

DIALECTICS

COMMUNIST INSTRUMENT
FOR WORLD CONQUEST

ERIC D. BUTLER

DIALECTICS

COMMUNIST INSTRUMENT FOR WORLD CONQUEST

BY
ERIC D. BUTLER

1963

Free EBOOK edition by Paul Bondarovski, 2018

CONTENTS

Introduction

I. Historical Background of Dialectical Materialism

II. What Does “Dialectic” Mean?

III. Dialectics and Communist Semantics

IV. Dialectics Within the Communist World

INTRODUCTION

The old saying that truth is stranger than fiction is strikingly confirmed by a study of the dynamic strategy and tactics by which the Communists have made giant strides towards their ultimate objective of complete world conquest. And yet, in spite of the disastrous retreats by the non-Communists in the face of the Communist offensive, even now there is only a handful of people outside the ranks of the Communists who have any real understanding of the Communist faith, *dialectical materialism*, or how the use of the “law” of dialectics has been a major factor in enabling the Communists to defeat their opponents time and time again.

Although the Western world is depicted as representing a civilization based upon spiritual values fighting for survival against a Communist challenge based on materialism, the truth is that various forms of materialism have so affected the peoples of the Western world that they are incapable of understanding that Communism is the policy of a certain philosophy, that which the Communists call *dialectical materialism*. Until sufficient people understand the claim of this Communist philosophy, grasp clearly the ideas which provide Communists with their motives for action, and learn something about how these ideas are applied, there is no legitimate hope of halting the Communist advance.

Over the recorded history of man there have been many attempts by some men to obtain complete power over all other men. But for the first time man is faced with a challenge by a power-seeking movement which claims that it is based upon a philosophy which can be used to demonstrate “scientifically” that murder, lying, deceit and stealing are but an aspect of Truth.

According to the Communist philosophy of dialectical materialism, anything which advances Communism is therefore true. This statement will appear incredible to those who know nothing about the “law” of dialectics as taught by the Communists. Dialectics is not some obscure subject which the non-Communist can safely ignore. Dialectics is a *weapon of conquest* in the hands of the dedicated Communist. He will continue to use that weapon with frightening result until it is sufficiently understood and opposed.

Because very few Western politicians have taken the trouble to understand

dialectics, most of them have been easily tricked on numerous occasions by what they thought was a Communist retreat. But in Communist dialectics, retreat is an essential part of the Communist advance!

The *essence* of the philosophy of dialectical materialism is that all development and progress, in human society and in nature, stems from *conflict*. Class warfare, for example, is inevitable and an essential part of the progress towards Communism. No true Communist can believe in “peaceful coexistence” for any indefinite period, because such a belief would be contrary to the philosophical foundations of Marxism-Leninism. The true Communist must not only accept the “revelation” of dialectical materialism; he must also learn to think and to act dialectically so that he is working with reality.

Most of those who attempt to deal with Communism make the major mistake of overlooking that the fully-conditioned Communist is a completely different type of human being. He thinks differently from all other human beings. Rational discussion is impossible with an individual who not only believes that under certain circumstances murder is necessary, but that it is “scientifically” justified. Confronted by human beings who have been conditioned to the point where they think and act dialectically, Western man faces something he has never before had to face in his struggle against those who challenged his civilization.

The Communist is not going to be halted by any appeals to reason. He, in fact, cannot be reached through the thought processes of Western man. No non-Communist can possibly reach the thoroughly conditioned and dedicated Communist unless he can challenge and expose his philosophy of dialectical materialism. But only in a comparatively few cases has this been possible. Those who want to defeat Communism must therefore face the truth that Communism poses two clear-cut alternatives: the non-Communist must either be victorious or be defeated. Will and determination are primary essentials for victory. There can be no compromise. Any attempt to compromise merely confirms the Communist’s faith in the inevitability of his eventual victory.

Whittaker Chambers, the former top Communist agent who became famous for his exposure of Alger Hiss, stated that very few of those who become Communists do so because they have read any Marxian economics. Men become Communists for a variety of reasons, many because of what is termed the “crisis of history.” They accept the Communist claim that Marx gave man a new revelation of how the crisis was to be resolved. The Communist Party becomes the repository of this revelation, and therefore everything which advances the Communist Party is “moral.” Whether or not individuals accept this revelation as an article of genuine faith, or whether they are criminals who see in dialectics

the most formidable weapon yet devised by the mind of man to conquer all other men and to achieve complete power, there can be no argument that dialectics provide a most flexible instrument for conquering non-Communists.

If the non-Communist mind can grasp that to the Communist the only absolute reality is the inevitability of the Communist victory, and that everything which advances that victory is moral and justified, it will have taken a big step forward towards understanding the nature of the problem confronting the non-Communist world.

The purpose of this booklet is to provide an elementary, non-technical outline of the significance of dialectics as taught and practised by the Communists. Although some may find the theoretical aspects of dialectics difficult to grasp completely at first reading, there should be no difficulty in seeing how the Communists think and act dialectically.

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

Although it can be easily demonstrated that Marx's philosophy of dialectical materialism is a monstrous *fraud*, it is perhaps the only original concept for which Marx can be given any credit. It is important to note that in the field of politics, economics and sociology Marx was a plagiarist who never had the decency to pay any kind of tribute to those from whom he borrowed. He pillaged freely from all the earlier Socialists, men like Robert Owen, most of whom had very different motives from those of Marx, and then dismissed them with a sneer.

In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx attacked the "Utopian Socialists" because they "consistently endeavour to suppress the class struggle and to reconcile antagonism." Marx took his theory of "wage-slavery" from the French Socialists, while his Communism was that of Babeuf, Louis Blanc and others. Even Marx's famous doctrine that "labour is the source of all wealth" had been first propounded by the early English Socialists, John Locke and William Petty, while the theory of "surplus value" was taken from Owen and the Chartists, who had developed it in 1835, seven years before Marx began to write.

Karl Marx and his collaborator, Friedrich Engels, claimed that, even though the earlier Socialists presented the magnet of a "new golden age," they had failed to make any progress towards their objective because they relied upon human intelligence and goodwill to attain their ideals of the perfect society. Marx and Engels stated that these earlier Socialists failed because they had not understood the laws of human society and history. It is elementary that if man can discover the laws which govern his life, he will be able to use these laws to decide his own destiny. Marx and Engels not only claimed to have discovered these laws; they claimed that these laws showed that it was "historically inevitable" that Socialism must be victorious. It was independent of, and superior to, mere human will.

The philosophy of dialectical materialism propounded by Marx, and his "scientific socialism," were clearly presented as the means by which Communists could obtain political power. The Communist claim is that as they

discovered the laws governing all development, then these laws become the custodians of the Communist Party, which must use them to gain and to hold Communist power.

Marx cannot be regarded as a true philosopher, but as a Socialist and a materialist seeking to present a philosophy which would make the development of Communism appear to be “historically inevitable.”

A brief historical sketch of Marx’s background and the development of his philosophy is necessary. The historical setting is important.

Marx’s Background

Karl Marx was born on May 5, 1818, at Trier, in the Rhineland, at a time when the Rhineland had been taken over by Prussia. The fact that the Rhineland had been deeply influenced by the flow of ideas stemming from the French Revolution resulted in conflict with Prussian Conservatism. Marx’s parents belonged to the Jewish middle class and were reasonably well-to-do. The father, Herschel, was the descendant of a long line of Rabbis and practised law, while the mother had originally come from Holland. The family background did not make for the development of much patriotism in Karl. His father did not accept the official religion of the Prussian State, while his mother had never learned to speak or write proper German. The background of Marx’s parents undoubtedly played a decisive part in that de-nationalised, international outlook on life which was a feature of Karl’s writings. It was when Karl Marx entered the University of Berlin in 1836 that he came under the philosophy of the famous philosopher Hegel, the man who provided Marx with his concept of dialectics, which he later altered to become part of his philosophy of materialism. “Hegel’s dialectic is the basic form of all dialectic,” wrote Marx (*Letters to Dr. Kugelmann*, New York, 1934, p. 63).

Hegel’s philosophy dominated all Marx’s subsequent thinking. He accepted Hegel’s teaching that all progress comes from a never-ending conflict between opposing forces. But Hegel was not a materialist but an idealist who believed in the primacy of thought and ideas over matter. He therefore applied the dialectic primarily to the development of ideas. Marx had early become a materialist, but he was looking for an activating principle which would overcome the mechanistic concepts of other materialists.

