

FILE / SUBJ.

DATE / SUB-CAT.

1/64

RECEIVED

TRANSLATIONS FROM HOC TAP (STUDIES)

No 1, 1964

- North Vietnam -

(Peace and Revolution)

TRAN
2004
TJ

PEACE AND REVOLUTION

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

The desire to live in peace, to live life without suffering and death caused by war is the common desire of all people of the world. All progressive people the world over agree on the protection of world peace. But they disagree on the means to protect world peace.

Communists have always advocated the necessity of protecting world peace and struggling against imperialist wars. Communists have endeavored to find the most efficient measures to struggle against war and to protect peace. In so doing communists have based themselves, on the one hand, on basic Marxist-Leninist principles and, on the other hand, on the concrete situation of each country and of the world. What are the factors in the world situation of our era which exert some influence on the problem of war and peace?

1. The possibility of preventing world war in our era.

In the world today there are new factors which are favorable for the struggle to protect world peace. These new factors are: socialism is an international system and exerts an increasingly decisive influence on the development of society; the national liberation movement is boiling in Asian, African and Latin American countries; and imperialism is weakening daily and the scope of its domination is lessened daily. The balance of forces in the world is increasingly advantageous to socialism, the national liberation movement, the movement of struggle for democracy and social progress, and the movement to protect world peace and increasingly disadvantageous to warlike imperialism. This new situation has created the possibility of preventing imperialism from waging world war.

Communists have never believed in fatalism. In saying that, "under the capitalist system, especially during its imperialist phase, war is unavoidable," Lenin did not propagandize for fatalism. He only set forth a rule about capitalism. Up to the present, this view of Lenin's has not become outmoded. Capitalism still rules over two-thirds of the population

and three-fourths of the land of the world. In this part of the world, this rule about capitalism as set forth by Lenin, is still in force. The scope of its effect, however, has been partially limited by the fact that the balance of class forces in the world has changed in a way favorable to the working class, laboring people and the oppressed.

For instance, as long as imperialism exists, contradictions among imperialist countries will exist and, consequently, war among these countries may break out. But because of the existence of the system of powerful socialist countries, the imperialist countries must do their best to check or postpone war out of fear that, if they let war break out, they will weaken each other and the socialist countries will then take advantage of the opportunity and gain superiority in the struggle against imperialism.

Here is another example: as long as imperialism exists, the imperialists can wage wars of aggression against small and weak countries. But ~~because of the existence of the socialist countries, the imperialists must be cautious.~~ They dare not devote all of their force to these wars. The liberation wars of small and weak countries, supported by the socialist countries, can triumph over the imperialists.

Thus, following the rule about capitalism set forth by Lenin, over ten wars of various sizes have broken out in the world since the end of World War II. This proves that in the world today there is not the possibility of preventing all wars.

However, since the end of World War II, almost 20 years have passed and World War III has not broken out. Now there is no sign that World War III is going to break out, although the danger of world war is still serious. This proves that the possibility of preventing world war actually exists. But possibility is not reality. The possibility may be transformed into reality or may not be. To transform possibility into reality, there must be human activity.

Communists do not believe in fatalism, whether they face peace or war. One cannot obtain peace passively. To have peace, one must struggle fiercely. Stalin once rightly said: "If the peoples of all countries rise up and assume the responsibility of maintaining peace and of doing so forever, peace can be maintained and consolidated." This statement reflects the role of human activity in transforming the possibility of preventing world war into a reality.

Modern revisionists, represented by the Tito group, on the one hand slander that true Marxist-Leninists believe that "War is inevitable" in order to accuse them of "being warlike." On the other hand they maintain that peace is inevitable and that peace can be achieved without having to struggle against the imperialist aggressors. This view is an illusion that paralyzes the clear thinking of the people of different countries and, at the same time, is a smokescreen which conceals the imperialists' preparations for war.

Modern revisionists try their best to make people believe that the possibility of preventing world war is the only possibility. In so doing they also make the people believe that the danger of a new world war no longer exists. In dealing with the possibility of preventing a world war in our present era, Marxist-Leninists always point out that, as long as imperialism exists, mankind will be continually threatened with war, and that, therefore, it is necessary to struggle absolutely against imperialist, war-like policies to prevent a new world war. Only then can the people of all countries be mobilized to struggle to protect world peace. This would keep the people of all countries from being passive and make them ready to resist in the event of a new world war provoked by the imperialists.

Modern revisionists try to put forth the possibility of preventing a world war in our present era as a possibility of preventing all war. The possibility of preventing world war is not also the possibility of preventing all wars, including civil wars and wars of national liberation. As long as imperialism exists there will be the possibility of war. As long as class and class struggle exist there will be the possibility of revolutionary war in a country. As long as the oppression of a people by another people exists there will be the possibility of a war of national liberation.

Lenin once said that Marxists are not unconditionally opposed to all wars. The aim of Marxists is to establish a socialist system which, by eliminating all human distinctions as to class and by eliminating the exploitation of man by man and of a people by the other people, will thoroughly eliminate all possibilities of war in general. But in struggling for socialism, Marxists may encounter the situation when the class struggle in a country may come up against a war among the different peoples which is caused by the class struggle itself. Therefore, Marxists cannot deny the possibility of revolutionary wars, which are caused by class struggles and conducted by revolutionary classes and which have an immediate, direct revolutionary effect. Lenin's view that "Under the capitalist system, war is inevitable" concerns not only world wars, but also all wars of different sizes and characters. Modern revisionists say that this view of Lenin's is now outmoded. They intentionally blinked at wars of different sizes and characters in Asia, Africa and Latin America since 1945. They call Asian, African and Latin American countries, which were and are being shaken by wars "peaceful areas." They do not consider the wars in Asia, Africa and Latin America as wars because these wars broke out outside of Europe at a time when Europe was enjoying peace. Nearly half a century ago Lenin criticized those who maintained that war outside of Europe is not war. He wrote: "Peace prevails in Europe, but the domination of hundreds of millions of people in colonies by European countries has been maintained by incessant wars, wars which we Europeans do not consider as wars because they are less like war than they are like a savage massacre, an annihilation of unarmed people" (Lenin: Complete Works: "War and Revolution," French, Socialist Publishing House, Paris: "Foreign Language" Publishing House, Moscow, 1958, Volume 24, page 410). More than half a century ago the colonial wars waged by the imperialists in Asia, Africa and Latin America were "less like wars than they are like a savage massacre." But today these wars are real wars in which the imperialists often hoist the white flag. Yet modern revisionists still refuse to recognize these wars. This is enough to show that modern revisionists are far more stubborn than the revisionists in Lenin's era.

