of resistance in the superstructure under many pretenses and eventually a new petty bourgeoisie arose from the new intelligentsia and bureaucracy as a result of uneven development and the errors and shortcomings of the revolutionary party of the proletariat

in the conduct of the two-line struggle with the bourgeoisie. Mao observed and fought the new petty bourgeoisie and won against it in his lifetime but his line would still be defeated after his death.

The new petty bourgeoisie is the initial social base of modern revisionism in socialist society. It generates supraclass or prematurely classless concepts, contempt for the proletariat and cynical disdain for the proletariat's historic mission of building socialism. It corrodes the ranks of communists. As a technocratic force, it buttresses and promotes at the highest level of the ruling communist party and socialist state a clique of revisionists ready to seize power from the proletariat at the opportune moment. It adulates the international bourgeoisie and contraposes bourgeois cosmopolitanism to proletarian internationalism.

After seizing political power, the top revisionists become bureaucrat monopoly capitalists. They revise the fundamental principles of Marxist-Leninist philosophy and whip up idealism and mechanical materialism. They prate about "universal humanism" and at the same time about the theory of productive forces. They proclaim—as in the Soviet Union—that the proletariat has already accomplished its historic mission of building socialism or—as in China—that classes and class struggle are dying out while they restore capitalism and impose social-fascism on the proletariat and the people.

They whip up the slogans of bourgeois populism, bourgeois democracy and bourgeois pacifism as Khrushchov initially did in order to lay aside the proletariat's epochal mission. They reinstate the capitalist law of value and re Commodify living labor and the means of production and expand the bourgeois right to exploit the working people. They claim at first that a certain amount of private enterprise in agriculture, handicrafts and services would help build socialism and they go so far as to say that a retrogression into the "new economic policy" is the main path to socialism rather than a transitory measure of the past. Eventually they widen

the road to capitalism for the domestic and international bourgeoisie.

For a long while, they use the names of the communist party and the socialist state and systematically further change their character and composition until the time comes for discarding shallow tokens of socialism and legalizing bureaucratic loot and unbridled privatization of public assets. The genuine communists know very well the historical course and ongoing consequences of revisionist betrayal and capitalist restoration in the former Soviet Union. They are in a better position to tell us about these. We admire the determination and effort to restore socialism and the Soviet Union and look forward to the resurgence and advance of the revolutionary movement for socialism.

It is our view that for them to be successful, proletarian revolutionaries must avail of the Marxist-Leninist legacy of Lenin and Stalin and rebuild a genuine Bolshevik party. They must arouse, organize and mobilize the proletariat and the entire people against the big bourgeoisie and the local reactionaries. They must build their independent armed organization and, in the same way that their Bolshevik forefathers did, build communist cells within the reactionary armed forces. They must overthrow the bourgeois class dictatorship and replace it with the proletarian class dictatorship.

If the objective is to restore a socialist Soviet Union, it is necessary to resolutely keep in mind and practice the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship as well as on the nationality question. Great Russian chauvinism and imperialism are now in force and at work in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and so is local bourgeois nationalism in various parts of the former Soviet Union against the proletariat and people.

The proletarian revolutionaries must pick up the swords of Lenin and Stalin, lead the proletariat and the oppressed nations and peoples, take away the initiative from the Russian imperial-

ists and the local bourgeois nationalists and smite them in order to restore proletarian dictatorship and build socialism. The oppressors and exploiters are vulnerable to armed revolution because they have so flagrantly robbed the social wealth created by the proletariat and people. The world's proletariat and people are eagerly awaiting an armed revolutionary movement to arise and punish the traitors and robbers in the former Soviet Union.

It is not only in the former Soviet Union that revisionist and neorevisionist currents about classes and class struggle are running in order to lead the proletariat and the people astray. In imperialist countries and some third world countries, there are parties that persist in generating these currents. Their understanding of classes and class struggle is preconditioned by Brezhnevism and neo-Brezhnevism even as they may either condemn Gorbachov or continue to adulate him as one who "sincerely" tried to "renew socialism".

The imperialist countries are powerful sources of the main conspicuously bourgeois ideas about classes and class struggle as well as deviously petty bourgeois ideas about these. The consistent line running through all these ideas is the obfuscation of class struggle and the espousal of class conciliation between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat. These ideas revolve around the practice of tripartism (collaboration of the state, the monopoly capitalists and the bureaucratized trade unions) or simply bipartism between the state and the monopoly capitalists.

The monopoly bourgeoisie has never ceased to use petty-bourgeois ideas in order to reinforce state power and impose social order in capitalist society. It has systematically spread the petty-bourgeois mentality among the more highly paid workers and has successfully done so in relative calm periods of the class struggle. In times of severe crisis, such petty-bourgeois ideas as bourgeois laborism, opportunism, reformism and revisionism are let loose to block the proletarian revolutionaries before the ultimate weapon

of fascist violence is used against an irrepressible revolutionary proletariat.

In recent decades, the most fantastic tale is that the proletariat is a vanishing tribe in a "post-industrial" society and that the "service sector" in the industrial capitalist countries is expanding the ranks of the white collars. The term "middle class" has been used to include the white collars and the more highly paid stratum of the blue collars. Some babblers speak of the white collars as the new vanguard to displace the "outdated" proletariat in fundamental change against the monopoly bourgeoisie. Other babblers more timidly describe the white collars as no more than beggars of reform and cooperators of the big bourgeoisie within the capitalist system.