When the Chinese Communist leader Mao Zedong in *On Contradiction* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1956, p. 16) wrote, “There is nothing in the world except matter in motion,” he summarised brilliantly the dialectical materialism of Marx. There is not only matter, but *matter in motion*. But this

motion was more than merely mechanical, as made clear in the following quotations from Engels and Lenin:

“The materialism of the last century was predominantly mechanical.... This exclusive application of the standards of mechanics to processes of a chemical and organic nature—in which process, it is true, the laws of mechanics are also valid, but are pushed into the background by other and higher laws—constitutes a specific but at that time inevitable limitation.... The second specific limitation of this materialism lay in its inability to comprehend the universe as a process—as matter developing in an historical process. This was in accordance with the level of the natural science of that time, and with the metaphysical, that is the anti-dialectical manner of philosophizing connected with it. Nature, it was known, was in constant motion. But according to the ideas of that time, this motion turned eternally in a circle and therefore never moved from the spot: it produced the same results over and over again. This conception was at that time inevitable.” (Engels in *Ludwig Feuerbach*, New York, 1934, pp. 36–37.)

“This defect of the old materialism is undeniable: its failure to appreciate the relativity of all scientific theories, its ignorance of dialectics, its exaggeration of the mechanical viewpoint.” (Lenin in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, New York, 1927, p. 266.)

When Ludwig Feuerbach published his work, *Essence of Christianity*, in 1841, it made a profound impression upon both Marx and his collaborator Engels. Although Marx was a materialist, he could not at this time see any method of marrying Hegel’s dialectic method to materialism. But now Feuerbach “in many respects forms an intermediate link between Hegelian philosophy and our conception” (Engels in *Ludwig Feuerbach*, New York, 1934, p. 28).

A Decisive Development

The next stage in Marx’s development took place when he went to Paris in 1843 to study social philosophy. During the period in Paris, from 1843 to 1846, Marx was deeply influenced by the French Socialist Proudhon, who persuaded him that if he looked around in society he would see the working out of real dialectics—in the class conflict was to be found the clash of opposites. It was at this time that Marx began to see how he could take Hegel’s dialectic out of its idealistic setting and use it to provide materialism with a “scientific” explanation of progress.

Engels states in the preface to Marx’s *Poverty of Philosophy* (New York, 1936, p. 7) that by 1846, “Marx had cleared up for himself the basic features of his new historical and economic outlook.” It is important to grasp that the philosophy of dialectical materialism eliminates any conception of evolutionary, organic growth in society. It was only out of the clash of opposites that progress

could take place.

It is not surprising that Marx was a man of violent hates and that violence and revolution are the recurring theme in Communist teachings. Some of Marx's most biting comments were applied to "reformists" who believed that progress was possible without violence.

Marxist-Leninists are revolutionaries, as made very clear in the following extract from the *Program of the Communist International*, adopted by the Sixth World Congress, September 1, 1928, Moscow:

"In its theoretical and practical work the Communist International ... stands unreservedly on the platform of revolutionary Marxism and of the form it took later, Leninism, which is nothing but the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution.

"The Communist International champions and propagates the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels, and employs it as a revolutionary method of perceiving reality, in order to accomplish the revolutionary transformation of that reality; it fights actively against every variety of bourgeois philosophy, and against opportunism in theory and practice. With its platform of consistent proletarian class struggle, it subordinates the temporary, sectional, national, and partial interests of the proletariat to its enduring, general, international interests. It mercilessly exposes the doctrine, borrowed by the reformists from the bourgeoisie, of 'class peace', in all its forms. In meeting the historical demand for an international organization of revolutionary proletarians, the gravedigger of the capitalist system, the Communist International is the only international force that has as its programme the dictatorship of the proletariat and communism, and that comes out openly as the organizer of the international proletarian revolution."

The foregoing is a brilliant outline of how the believers in dialectical materialism approach the task of advancing their program.

CHAPTER II

WHAT DOES “DIALECTIC” MEAN?

The term “dialectic” was first coined by the ancient Greeks, who used it to describe the art of discourse and rebuttal. Later the Scholastic philosophers used “dialectic” and “logic” as having the same meaning. It was taught that by one person making a statement and another person making an opposite statement it was possible to see two contradictory views on any subject more clearly. A greater understanding of truth to both opponents became possible.

The German philosopher Hegel took up this idea of using dialectics and applied it to the field of ideas. He came to the conclusion that dialectics always produces a much more developed idea with a greater content of truth. Hegel taught that the final idea was only reached through three stages. He termed the first stage the *thesis*. This is the enunciation of the truth in the original idea. Now, the thesis contains within itself its opposite, and Hegel termed the development of this the *antithesis*. The antithesis is not a mere negation of the thesis, but, in fact, must contain some truth because of its attack on error in the thesis. The next stage of development is the *synthesis*, which is the total of truth from both the thesis and antithesis. The synthesis then becomes the thesis of a new dialectical movement. Thus dialectical development can go on indefinitely.

However, Communists do not like to face the question of why; if they really believe in the “law” of dialectics, they can accept the Communist State as the final stage of development in society! Hegel was an idealist who believed that the Universe was a manifestation of the Absolute Idea, that man was only a portion of that Universe, and the idea in the mind of man would always be only partially true. Hegel therefore taught that the dialectical development in the field of ideas would continue *indefinitely*. Presumably the Communists hold the convenient view that once the “law” of dialectics produces the Communist State, it suddenly *stops*. A most convenient philosophy!

In *Ludwig Feuerbach* (New York, 1934, pp. 53–54), Engels summarised Hegel’s views as follows:

“According to Hegel, dialectics is the self-development of the concept. The Absolute Concept does not only exist ... from eternity, it is also the actual living soul of the whole existing world. It develops into itself through all the preliminary stages ... which are all

included in it. Then it ‘alienates’ itself by changing into nature, where, without consciousness of itself, disguised as a natural necessity, it goes through a new development and finally returns as man’s consciousness of himself. This self-consciousness then elaborates itself again in history in the crude form until finally the Absolute Concept again comes to itself completely in the Hegelian philosophy. According to Hegel, therefore, the dialectical development apparent in nature and history—that is, the casual interconnection of the progressive movement from the lower to the higher, which asserts itself through all zigzag movements and temporary retrogression—is only a miserable copy of the self-movement of the concept going on from eternity, no one knows where, but at all events independently of any thinking human brain.”

Applying the dialectic to materialism, Marx and Engels took a part of Hegel’s idealism, his dialectics, and used it as a basis for their materialism. Prior to this time most philosophies of materialism doomed each individual to accept fate without any opportunity for individual influence. But now Hegel’s dialectics provided materialism with an “energizing principle.”

Marx and Engels turned Hegel’s dialectic upside down, lifted it out of its philosophy of idealism, and made it the basis of a complete philosophical system of dialectical materialism. For Hegel, it was the *idea* that was composed of contradictory elements. But for Marx, *matter* was composed of contradictory elements. Matter is self-sufficient; there is nothing beyond or external to matter. And its contradictory nature provides it with a motive force of development, a principle which disposes of the necessity of any cause external to itself. This abolishes the concept of God.

The fusion of Marx’s materialism with Hegel’s dialectic produced a result completely overlooked by most opponents of Marxism: although Marx enunciated a deterministic and materialistic philosophy, he and his followers produced dedicated individuals prepared to devote their whole lives to make the inevitable come to pass. A Communist may not know a great amount about economics—he may not have even read one of Marx’s books with the possible exception of the *Communist Manifesto*—but he can be sustained by his deep faith in the “historical inevitability” of Communism. The faithful Communist knows that Communism is “the wave of the future.”

In his book, *How to be a Good Communist* (1939), Liu Shaoqi, the Chinese Marxist-Leninist theoretician, asks (p. 38): “Can Communist society be brought about? Our answer is yes. About this the whole theory of Marxism-Leninism offers a scientific explanation that leaves no room for doubt.” Now it is this “scientific explanation,” based upon the philosophy of dialectical materialism, that the Communists use to justify whatever has to be done to help advance Communism. And many so-called intellectuals have accepted this “scientific

explanation.”