Modern revisionists refuse to recognize wars provoked by capitalism in Asia, Africa and Latin America to show that capitalism is no longer the cause of war. In this way they want to say: "Look, brother! Capitalism still exists, but there is no war. There is no war in Europe; there is no war in the world. It is obvious that Lenin's view on the inevitability of war under the capitalist system is now outmoded."

Along with rejecting this view of Lenin's, modern revisionists also reject Lenin's view that "only socialism can save mankind from war." Modern revisionists maintain that peace can be protected and war can be opposed without having to struggle against capitalism and imperialism or for the victory of socialism and communism on a world scale.

These views of the modern revisionists actually aim at dressing up capitalism and protecting it. Communists believe that the struggle for peace cannot be separated from the struggle against imperialism and that only by completely destroying imperialism can war be eliminated. Lenin said: "Only after we overthrow and completely defeat the bourgeoisie throughout the world--not just in one country only--and deprive it of its ownership rights will we be able to prevent war." (Lenin, Complete Works, Vietnamese, Su That Publishing House, Hanoi, 1959, Volume 1, Chapter 2, page 537.)

War is the nature of capitalism. Without war imperialism has no other way to settle the contradiction between the development of imperialist productivity and accumulation and the division of colonies and scope of influence. On the other hand, peace is the nature of socialism. Marx wrote: "... (Ellipsis as published) unlike the old society--a society of poor economy and stupid politics--a new society has come into existence. It uses peace as its international principle because each people have the same ruler--labor." (Marx and Engels: Complete Works, Russian, "State Politics" Publishing House, Moscow, 1952, Volume I, page 449.)

When a socialist country is born, a peaceful factor appears. In a socialist country there is no class or class struggle. Therefore, war is not used to settle class contradictions in the country. A socialist country, no classes with privileges or special rights and no anarchic production or economic crises, does not need to provoke war to seize territory from other countries. A socialist country needs peace to achieve national construction in all fields, to make the country powerful, to insure the victory of the revolution, and to improve the people's living standard. Therefore, a socialist country, immediately after coming into existence, advocates the implementation of a peaceful foreign policy. It struggles to survive beside capitalist countries, that is, to be able to coexist with capitalist countries.

2. Concerning the policy of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems.

The policy of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems is based on Lenin's view on the irregular development of capitalism. Because of the irregular development of capitalism, the socialist revolutionary movement of the working class has also developed irregularly.

The socialist revolution has not been successful at the same time in all countries of the world, but it has been successful in the weakest link in the entire chain of capitalism. Irregular capitalist development has resulted in the fact that socialist countries came into existence not all at the same time, but one after the other. The socialist countries which were born first had no way other than to coexist for a definite period of time with the capitalist countries in which the socialist revolution was not yet successful.

Coexistence among countries with different social systems is an objective reality. Whether communists desire peaceful coexistence or not, they cannot deny this objective reality. Socialist countries advocate peaceful coexistence with capitalist countries to have peace in order to build socialism for if war breaks out socialist construction would encounter many obstacles. Socialist countries do not advocate the use of war to "expand" socialism to other countries because the socialist revolution in a country develops in proportion to the acuteness of the class contradictions within the country. With regard to the success of the socialist revolution in a country, internal factors are of decisive importance. Therefore, communists do not advocate the engineering of a revolution of people in other countries or the carrying out of a revolution according to the method of "placing an order for goods." Lenin said: "Revolution cannot be carried out in the same manner as placing an order for goods." (Lenin: Complete Works, in French, "Socialist" Publishing House, Paris: "Foreign Language" Publishing House, Moscow, 1961, Volume 28, page 39.)

The fact that the socialist countries advocate peaceful coexistence with the capitalist countries means that the socialist countries do not wage war or use military forces to attack capitalist countries if they are not forced to do so to defend themselves when invaded. Socialist countries advocate the development of economic relations with capitalist countries. Peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems--a coexistence which is advocated by communists--is a principled coexistence. The principles that socialist countries should maintain in carrying out peaceful coexistence with capitalist countries are: Mutual respect for territorial reignty, abstention from invading each other's territory, non-intervention in each other's internal affairs, equality, and mutual interests.

In setting forth the policy of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems, communists never shut their eyes to the aggressive character of imperialism, to the antagonistic contradictions between socialism and capitalism, and to the danger of the imperialist countries' permanent threat of attack on socialist countries. In coexisting peacefully with capitalist countries, socialist countries have never forgotten their duty to the revolutionary movement of the people in capitalist countries. Therefore, while advocating peaceful coexistence with capitalist countries, the socialist countries continue the struggle in the economic, political, and ideological fields against the ruling classes in capitalist countries.

As Lenin pointed out, because of its aggressive character, imperialism refuses to "coexist" with the socialist countries. In his report on war and peace read at the seventh Congress of the Russian Communist (Bolshevik -- Hoc Tap) Party on 7 March 1918, Lenin said: "Because of its objective position as well as the economic interests of the capitalist class it represents, imperialism--with all its capitalist strength and its perfectly organized military techniques, which make it a very strong force and a real fortress of international capitalists--cannot, under any circumstances, live beside the Soviet Union. It cannot because of commercial relations and international financial relations over which conflict is inevitable." Lenin believed that this was the greatest difficulty facing the Russian revolution and that to settle this difficulty it was necessary to step up the development of the international revolutionary movement.

Lenin wrote in the same report: "That is the greatest difficulty and the most important historic problem for the Russian revolution, that is, the necessity to settle international problems and the necessity to instigate the emergence of the world revolution and to develop our small-scale national revolution into a world revolution."

Lenin foresaw as early as March 1919 the possible combination of revolutionary wars of socialist countries against capitalist ones with civil wars within the capitalist countries. "The resistance of the exploiter clique will increase in proportion with proletarian pressure, and it will be especially intensified after the proletariat have gained success in a number of countries. Such resistance, coupled with the international solidarity and international organizational capabilities of the bourgeoisie, will naturally lead to this result--the combination of civil wars in various countries with revolutionary wars between the socialist countries and the bourgeois ones which defend capitalist rule." (Lenin: "Draft Platform for the Russian Communist Party")

Lenin's prediction was proven right by facts during World War II when the national salvation war of the USSR was closely combined with uprisings and guerrilla movements in several countries. No one can positively say that similar circumstances will not take place in the future.

