

DOCUMENTS OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

THE GREAT DEBATE

Volume I — 1956-1963

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

DOCUMENTS OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

THE GREAT DEBATE

Volume I — 1956-1963

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
Collection “Works of Maoism” #12

Contact — flpress@protonmail.com
<https://foreignlanguages.press>

Paris, 2021

First edition, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021

ISBN: 978-2-491182-84-7



This book is under license Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International
(CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

Note from Foreign Languages Press

This volume of the *Documents of the CPC* is the first of a trilogy that will cover the most important writings of the Great Debate. It covers the period between 1956 and 1963, when the struggle between China and the USSR was still carried out through intra-Party letters outside of the public eye.

For this reason, this period is sometimes labeled as just a “prelude” to the Great Debate, a terminology with which we take issue. Because while bourgeois historians call the time from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union’s (CPSU) 20th Congress and the CPC’s response to it the “Sino-Soviet split,” this volume shows that the core of the Great Debate was not the struggle between the two Parties in two different countries; it was actually between the path to socialism upheld by Marxists-Leninists, and the path toward the restoration of capitalism upheld by modern revisionists.

Therefore, in this first volume’s documents criticizing Titoism, we can foresee the main lines that will appear in the criticism of Khrushchevism, just as the documents criticizing Thorez (France) and Togliatti (Italy) envisage the capitulation of Euro-communism two decades later.

In gathering these writings, we considered reproducing the contents included in the three volumes of “The Great Debate,” a compilation released by comrades in India in 2005. These compilations contain a broader selection of documents, including different responses of the CPSU and other articles describing specific aspects of modern revisionism. We decided in the end to exclude those documents, because our goal was not to focus on the “split” aspect of the “Sino-Soviet split,” but on the CPC writings that seek to synthesize Marxism-Leninism and further its understanding in the face of the emergence of modern revisionism. In this way, we invite our readers to study the included documents from a less polemical perspective—defending or attacking positions or individuals and organizations—and rather from a more analytical perspective, seeking clarity and unity in the understanding of the struggle, a struggle that the CPC saw clearly and presciently as one that would be fierce and have far-reaching consequences.

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

Contents

1956

<i>April 5</i>	On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat	1
<i>December 29</i>	More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat	15

1958

<i>May 23</i>	Resolution on the Moscow Meetings of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties	47
<i>May 5</i>	Modern Revisionism Must Be Repudiated	57
<i>June 4</i>	Modern Revisionism Must Be Fought to the End	63
<i>June 1</i>	Yugoslav Revisionism—Product of Imperialist Policy	71
<i>June 14</i>	Yugoslav Revisionism is Just What US Imperialism Needs	83
<i>June 16</i>	In Refutation of Modern Revisionism's Reactionary Theory of the State	93
<i>June 26</i>	The More They Try to Hide, the More They Are Exposed—On Tito's Speech of June 15	107

1960

<i>April 16</i>	Long Live Leninism!	115
<i>April 22</i>	Forward Along the Path of the Great Lenin!	161
<i>April 22</i>	Unite Under Lenin's Revolutionary Banner!	187

1962

<i>December 15</i>	Workers of all Countries Unite, Oppose Our Common Enemy!	205
<i>December 31</i>	The Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us	221

1963

<i>January</i>	Leninism and Modern Revisionism	255
<i>January 27</i>	Let Us Unite on the Basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement	269
<i>February 27</i>	Whence the Differences?—A Reply to Thorez and Other Comrades	285
<i>March 4</i>	More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us—Some Important Problems of Leninism in the Contemporary World	311
<i>March 8</i>	A Comment on the Statement of the Communist Party of the USA	453
<i>March 9</i>	A Mirror for Revisionists	467

Appendices

<i>Nov. 1957</i>	Declaration of Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries	477
<i>Nov. 1957</i>	Peace Manifesto	493
<i>1960</i>	Statement of 81 Communist and Workers Parties—Meeting in Moscow, USSR	501

On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat¹

April 5, 1956

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, April 5, 1956, p. 1.

Translation: *The Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1959, pp. 1-20.

The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union summed up the fresh experience gained both in international relations and domestic construction. It took a series of momentous decisions on the steadfast implementation of Lenin's policy in regard to the possibility of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, on the development of Soviet democracy, on the thorough observance of the Party's principle of collective leadership, on the criticism of shortcomings within the Party, and on the sixth Five-Year Plan for development of the national economy.

The question of combating the cult of the individual occupied an important place in the discussions of the 20th Congress. The Congress very sharply exposed the prevalence of the cult of the individual which, for a long time in Soviet life, had given rise to many errors in work and had led to ill consequences. This courageous self-criticism of its past errors by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union demonstrated the high level of principle in inner-party life and the great vitality of Marxism-Leninism.

In history and in all the capitalist countries of today, no governing political party or bloc in the service of the exploiting classes has ever dared to expose its serious errors conscientiously before the mass of its own members and the people. With the parties of the working class, things are entirely different. The parties of the working class serve the broad masses of the people; by self-criticism, such parties lose nothing except their errors, they gain the support of the broad masses of the people.

¹ This article was written by the Editorial Department of *Renmin Ribao (People's Daily)* on the basis of a discussion at an enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. It was published in *Renmin Ribao* on April 5, 1956.

For more than a month now, reactionaries throughout the world have been crowing happily over self-criticism by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with regard to this cult of the individual. They say: Fine! The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the first to establish a socialist order, made appalling mistakes, and, what is more, it was Stalin himself, that widely renowned and honored leader, who made them! The reactionaries think they have got hold of something with which to discredit the communist parties of the Soviet Union and other countries. But they will get nothing for all their pains. Has any leading Marxist ever written that we could never commit mistakes or that it is absolutely impossible for a given Communist to commit mistakes? Isn't it precisely because we Marxist-Leninists deny the existence of a "demigod" who never makes big or small mistakes that we Communists use criticism and self-criticism in our inner-party life? Moreover, how could it be conceivable that a socialist state, which was the first in the world to put the dictatorship of the proletariat into practice, which did not have the benefit of any precedent, should make no mistakes of one kind or another?