Relevant Quotations Concerning the Dialectic

The following selection of quotations from the statements and writings of Communist leaders leave no doubt about the Marxist-Leninists’ belief that conflict is a basic feature of the development towards Communism:

“Many people confound dialectic with the theory of evolution. Dialectic is, in fact, a theory of evolution. But it differs profoundly from the vulgar theory of evolution, which is based substantially upon the principle that neither in nature nor in history do sudden changes occur, and that all changes taking place in the world occur gradually.” (G. Plekhanov in *Fundamental Problems of Marxism*, London, 1929, p. 145.)

“In spite of all intermediate steps, the transition from one form of motion to another always remains a leap, a decisive change.” (Engels in *Anti-Duhring*, New York, 1935, p. 78.)

“The bourgeois revolution limits itself to substituting one group of exploiters for another in the seat of power, and therefore has no need to destroy the old state machine; whereas the proletarian revolution removes all groups of exploiters from power, and places in power the leaders of all the toilers and exploited, the class of proletarians, and therefore it cannot avoid destroying the old state machine and replacing it by a new one.” (J. Stalin in *Problems of Leninism*, pp. 16–17.)

In speaking of the Paris Commune, Marx claimed that it was the failure of the proletariat to use ruthless force and violence that robbed it of true victory:

“Two errors robbed the brilliant victory of its fruit. The proletariat stopped half-way; instead of proceeding with the ‘expropriation of the expropriators,’ it was carried away with dreams of establishing supreme justice in the country.... The second error was unnecessary magnanimity of the proletariat; instead of annihilating its enemies, it endeavoured to exercise moral influence on them.” (Marx in *The Civil War in France*, New York, 1933, p. 80.)

Violence Necessary

“If the State is the product of the irreconcilable character of class antagonisms, if it is a force standing above society and increasingly separating itself from it, then it is clear that the liberation of the oppressed class is impossible not only without a violent revolution, but also without the destruction of the apparatus of state power, which was created by the ruling class.” (Lenin in *The State and Revolution*, p. 9.)

“The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot come about as a result of the peaceful development of bourgeois society and bourgeois democracy.” (Stalin in *The Foundations of Leninism*, p. 51.)

“The conquest of power by the proletariat does not mean peacefully capturing the ready-made bourgeois state machinery by means of a parliamentary majority. The bourgeoisie resorts to every means of violence and terror to safeguard and strengthen its predatory property and political domination.... Hence, the violence of the bourgeoisie can be suppressed only by the stern violence of the proletariat. The conquest of power by the proletariat is the violent overthrow of bourgeois power.” (*The Program of the Communist International*, New York, 1936, pp. 36–37.)

“What is the meaning of the impossibility of the complete and final victory of socialism in a single country without the victory of the revolution in other countries? It means the impossibility of having full guarantees against intervention, and hence against the restoration of the bourgeois order, without the victory of the revolution in at least a number of countries. To deny this indisputable fact is to abandon internationalism, to abandon Leninism.” (Stalin in *The Problems of Leninism*, p. 66.)

“The victory of socialism in one country is not an end in itself; it must be looked upon as a support, as a means of hastening the proletarian victory in every other land. For the victory of the revolution in one country (in Russia, for the nonce) is not only the result of the unequal development and the progressive decay of imperialism; it is likewise the beginning and the continuation of the world revolution.” (Stalin in *Leninism*, p. 212.)

“... Social democracy has utterly and completely betrayed Marxism, having traversed the road from revisionism to complete liberal bourgeois reformism and avowed social-imperialism; it has substituted in place of the Marxian theory of the contradiction of capitalism, the bourgeois theory of its harmonious development; it has pigeonholed the theory of crisis and of the pauperization of the proletariat; it has turned the flaming and menacing theory of class struggle into prosaic advocacy of class peace ... in place of the theory of the inevitability of war under capitalism it has substituted the bourgeois deceit of pacifism.... It has replaced revolution by evolution, the destruction of the bourgeois State by its active upbuilding....” (*Resolutions of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International*, pp. 225, 227.)

“With elemental force, imperialism exposes and accentuates all the contradictions of capitalist society; it carries class oppression to the utmost limits, intensifies the struggle between capitalist governments, inevitably gives rise to world-wide imperialist wars that shake the whole prevailing system of relationships to their foundations and inexorably leads to the World Proletarian Revolution.” (Introduction to *Program and Resolutions of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International*, p. 149.)

“Capitalism is decaying, but it must not be compared simply with a tree which has decayed to such an extent that it must fall to the ground of its own accord. No, revolution,

the substitution of one social system for another, has always been a struggle, a painful and cruel struggle, a life and death struggle, and every time the people of the new world came into power they had to defend themselves against the attempts of the old world to restore the old order by force.... The Communists regard the substitution of one special system for another not simply as a spontaneous and peaceful process, but as a complicated, long and violent process.” (Stalin in an interview with H. G. Wells, as recorded in *Marxism versus Liberalism—An Interview with Josef Stalin*, 1935, p. 16.)

One of the “crimes” for which Lenin so bitterly attacked Karl Kautsky, the leading Marxist theorist of the Second International, was his insistence that it was possible to have a peaceful transition from Capitalism to Socialism in England and America. Lenin wrote:

“... the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is violence against the bourgeoisie; and the necessity of such violence is particularly created, as Marx and Engels have repeatedly explained in detail (especially in *The Civil War in France* and in the preface to it), by the existence of a military clique and a bureaucracy.” (Lenin in *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1952, pp. 23–24.)

The Purpose of Violent Revolution

“... That force, however, plays yet another role (other than that of a diabolical power) in history, a revolutionary role; that, in the words of Marx, it is the midwife of every old society which is pregnant with a new one, that it is the instrument with which social movement forces its way through and shatters the dead, fossilized political forms—of this there is not a word in Herr Duhring. It is only with sighs and groans that he admits the possibility that force will perhaps be necessary for the overthrow of an economy based on exploitation—unfortunately, because all use of force demoralizes, he says, the person who uses it. And this in Germany, where a violent collision—which may, after all, be forced on the people—would at least have the advantage of wiping out the servility which has penetrated the nation’s mentality following the humiliation of the Thirty Years’ War. And this person’s mode of thought—dull, insipid, and impotent—presumes to impose itself on the most revolutionary party that history has ever known!”

The above is an extract from Engels’ book, *Anti-Duhring*, quoted by Lenin in *State and Revolution*, pp. 32–33.

In this book Lenin shows that the purpose of revolution was not to seize control of the State, but to destroy it. Most of the book deals with this thesis.

“It will be noticed how profoundly the Communist theory of violence is bound up with its theory of historic evolution. It is not a justification of violence as such. On the contrary, violence is regarded as a ‘*saeva necessitas*’ (a cruel necessity), inevitable simply because the bourgeois State does not surrender without giving battle. It is useless, say the

Communists, to fight unless you are going to win; and it is useless to win unless you propose to use your victory to serve the interests for which you fought. Your terrorism is justified because you, a ruling class, are fighting the bourgeoisie, a falling class, with the weapons they have made an inherent instrument of the conflict.” (Harold Laski in *Communism*, 1935, pp. 142]143.)

“Communists never demean themselves to dissemble their opinions and their aims. They openly proclaim that their ends can be gained only by the violent subversion of the whole traditional social order.” (*Program of the Communist International*, 1936, p. 80.)

Natural Philosophy is the Basis of Marxism

Marx and Engels did not regard nature merely as supporting their philosophy. They maintained that dialectical materialism is derived from nature. Marx and Engels insisted that the dialectic of nature is the basis of the class struggle. And Marx drew heavily upon the theory of evolution as propounded by Charles Darwin. In a letter to Lassale, Marx said, “Darwin’s volume is very important and provides me with the basis in natural science for the class struggle in history.” (*Selected Correspondence*, London, 1934, p. 135.)

Darwinism Exploited

The idea of evolution had been widely discussed and accepted in varying forms by scientists long before Charles Darwin’s *Origin of the Species* was published. The term “evolution” did not appear in the first edition of the *Origin of the Species*. Why did this book have such a tremendous impact? Because Darwin’s major thesis, concerning what he called “natural selection,” captivated materialists who urgently desired to get rid of will, purpose or design as explanations for life, and to substitute for them automatic material cause. The theory that natural selection was the means of evolution stressed the idea of struggle. Only the fittest survived. Here was the very teaching Marx required to confirm his social theories.