Lenin repeatedly dealt with the acute struggle between a socialist country and capitalist countries. In the article "On the European Federation Slogan," Lenin wrote: "After becoming victorious in a country and after expropriating the capitalists and organizing a socialist production system in the country, the proletariat will rise up against the remaining capitalist world, attract to their side the oppressed strata of other countries, and urge these strata to rise up against the capitalists and, if necessary, use military force against the exploiter class and their government." (Lenin: "Complete Works" -- Hoc Tap footnote). Lenin said that proletarian states will concentrate an increasing number of proletarian forces in one or several nations in order to "struggle against governments that have not yet stepped into socialism." In the article "On the European Federation Slogan," Lenin set forth as a law the struggle of socialist countries against capitalist ones by saying: "The free alliance of the

various peoples in a socialist system is impossible but for an acute and fairly long struggle by socialist countries against backward governments."

~~To describe the acute and protracted struggle between socialist and capitalist countries as "peaceful competition" based on "Mutual understanding and confidence" and without any class spirit is to close one's eyes to objective realities and to distort Marxism-Leninism. Due to their nature, capitalist countries are never willing to live peacefully with socialist countries, but instead continuously plot to eliminate socialist countries. It is only because they cannot eliminate socialist countries that the imperialist countries resign themselves to allowing socialist countries to exist. To believe that the imperialists "increasingly realize the necessity for peaceful coexistence" and that they have "recognized the rationality and realism of peaceful coexistence" is to display political naivete.~~

~~Nobody can deny that the contradiction between socialism and capitalism is an antagonistic contradiction which implies the disappearance of one and the survival of the other. The way in which this contradiction must be solved in a given area and at a given moment depends entirely on the comparative situation of forces of the two sides. In the attitude of the capitalist countries toward the socialist countries there simultaneously exist two tendencies. The first tendency causes the capitalist countries to form an alliance to counter the socialist countries and, if an opportunity arises, to carry out an offensive to eliminate the socialist countries. The second tendency induces the capitalist countries to coexist with the socialist countries. The first tendency stems from the nature of capitalism. The second tendency is due to the following reasons: The self-defense capabilities of the socialist countries, the contradictions among the capitalist countries; and common economic relationships on an international scale which compel capitalist countries to entertain commercial dealings with socialist countries, these objective relationships being beyond the subjective will of the leaders of capitalist countries.~~

In view of the simultaneous presence of these two tendencies in the attitude of capitalist countries toward socialist countries, the latter must have a dual attitude toward the former: On the one hand, they must strive to coexist peacefully with capitalist countries in order to be able to survive and develop amid capitalist encirclement; on the other hand, they must struggle politically, economically, and ideologically against the ruling class in capitalist countries, and at the same time, aid the working class and laboring people in capitalist countries to oppose the ruling bourgeoisie. That is the two aspects of the foreign policy of socialist countries with regard to capitalist countries in peacetime--and only in peacetime because if war breaks out and if capitalist countries launch a military offensive against socialist countries, then peaceful coexistence between the two sides no longer continues and the only way left for the socialist countries is to resort to war to repel and destroy the aggressors.

~~The Titoist modern revisionists place unilateral stress on "peaceful coexistence" and advocate "peaceful coexistence" at any cost and under whatever circumstances. They call on socialist countries to "coexist positively"~~

and "cooperate in all fields" with the imperialist countries on the basis of "mutual confidence." Influenced by the Titoist modern revisionists, a number of persons believe that "peaceful coexistence" is the "key problem of the present era," "The axis of international activities at the present time," "The road leading to socialism on a worldwide scale," "The key of the strategy of struggle for socialism on a worldwide scale," "The basic rule of life for all of modern society," "The strategic path for the entire period of transition from capitalism to socialism on a worldwide scale," and so forth. They believe that the objective of the working class throughout the world is "to set up an international system of peaceful coexistence." They believe that struggling for "peaceful coexistence" is the fundamental task of the working class and laboring people throughout the world, that this is the general task embracing all other tasks, and that all revolutionary tasks of the people of the world must depend on this "general task."

The modern revisionists and their followers want to eliminate the class struggle on a worldwide scale. They want the working class to abandon its mission of carrying out the world revolution. They want to "make permanent" peaceful coexistence between the two systems--that is, to "make permanent" the existence of capitalism in capitalist countries. Their reasoning is completely contrary to the content of our era, which is the era of transition from capitalism to socialism.

The socialist revolution first triumphs in one country, later, it triumphs in one country then another country. It finally triumphs throughout the world. Coexistence between socialist countries and capitalist countries lasts only for a certain period of history. When socialism triumphs in all countries and capitalism is completely eliminated, "coexistence" between socialist countries and capitalist countries will disappear. The plot to bring about a "permanent" peaceful coexistence is, by nature, a plot to protect the capitalist system.

In his talk to the conference of active combatants of the Moscow chapters on 6 December 1920, Lenin pointed out: "As long as capitalism and socialism exist, they cannot coexist peacefully. Either one side or the other will eventually triumph and will have to attend the funeral of either the Soviet Republic or World Capitalism." Of the two--socialism and capitalism--one side will finally eliminate the other. One side will surely attend the funeral of the other. There must be the funeral of one side. Modern revisionists do not want to attend the funeral of either side. In fact, they do not want to attend the funeral of capitalism. According to the logic of things, they are preparing to attend the funeral of socialism.

After successively carrying out a revolution and seizing state power, the working class must concentrate its force on economic construction, thus making the country rich and powerful. No communist denies the influence of economic construction under socialism. To build an economy in a socialist country is to pursue revolutionary work. A number of persons have quoted Lenin's statements incompletely on economic construction to propagandize for their friendship-filled doctrine of "peaceful emulation" with capitalism. Their efforts have been useless: No one believes their distorted propaganda.