Lenin said in October 1921:

Let the curs and swine of the moribund bourgeoisie and the petit-bourgeois democrats who trail behind it heap imprecations, abuse and derision upon our heads for our reverses and mistakes in the work of building up our Soviet system. We do not forget for a moment that we have committed and are committing numerous mistakes and are suffering numerous reverses. How can reverses and mistakes be avoided in a matter so new in the history of the world as the erection of a state edifice of an unprecedented type! We shall struggle unremittingly to set our reverses and mistakes right and to improve our practical application of Soviet principles, which is still very, very far from perfect.²

It is also inconceivable that certain mistakes made earlier should forever preclude the possibility of making other mistakes later or of repeating past mistakes to a greater or lesser degree. Since its division into classes with conflicting interests, human society has passed through several thousand years

² V. I. Lenin, "Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXIII.

of dictatorships—of slave-owners, of feudal lords and of the bourgeoisie; but it was not until the victory of the October Revolution that mankind began to see the dictatorship of the proletariat in action. The first three kinds of dictatorship are all dictatorships of the exploiting classes, though the dictatorship of feudal lords was more progressive than that of slave-owners, and that of the bourgeoisie more progressive than that of feudal lords. These exploiting classes, which once played a certain progressive role in the history of social development, invariably accumulated experience in their rule through making innumerable mistakes of historic import over long periods of time and through repeating these mistakes again and again. Nevertheless, with the sharpening of the contradiction between the relations of production which they represented and the productive forces of society, still they inevitably committed mistakes, bigger and more, precipitating a massive revolt of the oppressed classes and disintegration within their own ranks, and thus eventually bringing about their destruction. The dictatorship of the proletariat is fundamentally different in its nature from any of the previous kinds of dictatorship, which were dictatorships by the exploiting classes. It is a dictatorship of the exploited classes, a dictatorship of the majority over the minority, a dictatorship for the purpose of creating a socialist society in which there is no exploitation and poverty, and it is the most progressive and the last dictatorship in the history of mankind. But, since this dictatorship undertakes the greatest and the most difficult tasks and is confronted with a struggle which is the most complicated and tortuous in history, therefore, many mistakes, as Lenin has said, are bound to be made in its operation. If some Communists indulge in self-exaltation and self-complacency and develop a rigid way of thinking, they may even repeat their own mistakes or those of others. We Communists must take full account of this. To defeat powerful enemies, the dictatorship of the proletariat requires a high degree of centralization of power. This highly centralized power must be combined with a high level of democracy. When there is an undue emphasis on centralization, many mistakes are bound to occur. This is quite understandable. But whatever the mistakes, the dictatorship of the proletariat is, for the popular masses, always far superior to all dictatorships of the exploiting classes, to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Lenin was right when he said:

If our enemies reproach us and say that Lenin himself admits that the Bolsheviks have done a host of foolish things, I want to

reply by saying: yes, but do you know that the foolish things we have done are entirely different from those you have done?³

The exploiting classes, out for plunder, have all hoped to perpetuate their dictatorship generation after generation, and have therefore resorted to every possible means to grind down the people. Their mistakes are irremediable. On the other hand, the proletariat, which strives for the material and spiritual emancipation of the people, uses its dictatorship to bring about communism, to bring about harmony and equality among mankind, and lets its dictatorship gradually wither away. That is why it does its utmost to bring into full play the initiative and the positive role of the masses. The fact that, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is possible to bring into play without limit, the initiative and the positive role of the masses also makes it possible to correct any mistakes committed during the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Leaders of communist parties and socialist states in various fields are duty bound to do their utmost to reduce mistakes, avoid serious ones, endeavor to learn lessons from isolated, local and temporary mistakes and make every effort to prevent them from developing into mistakes of a nation-wide or prolonged nature. To do this, every leader must be most prudent and modest, keep close to the masses, consult them on all matters, investigate and study the actual situation again and again and constantly engage in criticism and self-criticism appropriate to the situation and well measured. It was precisely because of his failure to do this that Stalin, as the chief leader of the Party and the State, made certain serious mistakes in the later years of his work. He became conceited and imprudent. Subjectivism and one-sidedness developed in his thinking and he made erroneous decisions on certain important questions, which led to serious consequences.

With the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the people and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, under the leadership of Lenin, established the first socialist state on one-sixth of the earth. The Soviet Union speedily carried out socialist industrialization and collectivization of agriculture, developed socialist science and culture, established a solid union of many nationalities in the form of a union of the Soviets, and the formerly backward nationalities in the Soviet Union became socialist nationalities. During the Second World War, the Soviet Union was the

³ Ibid.

main force in defeating fascism and saving European civilization. It also helped the peoples in the East to defeat Japanese militarism. All these glorious achievements pointed out to all mankind its bright future—socialism and communism, seriously shook the rule of imperialism and made the Soviet Union the first and strong bulwark in the world struggle for lasting peace. The Soviet Union has encouraged and supported all other socialist countries in their construction, and it has been an inspiration to the world socialist movement, the anti-colonialist movement and every other movement for the progress of mankind. These are the great achievements made by the people and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the history of mankind. The man who showed the Soviet people and Communist Party the way to these great achievements was Lenin. In the struggle to carry out Lenin's principles, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, for its vigorous leadership, earned its credit, in which Stalin had an ineffaceable share.

After Lenin's death Stalin, as the chief leader of the Party and the State, creatively applied and developed Marxism-Leninism. In the struggle to defend the legacy of Leninism and against its enemies—the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and other bourgeois agents—Stalin expressed the will and wishes of the people and proved himself to be an outstanding Marxist-Leninist fighter. The reason why Stalin won the support of the Soviet people and played an important role in history was primarily because he, together with the other leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, defended Lenin's line on the industrialization of the Soviet state and the collectivization of agriculture. By pursuing this line, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union brought about the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union and created the conditions for the victory of the Soviet Union in the war against Hitler; these victories of the Soviet people conformed to the interests of the working class of the world and all progressive mankind. It was therefore quite natural for the name of Stalin to be greatly honored throughout the world. But, having won such high honor among the people, both at home and abroad, by his correct application of the Leninist line, Stalin erroneously exaggerated his own role and counterposed his individual authority to the collective leadership, and as a result certain of his actions were opposed to certain fundamental Marxist-Leninist concepts which he himself had propagated. On the one hand, he recognized that the masses were the makers of

history, that the Party must keep in constant touch with the people and that inner-party democracy and self-criticism and criticism from below must be developed. On the other hand, he accepted and fostered the cult of the individual, and indulged in arbitrary individual actions. Thus Stalin found himself in a contradiction on this question during the latter part of his life, with a discrepancy between his theory and practice.

Marxist-Leninists hold that leaders play a big role in history. The people and their parties need forerunners who are able to represent the interests and will of the people, stand in the forefront of their historic struggles and serve as their leaders. It is utterly wrong to deny the role of the individual, the role of forerunners and leaders. But when any leader of the Party or the State places himself over and above the Party and the masses instead of in their midst, when he alienates himself from the masses, he ceases to have an all-round, penetrating insight into the affairs of the state. As long as this was the case, even so outstanding a personality as Stalin could not avoid making unrealistic and erroneous decisions on certain important matters. Stalin failed to draw lessons from isolated, local and temporary mistakes on certain issues and so failed to prevent them from becoming serious mistakes of a nation-wide or prolonged nature. During the latter part of his life, Stalin took more and more pleasure in this cult of the individual, and violated the Party's system of democratic centralism and the principle of combining collective leadership with individual responsibility. As a result he made some serious mistakes such as the following: he broadened the scope of the suppression of counter-revolution; he lacked the necessary vigilance on the eve of the anti-fascist war; he failed to pay proper attention to the further development of agriculture and the material welfare of the peasantry; he gave certain wrong advice on the international communist movement, and, in particular, made a wrong decision on the question of Yugoslavia. On these issues, Stalin fell victim to subjectivism and one-sidedness, and divorced himself from objective reality and from the masses.

