

**November 18, 1957**

**Mao Zedong, 'Speech at a Meeting of the  
Representatives of Sixty-four Communist and  
Workers' Parties' (Edited by Mao)**

**Citation:**

"Mao Zedong, 'Speech at a Meeting of the Representatives of Sixty-four Communist and Workers' Parties' (Edited by Mao)", November 18, 1957, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Mao Zedong wenji (Collected Writings of Mao Zedong), vol. 7 (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 1999), 321-335. English translation from Michael Schoenhals, "Mao Zedong: Speeches at the 1957 'Moscow Conference'," Journal of Communist Studies 2, no. 2 (1986): 109-126. <https://wilson-center.drivingcreative.com/document/121559>

**Summary:**

During a speech at the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties of 1957 , Mao Zedong proclaims that "the east wind prevailing over the west wind." This version of the speech was edited by Mao for publication.

**Credits:**

This document was made possible with support from MacArthur Foundation

**Original Language:**

Chinese

**Contents:**

Original Scan  
Transcript - Chinese  
Translation - English

# 在莫斯科共产党和工人党 代表会议上的讲话<sup>〔 〕</sup>

（一九五七年十一月十八日）

同志们：

我讲几句话。请同志们允许我即席讲话。因为我在几年前害过一次脑贫血症，最近一两年好一些，站起来讲话还有些不方便。

我想讲两个问题：形势问题，团结问题。

现在我感到国际形势到了一个新的转折点。世界上现在有两股风：东风，西风。中国有句成语：不是东风压倒西风，就是西风压倒东风。我认为目前形势的特点是东风压倒西风，也就是说，社会主义的力量对于帝国主义的力量占了压倒的优势。

四十年前的十月革命是整个人类历史的转折点，怎么现在又有转折点呢？还是有的。打希特勒<sup>〔 〕</sup>，在一个时期，有一二年时间，希特勒占了上风。那时，希特勒不但占领大半个欧洲，而且打进苏联，苏联让出了一大块土地，可见希特勒一时占了上风。斯大林格勒一战<sup>〔 〕</sup>成为转折点，从此希特勒就走下坡路，苏联就势如破竹一直打到柏林。这不是一个转折点

吗？据我看来，斯大林格勒一仗，是整个第二次世界大战的转折点。

去年，最近这几年，西方世界非常猖狂，利用我们阵营中的一些问题，特别是匈牙利事件〔1〕，在我们阵营的脸上擦黑，我们的天上飞起许多乌云。但是匈牙利反革命被镇压下去了。在苏伊士运河事件〔2〕中，苏联的警告也起了制止侵略战争的作用。西方擦黑我们的脸的目的，依我看，主要是想〔整〕各国共产党。在这一方面，他们也达到了一部分目的。例如美国的法斯特〔3〕，共产主义的可耻的叛徒，就跑出党去了。还有一些共产党也跑出去了一些人。帝国主义对此大为高兴。我想我们也应该高兴。叛徒跑出去了，有什么不好？

今年，一九五七年，形势大为不同了。我们的天上是一片光明，西方的天上是一片乌云。我们很乐观，而他们呢，却是惶惶不安。两个卫星上天〔4〕，使他们睡不着觉。六十几国共产党在莫斯科开会是从没有过的事，从来也没有这样大的规模。但是在社会主义阵营各国中，在各国共产党中，特别是在各国人民中，还有相当多的人总是相信美国了不起。你看，他们还有那么多钢，有那么多飞机大炮。我们的比他们的少。西方国家无数的报纸、广播电台天天吹，美国之音、自由欧洲电台等等吹得神乎其神，于是乎造成一种假象，欺骗了相当多的一部分人。我们就要揭穿这种欺骗。我有十件证据来说明这个问题：究竟是他们行还是我们行，究竟是东风压倒西风，还是西风压倒东风？

第一件，打希特勒的时候，罗斯福〔5〕和丘吉尔〔6〕的手里有多少钢呢？大约有七千万吨。可是吃不下希特勒，毫无办法。

总要想个办法吧，于是采用了旅行的办法，一走就走到雅尔塔〔 00 〕，请求苏联帮助。那时，斯大林手中有多少钢呢？在战前有一千八百万吨。因为在战争中损失了许多地方，据赫鲁晓夫〔 00 〕同志告诉我，钢产量打了个对折，剩下九百万吨。有七千万吨钢的人，来请求有九百万吨钢的人。条件是什么呢？易北河以东划为红军的进攻区，就是说，他们忍痛下决心让这一大块区域脱离他们的体系，让这一大块区域有可能转变为社会主义体系。这件事很有说服力，说明物质力量多少不完全决定问题，人是主要的，制度是主要的。在雅尔塔又谈到打日本。又是美国人吃不下日本，又是要请共产主义帮助。中国的满洲〔 00 〕、朝鲜的一部分，作为红军的攻击区，并且决定让日本退还半个库页岛、一个千岛群岛。这也是忍痛让步啊！为了吃掉他们的同伴——日本帝国主义。

第二件，中国革命。一九四九年初国民党被我们打得呜呼哀哉的时候，向杜鲁门〔 00 〕大喊救命，说：美国老爷呀，你出几个兵吧！杜鲁门说：我一个兵也不能出！于是国民党又说：你可以不可以讲几句话呢？说长江以南这块地方，如果共产党到了那里的时候，美国就不能坐视。杜鲁门说：这个不行，讲不得的，共产党很厉害。于是乎蒋介石只好开跑。他现在在台湾。

第三件，朝鲜战争。在开始的时候，美国一个师有八百门炮，中国志愿军三个师才有五十多门炮。但是一打就像赶鸭子一样，几个星期就把美国人赶了几百公里，从鸭绿江赶到三八线〔 00 〕以南去了。后来美国人集中了力量进行反攻，我们和金日成〔 00 〕同志商量，退到了三八线相持，构筑阵地。一打，整个朝鲜战争差不多打了三年。美国的飞机就像黄蜂一样，我们在

第一线一架飞机也没有。双方同意讲和。在什么地点？他们说在一条丹麦的船上，我们说在开城，在我们的地方。他们说：好。因为会址在我们的地方，他们每天开会得打着白旗子来，开完会打着白旗子回去。后来，他们感到不好意思了□□天天打白旗子。说改一个地方吧，改到双方战线的中间，地名叫板门店。我们说也可以。但是又谈了年把，美国总是不甘心签字，拖。最后，在一九五三年，我们在三八线上突破了二十一公里的防线，美国人吓倒了，马上签字。那么厉害、有那么多钢的美国人，也只得如此。这个战争，实际上是三国打的，朝鲜、中国、苏联，苏联出了武器。但是敌人方面呢，有十六个国家〔00〕。

第四件，越南战争。法国人被胡志明〔00〕打得呜呼哀哉，屁滚尿流。有人可以作证，胡志明同志在座。法国人不想干了，美国人一定要干，因为他的钢多。但是美国人也只是出武器，维持紧张局势，出兵就不来。于是乎有日内瓦会议〔00〕，把大半个越南划给越南民主共和国。

第五件，苏伊士运河事件。两个帝国主义进攻，打了几天，苏联人讲了几句话，就缩回去了。当然还有第二个因素，就是全世界在讲话，反对英法侵略。

第六件事是叙利亚。美国作好了计划要打，又是苏联人讲了几句话，还任命了一个将军，叫做罗科索夫斯基。做了这两件事，他们说不好打了。这件事还没有完结，还要警惕，可能将来还闹乱子。但是现在总算没有打。

第七件是苏联抛上了两个卫星。抛卫星的国家有多少钢？五千一百万吨。不是讲美国非常厉害吗？你为什么到现在连一个山药蛋还没有抛上去？你有一万万吨钢，牛皮吹得那么大

呀，做出了先锋计划〔 〇〇〕。先锋计划要改名了，得改成落后计划。

由这七件事，我想可以得出一个概念：西方世界被抛到我们后面去了。抛得很近还是抛得很远？照我讲 〇 〇 也许我这个人有些冒险主义，我说，永远地抛下去了。在苏联发射人造卫星以前，社会主义国家在人心归向、人口众多方面已经对于帝国主义国家占了压倒的优势；而在苏联发射人造卫星以后，就在最重要的科学技术部门方面也占了压倒的优势。人们说，美国也会赶上来的，它也会抛卫星的。这是真的。赫鲁晓夫同志的报告就讲了美国会抛卫星的。但是他们现在正在争论究竟是一年、二年还是五年才能赶上苏联。我不管你是一年、二年还是五年，你总是被抛到后面去了。我们的苏联同志，赫鲁晓夫同志，大概只是晚上睡觉，白天不会睡觉。所有苏联人不会白天晚上，一年、二年、五年总是睡觉吧？你一年、二年、五年赶上苏联，但是苏联又前进啦。