Economic construction is an aspect of the fierce class struggle, of the "struggle" against capitalism. In a talk at the conference of Moscow chapters' secretaries on 26 November 1920 and dealing with the economic construction task and the problem of land rent, Lenin said: "To make concessions on land rent is to pursue the war on the economic front" and "To make concessions on land rent is not to achieve peace, but to pursue the war under another form." At the conference of active combatants of the Moscow chapters on 6 December 1920, Lenin spoke of the problems of economic construction and land rent in this way: "This is a form of war, a duel between two methods, two organizational forms, and two economies, that is, between communism and capitalism" and "To make concessions on land rent is not making peace with capitalism, but is putting the war on another front. War with weapons and tanks gives way to economic war." The way Lenin raised the problem of constructing a socialist economy is totally different from the "peaceful economic emulation" doctrine as set forth by modern revisionists. The fundamental task of the working class and laboring people in capitalist countries is to carry out the revolution in order to eliminate oppression and exploitation and to liberate themselves. One must not set forth the pretext of "peaceful coexistence" to prevent the peoples of these countries from carrying out revolutions. The views that communist and workers parties in capitalist countries must "consider the struggle for peaceful coexistence as the general principle of their policies" and that these parties must consider peaceful coexistence the "strategic base of communism: are fully erroneous.

Lenin set forth the policy of peaceful coexistence among countries having different social systems only for those communist parties which had carried out revolutions successfully and seized state power. As for communist parties that have not seized power, their fundamental task is to overthrow the ruling exploiting class. In the struggle against reactionaries inside countries, these parties must support proletarian dictatorships in countries where revolutions have triumphed, prevent the reactionaries in their own countries from waging war against socialist countries, force the reactionary governments of their countries to apply the policy of peaceful coexistence with socialist countries, and, finally, advance toward overthrowing these reactionary governments.

In each country the revolution must be mainly carried out by its own people. They must make sacrifices to carry out the revolution successfully. To make "peaceful coexistence" the cause of the success of a revolution in one country or another is an erroneous view.

The more firmly and strongly socialist countries are developed, the greater will be their influence on the revolutionary movements in other countries -- provided that socialist countries correctly implement Marxist-Leninist policy on disinterested aid to revolutionary movements in other countries. But this cannot replace a revolutionary struggle by the people of each country against their own rulers. The view that in 10 or 20 years, when socialist countries are strongly and firmly built, the revolution will naturally triumph in one country after another is erroneous

and harmful because it advises people to "open their mouths and wait for the ripe fruit to fall into it" and to abandon revolutionary struggle.

Proletarian internationalism requires the working class in each country, after successfully carrying out a revolution, to build the country into a firm and strong base for world revolution. After a successful revolution, the problem of economic construction has important significance. Through economic development a socialist country can exert a good influence on the international revolutionary movement because this development is proof of the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

Socialism has an exemplary influence. After seizing power, the working class must prove the superiority of socialism through real facts and good examples. Those who maintain that after exerting this exemplary influence the proletariat in a socialist country has fulfilled its international duty toward revolutionary movements in other countries are wrong and distort Lenin's view on this problem. Lenin said: "Nations that have triumphed over the bourgeoisie must be able to endure great sacrifices in order to overthrow international capitalism!" Other persons maintain that, according to Lenin, the exemplary influence of the working class in a country lies mainly in economic development. This view is fully erroneous because the exemplary influence is mainly in the carrying out of the revolution to overthrow the bourgeoisie and in aid to revolutionary movements in other countries. Lenin said: "Support the revolutions of the classes exploited by the capitalists and overthrow the capitalists in your country to set good examples for other countries."

A socialist country helps itself by helping revolutionary movements in other countries because, according to Lenin, "so long as the socialist revolution has not triumphed in all countries, the Soviet Republic can fall into slavery." Shortly after the success of the Russian revolution, Lenin pointed out on 14 December 1917: "The breaking of our socialist revolution in Russia is only the first step of the international socialist revolution."

In his book "Proletarian revolution and the traitor Kautsky," Lenin pointed out that the correctness of bolshevik strategy lay in the fact that this strategy was international in nature and that it "did the utmost to achieve everything possible in a country in order to develop, support, and arouse a revolution in all countries." The most trustworthy ally of proletarian dictatorship in socialist countries was the Revolutionary movement in countries under the capitalist system. Therefore, the imperialists sought every means to detach this ally from the socialist countries. They "Prohibited" the socialist countries to support revolutionary movements in other countries. There were persons who resigned themselves to yielding to this "demand" of the imperialists. These persons forgot Lenin's teaching that the final success of a national revolution can only be insured by the support of revolutionary movements in all countries. In his 7 March 1918 "Report on war and Peace," Lenin said: "If we consider the problem from the viewpoint of world history, we come

to the absolute conclusion that our revolution will not gain final success if it is isolated and if there are no revolutionary movements in other countries."

According to the dialectics of history, there are differences between the various socialist countries which came into being at different times. Socialist countries which came into being before others had to struggle very energetically to survive amid capitalist encirclement. Later, socialism gradually gained success in many other countries, thereby gradually repelling the capitalist siege. Thus, the socialist countries which were the first to come into being escaped the capitalist siege and were protected by a series of socialist countries that were born after them, that stood on the frontline, and that directly faced imperialism.

If the communist parties of the first born socialist countries had failed to instill Marxist-Leninist international revolutionary spirit into the masses permanently, pacifism and a desire for a quiet and pleasurable life might have easily developed among the masses. The more the capitalist siege was repelled, the more easily pacifism and a desire for a quiet life might have developed among the people of socialist countries, thus lowering the revolutionary zeal of these people. Communists in socialist countries need to use the Marxist-Leninist ideal of world revolution constantly to educate the masses in their own countries, to heighten the vigilance of the masses against imperialism, and to imbue the masses with sense of their noble duty toward their brothers and sisters of the same class who are living under capitalist shackles.

In setting forth the "peaceful coexistence" theme as a common, general task for people in all countries in the world, one propagandizes for "peaceful coexistence" between peoples who oppress and people who are oppressed and between classes that exploit and classes that are exploited. Thus, one disseminates a harmful illusion.

Lenin dealt long ago with "The bankruptcy of the illusion of petty bourgeois nations on the possibility of peaceful coexistence on an equal footing between the various nations in the capitalist regime." He also mocked at persons who dreamed of the possibility of persuading the imperialists to cease invading other nations. In his "Report on war and peace" Lenin wrote: "This can be compared to the situation where a tame domestic animal who is lying beside a tiger tries to persuade the tiger that to achieve peace neither annexation nor indemnification is needed, whereas this can only be achieved by attacking the tiger."

To struggle for peaceful coexistence between nations having different social regimes is one aspect of the struggle to defend world peace. However, communists must not concentrate the whole substance of the struggle for world peace on the struggle for peaceful coexistence.