The cult of the individual is a foul carry-over from the long history of mankind. The cult of the individual is rooted not only in the exploiting classes but also in the small producers. As is well known, patriarchy is a product of small-producer economy. After the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, even when the exploiting classes are eliminated, when small-producer economy has been replaced by a collective economy and

a socialist society has been founded, certain rotten, poisonous ideological survivals of the old society may still remain in people's minds for a very long time. "The force of habit of millions and tens of millions is a most terrible force" (Lenin).⁴ The cult of the individual is just one such force of habit of millions and tens of millions. Since this force of habit still exists in society, it can influence many government functionaries, and even such a leader as Stalin was also affected by it. The cult of the individual is a reflection in man's mind of a social phenomenon, and when leaders of the Party and State, such as Stalin, succumb to the influence of this backward ideology, they will in turn influence society, bringing losses to the cause and hampering the initiative and creativeness of the masses of the people.

The socialist productive forces, the economic and political system of socialism and the party life, as they develop, are increasingly coming into contradiction and conflict with such a state of mind as the cult of the individual. The struggle against the cult of the individual which was launched by the 20th Congress is a great and courageous fight by the Communists and the people of the Soviet Union to clear away the ideological obstacles in the way of their advance.

Such naïve ideas seem to suggest that contradictions no longer exist in a socialist society. To deny the existence of contradictions is to deny dialectics. The contradictions in various societies differ in character as do the forms of their solution, but society at all times develops through continual contradictions. Socialist society also develops through contradictions between the productive forces and the relations of production. In a socialist or communist society, technical innovations and improvement in the social system inevitably continue to take place; otherwise the development of society would come to a standstill and society could no longer advance. Humanity is still in its youth. The road it has yet to traverse will be no one knows how many times longer than the road it has already traveled. Contradictions, as between progress and conservatism, between the advanced and the backward, between the positive and the negative, will constantly occur under varying conditions and different circumstances. Things will keep on like this: one contradiction will lead to another; and when old contradictions are solved, new ones will arise. It is obviously incorrect to maintain, as some

⁴ V. I. Lenin, *"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, p. 32.

people do, that the contradiction between idealism and materialism can be eliminated in a socialist or communist society. As long as contradictions exist between the subjective and the objective, between the advanced and the backward, and between the productive forces and the relations of production, the contradiction between materialism and idealism will continue in a socialist or communist society, and will manifest itself in various forms. Since man lives in society, he reflects, in different circumstances and to varying degrees, the contradictions existing in each form of society. Therefore, not everybody will be perfect, even when a communist society is established. By then there will still be contradictions among people, and there will still be good people and bad, people whose thinking is relatively correct and others whose thinking is relatively incorrect. Hence there will still be struggle between people, though its nature and form will be different from those in class societies. Viewed in this light, the existence of contradictions between the individual and the collective in a socialist society is nothing strange. And if any leader of the Party or state isolates himself from collective leadership, from the masses of the people and from real life, he will inevitably fall into rigid ways of thinking and consequently make grave mistakes. What we must guard against is that some people, because the Party and the State have achieved many successes in work and won the great trust of the masses, may take advantage of this trust to abuse their authority and so commit some mistakes.

The Chinese Communist Party congratulates the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on its great achievements in this historic struggle against the cult of the individual. The experience of the Chinese revolution, too, testifies that it is only by relying on the wisdom of the masses of the people, on democratic centralism and on the system of combining collective leadership with individual responsibility that our Party can score great victories and do great things in times of revolution and in times of national construction. The Chinese Communist Party, in its revolutionary ranks, has incessantly fought against elevation of oneself and against individualist heroism, both of which mean isolation from the masses. Undoubtedly, such things will exist for a long time to come. Even when overcome, they re-emerge. They are found sometimes in one person, sometimes in another. When attention is paid to the role of the individual, the role of the masses and the collective is often ignored. That is why some people easily fall into the mistake

of self-conceit or blind faith in themselves or blind worship of others. We must therefore give unremitting attention to opposing elevation of oneself, individualist heroism, and the cult of the individual.

To counter subjectivist methods of leadership, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China adopted a resolution in June 1943 on methods of leadership. In discussing now the question of collective leadership in the Party, it is still worthwhile for all members of the Chinese Communist Party and all its leading personnel to refer to this resolution, which declared:

In all practical work of our Party, correct leadership can only be developed on the principle of “from the masses, to the masses.” This means summing up (i.e. coordinating and systematizing after careful study) the views of the masses (i.e. views scattered and unsystematic), then taking the resulting ideas back to the masses, explaining and popularizing them until the masses embrace the ideas as their own, stand up for them and translate them into action by way of testing their correctness. Then it is necessary once more to sum up the views of the masses, and once again take the resulting ideas back to the masses so that the masses give them their whole-hearted support... and so on, over and over again, so that each time these ideas emerge with greater correctness and become more vital and meaningful. This is what the Marxist theory of knowledge teaches us.⁵

For a long time, this method of leadership has been described in our Party by the popular term “the mass line.” The whole history of our work teaches us that whenever this line is followed, the work is always good, or relatively good, and even if there are mistakes they are easy to rectify; but whenever this line is departed from, the work is always marred by setbacks. This is the Marxist-Leninist method of leadership, the Marxist-Leninist line of work. After the victory of the revolution, when the working class and the Communist Party have become the leading class and party in the state, the leading personnel of the Party and State, beset by bureaucratism from many sides, face the great danger of using the machinery of state to take arbitrary action, alienating themselves from the masses and collective leadership,

⁵ Mao Zedong, “Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. III, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 107.

resorting to commandism, and violating party and state democracy. Therefore, if we want to avoid falling into such a quagmire, we must pay fuller attention to the use of the mass line method of leadership, not permitting the slightest negligence. To this end, it is necessary for us to establish certain systems, so as to ensure the thorough implementation of the mass line and collective leadership, to avoid elevation of oneself and individualist heroism, both of which mean divorce from the masses, and to reduce to a minimum subjectivism and one-sidedness in our work which represent a departure from objective reality.

We must also learn from the struggle of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union against the cult of the individual and continue our fight against doctrinairism.