同志们，我讲讲我们国家的事情吧。我国今年有了五百二十万吨钢，再过五年，可以有一千万到一千五百万吨钢；再过五年，可以有二千万到二千五百万吨钢；再过五年，可以有三千五百万到四千万吨钢。当然，也许我在这里说了大话，将来国际会议再开会的时候，你们可能批评我是主观主义。但是我是有相当根据的。我们有很多苏联专家帮助我们。中国人是想努力的。中国从政治上、人口上说是个大国，从经济上说现在还是个小国。他们想努力，他们非常热心工作，要把中国变成一个真正的大国。赫鲁晓夫同志告诉我们，十五年后，苏联可以超过美国。我也可以讲，十五年后我们可能赶上或者超过

英国。因为我和波立特、高兰〔 00〕同志谈过两次话，我问过他们国家的情况，他们说现在英国年产两千万吨钢，再过十五年，可能爬到年产三千万吨钢。中国呢，再过十五年可能是四千万吨，岂不超过了英国吗？那末，在十五年后，在我们阵营中间，苏联超过美国，中国超过英国。

归根结底，我们要争取十五年和平。到那个时候，我们就无敌于天下了，没有人敢同我们打了，世界也就可以得到持久和平了。

现在还要估计一种情况，就是想发动战争的疯子，他们可能把原子弹、氢弹到处摔。他们摔，我们也摔，这就打得一塌糊涂，这就要损失人。问题要放在最坏的基点上来考虑。我们党的政治局开过几次会，讲过这个问题。现在要打，中国只有手榴弹，没有原子弹，但是苏联有。要设想一下，如果爆发战争要死多少人。全世界二十七亿人口，可能损失三分之一；再多一点，可能损失一半。不是我们要打，是他们要打，一打就要摔原子弹、氢弹。我和一位外国政治家辩论过这个问题。他认为如果打原子战争，人会死绝的。我说，极而言之，死掉一半人，还有一半人，帝国主义打平了，全世界社会主义化了，再过多少年，又会有二十七亿，一定还要多。我们中国还没有建设好，我们希望和平。但是如果帝国主义硬要打仗，我们也只好横下一条心，打了仗再建设。每天怕战争，战争来了你有什么办法呢？我先是说东风压倒西风，战争打不起来，现在再就如果发生了战争的情况，作了这些补充的说明，这样两种可能性都估计到了。

我讲十件证据，刚才讲了七件，下面再讲三件。

第八件是英国退出亚洲、非洲很大一片土地。

第九件是荷兰退出印尼。

第十件是法国退出叙利亚、黎巴嫩、摩洛哥、突尼斯，在阿尔及利亚没有办法。

落后国家强些，还是先进国家强些？印度强些，还是英国强些？印尼强些，还是荷兰强些？阿尔及利亚强些，还是法国强些？我看所有帝国主义国家都是下午六点钟的太阳，而我们呢，是早上六点钟的太阳。于是乎转折点就来了。就是说，西方国家抛到后边了，我们大大占了上风了。一定不是西风压倒东风，因为西风是那么微弱。一定是东风压倒西风，因为我们强大。

问题是不能用钢铁数量多少来作决定，而是首先由人心的向背来作决定的。历史上从来就是如此。历史上从来就是弱者战胜强者，没有枪的人战胜全副武装的人。布尔什维克〔00〕曾经一枝枪也没有。苏联同志告诉我，二月革命〔00〕的时候，只有四万党员；十月革命的时候，也只有二十四万党员。

《联共（布）党史简明教程》那本书上的第一页第一段写了一个辩证法：从小组到全国。开头是稀稀拉拉的几十个人的小组，后来变成整个国家的领导者。苏联同志，你们修改《联共党史》的时候，我希望不要把这几句话修改掉了。我们中国也是如此，开头是稀稀拉拉几十个人的共产主义者的小组，现在也是领导着整个国家，领导着六亿四千万人口的大党。几十个共产主义者的小组，现在发展成一千二百万党员。我这话是特别想同资本主义国家共产党同志们交换意见的，因为他们现在还处在困难中，有些党很小，有些党有成批党员退出党。我说



这不足为怪,也许是好事。我们的道路是曲折的,是按照螺旋形上升的。

还要讲个纸老虎问题。一九四六年蒋介石开始向我们进攻的时候,我们许多同志,全国人民,都很忧虑,战争是不是能够打赢?我本人也忧虑这件事。但是我们有一条信心。那时有一个美国记者到了延安,名字叫安娜·路易斯·斯特朗。这个人就是在苏联住了二三十年,后来被斯大林赶走,以后又被赫鲁晓夫同志恢复了名誉的那位女作家。我同她谈话的时候谈了许多问题,蒋介石、希特勒、日本、美国、原子弹等等。我说一切所有号称强大的反动派统统不过是纸老虎,原因是他们脱离人民。你看,希特勒是不是纸老虎?希特勒不是被打倒了吗?我也谈到沙皇是纸老虎,中国皇帝是纸老虎,日本帝国主义是纸老虎,你看,都倒了。美帝国主义没有倒,还有原子弹,我看也是要倒的,也是纸老虎。蒋介石很强大,有四百多万正规军。那时我们在延安。延安这个地方有多少人?有七千人。我们有多少军队呢?我们有九十万游击队,统统被蒋介石分割成几十个根据地。但是我们说,蒋介石不过是一个纸老虎,我们一定会打赢他。为了同敌人作斗争,我们在一个长时间内形成了一个概念,就是说,在战略上我们要藐视一切敌人,在战术上我们要重视一切敌人。也就是说在整体上我们一定要藐视他,在一个一个的具体问题上我们一定要重视他。如果不是在整体上藐视敌人,我们就要犯机会主义的错误。马克思、恩格斯只有两个人,那时他们就说全世界资本主义要被打倒。但是在具体问题上,在一个一个敌人的问题上,如果我们不重视他,我们就要犯冒险主义的错误。打仗只能一仗一仗地打,敌

人只能一部分一部分地消灭。工厂只能一个一个地盖，农民犁田只能一块一块地犁。就是吃饭也是如此。我们在战略上藐视吃饭：这顿饭我们能够吃下去。但是具体地吃，却是一口一口地吃的，你不可能把一桌酒席一口吞下去。这叫做各个解决，军事书上叫做各个击破。

第一个问题讲完了。现在就第二个问题，团结问题，讲几句。

我非常高兴，非常庆幸我们的会议开得很团结。这次大会反映了全世界无产阶级和人民的上升的朝气、东风压倒西风这么一种形势。我们有很多缺点和错误，但是我们的成绩是主要的，是年年见成效的。于是乎反映在我们六十几国共产党大会上一股朝气，并且一致承认要有一个头，这个头就是苏联，就是苏共中央。中国有句俗话，蛇无头而不行。你看，我们每个人都有一个头。每个国家的党也有一个头，有集体的头 and 个人的头。中央委员会、政治局是集体，第一书记是个人，两者都要，不然就是无政府主义。

我高兴哥穆尔卡〔 〇〇〕同志昨天的演说，他说，承认苏联为首是一个真理，不是人为的，是历史上自然形成的。不过他那个国家的有些人在感情上还有问题，暂时不想讲这个话，要换一个形式讲，比如讲第一个和最强大的社会主义国家。他那个国家存在这样一个矛盾，先进分子同相当多的其他人之间还不调和。因此，他们还要做工作。我相信哥穆尔卡同志是好人。赫鲁晓夫同志两次向我表示：哥穆尔卡同志是可以信任的。我希望波兰、苏联、中国、其他国家完全团结起来，逐步地改进我们之间的关系。

我又高兴南斯拉夫的同志们在第二个宣言〔 〇〇〕上准备签字。他们在六十几个党的和平宣言上签字表示一件什么事情呢？就是表示团结。他们没有在十二国宣言〔 〇〇〕上签字，使十三国缺少了一国。他们说有困难，我们想也可以，我们不能强加于人，南斯拉夫不愿意签字就不签字好了。将来若干年后，我想他们是可以在另外一个宣言上签字的。

在团结问题上我想讲一点方法问题。我说对同志不管他是什么人，只要不是敌对分子、破坏分子，那就要采取团结的态度。对他们要采取辩证的方法，而不应采取形而上学的方法。什么叫辩证的方法？就是对一切加以分析，承认人总是要犯错误的，不因为一个人犯了错误就否定他的一切。列宁曾讲过，不犯错误的人全世界一个也没有〔 〇〇〕。我就是犯过许多错误的，这些错误对我很有益处，这些错误教育了我。任何一个人都要人支持。一个好汉也要三个帮，一个篱笆也要三个桩。这是中国的成语。中国还有一句成语，荷花虽好，也要绿叶扶持。你赫鲁晓夫同志这朵荷花虽好，也要绿叶扶持。我毛泽东这朵荷花不好，更要绿叶扶持。我们中国还有一句成语，三个臭皮匠，合成一个诸葛亮。这合乎我们赫鲁晓夫同志的口号〇〇集体领导。单独的一个诸葛亮总是不完全的，总是有缺陷的。你看我们这十二国宣言，已有第一、第二、第三、第四次草稿，现在文字上的修正还没有完结。我看要是自称全智全能，像上帝一样，那种思想是不妥当的。因此，对犯错误的同志应该采取什么态度呢？应该有分析，采取辩证的方法，而不采取形而上学的方法。我们党曾经陷入形而上学〇〇教条主义，对自己不喜欢的人就全部毁灭他。后来我们批判了教条主义，逐