In his funeral oration at Marx’s grave, Engels said: “Just as Darwin discovered the law of evolution of organic nature, so Marx discovered the evolutionary law of human history—the simple fact that ... the production of the material necessities of life and the corresponding stage of economic evolution of a people or a period provides a foundation upon which the national institutions, legal systems, art, and even the religious ideals of the people in question have been built, and upon which, therefore, their explanation must be based.”

Karl Kautsky, the German Socialist leader, said, “For Marx ... the class

struggle was but a particular emphasis of the universal law of evolution, whose essential qualities are in no way peaceful.”

The American Socialist, Morris Hillquit (Moishe Hillkowitz) writes in his *Socialism in Theory and Practice* (1909): “Karl Marx alone consistently introduced the spirit of Darwinism into the study of social phenomena by substituting the doctrine of the class struggle in the more modern stages of social development for ... the doctrine of the struggle for existence in the lower stages.”

Hillquit continues by claiming that “in the ascending scale of organic existence the struggle between individuals of the same species gradually abates and is superseded by collective struggles of such individuals.” Not only does the Marxist teaching that progress comes only through the clash of opposites apply to national groups; it means that clashes must take place between nations.

Irrespective of what Mr. Khrushchev may say about “peaceful coexistence” between the Communist and non-Communist nations, he knows as a Marxist-Leninist that to hold such a view would be a major ideological heresy. Lenin put the truth as follows: “We are living not merely in a State, but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Socialist Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.” (Quoted in Stalin’s *Problems of Leninism*.) Khrushchev says that when “we have ceased to be Marxist-Leninists, shrimps will have learned to whistle.”

Applying the Dialectic

The former admirer of Communism and recognised authority on Russia, Mr. Eugene Lyons, has made the following comment concerning dialectical materialism in his book *Assignment in Utopia*: “Dialectical materialism, whatever else it may be, is the smuggest and most convenient philosophy ever adapted by a ruling caste to its political needs. It finds a bogus consistency in the most startling inconsistencies. There is something monstrous in a dialectical materialism which exploits in order to end exploitation, which flouts elementary human values in the name of humanity, which fortifies new classes to achieve a classless society; which, in brief, presumes to be as heartless as history, instead of opposing its dreams and its hopes to history’s heartlessness.”

No non-Communist can possibly understand the true nature of Communism unless he has some understanding of the Communist belief in and use of dialectics. Every Communist leader must thoroughly understand dialectics. It is

significant that Stalin destroyed the greater Communist theoretician, Bukharin, a man who had been compared with Lenin, by attempting to prove that Bukharin did not understand Communist dialectics. Seeking for the evidence he required, Stalin quoted Lenin's views on Bukharin: "... it is very doubtful whether his theoretical views can be classed as fully Marxist, for there is something scholastic in him (he has never studied and, I think, has never fully understood dialectics)." (Stalin's *Problems of Leninism*.)

In spite of his great service to Communism, Bukharin was shot because he asked difficult questions which proved, according to Stalin, that he did not understand dialectics. Bukharin was concerned that the Communist theory about the development of the State in Russia after the revolution was not working out. There was no sign of the State starting to wither away. Bukharin claimed that the State was growing stronger. But Stalin claimed that this fact was in reality dialectical proof that it was withering away! Contradictions are the essence of dialectics. Communists are taught to think dialectically, a fact beyond the comprehension of most people. Because Communists think dialectically, they do not advance directly towards any objective. They believe that progress is made through opposites—advance and retreat. One of the principal Communist textbooks is Lenin's *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*. It is reported that in China school children are actually taught to do a dialectical march, taking three steps forward and two steps back.

Reverses Part of Advance

For people who do not understand dialectical thinking, it is difficult to grasp that what appear to be reverses are in fact regarded by the Communists as an essential part of their advance. The Communist firmly believes that the nature of reality demands that he must reach the ultimate Communist objective by often moving away from it. And because moving away from the objective is an essential part of the dialectical movement necessary to reach the objective, he must perform the "two steps back" with as much purpose as the "one step forward." Enormous numbers of people have been misled when they have seen the Communists moving in what they consider to be the very opposite of their objective.

When Lenin introduced his NEP (New Economic Policy) early in the twenties, superficial observers claimed that by encouraging private enterprise in some sections of the Soviet economy Lenin was retreating from Marxism. But Lenin was acting dialectically. Soviet doctrinaires have defended Lenin's NEP on the basis that it was the antithesis of early Bolshevism (the thesis) and that

Stalinism was the synthesis of the two. In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx taught of the necessity of abolishing marriage. But is family life being weakened in Soviet Russia? No. Exactly the opposite. Here again the superficial observer will claim that this is another retreat from Marxism, that Communism is becoming “different.” But the truth is that the Communists have found from experience that they have to develop a strong, patriotic basis to defeat their enemies. Strengthening family life helps strengthen the Soviet. This in turn helps the Soviet to conquer the world and to establish a Communist dictatorship. Steps can then be taken to “regenerate” mankind and to abolish the family. And so, dialectically, the Communist can argue that he is strengthening the family in order to destroy it!

Lenin said that “atheism is a natural and inseparable portion of Marxism, of the theory and practice of scientific socialism.” But religion in all countries conquered by the Communists has proved a strong force and not easily eradicated. The Communists have therefore decided to exploit this religious force in numerous ways. In China they have actually encouraged the growth of a Church—but firmly under Communist control. Visitors to Communist China see well-filled Churches and hear sermons from well-paid ministers. Knowing nothing about Communist dialectics, visitors to Communist China return home to report that Christianity is actually flourishing and expanding in China. This is then publicised as one more example of how Communism has become “different.” But the Communists have not ceased being anti-religion, particularly Christianity. They have merely made one more dialectical move, helping them to reach their ultimate objective, when with complete Communist control of environment religion can be abolished. Communism is therefore either exploiting or strengthening religion in order to reach the time when it can be destroyed. This is the application of Lenin’s teaching: “In its proper meaning, dialectics is the study of the contradiction within the very essence of things.” (Lenin’s *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1950, p. 133.)

While most Western commentators eagerly grasp at all contradictions, either in practice, theory or words, in the Communist world as evidence that Communism is either “collapsing” or becoming “different,” the Communist firmly believes them to be confirmation of his faith that progress is taking place through the “unity of opposites.” A dedicated Communist may be said to suffer from a form of insanity in that the theoretical concepts he holds are a greater reality to him than the evidence of facts.

Dialectical materialism enables the Communist to murder, lie, betray, to claim that which was black yesterday is white today. But the Communist does not

believe that he is murdering or lying or being treacherous. So long as he is advancing Communism he is in fact acting morally, because to the Communist the only morality is that which advances Communism.

Morris Hillquit, in his *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, writes: “All factors which impede the path of its [socialism’s] approximate realisation are anti-ethical or unmoral; contrariwise, all factors or movements which tend in its direction are ethical.”

Lenin put this question as follows: “The dictatorship of the proletariat is nothing else than power based upon force and limited by nothing—by no kind of law and by absolutely no rule.” (Complete Works, Vol. 18, p. 361.) And the “dictatorship of the proletariat” is justified because it is “historically inevitable” for such a dictatorship to advance as quickly as possible the complete Communist world.

The faith of the Communist in the alleged revelations of Marxism-Leninism concerning the nature of man and reality provides him with a dialectical flexibility which enables him to use any factor which will advance the Communist victory.

Lenin said that “proletarian morality is determined by the exigencies of the class struggle.” In other words, the dialectical tactics to be used at any moment depend upon the circumstances. The only absolute is the inevitability of the Communist victory.

One of the most significant novels to come out of the post-war period is *When the Gods are Silent* by Mikhail Soloviev. The book gives a moving account of the erosion of the faith of a dedicated Marxist. The hero at first tried to convince others: “We must smash the past that is part of us and everything around us. That’s harsh ... but we do it in the name of the future, which will not be harsh. You can’t chop wood without making splinters.... History will understand us, and it will not condemn us because of the splinters we’re making in our great work of construction.”

In face of the terrible realisation that “all the blood was shed in vain,” the hero clings desperately to the dialectics of freedom-through-slavery: “We shall come to power over the system through subjection to the system. That one simply must believe, and never dare to doubt” (p. 183). To “a real Stalinist ... the groans of human beings” are his “symphony of construction,” (p. 177), because “without violence you can’t open the door into the future” (p. 199).