The working class and the masses of the people, guided by Marxism-Leninism, won the revolution and took state power into their hands, while the victory of the revolution and the establishment of the revolutionary regime opened up boundless vistas for the development of Marxism-Leninism. Yet because Marxism, since the victory of the revolution, has been generally recognized as the guiding ideology in the whole country, it often happens that not a few of our propagandists rely only on administrative power and the prestige of the Party to instill into the minds of the masses Marxism-Leninism in the form of dogma, instead of working hard, marshalling a wealth of data, employing Marxist-Leninist methods of analysis and using the people's own language to explain convincingly the integration of the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the actual situation in China. We have, over the years, made some advances in research in philosophy, economics, history and literary criticism, but, on a whole, many unhealthy elements still exist. Not a few of our research workers still retain their doctrinaire habit, put their minds in a noose, lack the ability to think independently, lack the creative spirit, and in certain respects are influenced by the cult of Stalin. In this connection it must be pointed out that Stalin's works should, as before, still be seriously studied and that we should accept, as an important historical legacy, all that is of value in them, especially those many works in which he defended Leninism and correctly summarized the experience of building up the Soviet Union. Not to do so would be a mistake. But there are two ways of studying them—the Marxist way and the doctrinaire way. Some people treat Stalin's writings in a doctrinaire manner, with the result that they can-

not analyze and see what is correct and what is not correct—and even what is correct they treat as a panacea and apply indiscriminately; inevitably they make mistakes. For instance, Stalin put forward a formula that in different revolutionary periods, the main blow should be so directed as to isolate the middle-of-the-road social and political forces of the time. This formula of Stalin's should be treated according to circumstances and from a critical, Marxist point of view. In certain circumstances it may be correct to isolate the middle forces, but it is not correct to isolate them under all circumstances. Our experience teaches us that the main blow of the revolution should be directed at the chief enemy to isolate him, while as for the middle forces, a policy of both uniting with them and struggling against them should be adopted, so that they are at least neutralized; and, as circumstances permit, efforts should be made to shift them from their position of neutrality to one of alliance with us, for the purpose of facilitating the development of the revolution. But there was a time—the ten years of civil war from 1927 to 1936—when some of our comrades crudely applied this formula of Stalin's to China's revolution by turning their main attack on the middle forces, singling them out as the most dangerous enemy; the result was that, instead of isolating the real enemy, we isolated ourselves, and suffered losses to the advantage of the real enemy. In the light of this doctrinaire error, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, during the period of the anti-Japanese war, formulated a policy of “developing the progressive-forces, winning over the middle-of-the-roaders, and isolating the die-hards” for the purpose of defeating the Japanese aggressors. The progressive forces in question consisted of the workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals led by, or open to the influence of, the Communist Party. The middle forces in question consisted of the national bourgeoisie, the democratic parties and groups, and democrats without party affiliation. The die-hards referred to were the comprador-feudal forces headed by Chiang Kai-shek, who were passive in resisting the Japanese and active in fighting the Communists. Experience, gained through practice, proved that this policy of the Communist Party suited the circumstances of China's revolution and was correct.

The invariable fact is: doctrinairism is appreciated only by the mentally lazy; it brings nothing but harm to the revolution, to the people, and to Marxism-Leninism. To enhance the initiative of the masses, to stimulate their dynamic creative spirit, and to promote rapid development of practical

and theoretical work, it is still necessary, right now, to destroy blind faith in dogma.

The dictatorship of the proletariat (in China it is a people's democratic dictatorship led by the working class), has won great victories in countries inhabited by nine hundred million people. Each of them, whether it is the Soviet Union, or China or any other People's Democracy, has its own experience of success as well as its own experience of mistakes. We must keep on summing up such experience. We must be alive to the possibility that we may still commit mistakes in the future, The important lesson to learn is that the leading organs of our Party should limit errors to those of an isolated, local, temporary nature, and permit no isolated, local, initial mistakes to develop into mistakes of a nation-wide or prolonged nature.

The history of the Communist Party of China records the making of serious mistakes on several occasions. In the revolutionary period from 1924 to 1927, there appeared in our Party the wrong line represented by Chen Duxiu, a line of Right opportunism. Then, during the revolutionary period from 1927 to 1936, the erroneous line of "Left" opportunism appeared in our Party on three occasions. The lines pursued by Li Lisan in 1930 and by Wang Ming in 1931-1934 were particularly serious, while the Wang Ming line was the most damaging to the revolution. In this same period the erroneous, anti-Party Zhang Guotao line of Right opportunism in opposition to the Party's Central Committee, appeared in a key revolutionary base, doing serious damage to a vital section of the revolutionary forces. The errors committed in these two periods were nationwide, except for that caused by Zhang Guotao's line which was confined to one important revolutionary base. Once again there emerged in our Party during the war of resistance to Japanese aggression a wrong line, represented by Comrade Wang Ming, which was of Right opportunist nature. However, since our Party had drawn lessons from what happened during the previous two periods of the revolution, this wrong line was not allowed to develop, but was corrected by the Central Committee of our Party in a comparatively short time. After the founding of the People's Republic of China, there appeared in our Party in 1953 the anti-Party bloc of Gao Gang and Rao Shushi. This anti-Party bloc represented the forces of reaction at home and abroad, and its aim was to undermine the revolution. Had the Central Committee not discovered it

quickly and smashed it in time, incalculable damage would have been done to the Party and to the revolution.

From this it will be seen that the historical experience of our Party testifies that our Party too has been tempered through struggles against various wrong lines of policy, thus winning great victories in the revolution and in construction. As to local and isolated mistakes, they often occurred in our work, and it was only by relying on the collective wisdom of the Party and the wisdom of the masses of the people, and by exposing and correcting these mistakes in time, that they were nipped in the bud before they became mistakes of a nationwide or prolonged nature, doing harm to the people.

Communists must adopt an analytical attitude to errors made in the communist movement. Some people consider that Stalin was wrong in everything; this is a grave misconception. Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist, yet at the same time a Marxist-Leninist who committed several gross errors without realizing that they were errors. We should view Stalin from an historical standpoint, make a proper and all-round analysis to see where he was right and where he was wrong, and draw useful lessons therefrom. Both the things he did right and the things he did wrong were phenomena of the international communist movement and bore the imprint of the times. Taken as a whole, the international communist movement is only a little over a hundred years old and it is only 39 years since the victory of the October Revolution; experience in many fields of revolutionary work is still inadequate. Great achievements have been made, but there are still shortcomings and mistakes. Just as one achievement is followed by another, so one defect or mistake, once overcome, may be followed by another, which in turn must be overcome. However, the achievements always exceed the defects, the things which are right always outnumber those which are wrong, and the defects and mistakes are always overcome in the end.

The mark of a good leader is not so much that he makes no mistakes, but that he takes his mistakes seriously. There has never been a man in the world completely free from mistakes. Lenin said:

Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analyzing the conditions which led to it, and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it—that is the earmark of a serious par-

ty; that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the *class*, and then the *masses*.⁶

True to the behest of Lenin, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is dealing in a serious way both with certain mistakes of a grave nature committed by Stalin in directing the work of building socialism and with the surviving effects of such mistakes. Because of the seriousness of the effects, it is necessary for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, while affirming the great contributions of Stalin, to sharply expose the essence of his mistakes, to call upon the whole Party to take them as a warning, and to work resolutely to remove their ill consequences.