步地多学会了一点辩证法。辩证法的基本观点就是对立面的统一。承认这个观点，对犯错误的同志怎么办呢？对犯错误的同志第一是要斗争，要把错误思想彻底肃清；第二，还要帮助他。一曰斗，二曰帮。从善意出发帮助他改正错误，使他有一条出路。

对待另一种人就不同了。像托洛茨基〔 00〕那种人，像中国的陈独秀、张国焘、高岗〔 00〕那种人，对他们无法采取帮助态度，因为他们不可救药。还有像希特勒、蒋介石、沙皇，也都是无可救药，只能打倒，因为他们对于我们说来，是绝对地互相排斥的。在这个意义上来说，他们没有两重性，只有一重性。对于帝国主义制度、资本主义制度在最后说来也是如此，它们最后必然要被社会主义制度所代替。意识形态也是一样，要用唯物论代替唯心论，用无神论代替有神论。这是在战略目的上说的。在策略阶段上就不同了，就有妥协了。在朝鲜三八线上我们不是同美国人妥协了吗？在越南不是同法国人妥协了吗？在各个策略阶段上，要善于斗争，又善于妥协。

现在回到同志关系。我提议同志之间有隔阂要开谈判。有些人似乎以为，一进了共产党都是圣人，没有分歧，没有误会，不能分析，就是说铁板一块，整齐划一，就不需要讲谈判了。好像一进了共产党，就要是百分之百的马克思主义才行。其实有各种各样的马克思主义者：有百分之百的马克思主义者，有百分之九十的马克思主义者，有百分之八十的马克思主义者，有百分之七十的马克思主义者，有百分之六十的马克思主义者，有百分之五十的马克思主义者，有的人只有百分之十、百分之二十的马克思主义。我们可不可以在小房间里头两个人或者

几个人谈谈呢？可不可以从团结出发，用帮助的精神开谈判呢？这当然不是同帝国主义开谈判（对于帝国主义，我们也是要同他们开谈判的），这是共产主义内部的谈判。举一个例子。我们这回十二国是不是开谈判？六十几个党是不是开谈判？实际上是在开谈判。也就是说，在不损伤马克思列宁主义的原则下，接受人家一些可以接受的意见，放弃自己一些可以放弃的意见。这样我们就有两只手，对犯错误的同志，一只手跟他作斗争，一只手跟他讲团结。斗争的目的是坚持马克思主义原则，这叫原则性，这是一只手。另一只手讲团结，团结的目的是给他一条出路，跟他讲妥协，这叫做灵活性。原则性和灵活性的统一，是马克思列宁主义的原则，这是一种对立面的统一。

无论什么世界，当然特别是阶级社会，都是充满着矛盾的。有些人说社会主义社会可以□找到□矛盾，我看这个提法不对。不是什么找到或者找不到矛盾，而是充满着矛盾。没有一处不存在矛盾，没有一个人是不可以加以分析的。如果承认一个人是不可加以分析的，就是形而上学。你看在原子里头，就充满矛盾的统一。有原子核和电子两个对立面的统一。原子核里头又有质子和中子的对立统一。质子里又有质子、反质子，中子里又有中子、反中子。总之，对立面的统一是无往不在的。关于对立面的统一的观念，关于辩证法，需要作广泛的宣传。我说辩证法应该从哲学家的圈子走到广大人民群众中间去。我建议，要在各国党的政治局会议和中央全会上谈这个问题，要在党的各级地方委员会上谈这个问题。其实我们的支部书记是懂得辩证法的，当他准备在支部大会上作报告的时候，往往在小本子上写上两点，第一点是优点，第二点是缺点。一

分为二，这是个普遍的现象，这就是辩证法。

斯大林领导苏联党做了伟大的工作，他的成绩是主要的，缺点错误是第二位的。但是他在一个长时间内发展了形而上学，损害了辩证法。个人崇拜就是形而上学，任何人不能批评他。我看苏联的四十年是一个辩证法的过程。列宁的辩证法，斯大林有许多形而上学观点，这些观点见之行动，达于极点，势必走到它的反面，再来一个辩证法。我很高兴赫鲁晓夫同志在十月革命四十周年纪念会上讲了社会主义社会存在着矛盾。我很高兴苏联哲学界产生了许多篇文章谈社会主义社会的内部矛盾问题。有些文章还谈到了社会主义和资本主义的矛盾问题。这是两类性质不同的矛盾问题。

我的讲话就此结束吧。最后，再讲一句：我赞成两个宣言。

根据中国共产党第八届全国代表大会  
第二次会议文件刊印。

## 注 释

〔 ① 〕 这篇讲话选入本书时作了个别删节。

〔 ② 〕 希特勒，见本卷第 ①① 页注〔 ① 〕。

〔 ③ 〕 指斯大林格勒保卫战。一九四二年夏，德军在对苏联全面进攻失败后，转而苏德战场南翼实施重点进攻。七月十七日德军开始猛攻斯大林格勒，企图攻占该城，切断伏尔加河，南夺高加索油田，北攻莫斯科。苏军先后以五个方面军的兵力同广大人民一起艰苦奋斗，在顽强的防御战中消灭大量敌人。十一月十九日苏军转入反攻，二十三日包围了三十三万德军。次年二月二日全歼该敌。这一战役，德军损失兵力达一百五十万人，苏军夺得战略主动权，标志着苏德战争和第二次世界大战达到新的转折点。

〔 ④ 〕 匈牙利事件，指一九五六年十月至十一月发生在匈牙利的反政府政治事

件。

〔 〇 〕 苏伊士运河事件，见本卷第 〇〇〇页注〔 〇 〕。

〔 〇 〕 法斯特，一九一四年生，美国作家。一九四二年加入美国共产党。曾写过一些揭露资本主义社会的黑暗、反映美国历史上革命运动的作品，担任过世界和平理事会理事。苏联共产党第二十次代表大会和匈牙利事件后，宣布退出美国共产党。

〔 〇 〕 指一九五七年十月四日和十一月三日苏联成功发射两颗人造地球卫星。

〔 〇 〕 罗斯福，一九三三年至一九四五年任美国总统。

〔 〇 〕 丘吉尔，一九四〇年至一九四五年任英国战时联合内阁首相。

〔 〇〇 〕 雅尔塔，在前苏联的克里米亚半岛。一九四五年二月四日至十一日，苏、美、英三国首脑在这里举行会议，签订了《雅尔塔协定》。参见本卷第 〇〇〇页注〔 〇〇 〕。

〔 〇〇 〕 赫鲁晓夫，当时任苏联共产党中央委员会第一书记。

〔 〇〇 〕 满洲，这里指中国东北地区。

〔 〇〇 〕 杜鲁门（一八八四—一九七二），美国民主党人。一九四五年至一九五三年任美国总统。

〔 〇〇 〕 三八线，见本卷第 〇〇页注〔 〇 〕。

〔 〇〇 〕 金日成（一九一二—一九九四），当时任朝鲜劳动党中央委员会委员长、朝鲜民主主义人民共和国内阁首相。朝鲜战争期间，任朝鲜劳动党中央军事委员会委员长、朝鲜人民军最高司令官。

〔 〇〇 〕 朝鲜战争期间，美国在联合国军的名义下，组织了英国、法国、荷兰、比利时、卢森堡、澳大利亚、新西兰、加拿大、南非联邦、埃塞俄比亚、土耳其、希腊、菲律宾、泰国、哥伦比亚，连同美国共十六个国家的军队，对朝鲜民主主义人民共和国进行武装干涉。

〔 〇〇 〕 胡志明（一八九〇—一九六九），当时任越南劳动党中央委员会主席、越南民主共和国主席。

〔 〇〇 〕 日内瓦会议，指一九五四年四月二十六日至七月二十一日在瑞士日内瓦举行的讨论和平解决朝鲜问题和恢复印度支那和平问题的国际会议。这次会议达成的《关于在越南停止敌对行动的协定》中，规定法国军队集结在北纬十七度线以南。这样，就把大半个越南划给了越南民主共和国。

〔 00 〕 先锋计划，是当时美国制订的人造地球卫星发射计划。美国试图通过这一计划在航天技术领域居于世界前列。

〔 00 〕 波立特，当时任英国共产党中央执行委员会主席。高兰（一九一— 00 一九七七），当时任英国共产党中央委员会总书记。

〔 00 〕 布尔什维克，指布尔什维克党，原苏联共产党前身，一九二二年正式建立。

〔 00 〕 二月革命，指一九一七年三月（俄历二月）在俄国发生的推翻沙皇专制制度的资产阶级民主革命。

〔 00 〕 哥穆尔卡（一九〇五〇〇—一九八二），当时任波兰统一工人党中央委员会第一书记。

〔 00 〕 指一九五七年十一月十六日至十九日在莫斯科召开的六十四个国家共产党和工人党代表会议通过的《和平宣言》。

〔 00 〕 指一九五七年十一月十四日至十六日在莫斯科召开的社会主义国家共产党和工人党代表会议通过的《社会主义国家共产党和工人党代表会议宣言》（通称《莫斯科宣言》）。阿尔巴尼亚、保加利亚、匈牙利、波兰、德意志民主共和国、罗马尼亚、捷克斯洛伐克、苏联、越南、蒙古、朝鲜和中国等十二个国家执政的共产党和工人党代表团参加了这次会议。