“Scientific Socialism”

“The future.” This is the great magnet of Communism. A future in which, once

all power has been seized by the Communists, there will not only be a new type of society but a new type of individual. Socialists before Marx and Engels had also offered a new golden age, but they had appealed to and relied upon human intelligence and good will to attain their ideals of the perfect society. Marx and Engels claimed that the early Socialists failed because they did not understand the laws of human society and history. If mankind can discover the laws which govern its life, it will then be able to take its destiny into its own hands. Marx and Engels claimed to have discovered these laws. And these laws showed that it was “inevitable” that socialism must win. It was independent of and superior to human will.

A study of the history of Marxism reveals that while Marx and Engels introduced a powerful force when they claimed that their “science” proved that the victory of socialism (later called Communism) was a certainty, and that “economic determinism” was excellent for propaganda purposes, more than this was required for the actual reaching of the objective.

And clearly, Marx and Engels saw that there was one fatal flaw in their “science”—one which still exists today: if historical materialism makes it inevitable that “capitalism” is destroyed and replaced by socialism, then surely the same laws which removed “capitalism” must also remove socialism (Communism). Marx and Engels attempted to solve this problem by advancing the necessity for human political action. This duality in the Marxist movement (economic and determinist versus political and voluntarist) continued until Lenin’s contribution. Because Lenin saw the vital importance of “science”—“historical inevitability”—and maintained it as a vital element in Communist strategy. But the emphasis by Lenin was on the necessity for political action and organisation.

In his *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, Stalin explained why before Marx mankind, not knowing the laws governing its own life, could never take its fate into its own hands. But once known, the laws become the servants of man. And then, most astonishing, since the Communists discovered these laws, they serve Communists and Communist power!

Both the theory of historical materialism and the law of dialectics have become instruments to achieve political power. Dialectics have become a major and magic weapon. Marxian dialectics have to defend “the power of the working class,” i.e., the Communist Party. Dialectics are used to prove that all enemies of the Communist Party are wrong, morally corrupt and politically reactionary. Communist mistakes, inconsistencies and deviations are all “explained” away by dialectics. For example, aren’t Communists against oppression, the central idea of the *Communist Manifesto*? Isn’t the Soviet a denial of this idea?

Felix Dzerzhinsky, the first chief of the Soviet secret police, the “Cheka,” gave a fantastic (to the non-Communist) comment on the question: “One must have the inner consciousness of the necessity to meet death for the sake of life, to go into slavery for the sake of freedom, and have the strength to survive the whole hell of life with open eyes, feeling in your heart the great sublime hymn of beauty, truth and happiness wrung from it.” (Quoted in Igor Gouzenko’s *The Fall of a Titan*, 1954, p. 320.)

To Peace—Through War!

And what is the dialectical answer on the question of war? The Communists claim to be against war, but only when war does not serve Communist aims. “The Soviet Union ... is opposed to an imperialistic war,” solemnly declares the famous Communist leader Karl Radek. “It recognises as equitable only one war, the war for the defence of Socialism, the war of the enslaved peoples for their liberation.” (Karl Radek, “The Bases of Soviet Foreign Policy,” in *The Foreign Affairs Reader*, 1947, p. 181.)

The Chinese Communist leader Mao Zedong put it much more clearly: “We are for the abolition of wars. War, we don’t need it. But war can only be abolished through war. Thus, if you want to do away with rifles, grab your rifle.” (Quoted from his *Select Works*, Vol. 11, p. 262, in the French revue *Preuves*, May, 1956, pp. 1–3.)

Communists claim to be for the independence and self-determination of people. But what is the dialectical answer when it is pointed out that the Communists do not practise what they preach? Stalin quotes Lenin: “The particular postulates of democracy, among them self-determination, are not something absolute, but a small part of the general democratic ... world movement. In some cases the small part may conflict with the whole, and then it must be rejected.” (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 257–258).

Everything must be viewed and assessed from the “viewpoint of the interests of the revolutionary struggle.” Freedom, independence and self-determination is recognized only when it serves the interests of the Communist revolution and the consolidation of Communist power. Stalin spelled it out clearly: “There are occasions when the right of self-determination conflicts with the ... higher right—the right of the working class that has assumed power to consolidate its power. In such cases—this must be said bluntly—the right to self-determination cannot and must not serve as an obstacle to the exercise of the working class of its right to dictatorship. The former must give way to the latter. That, for instance, was the case in 1920, when in order to defend the power of the working class, we

were obliged to march on Warsaw.” (*Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, p. 58.)

Although the question of colonies has been regarded by the Communists as a special aspect of the national problem, it demands particular attention—particularly at the present time. Stalin claimed that the following is the correct formulation of the problem: can the revolutionary possibilities inherent in the revolutionary “liberation” movements of oppressed countries—“colonies and dependent countries”—be used to help overthrow imperialism and to further the proletarian revolution? Stalin comments: “The national movement of oppressed countries must not be evaluated from the viewpoint of formal democracy, but from the viewpoint of real results in the general balance of the struggle against imperialism.” (*Marxism and The National and Colonial Question*, p. 58.)

While “capitalism” exists, Communists must continue to proclaim the right of secession of the colonies, but this is only for the purpose of breaking up “imperialist unity.” In Communist dialectics, separation and fusion, or unification, of colonies are not two different concepts. Heed Master Lenin on the subject: “We preach separation although evolution is towards the fusion of nations ... for the same reason that we preach ... the dictatorship of the proletariat, although all evolution goes toward the abolition of the domination of force of one part of society over the other.” (Quoted by Milovan Djilas, *Lénine et les rapports entre états socialistes*, Paris: Le Livre yougoslave, 1949, p. 111.)

Colonies must be free from “capitalism” but “united” under Communism! This is the essence of Communist dialectics on the question of colonies and “oppressed” countries.

Communist Internationalism

Are Communists nationalists or internationalists? Tito, now in harmony with Moscow, provides a really dialectical gem: “As to whether or not we are nationalists, I can state the following: we are nationalists in as much as this is necessary to develop among our people a healthy socialistic patriotism, and socialistic patriotism in its essence is internationalism.” (“On Nationalism and Internationalism,” address given before the Slovene Academy of Arts and Sciences, November 16, 1948, p. 14.)

“Democracy” is one of the words used *ad nauseum* by the Communists. This does not mean free elections. In his *Foundations of Leninism* (p. 43), Stalin quotes Lenin’s view in *The State and Revolution*, that “the dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule—unrestricted by law and based on force—of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie ...”, and states that the first conclusion to be drawn from

this is that “the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be ‘complete’ democracy, democracy for all, for the rich as well as for the poor; the dictatorship of the proletariat ‘must be a state that is democratic *in a new way*’....” (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 34.)

When the Communists seize power, “the people” only must get freedom. Who are “the people”? Those who are for Communism. Those against Communism are the “reactionaries” and therefore are not entitled to freedom. Mao Zedong, accepted by all Communists as a brilliant Marxist-Leninist theoretician, deals with this question in his work *On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship* (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1951, p. 16). He states that “the democratic system is to be carried out within the ranks of the people, giving them freedom of speech, assembly and association. The right to vote is given only to the people, not to the reactionaries.” In answer to the question, “What, then, is Communism—democracy or dictatorship?”, Mao Zedong answers: “These two things, democracy for the people and dictatorship for the reactionaries, when combined, constitute the people’s democratic dictatorship.”

This astonishing dialectical answer by the Chinese Communist leader concerning democracy, has, however, been bettered in the following example given by the former Tito supporter, Djilas (now generally, but wrongly, accepted as an anti-Marxist). At the Yugoslav elections of 1950 there were no opposition candidates. Djilas asked, “Is that democratic?” and answered in the affirmative: “In our era, the bourgeoisie is an obstacle to the further development of production forces.... Therefore, its candidates would only be a superfluous hindrance.... Therefore, the non-existence of opposition candidates here is not lack of democracy in the elections and the whole state system, but the opposite; it is proof of the strength of the working class and working masses, proof that our democracy is a consistently people’s democracy, that it is consistently for the people....” (*On New Roads of Socialism*, 1950, pp. 5–6. Quoted by Slobodan Draskovic in *Tito, Moscow’s Trojan Horse*.)