We Chinese Communists are firmly convinced that as a result of the sharp criticisms made at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, all those positive factors which were seriously suppressed in the past as a result of certain mistaken policies will inevitably spring everywhere into life, and the Party and the people of the Soviet Union will become still more firmly united in the struggle to build a great communist society, such as mankind has never yet seen, and win a lasting world peace.

Reactionary forces the world over are pouring ridicule on this event; they jeer at the fact that we are overcoming mistakes in our camp. But what will come of all this ridicule? There is not the slightest doubt that these scoffers will find themselves facing a still more powerful, forever invincible, great camp of peace and socialism, headed by the Soviet Union, while the murderous, blood sucking enterprises of these scoffers will be in a pretty fix.

⁶ V. I. Lenin, "*Left-Wing*" *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat⁷

December 29, 1956

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, December 29, 1956, pp. 1-2.

Translation: *The Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1959, pp. 21-64.

In April 1956, we discussed the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in connection with the question of Stalin. Since then, a further train of events in the international communist movement has caused concern to the people of our country. The publication in Chinese newspapers of Comrade Tito's speech of November 11,⁸ and the comments on that speech by various communist parties, have led people again to raise many questions which call for an answer. In the present article we shall center our discussion on the following questions: first, an appraisal of the fundamental course taken by the Soviet Union in its revolution and construction; second, an appraisal of Stalin's merits and faults; third, the struggle against doctrinaireism and revisionism; and fourth, the international solidarity of the proletariat of all countries.

In examining modern international questions, we must proceed first of all from the most fundamental fact, the antagonism between the imperialist bloc of aggression and the popular forces in the world. The Chinese people, who have suffered enough from imperialist aggression, can never forget that imperialism has always opposed the liberation of all peoples and the independence of all oppressed nations, that it has always regarded the communist movement, which stands most resolutely for the people's interests, as a thorn in its flesh. Since the birth of the first socialist state, the Soviet Union, imperialism has tried by every means to wreck it. Following the

⁷ This article was written by the Editorial Department of *Renmin Ribao* on the basis of a discussion at an enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. It was published in *Renmin Ribao* on December 29, 1956.

⁸ Tito's speech in Pula, published on November 16, 1956 in *Borba* and partially translated and published in the *People's Daily* (December 11, 1956, p. 5). In this speech, Tito criticized the Soviet intervention in Hungary.

establishment of a whole group of socialist states, the hostility of the imperialist camp to the socialist camp, and its flagrant acts of sabotage against the latter, have become a still more pronounced feature of world politics. The leader of the imperialist camp, the United States, has been especially vicious and shameless in its interference in the domestic affairs of socialist countries; for many years it has been obstructing China's liberation of its own territory Taiwan, and for many years it has openly adopted as its official policy the subversion of the East European countries.

The activities of the imperialists in the Hungarian affair of October 1956 marked the gravest attack launched by them against the socialist camp since the war of aggression they had carried on in Korea. Just as the resolution adopted by the meeting of the Provisional Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party pointed out, the Hungarian affair was the result of various causes, both internal and external; and while any one-sided explanation is incorrect, among the causes international imperialism "played the main and decisive part." Following the defeat of their plot for a counter-revolutionary comeback in Hungary, the imperialist powers headed by the United States have maneuvered the United Nations into adopting resolutions directed against the Soviet Union and interfering in Hungary's internal affairs. At the same time, they stirred up a hysterical anti-communist wave throughout the Western world. Although US imperialism is taking advantage of the fiasco of the Anglo-French war of aggression against Egypt to grab British and French interests in the Middle East and North Africa in every way possible, it has pledged itself to eliminate its "misunderstandings" with Britain and France and to seek "closer and more intimate understanding" with them to repair their united front against communism, against the Asian and African peoples and against the peace-loving people of the world. To oppose communism, the people and peace, the imperialist countries should unite—this is the gist of Dulles' statement at the NATO council meeting on the so-called "need for a philosophy for living and acting at this critical point in world history." Somewhat intoxicated by his own illusions, Dulles asserted: "The Soviet communist structure is in a deteriorating condition [?], with the power of the rulers disintegrating [?]... Facing this situation, the free nations must maintain moral pressures which are helping to undermine the Soviet-Chinese communist system and maintain military strength and resolution." He called on the NATO countries "to disrupt the

powerful Soviet despotism [?] based upon militaristic [?] and atheistic concepts.” He also expressed the view that “a change of character of that [communist] world now seems to be within the realm of possibility [!].”

We have always considered our enemies our best teachers, and now Dulles is letting us have another lesson. He may slander us a thousand times and curse us ten thousand times, there is nothing new in this at all.

But when Dulles, putting the matter on a “philosophic” plane, urges the imperialist countries to place their contradiction with communism above all other contradictions, to bend all their efforts towards bringing about “a change of character of that [communist] world” and towards “undermining” and “disrupting” the socialist system headed by the Soviet Union, this is a lesson that is extremely helpful to us, though such efforts will certainly come to naught. Although we have consistently held and still hold that the socialist and capitalist countries should coexist in peace and carry out peaceful competition, the imperialists are always bent on destroying us. We must therefore never forget the stern struggle with the enemy, i.e. the class struggle on a world scale.

There are before us two types of contradiction which are different in nature. The first type consists of contradictions between our enemy and ourselves (contradictions between the camp of imperialism and that of socialism, contradictions between imperialism and the people and oppressed nations of the whole world, contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the imperialist countries, etc.). This is the fundamental type of contradiction, based on the clash of interests between antagonistic classes. The second type consists of contradictions within the ranks of the people (contradictions between different sections of the people, between comrades within the Communist Party, contradictions between the government and the people in socialist countries, contradictions between socialist countries, contradictions between communist parties, etc.). This type of contradiction is not basic; it is not the result of a fundamental clash of interests between classes, but of conflicts between right and wrong opinions or of a partial contradiction of interests. It is a type of contradiction whose solution must, first and foremost, be subordinated to the over-all interests of the struggle against the enemy. Contradictions among the people themselves can and ought to be resolved, proceeding from the desire for solidarity, through criticism or struggle, thus achieving a new solidarity under new conditions. Of

course, real life is complicated. Sometimes, it is possible that classes whose interests are in fundamental conflict unite to cope with their main common enemy. On the other hand, under specific conditions, a certain contradiction among the people may be gradually transformed into an antagonistic contradiction when one side of it gradually goes over to the enemy. Finally, the nature of such a contradiction may change completely so that it no longer belongs to the category of contradictions among the people themselves but becomes a component part of the contradiction between ourselves and the enemy. Such a phenomenon did come about in the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Communist Party of China. In a word, anyone who adopts the standpoint of the people should not equate the contradictions among the people with contradictions between the enemy and ourselves, or confuse these two types of contradiction, let alone place the contradictions among the people above the contradictions between the enemy and ourselves. Those who deny the class struggle and do not distinguish between the enemy and ourselves are definitely not Communists or Marxist-Leninists.

We think it necessary to settle this question of fundamental standpoint first, before proceeding to the questions to be discussed. Otherwise, we are bound to lose our bearings, and will be unable to explain correctly international events.