〔 00 〕 见列宁《共产主义运动中的“左派”幼稚病》。原文是：“不犯错误的人是没有而且也不可能有的。”（《列宁选集》第3卷，人民出版社2000年版，第300页）

〔 00 〕 托洛茨基（一八七九〇〇—一九四〇），十月革命时，任俄国社会民主工党（布尔什维克）中央政治局委员、彼得格勒苏维埃主席。十月革命胜利后，曾任外交人民委员、陆海军人民委员、革命军事委员会主席、共产国际执行委员会委员等职。一九二六年十月联共（布）中央全会决定，撤销他的中央政治局委员的职务。一九二七年一月共产国际执行委员会决定，撤销他的执行委员的职务。同年十一月被开除出党。一九二九年一月被驱逐出苏联。一九四〇年八月在墨西哥遭暗杀。

〔 00 〕 陈独秀，参见本卷第00页注〔 0 〕。张国焘，参见本卷第00页注〔 00 〕。高岗，参见本卷第00页注〔 0 〕。



同志们:

我讲几句话。请同志们允许我即席讲话。因为我在几年前害过一次脑贫血症，最近一两年好一些，站起来讲话还有些不方便。

我想讲两个问题:形势问题，团结问题。

现在我感到国际形势到了一个新的转折点。世界上现在有两股风:东风，西风。中国有句成语:不是东风压倒西风，就是西风压倒东风。我认为目前形势的特点是东风压倒西风，也就是说，社会主义的力量对于帝国主义的力量占了压倒的优势。四十年前的十月革命是整个人类历史的转折点，怎么现在又有转折点呢?还是有的。打希特勒，在一个时期，有一二年的时间，希特勒占了上风。那时，希特勒不但占领大半个欧洲，而且打进苏联，苏联让出了一大块土地，可见希特勒一时占了上风。斯大林格勒一战成为转折点，从此希特勒就走下坡路，苏联就势如破竹一直打到柏林。这不是一个转折点吗?据我看来，斯大林格勒一仗，是整个第二次世界大战的转折点。去年，最近这几年，西方世界非常猖狂，利用我们阵营中的一些问题，特别是匈牙利事件，在我们阵营的脸上擦黑，我们的天上飞起许多乌云。但是匈牙利反革命被镇压下去了。在苏伊士运河事件中，苏联的警告也起了制止侵略战争的作用。西方擦黑我们的脸的目的，依我看，主要是想“整”各国共产党。在这一方面，他们也达到了一部分目的。例如美国的法斯特，共产主义的可耻的叛徒，就跑出党去了。还有一些共产党也跑出去了一些人。帝国主义对此大为高兴。我想我们也应该高兴。叛徒跑出去了，有什么不好?

今年，一九五七年，形势大为不同了。我们的天上是一片光明，西方的天上是一片乌云。我们很乐观，而他们呢，却是皇皇不安。两个卫星上天，使他们睡不着觉。六十几国共产党在莫斯科开会是从没有过的事，从来也没有这样大的规模。但是在社会主义阵营各国中，在各国共产党中，特别是在各国人民中，还有相当多的人总是相信美国了不起。你看，他们还有那么多钢，有那么多飞机大炮。我们的比他们的少。西方国家无数的报纸、广播电台天天吹，美国之音、自由欧洲电台等等吹得神乎其神，于是乎造成一种假象，欺骗了相当多的一部分人。我们就要揭穿这种欺骗。我有十件证据来说明这个问题:究竟是他们行还是我们行，究竟是东风压倒西风，还是西风压倒东风?

第一件，打希特勒的时候，罗斯福和丘吉尔的手里有多少钢呢?大约有七千万吨。可是吃不下希特勒，毫无办法。总要想个办法吧，于是采用了旅行的办法，一走就走到雅尔塔，请求苏联帮助。那时，斯大林手中有多少钢呢?在战前有一千八百万吨。因为在战争中损失了许多地方，据赫鲁晓夫同志告诉我，钢产量打了个对折，剩下九百万吨。有七千万吨钢的人，来请求有九百万吨钢的人。条件是什么呢?易北河以东划为红军的进攻区，就是说，他们忍痛下决心让这一大块区域脱离他们的体系，让这一大块区域有可能转变为社会主义体系。这件事很有说服力，说明物质力量多少不完全决定问题，人是主要的，制度是主要的。在雅尔塔又谈到打日本。又是美国人吃不下日本，又要请共产主义帮助。中国的满洲，朝鲜的一部分，作为红军的攻击区，并且决定让日本退还半个库页岛、一个千岛群岛。这也是忍痛让步啊!为了吃掉他们的同伴——日本帝国主义。

第二件，中国革命。一九四九年初国民党被我们打得呜呼哀哉的时候，向杜鲁门大喊救命，说:美国老爷呀，你出几个兵吧!杜鲁门说:我一个兵也不能出!于是国民党又说:你可以不可以讲几句话呢?说长江以南这块地方，如果共产党到了那里的时候，美国就不能坐视。杜鲁门说:这个不行，讲不得的，共产党很厉害。于是乎蒋介石只好开跑。他现在在台湾。

第三件，朝鲜战争。在开始的时候，美国一个师有八百门炮，中国志愿军三个师才有五十多门炮。但是一打就像赶鸭子一样，几个星期就把美国人赶了几百公里，从鸭绿江赶到三八线以南去了。后来美国人集中了力量进行反攻，我们和金日成同志商量，退到了三八线相持，构筑阵地。一打，整个朝鲜战争差不多打了三年。美国的飞机就像黄蜂一样，我们在第一线一架飞机也没有。双方同意讲和。在什么地点?他们说在一条丹麦的船上，我们说在开城，在我们的地方。他们说:好。因为会址在我们的地方，他们每天开会得打着白旗子来，开完会打着白旗子回去。后来，他

们感到不好意思了一天打白旗子。说改一个地方吧，改到双方战线的中间，地名就叫板门店。我们说也可以。但是又谈了年把，美国总是不甘心签字，拖。最后，在一九五二年，我们在三八线上突破了二十公里的防线，美国人吓倒了，马上签字。那么厉害、有那么多钢的美国人，也只得如此。这个战争，实际上是三国打的，朝鲜、中国、苏联，苏联出了武器。但是敌人方面呢，有十六个国家。

第四件，越南战争。法国人被胡志明打得呜呼哀哉，屁滚尿流。有人可以作证，胡志明同志在座。法国人不想干了，美国人一定要干，因为他的钢多。但是美国人也只是出武器，维持紧张局势，出兵就不来。于是乎有日内瓦会议[18]，把大半个越南划给越南民主共和国。

第五件，苏伊士运河事件。两个帝国主义进攻，打了几天，苏联人讲了几句话，就缩回去了。当然还有第二个因素，就是全世界在讲话，反对英法侵略。

第六件事是叙利亚。美国作好了计划要打，又是苏联人讲了几句话，还任命了一个将军，叫做罗科索夫斯基。做了这两件事，他们说不好打了。这件事还没有完结，还要警惕，可能将来还闹乱子。但是现在总算没有打。

第七件是苏联抛上了两个卫星。抛卫星的国家有多少钢？五千一百万吨。不是讲美国非常厉害吗？你为什么到现在连一个山药蛋还没有抛上去？你有一万万吨钢，牛皮吹得那么大呀，做出了先锋计划。先锋计划要改名了，得改成落后计划。

由这七件事，我想可以得出一个概念：西方世界被抛到我们后面去了。抛得很近还是抛得很远？照我讲，也许我这个人有些冒险主义，我说，永远地抛下去了。在苏联发射人造卫星以前，社会主义国家在人心归向、人口众多方面已经对于帝国主义国家占了压倒的优势；而在苏联发射人造卫星以后，就在最重要的科学技术部门方面也占了压倒的优势。人们说，美国也会赶上来的，它也会抛卫星的。这是真的。赫鲁晓夫同志的报告就讲了美国会抛卫星的。但是他们现在正在争论究竟是一年、二年还是五年才能赶上苏联。我不管你是一年、二年还是五年，你总是被抛到后面去了。我们的苏联同志，赫鲁晓夫同志，大概只是晚上睡觉，白天不会睡觉。所有苏联人不会白天晚上，一年、二年、五年总是睡觉吧？你一年、二年、五年赶上苏联，但是苏联又前进啦。

