



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, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Mao Zedong wenji (Selected Works of Mao Zedong), vol. 7 (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 1999). English translation from Michael Schoenhals, "Mao Zedong: Speeches at the 1957 'Moscow Conference'," *Journal of Communist Studies* 2, no. 2 (1986): 109-126.
<http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/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 the MacArthur Foundation.

Original Language:

Chinese

Contents:

- English Translation
- Chinese Transcription

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 unity 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 masses 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.

同志：

我几句。同志允我即席。因我在几年前害一次血症，最近一年好一些，站起有些不方便。

我想：形，。

在我感到形到了一新的折点。世界上在有股：，西。中有句成：不是倒西，就是西倒。我目前形的特点是倒西，也就是，社主的力量于帝主的力量占了倒的优。四十年前的十月革命是整人史的折点，怎么在又有折点呢？是有的。打希特勒，在一期，有一二年，希特勒占了上。那，希特勒不但占大半洲，而且打，出了一大土地，可希特勒一占了上。斯大林格勒一成折点，此希特勒就走下坡路，就如破竹一直打到柏林。不是一折点？据我看，斯大林格勒一仗，是整第二次世界大的折点。去年，最近几年，西方世界非常猖狂，利用我中的一些，特是匈牙利事件，在我的上擦黑，我的天上起多云。但是匈牙利反革命被下去了。在伊士河事件中，的警告也起了制止侵略的作用。西方擦黑我的的目的，依我看，主要是想“整”各共党。在一方面，他也到了一部分目的。例如美的法斯特，共主的可的叛徒，就跑出党去了。有一些共党也跑出去了一些人。帝主此大高。我想我也高。叛徒跑出去了，有什么不好？

今年，一九五七年，形大不同了。我的天上是一片光明，西方的天上是一片云。我很，而他呢，却是皇皇不安。星上天，使他睡不着。六十几共党在莫斯科是有的事，也有大的模。但是在社主各中，在各共党中，特是在各人民中，有相多的人是相信美了不起。你看，他有那么多，有那么多机大炮。我的比他的少。西方家无的、播台天天吹，美之音、自由洲台等等吹得神乎其神，于是乎造成一种假象，欺了相多的一部分人。我就要揭穿种欺。我有十件据明：究竟是他行是我行，究竟是倒西，是西倒？

第一件，打希特勒的候，斯福和丘吉尔的手里有多少呢？大有七千万吨。可是吃不下希特勒，毫无办法。要想法吧，于是采用了旅行的法，一走就走到雅尔塔，求助。那，斯大林手中有多少呢？在前有一千八百万吨。因在中失了多地方，据赫夫同志告我，量打了折，剩下九百万吨。有七千万吨的人，求有九百万吨的人。件是什么呢？易北河以划的攻，就是，他忍痛下心一大域离他的体系，一大域有可能社主体系。件事很有服力，明物力量多少不完全定，人是主要的，制度是主要的。在雅尔塔又到打日本。又是美人吃不下日本，又是要共主助。中的洲，朝的一部分，作的攻，并且定日本退半、一千群。也是忍痛步啊！了吃掉他的同伴——日本帝主。

第二件，中革命。一九四九年初民党被我打得呼哀哉的候，向杜大喊救命：美老呀，你出几兵吧！杜：我一兵也不能出！于是民党又：你可以不可以几句呢？江以南地方，如果共党到了那里的候，美就不能坐。杜：不行，不得的，共党很害。于是乎介石只好跑。他在在在在。

第三件，朝。在始的候，美一有八百炮，中志愿三才有五十多炮。但是一打就像赶子一，几星期就把美人赶了几百公里，江赶到三八以南去了。后美人集中了力量行反攻，我和金日成同志商量，退到了三八相持，构筑地。一打，整朝差不多打了三年。美的机就像蜂一，我在第一一架机也有。双方同意和。在什么地点？他在一丹的船上，我在城，在我的地方。他：好。因址在我的地方，他每天得打着白旗子，完打着白旗子回去。后，他感到不好意思了——天天打白旗子。改一地方吧，改到双方的中，地名叫板店。我也可以。但是又了年把，美是不甘心字，拖。最后，在一九五三年，我在三八上突破了二十一公里的防，美人倒了，上字。那么害、有那么多的美人，也只得如此。，上是三打的，朝、中、，出了武器。但是人方面呢，有十六家。