I

The attacks by the imperialists on the international communist movement have long been concentrated mainly on the Soviet Union. Recent controversies in the international communist movement, for the most part, have also involved the question of one's understanding of the Soviet Union. Therefore, the problem of correctly assessing the fundamental course taken by the Soviet Union in its revolution and construction is an important one which Marxist-Leninists must solve.

The Marxist theory of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat is a scientific summing-up of the experience of the working-class movement. However, with the exception of the Paris Commune, which lasted only 72 days, Marx and Engels did not live to see for themselves the realization of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat for which they had striven throughout their lives. In 1917, led by Lenin and

the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Russian proletariat carried the proletarian revolution to victory and established the dictatorship of the proletariat; it then successfully built up a socialist society. From this time on, scientific socialism was transformed from a theory and ideal into a living reality. And so, the Russian October Revolution of 1917 ushered in a new era, not only in the history of the communist movement but also in the history of mankind.

The Soviet Union has achieved tremendous successes in the 39 years since the revolution. Having eliminated the system of exploitation, the Soviet Union put an end to anarchy, crisis and unemployment in its economic life. Soviet economy and culture have advanced at a pace beyond the reach of capitalist countries. Soviet industrial output in 1956 is 30 times what it was in 1913, the peak year before the revolution. A country which before the revolution was industrially backward and had a high rate of illiteracy has now become the world's second greatest industrial power, possessing scientific and technical forces which are advanced by any standards, and a highly developed socialist culture. The working people of the Soviet Union, who were oppressed before the revolution, have become masters of their own country and society; they have displayed great enthusiasm and creativeness in revolutionary struggle and in construction and a fundamental change has taken place in their material and cultural life. While before the October Revolution Russia was a prison of nations, after the October Revolution these nations achieved equality in the Soviet Union and developed rapidly into advanced socialist nations.

The development of the Soviet Union has not been plain sailing. During 1918-1920, the country was attacked by 14 capitalist powers. In its early years, the Soviet Union went through severe ordeals such as civil war, famine, economic difficulties, and factional splitting activities within the Party. In a decisive period of the Second World War, before the Western countries opened the second front, the Soviet Union, single-handed, met and defeated the attacks of millions of troops of Hitler and his partners. These stern trials failed to crush the Soviet Union or stop its progress.

The existence of the Soviet Union has shaken imperialist rule to its very foundations and brought unbounded hope, confidence and courage to all revolutionary movements of the workers and liberation movements of the oppressed nations. The working people of all countries have helped the Sovi-

et Union, and the Soviet Union has also helped them. It has carried on a foreign policy that guards world peace, recognizes the equality of all nations, and opposes imperialist aggression. The Soviet Union was the main force in defeating fascist aggression throughout the world. The heroic armies of the Soviet Union liberated the East European countries, part of Central Europe, north-east China and the northern part of Korea in cooperation with the popular forces of these countries. The Soviet Union has established friendly relations with the People's Democracies, aided them in economic construction and, together with them, formed a mighty bulwark of world peace—the camp of socialism. The Soviet Union has also given powerful support to the independence movements of the oppressed nations, to the peace movement of the people of the world and to the many peaceable new states in Asia and Africa established since the Second World War.

These are incontrovertible facts that people have known for a long time. Why is it necessary then to bring them up again? It is because, while the enemies of communism have naturally always denied all this, certain Communists at the present time, in examining Soviet experience, often focus their attention on the secondary aspects of the matter and neglect the main aspects.

There are different aspects to Soviet experience in revolution and construction as far as its international significance is concerned. Of the successful experience of the Soviet Union, one part is fundamental and of universal significance at the present stage of human history. This is the most important and fundamental phase of Soviet experience. The other part is not of universal significance. In addition, the Soviet Union has also had its mistakes and failures. No country can ever avoid these entirely, though they may vary in form and degree. And it was even more difficult for the Soviet Union to avoid them, because it was the first socialist country and had no successful experience of others to go by. Such mistakes and failures, however, provide extremely useful lessons for all Communists. That is why all Soviet experience, including certain mistakes and failures, deserves careful study while the fundamental part of the successful Soviet experience is of particular importance. The very fact of the advance of the Soviet Union is proof that the fundamental experience of the Soviet Union in revolution and construction is a great accomplishment, the first paean of victory of Marxism-Leninism in the history of mankind.

What is the fundamental experience of the Soviet Union in revolution and construction? In our opinion, the following, at the very least, should be considered fundamental:

- (1) The advanced members of the proletariat organize themselves into a communist party which takes Marxism-Leninism as its guide to action, builds itself up along the lines of democratic centralism, establishes close links with the masses, strives to become the core of the laboring masses and educates its Party members and the masses of people in Marxism-Leninism.
- (2) The proletariat, under the leadership of the Communist Party, rallying all the laboring people, takes state power from the bourgeoisie by means of revolutionary struggle.
- (3) After the victory of the revolution, the proletariat, under the leadership of the Communist Party, rallying the broad mass of the people on the basis of a worker-peasant alliance, establishes a dictatorship of the proletariat over the landlord and capitalist classes, crushes the resistance of the counter-revolutionaries, and carries out the nationalization of industry and the step-by-step collectivization of agriculture, thereby eliminating the system of exploitation, private ownership of the means of production and classes.
- (4) The state, led by the proletariat and the Communist Party, leads the people in the planned development of socialist economy and culture, and on this basis gradually raises the people's living standards and actively prepares and works for the transition to communist society.
- (5) The state, led by the proletariat and the Communist Party, resolutely opposes imperialist aggression, recognizes the equality of all nations and defends world peace; firmly adheres to the principles of proletarian internationalism, strives to win the help of the laboring people of all countries, and at the same time strives to help them and all oppressed nations.

What we commonly refer to as the path of the October Revolution means precisely these basic things, leaving aside the specific form it took at that particular time and place. These basic things are all universally applicable truths of Marxism-Leninism.

In the course of revolution and construction in different countries there are, besides aspects common to all, aspects which are different. In this sense, each country has its own specific path of development. We shall discuss this question further on. But as far as basic theory is concerned, the road of the October Revolution reflects the general laws of revolution and construction at a particular stage in the long course of the development of human society. It is not only the broad road for the proletariat of the Soviet Union, but also the broad road which the proletariat of all countries must travel to gain victory. Precisely for this reason the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China stated in its Political Report to the Party's Eighth National Congress: "Despite the fact that the revolution in our country has many characteristics of its own, Chinese Communists regard the cause for which they work as a continuation of the Great October Revolution."

In the present international situation, it is of particularly great significance to defend this Marxist-Leninist path opened by the October Revolution. When the imperialists proclaim that they want to bring about "a change of character of the communist world," it is precisely this revolutionary path which they want to change. For decades, the views put forward by all the revisionists to revise Marxism-Leninism, and the Right-opportunist ideas which they spread, have been aimed precisely at evading this road, the road which the proletariat must take for its liberation. It is the task of all Communists to unite the proletariat and the masses of the people to beat back resolutely the savage onslaught of the imperialists against the socialist world, and to march forward resolutely along the path blazed by the October Revolution.