同志们，我讲讲我们国家的事情吧。我国今年有了五百二十万吨钢，再过五年，可以有一千万到一千五百万吨钢；再过五年，可以有二千万到二千五百万吨钢；再过五年，可以有三千万到四千万吨钢。当然，也许我在这里说了大话，将来国际会议再开会的时候，你们可能批评我是主观主义。但是我是有相当根据的。我们有很多苏联专家帮助我们。中国人是想努力的。中国从政治上、人口上说是个大国，从经济上说现在还是个小国。他们想努力，他们非常热心工作，要把中国变成一个真正的大国。赫鲁晓夫同志告诉我们，十五年后，苏联可以超过美国。我也可以讲，十五年后我们可能赶上或者超过英国。因为我和波立特、高兰同志谈过两次话，我问过他们国家的情况，他们说现在英国年产两千万吨钢，再过十五年，可能爬到年产三千万吨钢。中国呢，再过十五年可能是四千万吨，岂不超过了英国吗？那末，在十五年后，在我们阵营中间，苏联超过美国，中国超过英国。

归根结底，我们要争取十五年和平。到那个时候，我们就无敌于天下了，没有人敢同我们打了，世界也就可以得到持久和平了。

现在还要估计一种情况，就是想发动战争的疯子，他们可能把原子弹、氢弹到处摔。他们摔，我们也摔，这就打得一塌糊涂，这就要损失人。问题要放在最坏的基点上来考虑。我们党的政治局开过几次会，讲过这个问题。现在要打，中国只有手榴弹，没有原子弹，但是苏联有。要设想一下，如果爆发战争要死多少人。全世界十七亿人口，可能损失三分之一；再多一点，可能损失一半。不是我们要打，是他要打，一打就要摔原子弹、氢弹。我和一位外国政治家辩论过这个问题。他认为如果打原子战争，人会死绝的。我说，极而言之，死掉一半人，还有一半人，帝国主义打平了，全世界社会主义化了，再过多少年，又会有二十七亿，一定还要多。我们中国还没有建设好，我们希望和平。但是如果帝国主义硬要打仗，我们也只好

横下一条心，打了仗再建设。每天怕战争，战争来了你有什么办法呢？我先是说东风压倒西风，战争打不起来，现在再就如果发生了战争的情况，作了这些补充的说明，这样两种可能性都估计到了。

我讲十件证据，刚才讲了七件，下面再讲三件。

第八件是英国退出亚洲、非洲很大一片土地。

第九件是荷兰退出印尼。

第十件是法国退出叙利亚、黎巴嫩、摩洛哥、突尼斯，在阿尔及利亚没有办法。

落后国家强些，还是先进国家强些？印度强些，还是英国强些？印尼强些，还是荷兰强些？阿尔及利亚强些，还是法国强些？我看所有帝国主义国家都是下午六点钟的太阳，而我们呢，是早上六点钟的太阳。于是乎转折点就来了。就是说，西方国家抛到后边了，我们大大占了上风了。一定不是西风压倒东风，因为西风是那么微弱。一定是东风压倒西风，因为我们强大。

问题是不能用钢铁数量多少来作决定，而是首先由人心的向背来作决定的。历史上从来就是如此。历史上从来就是弱者战胜强者，没有枪的人战胜全副武装的人。布尔什维克曾经一枝枪也没有。苏联同志告诉我，二月革命[22]的时候，只有四万党员；十月革命的时候，也只有二十四万党员。《联共(布)党史简明教程》那本书上的第一页第一段写了一个辩证法：从小组到全国。开头是稀稀拉拉的几十个人的小组，后来变成整个国家的领导者。苏联同志，你们修改《联共党史》的时候，我希望不要把这几句话修改掉了。我们中国也是如此，开头是稀稀拉拉几十个人的共产主义者的小组，现在也是领导着整个国家，领导着六亿四千万人口的大党。几十个共产主义者的小组，现在发展成一千二百万党员。我这话是特别想同资本主义国家共产党同志们交换意见的，因为他们现在还处在困难中，有些党很小，有些党有成批党员退出党。我说这不足为怪，也许是好事。我们的道路是曲折的，是按照螺旋形上升的。

还要讲个纸老虎问题。一九四六年蒋介石开始向我们进攻的时候，我们许多同志，全国人民，都很忧虑：战争是不是能够打赢？我本人也忧虑这件事。但是我们有一条信心。那时有一个美国记者到了延安，名字叫安娜·路易斯·斯特朗。这个人就是在苏联住了二十二年，后来被斯大林赶走，以后又被赫鲁晓夫同志恢复了名誉的那位女作家。我同她谈话的时候谈了许多问题，蒋介石、希特勒、日本、美国、原子弹等等。我说一切所有号称强大的反动派统统不过是纸老虎，原因是他们脱离人民。你看，希特勒是不是纸老虎？希特勒不是被打倒了吗？我也谈到沙皇是纸老虎，中国皇帝是纸老虎，日本帝国主义是纸老虎，你看，都倒了。

美帝国主义没有倒，还有原子弹，我看也是要倒的，也是纸老虎。蒋介石很强大，有四百多万正规军。那时我们在延安。延安这个地方有多少人？有七千人。我们有多少军队呢？我们有九十万游击队，统统被蒋介石分割成几十个根据地。但是 we 说，蒋介石不过是一个纸老虎，我们一定会打赢他。为了同敌人作斗争，我们在一个长时间内形成了一个概念，就是说，在战略上我们要藐视一切敌人，在战术上我们要重视一切敌人。也就是说在整体上我们一定要藐视他，在一个一个的具体问题上我们一定要重视他。如果不是在整体上藐视敌人，我们就要犯机会主义的错误。马克思、恩格斯只有两个人，那时他们就说全世界资本主义要被打倒。但是在具体问题上，在一个一个敌人的问题上，如果我们不重视他，我们就要犯冒险主义的错误。打仗只能一仗一仗地打，敌人只能一部分一部分地消灭。工厂只能一个一个地盖，农民犁田只能一块一块地犁。就是吃饭也是如此。我们在战略上藐视吃饭：这顿饭我们能够吃下去。但是具体地吃，却是一口一口地吃的，你不可能把一桌酒席一口吞下去。这叫做各个解决，军事书上叫做各个击破。

第一个问题讲完了。现在就第二个问题，团结问题，讲几句。

我非常高兴，非常庆幸我们的会议开得很团结。这次大会反映了全世界无产阶级和人民的上升的朝气，是东欧国家倒西风的一种形势。我们有很多缺点和错误，但是我们的成绩是主要的，是年年有成效的。于是乎反映在我们六十几个共产党大会上有一股朝气，并且一致承认要有个头，这个头就是苏联，就是苏共中央。中国有一句俗话：蛇无头而不行。你看，我们每个国家都有一个头，有集体的头和个人的头。中央委员会、政治局是集体，第一书记是个人，两者都要，不然就是无政府主义。

我高兴哥穆尔卡同志昨天的演说，他说，承认苏联为首是一个真理，不是人为的，是历史上自然形成的。不过他那个国家的有些人在感情上还有问题，暂时不想讲这个话，要换一个形式讲，比如讲第一个和最强大的社会主义国家。他们那个国家存在这样一个矛盾，先进分子同相当多的其他人之间还不调和。因此，他们还要做工作。我相信哥穆尔卡同志是好人。赫鲁晓夫同志两次向我表示：哥穆尔卡同志是可以信任的。我希望波兰、苏联、中国、其他国家完全团结起来，逐步地改进我们之间的关系。

我又高兴南斯拉夫的同志们在第二个宣言上准备签字。他们在六十几个党的和平宣言上签字表示一件什么事情呢？就是表示团结。他们没有在十二国宣言上签字，使十三国缺少了一国。他们说有困难，我们想也可以，我们不能强加于人，南斯拉夫不愿意签字就不签字好了。将来若干年后，我想他们是可以另外在另外一个宣言上签字的。

在团结问题上我想讲一点方法问题。我说对同志不管他是什么人，只要不是敌对分子、破坏分子，那就要采取团结的态度。对他们要采取辩证的方法，而不应采取形而上学的方法。什么叫辩证的方法？就是对一切加以分析，承认人总是要犯错误的，不因为一个人犯了错误就否定他的一切。列宁曾讲过，不犯错误的人全世界一个也没有。我就是犯过许多错误的，这些错误对我很有益处，这些错误教育了我。任何一个人都要人支持。一个好汉也要三个帮，一个篱笆也要三个桩。这是中国的成语。

中国还有一句成语，荷花虽好，也要绿叶扶持。你赫鲁晓夫同志这朵荷花虽好，也要绿叶扶持。我毛泽东这朵荷花不好，更要绿叶扶持。我们中国还有一句成语，三个臭皮匠，合成一个诸葛亮。这合乎我们赫鲁晓夫同志的口号——集体领导。单独的一个诸葛亮总是不完全的，总是有缺陷的。你看我们这十二国宣言，已有第一、第二、第三、第四次草稿，现在文字上的修正还没有完结。我看要是自称全智全能，像上帝一样，那种思想是不妥当的。因此，对犯错误的同志应该采取什么态度呢？应该有分析，采取辩证的方法，而不采取形而上学的方法。我们党曾经陷入形而上学教条主义，对自己不喜欢的人就全部毁灭他。后来我们批判了教条主义，逐步地多学会了一点辩证法。辩证法的基本观点就是对立面的统一。承认这个观点，对犯错误的同志怎么办呢？对犯错误的同志第一是要斗争，要把错误思想彻底肃清；第二，还要帮助他。一曰斗，二曰帮。从善意出发帮助他改正错误，使他有一条出路。