A final classic is provided by Stalin in his *Foundations of Leninism*. According to the Marxian theory of the State, it is not representative of all sections, but is an instrument of oppression by the “ruling class.” Marxists are therefore against the State. It will “wither away.” But when the Communists seize power, the State becomes stronger. All non-Communists will immediately say, “The Communists are hypocrites and contradict themselves.” But they know nothing about dialectical thinking!

Let Stalin explain: “We are for the withering away of the State. And yet we also believe in the proletarian dictatorship which represents the strongest and mightiest form of state power that has existed up to now. To keep on developing

state power in order to prepare the conditions for the withering away of state power—that is the Marxist formula. Is it ‘contradictory’? Yes, ‘contradictory.’ But the contradiction is vital, and wholly reflects the Marxist dialectic.... Whoever has not understood this feature of the contradictions belonging to our transitional time, whoever has not understood this dialectic of historical processes, that person is dead to Marxism.”

CHAPTER III

DIALECTICS AND COMMUNIST SEMANTICS

A grasp of Communist dialectics enables a much clearer understanding of the Communist's terminology. The widespread confusion amongst non-Communists concerning Communist semantics is a great source of weakness and one of great strength for the Communists. Terms like "freedom," "justice," "peace," "civil and human progress," "humanity," "welfare of the people," etc., mean one thing to non-Communists and something very different to Communists. And, of course, there is "peaceful coexistence." Most opponents of Communism are at a disadvantage because they talk and act against a set of fixed moral principles. But to a Communist everything is moral which will advance Communism. Communism is "historically inevitable" and is therefore a manifestation of truth.

Every act which advances this truth therefore must be right. For example, the Communists believe that certain classes in the community must be killed when the Communists obtain power. This, to the Communist, is not murder. Murder is a bourgeois term which means killing individuals for bad reasons. Killing Communists is murder. But killing classes of people to advance Communism is not murder; it is a moral act. Lying is not lying if it advances Communism. The ultimate truth is the will of the Communist Party, which history has made necessary. Because the end creates the means, all killing and brutality is peaceful if it advances the Communist conquest.

Lenin said that "proletarian morality is determined by the exigencies of the class struggle." Now it will be pointed out in opposition to this that the Communists are forever talking about the desirability of peace. How can peace and conflict be reconciled? Easily, in Communist dialectics. The Communists accept class warfare as a basic law of historical development, but they also believe that the historical synthesis of this basic law is the *peace which will follow the Communist victory* over the whole world. Even war is, therefore, part of a peaceful process—in Communist dialectics and semantics!

Words become weapons to the Communist. Because his basic philosophy provides him with complete freedom of movement, he can even support at the same time two conflicting opposites, providing that this will advance

Communism: “the will of history.” All agreements are regarded from one viewpoint only: will they advance Communism? To the complete Marxist-Leninist, every question must be answered against the background of whether or not it will advance Communism.

The Communist mind is not immoral, but amoral. If it were immoral, there would be a starting point to reach it. But a mind which not only rejects all concepts of fixed moral precepts, but which can make anything moral which advances the Marxist “revelation,” cannot be reached within the thought-forms of the West. Most discussion, “summit talks,” etc., are therefore not only a waste of time, but further the dangerous delusion that it is possible to reason with the Communists. The only starting point for realistic talks would be an attack upon the basis Communist philosophy of dialectical materialism. But there does not appear to be one Western leader capable of doing this. Rather do they reflect the general ignorance of the problem confronting the West by clinging to the hope that if the West can at least maintain its military defences, Communism will become “different.” And in the meantime much is heard of “peaceful coexistence,” or, as Khrushchev calls it, “competitive coexistence.”

What “Peaceful Coexistence” Means

The Western concept of “peaceful coexistence” naturally differs from that of the Communists, because the meaning given to the two words is different. As the Communist believes that conflict and revolution are a part of historical reality, he cannot accept the Western concept of peace, nor can he believe in any indefinite period of coexistence. But the “class struggle” and other revolutionary activities can and do continue in the absence of a major military struggle. It is no use superficial opponents of Communism pointing to Communist influence in revolutionary activities in any part of the world and claiming that the Communists are breaking their word about “peaceful coexistence.” The Communists will reply that these activities are but a confirmation of their analysis of reality. And who can deny the logic of this answer, providing the Communist philosophy of dialectical materialism is not completely rejected and exposed?

Communist dialectics justify the use of “peaceful coexistence” as a very necessary tactical move. Lenin used it to coexist with other groups until he had used them, and could then destroy them. Stalin used it when, rejecting Trotsky’s doctrine of immediate world-wide revolutionary activities, he decided to coexist with the non-Communists until he had first strengthened the base of World Revolution. The Popular Front Movements of the thirties came out of the

teaching of “peaceful coexistence.” Under the cover of “peaceful coexistence” a world-wide espionage system was established.

The Soviet *Diplomatic Dictionary* (quoted in *Double Talk* by Harry Hodgkinson, p. 26) makes it clear that coexistence was not chosen by the Communists, but was forced upon them by events, and is not to be regarded as a permanent state of affairs: “Lenin and Stalin, in their theoretical inquiries and in their practical work as leaders of the Soviet Socialist State, set out from an acceptance of the principle of the inescapable temporary coexistence of the two systems—the capitalist and the socialist.” Communist “coexistence” with the non-Communist world is in fact but part of Communism’s total program of conquest. Both in Marxist theory and propaganda, the point is stressed time and time again that in order to thrive, Communism needs “complete security.” Until world-wide victory is achieved, there is always the possibility of “capitalist reactionaries” fighting back.

In Communist semantics, “coexistence” means that the non-Communists will depart from the world stage without a struggle. It is true that the West has “coexisted” with the Communists for over 40 years. But during this period the Communists have increased their control of the world’s population from approximately 150 millions to approximately 1000 millions—one-third of the world’s total population. Another decade of “coexistence” could be the end for the West.

CHAPTER IV

DIALECTICS WITHIN THE COMMUNIST WORLD

The world's press headlines have proclaimed that there is a "major ideological cleavage" between Moscow and the Chinese Communists. Overlooked by the same press, which merely reflects the general ignorance of Marxism-Leninism in the West, was the fact that when Khrushchev was making a defence of his actions concerning Cuba and, by strong inference, criticising the Chinese Communists, he was being strongly supported by Tito, Communist dictator of Yugoslavia. It is not so many years back that the world's press was proclaiming a "major ideological cleavage" between Tito and Moscow. In fact, the pretence is still maintained that Tito is a "different kind" of Communist, and must therefore be assisted economically by the West.

The Stalin-Trotsky Clash

It is certainly true that there have been differences of opinion between the Marxist-Leninists, both before and since they seized control in Soviet Russia. But these differences have not been about basic ideology—dialectical materialism. When Stalin defeated Trotsky for the leadership of the Communist dictatorship in Russia, there were many in the West who proclaimed this as a victory of the "moderates." But in the hearing conducted in Mexico on a voluntary basis in 1937, Trotsky's counsel, Albert Goldman, stressed the fact that Trotsky was a dedicated Marxist-Leninist. Even after being expelled from the Soviet, he still wanted to defend it "against all" enemies. When asked whether he was prepared to collaborate with Stalin, Trotsky said that he would. He was defending Stalin because "we do not want to overthrow the system, but to reform it."

Although Trotsky called the Soviet "the most inquisitorial system of all time," nevertheless he said that he preferred it to democracy. The Soviet Union "represents a tremendous step forward in the development of mankind" and every Communist has "the absolute duty ... to defend the U.S.S.R. against imperialism despite the Soviet bureaucracy."

So far from the conflict between Stalin and Trotsky weakening Marxism-Leninism, it did the very opposite. And thus provided the dialectical materialists with convincing evidence that greater strength was to be obtained by the application of the dialectic—"self-criticism" being an essential feature.

The story of Tito's valuable contribution to the advancement of Marxism-Leninism from the time he broke with Stalin in 1948 until the present, is a fascinating and frightening example of the Marxist dialecticians working out their own internal differences about correct tactics while at the same time consistently fooling the non-Communists.

Titoism

Although the West generally has accepted the story that Tito broke with Stalin because he was a "patriot" who would not be dictated to, there is no evidence whatever to support this. Whatever Stalin's motives for initiating action against Tito (there has never been any satisfactory explanation for Stalin's move), the record shows conclusively that Tito opposed the expulsion from the Communist bloc and kept protesting his loyalty to both the Soviet and to Marxism-Leninism. There is no evidence whatever to support the story that he was fighting for Yugoslavia's independence against Moscow pressure.