Because of the existence of weapons of mass destruction at present, a war among countries having nuclear weapons -- if it breaks out -- may

become a nuclear war and, as a result, cause great damage to the peoples of different countries. That is why the struggle for the implementation of Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence has now become urgent. But the realities of life in today's world are very complex and diversified. Considering these realities, it is not simply a case of one of two possibilities: Peaceful coexistence or nuclear war. The peoples of different countries not only have only the right to choose one of these two possibilities, they also have the right to follow other paths in solving problems concerning their fate.

In the recent Korean war between socialist Korea and Imperialist United States, there was neither peaceful coexistence nor nuclear war. Between the Korean people and U.S. imperialists at present there still is neither peaceful coexistence nor nuclear war. Also in the past revolutionary struggle between the Cuban people and the U.S. imperialists, there was neither peaceful coexistence nor nuclear war. Socialist Cuba has now earned the right to survive beside the imperialist United States and "coexist" with it. But between Cuba and the United States there is not actually "peaceful coexistence"; there is a state of "cold war" between them. Since the end of World War II in Vietnam, between our people and the imperialists -- first the French imperialists, then the U.S. imperialists -- there has been neither peaceful coexistence nor nuclear war and our people have not had to choose one or the other. Many similar examples can be found around the world.

In the past Lenin also raised the problem of choice. But he never raised the problem of choosing between abstract peace or abstract war without class content because this is contrary to the class standpoint of Marxism. In his article "The Foreign Policy of the Russian Revolution" published in 1917, Lenin said: "Capitalist realities have raised the problem unilaterally: either surrender to one of the imperialist groups or participate in the revolutionary struggle against imperialism." In his article "On the French Communist Party Platform on Land Reforms" published on 11 December 1921, Lenin said: "Either a new war or a series of new wars for 'protecting' French imperialism or socialist revolution -- French workers and peasants do not have any other choice." Thus it is clear that Lenin raised the problem of choosing between surrender to or protection of either imperialism or revolutionary struggle. He did not raise the problem of choosing between surrender to imperialism or acceptance of being exterminated, as a number of persons, oddly enough, have raised the problem today.

A number of persons maintain that peaceful coexistence is the common line of the foreign policies of socialist countries. They are wrong because the foreign policy of each socialist country aims at different objectives. These objectives are: other socialist countries, the national liberation movement; the revolutionary movements in capitalist countries; nationalist countries, bourgeois countries implementing the policy of peace and neutrality, and imperialist countries. For each of these objectives, there must be a different policy. Peaceful coexistence is only one aspect of the foreign policies of socialist countries toward capitalist countries.

In his article "The Foreign Policy of the Russian Revolution," Lenin said: "Allying with revolutionists in progressive countries and with the oppressed in order to struggle against all imperialists is the foreign policy of the proletariat." Originating in proletarian internationalism, The foreign policy of a socialist country must efficiently serve the revolutionary tasks of the working class and laboring people within and without the country. That is why this policy must contribute to the uniting of the socialist forces, national liberation movements, revolutionary movements in capitalist countries, and the forces of democracy and peace for the struggle against imperialism and contribute to the isolation of the imperialists and the struggle against imperialism.

The foreign policy of a socialist country is a policy based on principles. In his 15 May 1918 "Report on Foreign Policy," Lenin said that "The foreign policy of the Soviet state is a strict policy" and "This policy has a firm base and is not utopian." Communists do not refuse to negotiate or to come to agreement with the enemy when necessary; but negotiations and agreements must be based on principles. Lenin once said that the duty of a truly revolutionary party does not consist of declaring that it rejects all agreements, but that it consists of maintaining its loyalty to its principles, its class, and its revolutionary mission in all agreements, provided that these agreements are unavoidable. Lenin also said: "We are ready to make great concessions and sacrifices, but not every concession sacrifice, but not endless concessions and sacrifices..." and "We never forget that we are revolutionists."

Lenin set the good example of respecting principles in agreements with the enemy. He approved the signing of the Brest-Litovsk Treat, the Rapallo Treaty, and the Agreement on Concessions concerning land rent. After Lenin's death, the Soviet Government, under Stalin's leadership, also applied a highly principled policy in agreements with the enemy, such as joining the League of Nations, signing a nonaggression pact with Germany, allying itself with Britain and the United States in the war against the German Fascists, and signing the Teheran, Yalta, San Francisco, and other accords. The signing of the 1954 Geneva accords to reestablish peace in Indochina by the socialist countries -- the USSR, the CPR, and the DRV -- was also a brilliant example of agreement with the enemy, agreement which had principled character. The experiences drawn from all past negotiations teach us that, to gain advantages for the working class and laboring people in negotiations and agreements with the enemy, first of all it is necessary to be powerful. In conferences the enemy has the habit of trying to gain advantages that they cannot gain on the battlefield. The building and reinforcement of this power is necessary not only during war time, but also during peaceful negotiations. When we have a powerful force we can struggle against the enemy at any moment, in any place, and with any plan. Thus, the building of a force for the revolution is the most fundamental task.

Marxist-Leninists say it is possible to negotiate and agree with the enemy. The revisionists also say it is possible to negotiate and come to an agreement. What is the difference between these two statements?

the difference is in the fact that the revisionists sacrifice basic interests for regional and temporary interests while Marxist-Leninists do the contrary.

Lenin advised us that "Negotiation for peace is a measure to gather forces." At the same time he warned us of the constant need to have vigilance with regard to the imperialists. In his 15 May 1918 "Report on Foreign Policy," he said: "All treaties and all laws on neutrality have been, are, and will be trampled down for a long time to come as long as capitalism exists." In his 11 April 1921 "Report on Territorial Concessions," Lenin said: "Each peace treaty signed with bourgeois nations is a treaty which contains some articles on war." He asserted that each article of a treaty which deals with territorial concessions constitutes a military treaty because each article is a pretext for war.

Lenin not only instructed us to be vigilant when negotiating and signing treaties with capitalist countries, but he also strongly opposed the "secret diplomatic method" of concluding unprincipled agreements with the imperialists without the people's knowledge. The secret diplomatic method of "exchanging concessions" is prejudicial to the people's interests and completely foreign to the principled foreign policy of Lenin.