对待另一种人就不同了。像托洛茨基那种人，像中国的陈独秀、张国焘、高岗那种人，对他们无法采取帮助态度，因为他们不可救药。还有像希特勒、蒋介石、沙皇，也都是无可救药，只能打倒，因为他们对于我们说来，是绝对地互相排斥的。在这个意义上来说，他们没有两重性，只有一重性。对于帝国主义制度、资本主义制度在最后说来也是如此，它们最后必然要被社会主义制度所代替。意识形态也是一样，要用唯物论代替唯心论，用无神论代替有神论。这是在战略目的上说的。在策略阶段上就不同了，就有妥协了。在朝鲜三八线上我们不是同美国人妥协了吗？在越南不是同法国人妥协了吗？在各个策略阶段上，要善于斗争，又善于妥协。

现在回到同志关系。我提议同志之间有隔阂要开谈判。有些人似乎以为，一进了共产党都是圣人，没有分歧，没有误会，不能分析，就是说铁板一块，整齐划一，就不需要谈判了。好像一进了共产党，就要是百分之百的马克思主义才行。其实有各种各样的马克思主义者：有百分之百的马克思主义者，有百分之九十的马克思主义者，有百分之八十的马克思主义者，有百分之七十的马克思主义者，有百分之六十的马克思主义者，有百分之五十的马克思主义者，有的人只有百分之十、百分之

二十的马克思主义。我们可不可以小房间里头两个人或者几个人谈谈呢?可不可以从团结出发,用帮助的精神开谈判呢?这当然不是同帝国主义开谈判(对于帝国主义,我们也是同他们开谈判的),这是共产主义内部的谈判。举一个例子。我们这回十二国是不是开谈判?六十几个党是不是开谈判?实际上是在开谈判。也就是说,在不损伤马克思列宁主义的原则下,接受人家一些可以接受的意见,放弃自己一些可以放弃的意见。这样我们就有两只手,对犯错误的同志,一只手跟他作斗争,一只手跟他讲团结。斗争的目的是坚持马克思主义原则,这叫原则性,这是一只手。另一只手讲团结,团结的目的是给他一条出路,跟他讲妥协,这叫做灵活性。原则性和灵活性的统一,是马克思列宁主义的原则,这是一种对立面的统一。

无论什么世界,当然特别是阶级社会,都是充满着矛盾的。有些人说社会主义社会可以“找到”矛盾,我看这个提法不对。不是什么找到或者找不到矛盾,而是一个充满着矛盾。没有一处不存在矛盾,没有一个人不可以加以分析的。如果承认是一个原子核和电子两个对立面的统一。原子核里头又有质子和中子的对立统一。质子里面又有质子和反质子的对立统一。中子里面又有中子和反中子的对立统一。总之,对立面的统一是无处不在的。哲学上对于对立面的统一,关于辩证法,需要作广泛的宣传。我说辩证法应该从哲学会上谈这个问题,要上得辩证的,当他准备在支部大会上作报告的时候,往往在小本子上写上两点,第一点是优点,第二点是缺点。一分为二,这是个普遍的现象,这就是辩证法。

斯大林领导苏联党做了伟大的工作,他的成绩是主要的,缺点错误是第二位的。但他在一个长时间内发展了形而上学,损害了辩证法。个人崇拜就是形而上学,任林何人不能批评他。我看苏联的四十年是一个辩证法的过程。列宁的辩证法,斯大林有许多形而上学观点,这些观点见之行动,达于极点,势必走到它的反面,再来一个辩证法。我很高兴赫鲁晓夫同志在十月革命四十周年纪念会上讲了社会主义社会存在着矛盾。我很高兴苏联哲学界产生了许多篇文章谈社会主义社会的内部矛盾问题。有些文章还谈到了社会主义和资本主义的矛盾问题。这是两类性质不同的矛盾问题。

我的讲话就此结束吧。最后,再讲一句:我赞成两个宣言。

Comrades:

I will say a few words. Please allow me to remain seated while speaking. I suffered a stroke some years ago, and though my condition has improved these two years, I still find it a little difficult to stand while speaking.

I should like to discuss two questions: the [present international] situation and [our] unity.

It is my opinion that the international situation has now reached a new turning point. There are two winds in the world today, the east wind and the west wind. There is a Chinese saying, 'Either the east wind prevails over the west wind or the west wind prevails over the east wind'. It is characteristic of the situation today, I believe, that the east wind is prevailing over the west wind. That is to say, the forces of socialism are overwhelmingly superior to forces of imperialism.

The October Revolution, 40 years ago, was a turning-point in the history of mankind. So how come we now have yet another turning-point? Well, we have. For a while, for a year or two, Hitler had the upper hand. At the time, he not only occupied half of Europe but also invaded the Soviet Union, causing it to surrender a large territory. It is clear that he temporarily had the upper hand then. But the battle of Stalingrad was a turning-point, and from then on Hitler went downhill, while the Soviet Union pushed its way with irresistible force all the way to Berlin. Wasn't it a turning-point? In my opinion, the battle of Stalingrad was the turning-point of the entire Second World War.

Last year, and in the preceding years, the West was very ferocious. They took advantage of some problems within our camp - in particular the Hungarian incident - to discredit us. But though many dark clouds appeared in our skies, the Hungarian counter-revolutionaries were suppressed. During the Suez crisis, the warning issued by the Soviet Union also served to prevent a war of occupation. The aim of the West in trying to discredit us was in my view mainly to give the various communist parties 'a bad time'. In this they did succeed up to a point. For example, that shameless traitor of communism the American Fast, deserted the party. Other communist parties saw people desert them as well, to the delight of the imperialists. I think we should be happy too, since what is so bad about a few traitors pulling out?

This year, 1957, the situation is very different. Our skies are all bright but those of the West are darkened by cloud. We are very optimistic, but how about them? They are in a state of anxiety. After the launching of the two sputniks, they have not been able to go to sleep. Never before have over 60 communist parties convened a meeting on this major scale here in Moscow.

Within the communist parties, and in particular among the people of our various countries, there are still many who believe that the United States is something extraordinary. They have all that steel, and all those aeroplanes and cannons! We have less than they do! Innumerable Western newspapers and radio stations, such as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, all laud them to the skies and create a false image which has duped a considerable number of people. We must expose this fraud will present ten pieces of evidence as an answer to the following question: are they stronger or are we stronger? Is the east wind prevailing over the west wind, or is the west wind prevailing over the east wind?

Number one: When they fought Hitler, how much steel did Roosevelt and Churchill have? They had about 70 million tons. But even so, they were helpless and unable to bring Hitler to his knees. In the end they had to come up with a solution and so they chose to set off on a journey. They went all the way to Yalta, to ask Stalin for help. How much steel did Stalin have at the time?

Before the war, he had had about 18 million tons, but after losing so much territory, his steel production, so comrade Khrushchev has told me, was reduced by half and only nine million tons remained. Men with 70 million tons of steel were asking a man with nine million tons of steel to help them. And what were the conditions? That the territory east of the Elbe river be regarded as the attack sector of the Red Army. This is to say, they reluctantly decided to cede this large territory and face the possibility of it all becoming socialist. This fact is very convincing and demonstrates that material might is not the only thing that counts. People and systems are of primary importance. At Yalta, the fight against Japan was also discussed: once more it was the

Americans who were unable to defeat the Japanese and had to ask for communist help. Manchuria and a part of Korea were designated attack sectors of the Red Army, and it was decided that Japan would have to return half of Sakhalin and all of the Kurile Islands. Once more they had to make concessions against their will in order to defeat their own kind - the Japanese imperialists.

Number two: the Chinese revolution. In 1949, when we had trounced the Guomindang, they turned to Truman and cried for help, saying: Dear master, please send some soldiers! Truman said: I cannot send you even a single one! Then the Guomindang said: Is it possible for you to say a few words then, such as 'Should the Communists cross the Yangzi, the United States will no longer be able to stand by and remain indifferent'. Truman said: There is no way I can say that! The Communists are very formidable. So Jiang Jieshi [Chiang Kai-shek] had no choice but to run off. Now he is in Taiwan.

Number three: the Korean war. When it began, one US division had 800 cannons, while the three divisions of the Chinese Volunteer Army possessed only a little over 50 cannons. But as soon as the fighting started, it was like chasing ducks, and in just a few weeks the American troops had been chased hundreds of kilometres, from the Yalu river to the south of the 38th Parallel. Later the Americans concentrated their forces and waged a counter-offensive. We and comrade Kim Il Sung withdrew to the 38th Parallel, where we ended up locked in a stalemate and dug in. The entire Korean war lasted for almost three years. The US aircraft were like wasps, while we did not have even a single plane at the front. Both sides agreed to hold peace talks, but where? They suggested a Danish boat; we suggested Kaesong, part of our territory, and they agreed. But since this meant arriving and leaving the meetings each day under a white flag, they soon felt very embarrassed, and suggested changing to another place, right on the front line, called Panmunjom. We said OK. But after a year of talks, the Americans still wouldn't put their signature on anything, and kept procrastinating. Finally, in 1953, we broke through the 38th Parallel along a sector of 20 kilometres, which frightened the Americans so much they signed right away. For all their strength, all their steel, the Americans could not do otherwise. This war was actually fought by three countries, Korea, China and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union supplied the arms. But on the enemy side, there were 16 countries.