II

People ask: Since the basic path of the Soviet Union in revolution and construction was correct, how did Stalin's mistakes happen?

We discussed this question in our article published in April this year. But as a result of recent events in Eastern Europe and other related developments, the question of correctly understanding and dealing with Stalin's mistakes has become a matter of importance affecting developments within the communist parties of many countries, unity between communist parties, and the common struggle of the communist forces of the world against

imperialism. So it is necessary to further expound our views on this question.

Stalin made a great contribution to the progress of the Soviet Union and to the development of the international communist movement. In *On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat* we wrote:

After Lenin's death Stalin, as the chief leader of the Party and the State, creatively applied and developed Marxism-Leninism. In the struggle to defend the legacy of Leninism against its enemies—the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and other bourgeois agents—Stalin expressed the will and wishes of the people and proved himself to be an outstanding Marxist-Leninist fighter. The reason why Stalin won the support of the Soviet people and played an important role in history was primarily because he, together with the other leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, defended Lenin's line on the industrialization of the Soviet state and the collectivization of agriculture. By pursuing this line, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union brought about the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union and created the conditions for the victory of the Soviet Union in the war against Hitler; these victories of the Soviet people conformed to the interests of the working class of the world and all progressive mankind. It was therefore quite natural for the name of Stalin to be greatly honored throughout the world.

But Stalin made some serious mistakes in regard to the domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet Union. His arbitrary method of work impaired to a certain extent the principle of democratic centralism both in the life of the Party and in the state system of the Soviet Union, and led to a partial disruption of socialist legality. Because in many fields of work Stalin estranged himself from the masses to a serious extent, and made personal, arbitrary decisions concerning many important policies, it was inevitable that he should have made grave mistakes. These mistakes stood out most conspicuously in the suppression of counter-revolution and in relations with certain foreign countries. In suppressing counter-revolutionaries, Stalin, on the one hand, punished many counter-revolutionaries whom it was necessary to punish and, in the main, accomplished the tasks on this front; but, on the other hand, he wronged many loyal Communists and honest citi-

zens, and this caused serious losses. On the whole, in relations with brother countries and parties, Stalin took an internationalist stand and helped the struggles of other peoples and the growth of the socialist camp; but in tackling certain concrete questions, he showed a tendency towards great-nation chauvinism and himself lacked a spirit of equality, let alone educating the mass of cadres to be modest. Sometimes he even intervened mistakenly, with many grave consequences, in the internal affairs of certain brother countries and parties.

How are these serious mistakes of Stalin's to be explained? What is the connection between these mistakes and the socialist system of the Soviet Union?

The science of Marxist-Leninist dialectics teaches us that all types of relations of production, as well as the superstructures built up on their basis, have their own course of emergence, development, and extinction. When the old relations of production on the whole no longer correspond to the productive forces, the latter having reached a certain stage of development, and when the old superstructure on the whole no longer corresponds to the economic basis, the latter having reached a certain stage of development, then changes of a fundamental nature must inevitably occur: whoever tries to resist such changes is discarded by history. This law is applicable through different forms to all types of society. That is to say, it also applies to socialist society of today and communist society of tomorrow.

Were Stalin's mistakes due to the fact that the socialist economic and political system of the Soviet Union had become outmoded and no longer suited the needs of the development of the Soviet Union? Certainly not. Soviet socialist society is still young; it is not even 40 years old. The fact that the Soviet Union has made rapid progress economically proves that its economic system is, in the main, suited to the development of its productive forces; and that its political system is also, in the main, suited to the needs of its economic basis. Stalin's mistakes did not originate in the socialist system; it therefore follows that it is not necessary to "correct" the socialist system in order to correct these mistakes. The bourgeoisie of the West has not a leg to stand on when it tries to use Stalin's errors to prove that the socialist system is a "mistake." Unconvincing too are the arguments of others who trace Stalin's mistakes to the administration of economic affairs by the socialist state power, and assert that once the government takes charge of economic affairs

it is bound to become a “bureaucratic machine” hindering the development of the socialist forces. No one can deny that the tremendous upsurge of Soviet economy is the result precisely of the planned administration of economic affairs by the state of the working people, while the main mistakes committed by Stalin had very little to do with shortcomings of the state organs administering economic affairs.

But even where the basic system corresponds to the need, there are still certain contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic basis. These contradictions find expression in defects in certain links of the economic and political systems. Though it is not necessary to effect fundamental changes in order to solve these contradictions, readjustments must be made in good time.

Can we guarantee that mistakes will not happen once we have a basic system which corresponds to the need and have adjusted ordinary contradictions in the system (to use the language of dialectics, contradictions at the stage of “quantitative change”)? The matter is not that simple. Systems are of decisive importance, but systems themselves are not all-powerful. No system, however excellent, is in itself a guarantee against serious mistakes in our work. Once we have the right system, the main question is whether we can make the right use of it; whether we have the right policies, and right methods and style of work. Without all this, even under a good system it is still possible for people to commit serious mistakes and to use a good state apparatus to do evil things.

To solve the problems mentioned above, we must rely on the accumulation of experience and the test of practice; we cannot expect results overnight. What is more, with conditions constantly changing, new problems arise as old ones are solved, and there is no solution which holds good for all times. Viewed from this angle, it is not surprising to find that even in socialist countries which have been established on a firm basis there are still defects in certain links of their relations of production and superstructure, and deviations of one kind or another in the policies and methods and style of work of the Party and the State.

In the socialist countries, the task of the Party and the State is, by relying on the strength of the masses and the collective, to make timely readjustments in the various links of the economic and political systems, and to

discover and correct mistakes in their work in good time. Naturally, it is not possible for the subjective views of the leading personnel of the Party and the State to conform completely to objective reality. Isolated, local and temporary mistakes in their work are therefore unavoidable. But so long as the principles of the dialectical materialist science of Marxism-Leninism are strictly observed and efforts are made to develop them, so long as the principles of democratic centralism of the Party and the State is thoroughly observed, and so long as we really rely on the masses, persistent and serious mistakes affecting the whole country can be avoided.