第四件，越南。法人被胡志明打得呼哀哉，屁尿流。有人可以作，胡志明同志在座。法人不想干了，美人一定要干，因他的多。但是美人也只是出武器，持局，出兵就不。于是乎有日瓦 [18]，把大半越南划越南民主共和。

第五件，伊士河事件。帝主攻，打了几天，人了几句，就回去了。然有第二因素，就是全世界在，反英法侵略。

第六件事是利。美作好了划要打，又是人了几句，任命了一，叫做科索夫斯基。做了件事，他不好打了。件事有完，要警惕，可能子。但是在算有打。

第七件是抛上了星。抛星的家有多少？五千一百万吨。不是美非常害？你什么到在一山蛋有抛上去？你有一万万吨，牛皮吹得那么大呀，做出了先划。先划要改名了，得改成落后划。

由七件事，我想可以得出一概念：西方世界被抛到我后面去了。抛得很近是抛得很？照我——也我人有些冒主，我，永地抛下去了。在射人造星以前，社主家在人心向、人口多方面已于帝主家占了倒的优；而在射人造星以后，就在最重要的科技部方面也占了倒的优。人，美也赶上的，它也抛星的。是真的。赫夫同志的告就了美抛星的。但是他正在究竟是一年、二年是五年才能赶上。我不管你是一年、二年是五年，你是被抛到后面去了。我的同志，赫夫同志，大概只是晚上睡，白天不睡。所有人不白天晚上，一年、二年、五年是睡吧？你一年、二年、五年赶上，但是又前啦。

同志，我我家的事情吧。我今年有了五百二十万吨，再五年，可以有一千万到一千五百万吨；再五年，可以有二千万到二千五百万吨；再五年，可以有三千五百万到四千万吨。然，也我在里了大，再的候，你可能批我是主主。但是我是有相根据的。我有很多家助我。中人是想努力的。中政治上、人口上是大的，上在是小的。他想努力，他非常心工作，要把中成——真正的大。赫夫同志告我，十五年后，可以超美。我也可以，十五年后我可能赶上或者超英。因我和波立特、高同志次，我他家的情，他在英年千万吨，再十五年，可能爬到年三千万吨。中呢，再十五年可能是四千万吨，不超了英？那末，在十五年后，在我中，超美，中超英。

根底，我要取十五年和平。到那候，我就无于天下了，有人敢同我打了，世界也就可以得到持久和平了。

在要估一种情，就是想子的，他可能把原子、到摔。他摔，我也摔，就打得一塌糊涂，就要失人。要放在最坏的基点上考。我党的政治局几次，。在要打，中只有手榴，有原子，但是有。要想一下，如果爆要死多少人。全世界二十七人口，可能失三分之一；再多一点，可能失一半。不是我要打，是他要打，一打就要摔原子、。我和一位外政治家。他如果打原子，人死的。我，极而言之，死掉一半人，有一半人，帝主打平了，全世界社主化了，再多少年，又有二十七，一定要多。我中有建好，我希望和平。但是如果帝主硬要打仗，我也只好下一心，打了仗再建。每天怕，了你有什么法呢？我先是倒西，打不起，在再就如果生了的情，作了些充的明，种可能性都估到了。

我十件据，才了七件，下面再三件。

第八件是英退出洲、非洲很大一片土地。

第九件是荷退出印尼。

第十件是法退出利、黎巴嫩、摩洛哥、突尼斯，在阿尔及利有法。

落后家强些，是先家强些？印度强些，是英强些？印尼强些，是荷强些？阿尔及利强些，是法强些？我看所有帝主家都是下午六点的太，而我呢，是早上六点的太。于是乎折点就了。就是，西方家抛到后了，我大大占了上了。一定不是西倒，因西是那么微弱。一定是倒西，因我强大。