The argument that making concessions to the imperialists may ease world tension and that struggling against the imperialists and baring their crimes will cause world tension is completely erroneous. The usual policy of the imperialists is "to bend what is soft and to let go of what is tough." Therefore, only by resolutely struggling against imperialism and smashing its plots can one repel imperialism and truly ease a situation. On the contrary, making unprincipled concessions to imperialism will induce it to advance further and to bring more pressure to bear on the socialist countries and the revolutionary movement in various nations, thus making the situation more tense.

3. The Disarmament Problem.

In the task of seeking measures to prevent war and protect world peace, disarmament is a problem which has given rise to heated discussions. What attitude must communists adopt with regard to the disarmament problem? For Marxist-Leninists, to speak of the armament or weapon problem is not simply to speak of this or that weapon, but to speak of the army, the principal tool of the machinery for oppressing classes, that is, of the state. To speak of the army is to speak of classes and class struggle and of violence and the dictatorship of the classes. To speak of the armament problem is not just to speak of this or that gun or bomb, but to speak of the classes which use these weapons and the purposes for using them. Like the state itself, the army is born at the same time as classes and develops along with the development of the class struggle. When classes and the class struggle disappear, the army will also disappear, that is, armaments will disappear, one is no longer a Marxist-Leninist if one forgets this Marxist-Leninist view when dealing with the disarmament problem.

Communists speak openly of their aspirations to destroy armaments, to eliminate the state, and to eliminate classes in General. At the same time they declare that this noble ideal can be achieved only when socialism and communism triumph throughout the world. As long as imperialism, classes, and class struggle exist, disarmament is completely unfeasible. To achieve the ideal of complete disarmament, communists advocate the necessity of undertaking the class struggle to the end, arming the people, disarming the ruling exploiting classes, destroying imperialism, and causing socialism to triumph throughout the world.

Long ago Lenin criticized the utopian idea of achieving disarmament under capitalism. In an article titled "On the 'Disarmament' Slogan," Lenin said: "Disarmament is the ideal of socialism. In the socialist society there will be no war. Thus, disarmament will be achieved. But one is not socialist if one hopes to achieve socialism outside the social revolution and proletarian dictatorship. Dictatorship is state administration that directly depends on violence. In the 20th century, a civilized era, violence does not come from a fist or bludgeon, but the army. To inscribe 'Disarmament' on the program means that, generally speaking, we oppose the use of weapons. There is nothing Marxist in it to say as well that we oppose the use of violence."

Lenin considered Kautsky's disarmament slogan as a manifestation of wicked opportunism and bourgeois pacifism and aimed in fact at drawing workers away from revolutionary struggle. Lenin pointed out that to propose that revolutionaries demand disarmament is to reject fully views on class struggle and to abandon the desire to engage in revolutionary activities. Lenin said: "Our slogan is to arm the proletariat so that it can vanquish and disarm the bourgeoisie. This is the only possible strategy for the revolutionary class. This strategy is drawn from and required by the objective evolution of capitalist militarism." Lenin also pointed out that only after disarming the bourgeoisie can the proletariat throw away all weapons without betraying its historic mission. In his book "The Draft Platform of the Russian Communist Party" published in March 1919, Lenin said: "The Russian Communist Party resolutely rejects all disarmament achieved under capitalism and regards it as a reactionary utopia of petty bourgeois democrats who call themselves socialists or social-democrats. All slogans of this sort are only deceitful bourgeois tricks. To struggle against these slogans, the party sets forth the slogan of arming the proletariat and disarming the bourgeoisie, the slogan of fully and mercilessly repressing the exploiters, and the slogan of struggling until final victory against the world bourgeoisie in the civil war in each country as well as in the international revolutionary war."

~~While helping the masses rid themselves of the utopian idea that it is possible to achieve disarmament under capitalism, communists under certain concrete circumstances can set forth a disarmament plan to muster the masses for the struggle to demand that bourgeois governments put an end to the arms race, reduce national defense budgets, reduce military strength, and abandon the use of a number of weapons of mass destruction,~~

thus thwarting the plans of these governments to prepare for war and contributing to the protection of world peace.

Under Lenin's direct leadership the Soviet Government set forth such a plan at the international economic conference held in Genoa, Italy, in May 1922. At this conference the Soviet delegation set forth many proposals aimed at establishing and developing economic relations among countries and finding means to consolidate peace. The Soviet delegation also set forth a plan for a general reduction of armaments or a general disarmament plan. This plan was rejected by imperialist countries. Since then, at many international conferences, the Soviet Government under Stalin's leadership, also set forth many proposals on general or partial disarmament. In setting forth these proposals, the Soviet Government aimed at unmasking the aggressive policies of the imperialists and at mustering the majority of the masses for the antiimperialist struggle. The Soviet Government did not cultivate the utopian idea that it was possible to achieve disarmament under capitalism.

In the old days of our country, imperialist lackeys slandered the Soviet proposals on disarmament. We still remember that early in 1929 Pham Quynh commented as follows in his journal "Nam Phong" on the disarmament proposal set forth by comrades (Checherine --- phonetic) and Litvinov at that time: "If the Soviet authorities sincerely believe that it is possible to achieve disarmament immediately and completely, why do they not try to achieve this good idea?... Why does not the USSR resolutely undertake this task first? Certainly it is an adventure. But how glorious an adventure! And of all nations, who has the courage to undertake such an adventure, except the USSR?" Naturally, the USSR did not do what Vietnamese traitors urged it to do, because what imperialist lackeys called a "glorious adventure" was only a surrender to imperialism. Modern revisionists continuously propagandize for their disarmament policy and boast that it is their "creation." There is, in fact, nothing new about this policy. What is new is the fact that modern revisionists use this slogan to sow the utopian view among the masses that it is possible to achieve disarmament under capitalism, while Marxist-Leninists regard it as a measure to muster the masses to struggle against imperialism and its preparations for war. To believe that the imperialist bourgeoisie volunteers to achieve "general and complete disarmament" is to believe that they volunteer to surrender power and are ready to disband their army, destroy the state machinery, and hand power over to the working class and laboring people. This is fully contrary to Marxism-Leninism.

The "Disarmament" slogan is ambiguous. Lenin denounced this in his article "About the 'Disarmament' slogan." The slogan has two meanings: first, it means a reduction in armaments and, second, it means a destruction of all weapons. The destruction of all weapons can be achieved only when there is no opposing class in the society, that is, when socialism has triumphed throughout the world. The belief that even during the existence of imperialism it is possible to achieve "general and complete disarmament" and possible to build "a world where there are no weapons, no armies, and

no war" is fully erroneous and harmful because it gives rise to the utopian view that imperialists are ready to throw away their weapons voluntarily. It is clear that there is nothing Marxist in this argument.