Time and time again Tito made it clear that he was a loyal Marxist-Leninist. He believed in dialectical materialism and the "historical inevitability" of Communism. He and his colleagues openly proclaimed that their difference of opinion with Moscow was not about the right of Yugoslavia to "independent development," but about the best way to promote Communism in the world. Even if Stalin had not intended it, his expulsion of Tito and the world-wide propaganda to present Tito as a "different kind" of Communist paid enormous dividends to the Communist camp. He was wildly eulogised in the West by all the "eminent commentators," and soon was obtaining a steady flow of dollar assistance.

Typical of the gullible comments was the following from an editorial in the *New York Herald Tribune* of August 28, 1951: "Our dislike for Communism, be it Stalinist or Titoist, need not blind us to the fact that Tito's thirty-two divisions form the outer armour of the West's Mediterranean defences and that, if they go down, the Kremlin would be well on its way toward conquering Western Europe."

The carefully-fostered view was that in order to save itself, the West had to save Tito. And Tito, a man trained from his youth in Communist dialectics and semantics, played up to the widely-propagated view that he was doing

tremendous harm to the Communist bloc—whereas in fact he was advancing the strategy of International Communism.

Tito worked numerous successful hoaxes on the West concerning the “liberalisation” of his regime. Speaking to the students of a partisan high school in June, 1950, Tito dealt with the question of the essence of the “tremendous difference between Communism as practised in Russia and Yugoslavia.” Tito said, “Our party must avoid becoming ... bureaucratic, as in the case with the All-Union Communist Party (bolshevik). Our party must ... control the state apparatus, it must direct all fields of activity in our country—but it must not become bureaucratic.” Now Tito’s advice to Yugoslav Communists to practice bureaucratism without becoming bureaucratic was not a cynical joke. It was the logical application of the law of dialectics to the bureaucratic situation in Yugoslavia. The state must wither and it is withering, but only dialectically through first making the state stronger!

Not knowing anything about Communist dialectics, Western “experts” continued to swallow Titoism uncritically. We have already quoted Tito’s famous remarks concerning the 1950 Yugoslavian “elections.” But these “elections” were quoted in the West as further evidence that Tito was moving further away from Moscow. Although Tito’s voting in the United Nations has been 100 per cent for all Soviet policies, and although he has continued to make it clear that he was working for a Communist world—by “different” methods, of course!—his few verbal criticisms of Moscow have been sufficient to keep the flow of dollars coming. This has enabled him to strengthen his armed forces and to gain a tighter grip on the nation.

To counteract American critics of American support for his regime, Tito started a campaign of counter-propaganda, the essence of which was: By supporting Tito, Washington was strengthening the West against potential Soviet aggression. Americans criticising help for Tito were weakening their Government in its efforts to strengthen the West. They were therefore “unpatriotic.” Here were Communist dialectics at their best. Support for Communist Tito was a gauge of an American citizen’s patriotism!

By 1955, after Tito’s successful missions to Asia, where he persuaded the Asians that Stalin’s successors were, like himself, “different” Communists, it was clear to the Moscow Communists that Tito was making a tremendous contribution towards the advancement of Communist victory. Tito was continually proclaiming for the benefit of the West that a “new era” had been introduced in Russia following Stalin’s death. The visit to Tito of Bulganin and Khrushchev in 1955 produced some fantastic comment in the Western press. Tito had “humbled” the mighty Soviet.

One report said that Tito had agreed to normalize his relations with the Soviet because he was “convinced the Russians have dropped their plans for world domination.” This report must have created hilarious comment amongst the Marxist-Leninists. Tito continued to make it clear that he was still working for a Communist world. And the U.S.A. continued to supply him with dollars—to enable him to continue with his “different” Communism.

Khrushchev’s Dialectical Retreat

Khrushchev fired his first major shot to convince the West that he, like Tito, was also a “different kind” of Communist, in his famous attack upon Stalin. This was a calculated dialectical move. It is generally claimed that Khrushchev condemned Stalin in his address because he dealt with Stalin’s sadistic acts. But after outlining in lurid detail Stalin’s criminal record, the torture of his own associates, Khrushchev then said he did not want to be misunderstood. He (Stalin) acted as a Marxist-Leninist. He acted in the interest of the working class.

Khrushchev’s campaign for “peaceful coexistence” received a severe set-back with the Hungarian uprising of 1956. He then had to act in true Stalinist style. And, most significant, Tito supported Khrushchev. This was in accordance with Communist dialectics: it is “immoral” for Communists to relinquish power once they have obtained it. But still the West persisted in believing that Communism could be defeated not by attacking the very foundations of Communism, but by assisting “different” Communists. While it is probably true, as all competent authorities on Communism agree, that originally Stalin’s clash with Tito was the result of the new historical situation following the unprecedented expansion of Communist power after the war, both Moscow and Tito soon realised that, providing the West did not attempt to exploit their differences, they could work dialectically to use these differences to advance their common objective, Communism.

Once the Western peoples started to recover from the honeymoon of “coexistence” with Communism during the war, Stalin’s methods produced a definite reaction. “Stalinism” was making it clear that Communism was bad. This meant a life and death fight for the West, because there was no other alternative. But the arrival of Tito introduced a new factor. The West was confused into seeing Tito’s Communism as an alternative to Stalin’s Communism. This has had a serious effect on the West’s will to fight and win.

All Communists believe in the inevitability of complete Communist victory. That victory can be hastened if they can persuade their opponents that some Communists are “different” from others and should therefore be supported. The

policy of helping the “different” Communists (in Poland, too) certainly contains no message of hope to the world about the possible destruction of Communism. It contains the opposite message: that it takes a Communist to fight a Communist, that the only way to defeat Communism is to support Communism. In fact that there is no alternative to Communism in the world.

Separate Roads to Socialism

Khrushchev and Bulganin visited Tito in May and June of 1955. They openly recognised Tito’s right to his own “road to Socialism.” Tito’s “different” Communism was much more efficient in destroying the West than Soviet Communism. For practical reasons, this right to a separate road to Socialism could not be confined to Yugoslavia. And so the principle of different roads to Socialism was endorsed at the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party held in February, 1956.

Then followed a great deal of coming and going by Communist leaders everywhere, both in the Communist bloc and in the non-Communist world. Communism was becoming “different” with a vengeance. The West was delighted with the “change.” Communism was becoming more “democratic”! Attacks on “Stalinists” were featured. But it was necessary to be careful. After all, both Khrushchev and Tito had been Stalin’s associates.

Tito urged moderation in the new “self-criticism,” pretending that it could lead to the defeat of Khrushchev and “would strengthen the Stalinist opposition.” And as a good Communist dialectician, Tito complained about the use of the term *satellites*. “Why do you always call them satellites?... We saw here in Romania that the Romanians are self-ruling people.” (Quoted in the *New York Times*, June 27, 1956.)

Tito’s campaign for anti-Moscow independence of the satellites was clearly dialectic. European Communists were to attack the Soviet only within the limits of Soviet permission. This tactic was probably decided in Moscow. Proof of this was provided in Poland following the demonstration of workers at Pozan, who, encouraged by anti-Stalinist and Titoist propaganda, demanded both bread and freedom. Although Soviet tanks were immediately used to deal with the uprising, this appeared to make no impression on gullible Western commentators who persisted in believing that “liberalising” forces were at work.

Gomulka, the alleged Titoist purged from the Polish Communist Party in 1949, was brought to power. Some quite fantastic stories, now known to be completely false, were fed out to the West of how Gomulka was standing up to Moscow. No sooner had Gomulka been installed—but still surrounded by the

very men appointed by Stalin—in Poland than he said that it would be “naïve” to think that Poland “was leaning away from Russia towards the West.”

He told President Eisenhower that Poland’s “new freedom” did not give America the right to interfere in Poland’s internal affairs. There was no fear of this. The American policy makers were so convinced that the “new freedom” mentioned by Gomulka was the same type of freedom they had in mind, that they lost no time in recommending that Gomulka, like Tito, should also receive a liberal flow of dollar support. Certainly not all these policy makers are gullible victims of Communist dialectics. But they have persuaded many Americans that the way to defeat Communism is to finance “different” kinds of Communism! When Gomulka spoke about Poland’s “new freedom” he was, of course, speaking dialectically.