The information technology has been presumed to reduce and replace the blue collars on the way from one severe crisis of overproduction to another. And yet they have remained as basic producers, despite the rise of productivity and chronic unemployment. The basic electro-mechanical processes cannot run without the blue collars operating them and producing new values with their labor power. In the '80s, the blue collars appeared to be more vulnerable than the white collars to displacement by automatons and computers. But now, in the '90s, the white collars are as vulnerable as or even more so than the blue collars in the drive of the monopoly bourgeois to maximize profits, accumulate constant capital and reduce the wage fund.

In industrial capitalist societies, the blue collars by themselves alone outnumber by so many times their class opponent, the monopoly bourgeoisie. But if we were to divide these societies into those that own capital and those that have to sell their labor power in order to subsist, including the blue and white collars, then Marx's prediction of capitalist society being divided into the two camps has long been fulfilled.

In the most advanced capitalist countries, as well as in the semicolonies and dependent countries where cheap labor is resorted to by the multinational corporations, the proletariat as a class concept remains valid. The proletariat continues to be a real force for fighting and overthrowing the monopoly bourgeoisie and for building socialism in the future. To make believe that the proletariat is disappearing or has become inconsequential will not create any other new vanguard for socialism.

The petty bourgeoisie or the petty bourgeois-minded cannot move away from their servitude and servility to capitalism unless they follow the class leadership of the proletariat and join the broad revolutionary mass movement. By remoulding themselves into communists in the course of revolutionary struggle, some petty bourgeois can change their class position to that of the proletariat. But the general run of the petty bourgeoisie will tend to be servitors of the bourgeoisie in periods of relatively unhindered capital expansion and tend to follow the revolutionary proletariat in periods of severe crisis in the capitalist system.

The imperialists and the most reactionary forces have long funded a few petty-bourgeois hirelings in the industrial capitalist and underdeveloped countries to specialize in spreading anticommunist and antiproletarian notions and undertake programs and projects to obscure and blunt the class struggle of the proletariat and the big bourgeoisie and the anti-imperialist struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations.

The petty-bourgeois hirelings pretend to criticize their imperialist and reactionary benefactors but prettify them by conjuring illusions that these can reform themselves about such issues as oppression and exploitation, sustainable development, poverty alleviation, environment, gender equality, ethnicity, civil society and so on. Pretending to be engaged in social movement or civic initiative, above classes and without class or government support,

they misappropriate certain issues to slander and attack the proletariat and its revolutionary party.

The reality of exploiting and exploited classes and class struggle in the underdeveloped countries of the third world is similar to that obtaining in the many economically depressed and underdeveloped republics of Russia and the former Soviet Union. The long process of restoring capitalism and the current deprecations of undisguised capitalism of the most barbaric kind have destroyed the productive forces in a big and deepgoing way and have degraded many republics to the status of backward third world countries. To prevent Russia from rebounding as a major imperialist rival and to let her military capability deteriorate further, the US, the European Union and Japan are deliberately carrying out a policy of dumping surplus goods on her, limiting productive investments from abroad and effecting the further destruction of her industrial and military-industrial base.

In most of the underdeveloped countries of the third world, a modern industrial proletariat has somehow arisen from import-dependent manufacturing, transport and communications, public utilities, mining and so on. Only in a few countries of the third world is there a modern industrial proletariat arising from some comprehensive industrial foundation or some heavy and basic industries, where once before socialism was in place as in China or where once before an anti-imperialist bourgeois nationalism could insist on national industrialization as in India.

There is a new development in the world arising from high-tech capitalist production for profit and the most avaricious forms of profit-taking by finance capitalism. There is an unprecedentedly high rate of capital accumulation, concentration and centralization of capital in such global centers of capitalism as the US, the European Union and Japan. As a result, there is a rapid process of deindustrialization and decapitalization in most countries of the world.

In some ten countries outside the said global centers of capitalism, investments are concentrated on sweatshops engaged in the manufacture or reassembly of consumer goods for the industrial capitalist countries. These avail of cheap labor, do not provide job tenure and other workers' rights, are easily relocated, undermine the national industry and are now increasingly vulnerable to their own distinctive crisis of overproduction and to reduced consumption in the recession-ridden export market.

At the same time, in most of the underdeveloped countries where these sweatshops are not established and where production equipment are not renovated, there are depressed economic conditions, extreme poverty and social disorder as a result of the overproduction of raw materials since the 1970s. Production of raw materials and some manufactures with the old equipment has become uncompetitive in the world capitalist system and has resulted in stagnation and closures.

At present, there is a great spasm in the world capitalist system due to the crisis of overproduction induced by high technology for profit and the most abusive forms of finance capitalism. There is widespread destruction of productive forces through mass unemployment and closures of factories. Condition in the republics of the former Soviet Union are increasingly becoming similar to those in the third world.

But the monopoly capitalists will always need a proletariat to exploit in their own homegrounds and on a world scale. No matter how far the current crisis of the world capitalist system goes, the modern industrial proletariat will continue to exist in most countries of the world and remain as the most productive and progressive political force against monopoly capitalism. There is no way for another class to take away from the proletariat the revolutionary role of class leadership in the struggle for socialism against imperialism.

We are still in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution as defined by Lenin. This is true especially because of the revisionist betrayal and capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union and other former socialist countries. The teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao about classes and class struggle remain valid to this day. Without a foundation in the revolutionary theory and practice, we cannot make new theoretical and practical advances in the struggle of the proletariat for socialism and communism.

Long live Lenin and Stalin!

Build a Marxist-Leninist party in Russia!

Long live Marxism-Leninism! #