~~As for the reduction of armaments, this can be achieved to a certain extent. Under certain circumstances,~~ faced with the strong struggle movement of the masses of people, and faced with the necessity of achieving an equilibrium among the forces in the world, the governments of bourgeois countries are forced to take a number of measures aimed at reducing or restricting armaments, such as reducing the national defense budget reducing the strength of the regular army, reducing the number of military bases, restricting the tonnage of warships, and so forth. These cases may occur. The use of a number of weapons of mass destruction may be forbidden -- as was the case with bacteriological weapons, poison gas shells, and dum-dum bullets -- if the countries participating in a war feel that their use may cause danger to all parties concerned under present conditions, the socialist force is stronger than the imperialist force and the force for peace is stronger than the force for war. That is why there is a possibility of forcing the imperialists to reduce armaments step by step. Therefore, communists can use the general disarmament slogan to mobilize the peoples in all countries to struggle against the arms race policy of the imperialists, to prevent aggressive wars, and to protect world peace.

It is the same with nuclear weapons. It is possible to arrive at an international agreement on a complete banning of nuclear weapons. If world people's struggle movement for a ban on nuclear weapons develops, if socialist countries have a sufficient stock of these weapons for self-defense, if all countries feel that the use of these weapons will cause great damage to all countries participating in a war, if the enlightenment of the peoples in different countries is so high that the deceitful propaganda about nuclear weapons does not have any effect, and so forth, a complete ban of nuclear weapons can be achieved. Now let us speak of nuclear weapons. A number of persons attribute to nuclear weapons qualities they do not have. According to these persons, nuclear weapons will upset the existing ideological systems of mankind and even cause a number of basic principles of Marxism-Leninism to become outmoded. Although they have great destructive power, nuclear weapons are not as dangerous as people imagine. Dangerous weapons like nuclear weapons must be handled by men. They depend on men. In the hands of the working class and socialist countries, they serve peace. On the other hand, in the hands of the bourgeoisie and the imperialist countries, they serve imperialist wars.

Although dangerous, nuclear weapons have basic weak points that the imperialists are unable to overcome. That is why nuclear weapons cannot efficiently serve the imperialists. The imperialists wage wars to gain colonies, to turn them into dumping grounds for their goods, to force them to supply raw materials, and to exploit the labor force of these countries, and not to seize a piece of land which has been contaminated by nuclear fallout, land which the imperialists themselves dare not set foot on. That

is why they can only use nuclear weapons as a scarecrow to frighten shy people and force them to surrender. They cannot use nuclear weapons in aggressive wars, because if they use nuclear weapons the results would be contrary to the objectives they have set forth.

On nations longing for freedom or that have risen up to struggle under the slogan "freedom or death," nuclear weapons have no effect. Moreover in national liberation wars or civil wars where forces of both camps are interpolated and where there is no clear front, the use of nuclear weapons for mass destruction is totally impossible. The recently assassinated U.S. President Kennedy himself had to admit the weaknesses of nuclear weapons.

In a speech delivered in Seattle in November 1961, Kennedy said: "We have a weapon which has formidable power of destruction, but which has proved itself the least effective in the struggle against the weapon usually used by the enemy of freedom: sabotage, infiltration, and trouble." The persons that Kennedy called "The Enemy of Freedom" are those who struggle for independence and democracy, and the activities that Kennedy called "sabotage, infiltration, and trouble" are the secret revolutionary activities, guerrilla movements, and so forth.

~~Nuclear weapons are dangerous weapons. As long as the imperialists are not disarmed and are going ahead with war preparations, socialist countries should reinforce their national defense and have adequate modern weapons for their defense, including nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons in the hands of socialist countries are only weapons of self-defense, and socialist countries will not use these dangerous weapons if they are not attacked with nuclear weapons.~~

~~According to a number of people, nuclear weapons can play a determining role in the war issue. This is entirely contrary to Marxist-Leninist doctrine. According to Marxist-Leninist doctrine, not weapons but human beings play the determining role in the war issue. In his book "Anti-Duhring," Engels wrote: "The entire organization and the methods of combat of the armed forces--on which victories and defeats depend are obviously subordinated to material conditions--that is, economic conditions--and the strength of men and weapons--that is, the quality and quantity of people and techniques.~~

In his article "Talk to the Soviet Troops and Workers" on 13 May 1920, Lenin said: "In any war the final victory depends on the morale of the masses who lose their blood on the battlefield ... (Ellipsis as published) The fact that the masses are conscious of the objective and cause of war is very important: This is the guarantee for final victory." The argument stating that war today is pushbutton war and that victory or defeat in war today depends on government heads and is decided by individuals and not by the masses is entirely wrong and contrary to Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Modern war is overall war, a war of all forces. If modern war breaks out, we must mobilize all human strength, property, and money of the entire country to fight the war. Thus, the masses play a determining role in the war issue.

The argument stating that the war issue can be decided by individuals means that nuclear weapons can decide the war issue. This is a kind of argument based on weapons and is contrary to Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

Because they argue that war is provoked by weapons and the war issue is decided by weapons, a number of people advocate that "the best way to prevent war is to eliminate the means to wage it." For this reason these people consider "the basic measure to guarantee a lasting peace to be total and complete disarmament." This argument is entirely wrong because it advocates that the cause of war is weapons and not imperialism and that the basic measure to oppose war and preserve world peace is to oppose weapons and not imperialism. This argument is wrong because it considers "disarmament" an objective covering everything in the struggle for peace.

Other people even advocate that the money saved as a result of total and complete disarmament of various countries be used, according to their plans, to aid backward countries in developing their economies. This argument wipes out the difference between the disinterested aid of socialist countries to underdeveloped countries and invasion under the "aid" label of underdeveloped countries by the imperialist bloc. It is clear that this is unpaid propaganda for what is called "aid" from the imperialist countries, especially the imperialist United States. Everyone knows that the imperialist bloc, especially the U.S. imperialists, had used the plot called "aid" to invade and enslave other peoples, especially the peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Those people who worked out this plan have voluntarily or involuntarily hailed this so-called "aid" and expressed the desire to see the imperialists increase this so-called "aid".