Number four: the war in Vietnam. The French were so severely beaten by Ho Chi-Minh they were shitting their pants. There are people here to prove it; comrade Ho Chi-Minh is here among us. The French did not want to go on, but the Americans insisted. They had more steel. But even the Americans were only able to supply weapons and keep up the tension. They did not send any soldiers. Hence the Geneva conference, where more than half of Vietnam became the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

Number five: the Suez incident. Two of the imperialists waged an attack and fought for a few days. Then the Soviet Union spoke up and they withdrew. Of course, there was also a second factor, namely, that the entire world spoke up and opposed the Anglo-French occupation.

Number six: Syria. The Americans had already planned an attack when the Soviet

Union not only spoke up but appointed a general by the name of Rokossovsky. These two things made them decide not to fight. But this affair is not over yet, and we must remain vigilant. There may still be trouble, but so far there has not yet been any fighting.

Number seven: the Soviet Union has launched two sputniks. How much steel did they have when they managed to do that? Fifty-one million tons. But aren't the United States supposed to be formidable? Then why haven't they been able to launch even a pellet, what with their hundred million tons of steel, their boasting and their Vanguard project. Why, they should change the name of the Vanguard project to the Trail Behind project!

From these seven events, I think we can draw the following conclusion: we have left the West behind. Close behind or far behind? In my view – and perhaps I am somewhat of an adventurer – I'd say they have been left behind for good. Before the Soviet Union had launched the sputniks the socialist states were already overwhelmingly superior to the imperialist countries in terms of popular support and populousness. Now, with the launching of the Soviet sputniks, we are overwhelmingly superior in the most important field of science and technology as well. People say that the United States will be able to catch up with us and that they too will be able to launch sputniks. This is true. Comrade Khrushchev said in his report that the United States is able to launch sputniks. But at the moment they are still debating about whether they need one, two or even five years to catch up with the Soviet Union. I don't care whether it's one, two or five years; they are still behind. Presumably our Soviet comrades, and you, comrade Khrushchev, sleep only at night and not during the day. It won't be as though the Soviet people will be sleeping day and night during that time, will it? The Americans may think they will catch up with the Soviet Union in one, two or five years, but by then the Soviet Union will be even further ahead.

Comrades, let me say something about China's domestic affairs. This year we have produced 5.2 million tons of steel. In another five years, we can produce 10 to 15 million tons of steel. In another five years, we can produce 20 to 25 million tons of steel and in yet another five years we can produce 35 to 40 million tons of steel. Of course, perhaps I am only bragging and maybe at the next session of this international conference you will accuse me of having been subjectivistic. But these assertions of mine are really well founded: we have many Soviet advisers who help us and the Chinese people are willing to exert themselves. Although today China is a major country politically and as far as the size of her population is concerned, economically she is still a small country. But our people are willing to exert themselves and work enthusiastically to turn China into a truly major country. Khrushchev has told us that the Soviet Union can overtake the United States in 15 years. I can also tell you that in 15 years, we may have caught up with or overtaken Great Britain. Because, after talking twice to comrades Pollitt and Gollan and asking them about the situation in their country, I found out that at present Great Britain produces an annual 20 million tons of steel and in another 15 years she may accomplish an annual 30 million tons of steel. Well, what about China? In another 15 years we may have achieved 40 million tons. Would that not amount to overtaking Great Britain? Therefore, in 15 years, within our camp, the Soviet Union will have overtaken the United States and China will have overtaken Great Britain.

What it all boils down to is that we must strive for 15 years of peace. Then, after that, we will be invincible. Nobody will dare to fight us. There will be everlasting peace on earth.

At present another situation has to be taken into account, namely, that the war maniacs may drop atomic and hydrogen bombs everywhere. They drop them and we act after their fashion; thus there will be chaos and lives will be lost. The question has to be considered for the worst. The Politburo of our party has held several sessions to discuss this question. If fighting breaks out now, China has only hand-grenades and



not atomic bombs - which the Soviet Union has, though. Let us imagine, how many people will die if war should break out? Out of the world's population of 2,700 million, one-third - or if more, half - may be lost. It is they and not we who want to fight; when a fight starts, atomic and hydrogen bombs may be dropped. I debated this question with a foreign statesman. He believed that if an atomic war was fought, the whole of mankind would be annihilated. I said that if the worst came to the worst and half of mankind died, the other half would remain while imperialism would be razed to the ground and the whole world would become socialist; in a number of years there would be 2,700 million people again and

definitely more. We Chinese have not yet completed our construction and we desire peace. However, if imperialism insists on fighting a war we will have no alternative but to make up our minds and fight to the finish before going ahead with our construction. If every day you are afraid of war and war eventually comes, what will you do then? First, I have said that the east wind prevails over the west wind and that war will not break out, and now I have added these explanations about the situation in case war should break out. In this way both possibilities have been taken into account.

I said ten pieces of evidence and just now I mentioned seven. Here are three more:

The eighth is the withdrawal of the United States from large territories in Asia and Africa.

The ninth is the Dutch withdrawal from Indonesia.

The tenth is the withdrawal of France from Syria, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia, and their hopeless situation in Algeria.

Who are the stronger ones, the backward countries or the advanced countries? India or Great Britain? Indonesia or Holland? Algeria or France? In my view, all imperialists are like the sun at six o'clock in the afternoon and we are like the sun at six o'clock in the morning. Hence a turning-point has been reached, that is to say the Western countries have been left behind

and we now clearly have the upper hand. It is definitely not the west wind that prevails over the east wind, so weak is the west wind. It is definitely the east wind that prevails over the west wind, because we are the stronger ones.

The decisive factor is not the amount of steel, but rather first of all the desire of the people. Throughout history, this has always been the case. Throughout history, the weak have always defeated the strong and people without guns have always defeated the fully armed. Once upon a time the Bolsheviks did not have a single gun. The Soviet comrades told me that at the time of the February revolution they had only 40,000 party members. At the time of the October Revolution they still only had 2.4 million party members. On page one of the first chapter of the History of the CPSU (Bolsheviks), Short Course there is an example of dialectics which describes a development from a tiny group to an entire country and how the CPSU, from being at first only a small group of a few dozens of scattered people, became the leaders of the entire country. Soviet comrades, when you revise the History of the CPSU, I hope you will not delete these lies. It was the same in China. At first we were just a small communist group consisting of a few dozens of scattered people and now we too are the leaders of our entire country, a party leading 640 million people. Our small group of a few dozen communists has now developed into a big party with 12 million members. I address these words in particular to the comrades from the communist parties of the capitalist countries, because they are still having a hard time. Some parties are very small and some have seen party members withdraw in droves. My view is that this is nothing strange. Perhaps it is even a good thing. Our road is tortuous and resembles an ascending spiral.

Let me say something about paper tigers. When Jiang Jieshi started his offensive against us in 1946, many of our comrades and the people of the country were much concerned about whether we could win the war. I myself was concerned. But we were confident of one thing. At that time an American correspondent, Anna Louise Strong, came to Yan'an. She is the woman author who lived in the Soviet Union for 20, 30 years and who was kicked out by Stalin but later rehabilitated by comrade Khrushchev. I discussed many questions with her, including Jiang Jieshi, Hitler, Japan, the United States and the atom bomb. I said all allegedly powerful reactionaries are merely paper tigers. The reason is that they are divorced from the people. Look! Wasn't Hitler a paper tiger? Wasn't he overthrown? I also said that the tsar of Russia was a paper tiger, as were the emperor of China and Japanese imperialism, and see, they were all overthrown. US imperialism has not yet been overthrown and it has the atom bomb, but I believe it too is a paper tiger and will be overthrown. Jiang Jieshi was very powerful, for he had a regular army of more than four million. We were then in Yan'an. What was the population of Yan'an? Seven thousand. How many troops did we have? We had 900,000 guerillas, all isolated by Jiang Jieshi in scores of base areas. But we said that Jiang Jieshi was only a paper tiger and that we could certainly defeat him. We have developed a concept over a long period for the struggle against the enemy, namely, strategically we should despise all our enemies, but tactically we should take them all seriously. In other words, with regard to the whole we must despise the enemy, but with regard to each specific problem we must take him seriously. If we do not despise him with regard to the whole, we shall commit opportunist errors. Marx and Engels were but two individuals, and yet in those early days they already declared that capitalism would be overthrown throughout the world. But with regard to specific problems and specific enemies, if we do not take them seriously, we shall commit adventurist errors. In war, battles can only be fought one by one and the enemy forces can be destroyed only one part at a time. Factories can be built only one by one. Peasants can plough the land only plot by plot. The same is even true of eating a meal. Strategically, we take the eating of a light meal lightly, we are sure we can manage it. But when it comes to the actual eating, it must be done mouthful by mouthful: you cannot swallow an entire banquet at one gulp. This is called the piecemeal solution and is known in military writings as destroying the enemy forces one by one.