Western victims of Communist propaganda have made much of how Gomulka stood up to Moscow on the question of Soviet troops being withdrawn. The fact is that when Gomulka visited Moscow after being reinstated, he assured the Soviet leaders that there could be no talk of Poland leaving the Warsaw Pact. This Pact legalised Soviet troops in Poland, where they have stayed. But the Soviet-Polish pact declared that it was establishing “complete equality” between Poland and the Soviet. The Soviet leaders were allegedly promoting “national independence.” And, of course, were anti-Stalinist!

But students of Communism know that the theoretical justification for “different roads” to Socialism is to be found in Lenin and Stalin. In *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Stalin enthusiastically advocated Communist equality, sovereignty and national independence.

Hungarian Set-Back

The events in Hungary in 1956 provide one more frightening example of Communist dialectics. The Hungarian Communist leaders, including Imre Nagy, the “national” Communist Prime Minister, wanted to stage a show of anti-Stalinism which would in fact change nothing. But the unexpected popular revolt blew up in their faces, and Nagy had to call in Soviet troops to quell the riots. But when events went against the Communists in the last days of October, Nagy attempted to divorce himself from the Soviet, later taking refuge in the Yugoslav Embassy.

Having taken one step backwards when they withdrew from Hungary, the Soviet leaders quickly realised that the West was not acting, and so they took two brutal dialectical steps forward with Mongolian troops. They then installed their man Kadar in power.

To fit in with the dialectical play, Kadar then obediently breathed anti-Soviet defiance! He proclaimed Point 1 of his 15-point program: “Unconditional insurance of the national independence and sovereignty of our country.” His Soviet masters helped him to broadcast his proclamation! Tito, Gomulka, the Chinese Communists—and, of course, Communist leaders everywhere—applauded.

Tito said shortly afterwards that in his opinion the new Communist leaders in Hungary “represent that which is most honest in Hungary.”

Tito said that he was against Soviet military intervention, but as against that there was chaos, civil war and counter-revolution in Hungary. “And, of course, if [intervention] saves Socialism in Hungary, then we shall be able, comrades, to say that, although we are against intervention, the Soviet intervention was necessary.”

Surely this statement by Tito establishes him as an absolute master of Communist dialectics. And if having hailed Khrushchev, following the brutal massacres of Budapest, as a democratic, anti-Stalinist Communist, Tito can still be claimed in the West as a courageous adversary of Moscow and worthy of more dollar and military assistance, then the Communist leaders must be convinced that the strategy of “different,” “independent,” “national” Communism works miracles.

After the history of the Moscow-Belgrade strategy, it would be reasonable to hope that Western political leaders should be more careful about the Moscow-Peking “split.”

But already the “line” is emerging that Khrushchev is the “moderate” and must be supported as a counter to the Peking “Stalinists.” When the harsh exchanges between Tito and Moscow are recalled, it is ironical that Tito is now solidly supporting Khrushchev. Whether or not the verbal controversies between the Chinese Communists, Moscow and most other Western Communist groups are genuine or a deliberately planned dialectical move, it is paying big dividends to the Communists.

The Chinese Communists have nothing to learn about the use of dialectics from Moscow. This fact increases the significance of the following statement by the *People’s Daily*, the Chinese Communist paper, as quoted in *The Sun*, Melbourne, on January 1, 1963: “We have never considered that it was a Marxist-Leninist attitude to brandish nuclear weapons as a way of settling international disputes. What we did strongly oppose, still strongly oppose and will strongly oppose in the future is the sacrifice of another country’s sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism.... A compromise of this sort has nothing in common with the policy of peaceful

coexistence of the socialist countries.”

That Cuban “Retreat”

As the Chinese Communists knew as well as did Khrushchev, the vital importance of saving Cuba as a key Communist base for revolutionary activities throughout Latin-America, their statement can only be designed to help further the false idea that Communism suffered a major reverse and that if they had been in charge of the proceedings, they would have not “compromised”—whatever that might mean.

In exchange for carting away nuclear weapons which he had no intention of using, Khrushchev obtained from Kennedy a promise not to invade Castro’s Cuba. Castro has since openly paraded some of the extensive military equipment he has been given by the Soviet and taunted the Americans with having been forced to pay an indemnity to Socialist Cuba to get back to the U.S.A. those who participated in the abortive Bay of Pigs incident.

The readiness of Mr. Khrushchev to take away his nuclear weapons (if he did; some have doubts about this in the absence of direct inspection) has been widely commented on to prove that he is one of the “reasonable” Communist leaders! Whatever the reason for the Chinese Communists’ military aggression against “neutralist” India and the sudden withdrawal when the Chinese were carrying all before them, this incident has been paraded as still further evidence of the “moderation” of the Soviet leaders compared with the “Stalinist” Chinese.

The fact that Khrushchev can be successfully presented to the world as an “anti-Stalinist,” a “moderate” Communist who genuinely believes in “peaceful coexistence” and who must therefore be supported against Peking is overwhelming proof of the success of Communist dialectics.

Khrushchev’s retreat has been so well presented that comparatively few remember that it was Stalin himself, at the 19th Congress of the Communist Party held in Moscow in 1953, who altered the doctrine of inevitable military conflict between the Communists and non-Communists, to the doctrine of *conquest through “peaceful coexistence.”* Stalin was convinced that the non-Communists would surrender more quickly under this doctrine, made necessary because of the danger of nuclear war.

A Great Stalinist

So far from being an “anti-Stalinist,” Khrushchev was one of the greatest Stalinists, because he was one of the very few who managed to survive the Stalin

purges. He was actually one of Stalin's principal instruments of mass murder and is remembered in Russia as "the butcher of the Ukraine." Khrushchev therefore took over Stalin's policy of "peaceful coexistence" and set out to create a new image for himself. But in an address in Poland in 1955 Khrushchev said, "We must realise that we cannot coexist eternally for a long time. One of us must go to his grave."

This statement recalls the comment by the Melbourne Communist journal, *The Guardian*, concerning the Moscow-Peking "split," which said that the difference of opinion was only about the funeral arrangements for the West. Mr. Mao Zedong appears to be in a hurry to get the funeral completed, while Khrushchev suggests that any attempt at being too hasty could produce resistance in the West, whereas his current dialectical "retreat" is the most effective means of pushing the West to its grave.

It is clear, therefore, that irrespective of whether the verbal duels between Moscow and Peking are genuine or not, they are making a major contribution to the general Communist advance. Trained Communists right around the world understand the true nature of the Moscow-Peking differences. And while deluded non-Communists may attempt to console themselves that there is a real split, the Communists note with satisfaction that Khrushchev, the "anti-Stalinist" has promised Mao Zedong that any attack on Communist China will immediately bring the full might of the Soviet to China's defence.

It is the Moscow-Tito "split" all over again. During that "split" Khrushchev warned the West that differences between Tito and Moscow were "internal" matters to be settled between the Communists themselves. And these differences were settled most satisfactorily—for the Communists! Now Khrushchev warns the "capitalists" not to interfere in a "family" dispute between Moscow and Peking.

Unless there is a major change in Western outlook and understanding, there is no fear of this.

No Compromise Possible

From the time of Marx and Engels, there have been differences of opinion amongst the Marxist-Leninists concerning tactics. But the controversies concerning tactics have merely assisted the Marxist-Leninists to improve their methods for advancing a fixed and unalterable strategy. And of course, there have been struggles for power within the Communist Empire.

As the Empire expands, it is certain that internal tensions and frictions will increase. Friction and tensions in the Communist bloc would, of course, help the

West if the West made up its mind that there can be no compromise with Communism, whatever brand it may be.

The West must develop the will to win. And as an essential part of its program for victory, it must ensure that sufficient people, particularly leaders, understand the real nature of Communism. With that understanding, it would be possible to tear to tatters all Communist theories, and to offer hope to the peoples suffering under Communism. These people are not impressed with Communist dialectics; they know Communist reality.

When Western leaders take the trouble to see through the Communists' dialectical trickery, they will also act from a basis of reality. And, contrary to the philosophy of dialectical materialism, reality is far more than the mere sum total of material factors. It is this reality which provides hope for Civilization.