Many times over, however, because the peoples of the various countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America know well what "aid" from the imperialists is, they are determined not to fall for the tricks of those gentlemen who worked out the above-mentioned "sound" plan. The peoples in these underdeveloped countries are determined not to run after "false aid", to be deceived by unprincipled diplomatic lines, and not to reach agreement with imperialism.

The struggle against imperialist war and for world peace is a worldwide class struggle. The basic measure of that struggle is to mobilize the masses to carry out revolution to annihilate imperialism. To argue that disarmament is a "basic measure" of the struggle against war and for the preservation of peace is entirely wrong and contrary to Lenin's ideas on anti-war measures. In a letter sent to Comrades Molotov and other comrades on 4 February 1922, Lenin pointed out the mistakes of the International Metallurgists Trade Union with regard to the measures of struggle against war, and he clearly said: "Only a proven revolutionary part, one prepared in advance and with a good illegal apparatus, can lead that struggle to victory, and the weapons used in the anti-war struggle are not work strikes but the establishment of revolutionary "chi bo" within the opposing armed forces and the preparations made for these chi bo to carry out revolution." In the directive issued to the Soviet delegation which attended the world peace conference convened in the Hague by the Amsterdam International Trade Union

in December 1922, Lenin clearly said: "The only measure which enables us to struggle against war is to establish and secure an illegal organization in order that we can carry out protracted anti-war activities in which all revolutionaries engaged in fighting the war must participate - all these things must be set forth first." Lenin also directed the Soviet delegation to endeavor to present its views on war and that conference, regardless of the conference chairman's interruptions. The proposals of the Soviet delegation presented at the Hague conference according to Lenin's directives were rejected. However, history has proved that truth was not on the side of the opportunists who dominated the Hague conference, but on Lenin's side.

Marxist-Leninists never separate the anti-war struggle problem from the problem of stepping up the revolutionary struggle aimed at annihilating imperialism. To refuse to denounce the crimes committed by imperialism under the pretext of "peaceful coexistence" and "disarmament" is to renounce the anti-imperialist struggle.

The struggle against imperialist war and for the preservation of world peace must unceasingly strengthen anti-imperialist forces and weaken imperialist forces. The revolutionary war of the peoples in anti-imperialist countries is never contrary to the struggle for the preservation of world peace, but is a main part of that struggle. Peoples in all countries hope that a lasting peace will be maintained on earth. In order to maintain lasting world peace, the forces of the socialist bloc should be strengthened in all fields. The national defense capabilities of each socialist country and of the entire socialist bloc must be strengthened to cope with the imperialists' plots of aggression. Socialist countries are always ready to help each other when attacked from outside or from within by reactionaries. Peoples in socialist countries are always heightening their vigilance to protect their socialist fatherland and the entire socialist bloc. Socialist countries carry out the policy of peaceful coexistence with other countries having another socialist regime by basing themselves on five principles: To respect on a mutual basis their sovereignty and territories, not to carry out acts of aggression against each other, not to intervene in the internal affairs of each other, to be on an equal footing for their mutual benefit, and to coexist peacefully.

In order to maintain lasting world peace, the oppressed and the peoples in capitalist countries must step up revolutions for the liberation of peoples and the socialist revolution, thus developing these revolutions and making them continually successful, driving imperialism back step by step, knocking out imperialism organ by organ, and advancing toward complete destruction of imperialism.

Peoples in all countries not only want to live in peace and tranquility, but they also want to enjoy freedom and happiness. For the two-thirds of mankind now living under the capitalist regime, even if world peace is lasting and world war completely prevented, they are still oppressed and exploited and they still do not have freedom and happiness. Therefore, not only do they need world peace, they also need revolution. Therefore, because they need revolution, when necessary they must destroy the present peace in their countries--that is, the capitalist peace--in order to build a new peace, a socialist and democratic peace.

The present objective of the movement for preserving world peace does not embrace a change of capitalist relations in capitalist countries and the establishment of socialist relations in these countries. The present objective will be considered as reached if imperialist war is deterred. To change the present social relations in these countries, the peoples of these countries must fulfill other duties in addition to protecting world peace. One of these duties is to carry out a revolution in order to overthrow the exploiting rulers.

The duty of protecting world peace is an urgent duty. The duty of carrying out the revolution to overthrow the exploiting rulers is a fundamental duty (for peoples in capitalist countries-brackets as published). These two duties are closely related, but completely different. To consider that the duty of protecting world peace outranks the duty of carrying out a revolution to overthrow the exploiting rulers and that the duty of protecting world peace is above everything, is a "strategic" duty, and is a fundamental duty and to overlook the duty of carrying out the revolution to overthrow the exploiting rulers finally results in eliminating revolution in capitalist countries.

To succeed, the duty of protecting world peace and struggling against imperialist war which is the common duty of all world peoples, must be participated in by all strata of the people. The people's front struggling for world peace must be widely composed of all people supporting peace, but it must be firmly based on an alliance of the working class, the peasantry, and the oppressed. Mobilizing progressive personalities and the people's strata mentioned above to join the movement for protecting world peace is necessary. But this task must not lead to slighting the role of the masses of workers and peasants and the oppressed in the struggle for world peace. The view that the peace front must include the arch imperialists, such as the U.S. President and his wife, is completely erroneous. In the work of protecting world peace, the socialist camp plays the main and important role, and the struggle of the masses of peoples in capitalist countries has very important significance.

To insure success for the struggle against imperialist war and the struggle to protect world peace, it is necessary to struggle relentlessly against erroneous views, such as fear of imperialism--especially fear of the United States--the spirit of compromising with and surrender to imperialism, pacifist views, and so forth. At the same time it is necessary to struggle against adventurism and impatience. Only by overcoming the "argument based on weapons" is it possible to develop the role of the masses of people in the struggle to protect world peace.

6155
COW
RAB

The aspiration to live in peace, independence, and freedom is an age-old and ardent aspiration of our people. We long to live in peace. At the same time we are ready to take up weapons to defend our independence and freedom. We long to coexist peacefully with other countries and to establish normal relations with other countries without distinction of their social system. If wars have broken out and devastated our country, this was not our fault, but was the fault of the imperialists who want to enslave our people.

A war waged by the U.S. imperialists is now devastating the southern part of our country. The southern part of our country will have peace immediately after the withdrawal of the U.S. bandits.

We ardently desire the maintaining of world peace because this is advantageous to us. We pledge to devote all our strength and collaborate with peace lovers in all countries to struggle for lasting peace in the world.

- END -

CSO: 3520-D