I have finished talking about the first question. Now I would like to address the second question and say a few words about unity.

I am very glad, very happy, that our meeting has been so united. This meeting has reflected a trend: that of the increasing vigour of the proletariat and peoples of the entire world and of the east wind prevailing over the west wind. We have many defects and have committed many errors, but our achievements are what counts. Year after year we have scored remarkable achievements. All this can be seen in the vigour of this meeting of more than 60 communist parties. We have all agreed that we must have a head. That head is the Soviet Union and the CPSU. There is a Chinese saying which goes, 'A snake without a head cannot proceed'. Look: each person here has a head, and every party of every country also has its head. There are collective heads and individual heads. Central committees and politburos are collectives, and first secretaries are individuals. We must have both, otherwise there will be anarchy.

Gomulka's speech yesterday made me happy. He said that to admit that the Soviet Union is our head is to admit the truth, and not something manmade, but the product of historical development. But in his country, there are still some people who for the time being balk a bit at that description, and who prefer using such expressions as 'the first and mightiest socialist power'. In his country, there exists this kind of a contradiction: the progressive elements have not yet been able to reconcile themselves with a substantial number of people. They still have to work at it. I believe comrade Gomulka is a good person. Comrade Khrushchev has indicated to me twice that comrade Gomulka can be trusted. I hope that we - Poland, the Soviet Union, China and all other countries - can become completely united and that we can gradually improve our relations.

I am also glad the Yugoslav comrades signed the second declaration. The fact that they signed the Peace Manifesto of the 60-odd parties, what does it signify? It signifies unity. They did not sign the 12-country declaration, and therefore of the 13 countries one is missing. They say they would have found it difficult, and I figure this is also acceptable. We cannot coerce people, and if Yugoslavia is unwilling to sign then let us leave it at that. In another couple of years, I think they will be able to sign a different declaration.

With regard to the question of unity I'd like to say something about approaches. I think our attitude should be one of unity towards every comrade, no matter who, provided he is not a hostile element or a saboteur. We should adopt a dialectical, not a metaphysical, approach towards him. What is meant by a dialectical approach? It means being analytical about everything, acknowledging that human beings all make mistakes and not negating a person completely just because he has made mistakes. Lenin once said that there is not a single person in the world who does not make mistakes. I have made many mistakes and these mistakes have been very beneficial to me and taught me a lesson. Everyone needs support. An able fellow needs the help of three other people, a fence needs the support of three stakes. These are Chinese proverbs. Still another Chinese proverb says with all its beauty the lotus needs the green of its leaves to set it off. You, comrade Khrushchev, even though you are a beautiful lotus, you too need the leaves to set you off. I, Mao Zedong, while not a beautiful lotus, also need leaves to set me off. Still another Chinese proverb says three cobblers with their wits combined equal Zhuge Liang, the master mind. This corresponds to comrade Khrushchev's slogan - collective leadership. Zhuge Liang by himself can never be perfect, he has his limitations. Look at this declaration of our 12 countries. We have gone through a first, second, third and fourth draft and have not yet finished polishing it. I think it would be presumptuous for anyone to claim God-like omniscience and omnipotence. So what attitude should we adopt towards a comrade who has made mistakes? We should be analytical and adopt a dialectical, rather than a metaphysical approach. Our party once got bogged down in metaphysics, in dogmatism, which totally destroyed anyone not to its liking. Later we repudiated dogmatism and came to learn a little more dialectics. The unit; of opposites is the fundamental concept of dialectics. In accordance with this concept, what should we do with a comrade who has made mistakes? We should first wage a struggle to rid him of his wrong ideas. Second, we should also help him. Point one, struggle, and point two, help. We should proceed from good intentions to help him correct his mistakes so that he will have a way out.

However, dealing with persons of another type is different. Towards persons like Trotsky and like Chen Duxiu, Zhang Guotao and Gao Gang in China, it was impossible to adopt a helpful attitude, for they were incorrigible. And there were individuals like Hitler, Jiang Jieshi and the tsar, who were likewise incorrigible and had to be overthrown because we and they were absolutely exclusive of each other. In this sense, there is only one aspect of their nature, not two. In the final analysis, this is also true of the imperialist and capitalist systems, which are bound to be replaced in the end by the socialist system. The same applies to ideology, idealism will be replaced by materialism and theism by atheism. Here we are speaking of the strategic objective. But the case is different with tactical stages, where compromises may be made. Didn't we compromise with the Americans on the 38th Parallel in Korea? Wasn't there a compromise with the French in Vietnam?

At each tactical stage, it is necessary to be good at making compromises as well as waging struggles. Now let us return to the relations between comrades. I would suggest that talks be held by comrades where there has been some misunderstanding between them. Some seem to think that, once in the communist party, people all become saints with no differences or misunderstandings, and that the party is not subject to analysis, that is to say, it is monolithic and uniform, hence there is no need for talks. It seems as if people have to be 100 per cent Marxists once they are in the party. Actually there are Marxists of all degrees, those who are 100

per cent, 90, 80, 70, 60, or 50 per cent Marxist, and some who are only 10 or 20 per cent Marxist. Can't two or more of us have talks together in a small room? Can't we proceed from the desire for unity and hold talks in the spirit of helping each other? Of course I'm referring to talks within the communist ranks, and not to talks with the imperialists (though we do hold talks with them as well). Let me give an example. Aren't our 12 countries holding talks on the present occasion? Aren't the more than 60 parties holding talks too? As a matter of fact they are. In other words, provided that no damage is done to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, we accept from others certain views that are acceptable and give up certain of our own views that can be given up. Thus we have two hands to deal with a comrade who has made mistakes, one hand to struggle with and the other to unite with him. The aim of struggle is to uphold the principles of Marxism, which means being principled; that is one hand. The other hand is to unite with him. The aim of unity is to provide him with a way out, to compromise with him, which means being flexible. The integration of principle with flexibility is a Marxist-Leninist principle, and it is a unity of opposites.

Any kind of world, and of course class society in particular, teems with contradictions. Some say that there are contradictions to be 'found' in socialist society, but I think this is a wrong way of putting things. The point is not that there are contradictions to be found, but that it teems with contradictions. There is no place where contradictions do not exist, nor is there any person who cannot be analysed. To think that he cannot is being metaphysical. You see an atom is a complex of unities of opposites. There is a unity of the two opposites, the nucleus and the electrons. In a nucleus there is again a unity of opposites, the protons and the neutrons. Speaking of the proton, there are protons and antiprotons, and as for the neutrons there are neutrons and antineutrons. In short, the unity of opposites is present everywhere. The concept of the unity of opposites, dialectics, must be widely propagated. I say dialectics should be moved from the small circle of philosophers to the broad masse s of the people. I suggest that this question be discussed at meetings of the politburos and at the plenary sessions of the central committees of the various parties and also at meetings of their party committees at all levels. As a matter of fact, the secretaries of our party branches understand dialectics, when they prepare reports to branch meetings, they usually write down two items in their notebooks, first, the achievements and, second, the shortcomings. One divides into two - this is a universal phenomenon, and this is dialectics.

Perhaps you resent it when I talk about questions like these at this kind of meeting, but I am not much of a person for following trends. I have also been talking for quite some time now, so I intend to finish. But before I do so, want to say just a few more things. I endorse the CPSU Central Committee's solution of the Molotov question. That was a struggle of opposites. The facts prove that unity could not be achieved and that the two sides excluded each other. The Molotov clique took the opportunity to attack at a time when comrade Khrushchev was abroad and unprepared. However, even though they waged a surprise attack, our comrade Khrushchev is no fool, he is a smart person who immediately mobilized his troops and waged a victorious counterattack. That struggle was one between two lines: one erroneous and one relatively correct. In the four or five years since Stalin's death the situation has improved considerably in the Soviet Union in the sphere of both domestic policy and policy. This shows that the line represented by comrade Khrushchev is more correct and that opposition to this line is incorrect. Comrade Molotov is an old comrade with a long fighting history, but this time he made a mistake. This struggle between two lines within the CPSU was of the antagonistic kind, because the two sides could not accommodate each other and one side excluded the other. When this is the case, if everything is handled well there need not be any trouble, but if things are not handled well there is the danger of trouble.

Stalin did a great job in leading the Soviet party, and his achievements were primary and outweighed his faults and errors. However, over a long period his way of thinking became increasingly metaphysical and he did a lot of harm to dialectics. The personality cult was metaphysical and nobody could criticize him. In my view, these

40 years of the Soviet Union amount to a dialectical process. First, Lenin's dialectics, then Stalin's numerous metaphysical viewpoints. Some viewpoints, when translated into action and taken to their extreme, inevitably turned into their own opposites and so we have dialectics once again. I am very glad that comrade Khrushchev said in his speech at the meeting to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the October Revolution that contradictions exist in socialist society. I am very glad about the many articles produced in Soviet philosophical circles addressing the internal contradictions of socialist society. Some articles have also touched upon the problem of contradictions between socialism and capitalism. These are problems involving two different kinds of contradictions.

Let me end my talk here, by declaring once more that I endorse both resolutions.