是不能用量多少作定，而是首先由人心的向背作定的。史上就是如此。史上就是弱者胜强者，有的人胜全副武的人。布尔什克曾一枝也有。同志告我，二月革命[22]的候，只有四万党；十月革命的候，也只有二十四万党。《共(布)党史明教程》那本上的第一第一段了一法：小到全。是稀稀拉拉的几十人的小，后成整家的者。同志，你修改《共党史》的候，我希望不要把几句修改掉了。我中也是如此，是稀稀拉拉几十人的共主者的小，在也是着整家，着六四千万人口的大党。几十共主者的小，在展成一千二百万党。我是特想同本主家共党同志交意的，因他在在困中，有些党很小，有些党有成批党退出党。我不足怪，也是好事。我的道路是曲折的，是按照螺旋形上升的。

要老虎。一九四六年介石始向我攻的候，我多同志，全人民，都很：是不是能打？我本人也件事。但是我有一信心。那有一美者到了延安，名字叫安娜·路易斯·斯特朗。人就是在住了二三十年，后被斯大林赶走，以后又被赫夫同志恢复了名的那位女作家。我同她的候了多，介石、希特勒、日本、美、原子等等。我一切所有强大的反派不是老虎，原因是他离人民。你看，希特勒

是不是老虎?希特勒不是被打倒了?我也到沙皇是老虎,中皇帝是老虎,日本帝主是老虎,你看,都倒了。

美帝主有倒,有原子,我看也是要倒的,也是老虎。介石很强大,有四百多万正。那我在延安。延安地方有多少人?有七千人。我有多少呢?我有九十万游,被介石分割成几十根据地。但是我,介石不是一老虎,我一定打他。了同人作斗,我在——形成了一概念,就是,在略上我要藐一切人,在上我要重一切人。也就是在整体上我一定要藐他,在——的具体上我一定要重他。如果不是在整体上藐人,我就要犯机主的。克思、恩格斯只有人,那他就全世界本主要被打倒。但是在具体上,在——人的上,如果不重他,我就要犯冒主的。打仗只能一仗一仗地打,人只能一部分一部分地消。工厂只能——地盖,民犁田只能——地犁。就是吃也是如此。我在略上藐吃:我能吃下去。但是具体地吃,却是一口口地吃的,你不可能把一桌酒席一口吞下去。叫做各解,事上叫做各破。

第一完了。在就第二,——,几句。

我非常高,非常幸我的——得很。次大反映了全世界无——和人民的上升的朝气、——倒西么一种形。我有很多缺点和——,但是我的成是主要的,是年年成效的。于是乎反映在我六十几共党大上一股朝气,并且一致承要有一——,就是——,就是共中央。中有句俗,蛇无——而不行。你看,我每人都有一。每家的党也有一——,有集体的和人的。中央委、政治局是集体,第一是人,——者都要,不然就是无政府主。

我高哥穆尔卡同志昨天的演,他,承——首是一真理,不是人的,是史上自然形成的。不他那家的有些人感情上有——,不想——,要一形式,比如第一和最强大的社主家。他那家存在——矛盾,先分子同相多的其他人之——不和。因此,他要做工作。我相信哥穆尔卡同志是好人。赫夫同志次向我表示:哥穆尔卡同志是可以信任的。我希望波——、中、其他家完全起,逐步地改我之的系。

我又高南斯拉夫的同志在第二宣言[上准字。他在六十几党的和平宣言上字表示一件什么事情呢?就是表示——。他有在十二宣言上字,使十三缺少了一——。他有困,我想也可以,我不能强加于人,南斯拉夫不愿意字就不字好了。若干年后,我想他是可以在另外一宣言上字的。

在上我想一点方法。我同志不管他是什么人,只要不是——分子、破坏分子,那就要采取——的度。他要采取——的方法,而不采取形而上的方法。什么叫——的方法?就是一切加以分析,承人是要犯的,不因——一人犯了就否定他的一切。列宁曾——,不犯的人全世界——也有。我就是犯多的,——些我很有益,——些教育了我。任何一人都要人支持。——好也要三——,一篱笆也要三——。是中的成。

中有一句成,荷花好,也要扶持。你赫夫同志朵荷花好,也要扶持。我毛朵荷花不好,更要扶持。我中有一句成,三臭皮匠,合成——葛亮。合乎我赫夫同志的口——集体。——的一葛亮是不完全的,是有缺陷的。你看我十二宣言,已有第一、第二、第三、第四次草稿,在文字上的修正有完。我看要是自全智全能,像上帝——,那种思想是不妥的。因此,犯——的同志采取什么度呢?有分析,采取——的方法,而不采取形而上的方法。我党曾陷入形而上——教——主,自己不喜的人就全部毁他。后我批判了教——主,逐步地多——了一点法。法的基本点就是立面的——。承——点,犯——的同志怎么办呢?犯——的同志第一是要斗,要把思想底清;第二,要助他。——日斗,二日——。善意出——助他改正,使他有一出路。

待另一种人就不同了。像托洛茨基那种人,像中的秀——、高——那种人,他无法采取助度,因他不可救。有像希特勒、介石、沙皇,也都是无可救,只能打倒,因他于我——,是地互相排斥的。在意上,他有重性,只有一重性。于帝——主制度、本主制度在最后也是如此,它最后必然要被社主制度所代替。意形也是一——,要用唯物代替唯心,用无神代替有神。是在略目的上的。在策略段上就不同了,就有妥了。在朝三八上我不是同美人妥了?在越南不是同法人妥了?在各策略段上,要善于斗,又善于妥。

在回到同志系。我提同志之有隔要判。有些人似乎以——,了共党都是圣人,有分歧,有——,不能分析,就是板——一,整齐划一,就不需要判了。好像——了共党,就要是百分之百的克思主才行。其有各种各的克思主者:有百分之百的克思主者,有百分之九十的克思主者,有百分之八十的克思主者,有百分之七十的克思主者,有百分之六十的克思主者,有百分之五十的克思主者,有的人只有百分之十、百分之二十的克思主。我可不可以小房里——人或者几人呢?可不可以出——,用助的精神判

呢？然不是同帝主判(于帝主，我也是要同他判的)，是共主部的判。一例子。我回十二是不是判？六十几党是不是判？上是在判。也就是，在不克思列宁主的原下，接受人家一些可以接受的意，放自己一些可以放的意。我就有只手，犯的同志，一只手跟他作斗，一只手跟他。斗的目的是持克思主原，叫原性，是一只手。另一只手，的目的是他一出路，跟他妥，叫做活性。原性和活性的一，是克思列宁主的原，是一种立面的一。

无什么世界，然特是社，都是充着矛盾的。有些人社主社可以“找到”矛盾，我看提法不。不是什么找到或者找不到矛盾，而是充着矛盾。有一不存在矛盾，有一人是不可以加以分析的。如果承一人是不可加以分析的，就是形而上。你看在原子里，就充矛盾的一。有原子核和子立面的一。原子核里又有子和中子的立一。子里又有子、反子，中子里又有中子、反中子。之，立面的一是无往不在的。于立面的一的念，于法，需要作泛的宣。我法哲家的圈子走到大人民群中去。我建，要在各党的政治局和中央全上，要在党的各地方委上。其我的支部是懂得法的，他准在支部大上作告的候，往往在小本子上上点，第一点是优点，第二点是缺点。一分二，是普遍的象，就是法。

斯大林党做了大的工作，他的成是主要的，缺点是第二位的。但是他在一展了形而上，害了法。人崇拜就是形而上，任何人不能批他。我看的四十年是一法的程。列宁的法，斯大林有多形而上点，些点之行，于极点，必走到它的反面，再一法。我很高赫夫同志在十月革命四十周年念上了社主社存在着矛盾。我很高哲界生了多篇文章社主社的部矛盾。有些文章到了社主和本主的矛盾。是性不同的矛盾。

我的就此束吧。最后，再一句：我成宣言。