The reason why some of the mistakes made by Stalin during the later years of his life became serious, nation-wide and persistent, and were not corrected in time, was precisely that in certain fields and to a certain degree, he became isolated from the masses and the collective and violated the principle of democratic centralism of the Party and the State. The reason for certain infractions of democratic centralism lay in certain social and historical conditions: the Party lacked experience in leading the state; the new system was not sufficiently consolidated to be able to resist every encroachment of the influence of the old era (the consolidation of a new system and the dying away of the old influences do not operate in a straightforward fashion but often assume the form of an undulating movement at turning points in history); there was the constricting effect which acute internal and external struggles had on certain aspects of the development of democracy, etc. Nevertheless, these objective conditions alone would not have been enough to transform the possibility of making mistakes into their actual commission. Lenin, working under conditions which were much more complicated and difficult than those encountered by Stalin, did not make the mistakes that Stalin made. Here, the decisive factor is man's ideological condition. A series of victories and the eulogies which Stalin received in the latter part of his life turned his head. He deviated partly, but grossly, from the dialectical materialist way of thinking and fell into subjectivism. He began to put blind faith in personal wisdom and authority; he would not investigate and study complicated conditions seriously or listen carefully to the opinions of his comrades and the voice of the masses. As a result, some of the policies and measures he adopted were often at variance with objective reality. He often stubbornly persisted in carrying out these mistaken measures over long periods and was unable to correct his mistakes in time.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has already taken measures to correct Stalin's mistakes and eliminate their consequences. These measures are beginning to bear fruit. The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union showed great determination and courage in doing away with blind faith in Stalin, in exposing the gravity of Stalin's mistakes and in eliminating their effects. Marxist-Leninists throughout the world, and all those who sympathize with the communist cause, support the efforts of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to correct mistakes, and hope that the efforts of the Soviet comrades will meet with complete success. It is obvious that since Stalin's mistakes were not of short duration, their thorough correction cannot be achieved overnight, but demands fairly protracted efforts and thoroughgoing ideological education. We believe that the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has already overcome countless difficulties, will triumph over these difficulties and achieve its purpose.

It was not to be expected, of course, that this effort of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to correct mistakes would get any support from the bourgeoisie and the Right-wing Social-Democrats of the West. Eager to take advantage of the opportunity to erase what was correct in Stalin's work as well as the past immense achievements of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist camp, and to create confusion and division in the communist ranks, the Western bourgeoisie and Right-wing Social-Democrats have deliberately labeled the correction of Stalin's mistakes "de-Stalinization" and described it as a struggle waged by "anti-Stalinist elements" against "Stalinist elements." Their vicious intent is evident enough. Unfortunately, similar views of this kind have also gained ground among some Communists. We consider it extremely harmful for Communists to hold such views.

As is well known, although Stalin committed some grave mistakes in his later years, his was nevertheless the life of a great Marxist-Leninist revolutionary. In his youth, Stalin fought against the tsarist system and for the spread of Marxism-Leninism. After he joined the central leading organ of the Party, he took part in the struggle to pave the way for the revolution of 1917. After the October Revolution, he fought to defend its fruits. In the nearly 30 years after Lenin's death, he worked to build socialism, defend the socialist fatherland and advance the world communist movement. All in all, Stalin always stood at the head of historical developments and guided the struggle; he was an implacable foe of imperialism. His tragedy was that

even when he made the mistakes, he believed what he did was necessary for the defense of the interests of the working people against encroachments by the enemy. Stalin's mistakes did harm to the Soviet Union, which could have been avoided. Nonetheless, the Socialist Soviet Union made tremendous progress during the period of Stalin's leadership. This undeniable fact not only testifies to the strength of the socialist system, but also shows that Stalin was after all a staunch Communist. Therefore, in summing up Stalin's thoughts and activities, we must consider both his positive and negative sides, both his achievements and his mistakes. As long as we examine the matter in an all-round way, then, even if people must speak of "Stalinism," this can only mean, in the first place, communism and Marxism-Leninism, which is the main aspect; and secondarily it contains certain extremely serious mistakes which go against Marxism-Leninism and must be thoroughly corrected. Even though at times it is necessary to stress these mistakes in order to correct them, it is also necessary to set them in their proper place so as to make a correct appraisal and avoid misleading people. In our opinion Stalin's mistakes take second place to his achievements.

Only by adopting an objective and analytical attitude can we correctly appraise Stalin and all those comrades who made similar mistakes under his influence, and only so can we correctly deal with their mistakes. Since these mistakes were made by Communists in the course of their work, what is involved is a question of right versus wrong within communist ranks, not an issue of ourselves versus the enemy in the class struggle. We should therefore adopt a comradely attitude towards these people and not treat them as enemies. We should defend what is correct in their work while criticizing their mistakes, and not blankly denounce everything they did. Their mistakes have a social and historical background and can be attributed especially to their ideology and understanding. In just the same way, such mistakes may also occur in the work of other comrades. That is why, having recognized the mistakes and undertaken their correction, it is necessary that we regard them as a grave lesson, as an asset that can be used for heightening the political consciousness of all Communists, thus preventing the recurrence of such mistakes and advancing the cause of communism. If, on the contrary, one takes a completely negative attitude towards those who made mistakes, treats them with hostility and discriminates against them by labeling them this or that kind of element, it will not help our comrades learn the lesson

they should learn. Moreover, since this means confusing the two entirely different types of contradiction—that of right versus wrong within our own ranks and that of ourselves versus the enemy—it will only help the enemy in his attacks on the communist ranks and in his attempts at disintegrating the communist position.

The attitude taken by Comrade Tito and other leading comrades of the Yugoslav League of Communists towards Stalin's mistakes and other related questions, as their recently stated views indicate, cannot be regarded by us as well-balanced or objective. It is understandable that the Yugoslav comrades bear a particular resentment against Stalin's mistakes. In the past, they made worthy efforts to stick to socialism under difficult conditions. Their experiments in the democratic management of economic enterprises and other social organizations have also attracted attention. The Chinese people welcome the reconciliation between the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on the one hand, and Yugoslavia on the other, as well as the establishment and development of friendly relations between China and Yugoslavia. Like the Yugoslav people, the Chinese people hope that Yugoslavia will become ever more prosperous and powerful on the way to socialism. We also agree with some of the points in Comrade Tito's speech, for instance, his condemnation of the Hungarian counter-revolutionaries, his support for the Worker-Peasant Revolutionary Government of Hungary, his condemnation of Britain, France and Israel for their aggression against Egypt, and his condemnation of the French Socialist Party for adopting a policy of aggression. But we are amazed that, in his speech, he attacked almost all the socialist countries and many of the communist parties. Comrade Tito made assertions about "those hard-bitten Stalinist elements who in various parties have managed still to maintain themselves in their posts and who would again wish to consolidate their rule and impose those Stalinist tendencies upon their people, and even others." Therefore, he declared, "Together with the Polish comrades we shall have to fight such tendencies which crop up in various other parties, whether in the Eastern countries or in the West." We have not come across any statement put forward by leading comrades of the Polish United Workers' Party saying that it was necessary to adopt such a hostile attitude towards brother parties. We feel it necessary to say in connection with these views of Comrade Tito's that he took up a wrong attitude when he set up the so-called "Stalinism," "Stalinist elements," etc.,

as objects of attack and maintained that the question now was whether the course “begun in Yugoslavia” or the so-called “Stalinist course” would win out. This can only lead to a split in the communist movement.

Comrade Tito correctly pointed out that “viewing the current development in Hungary from the perspective—socialism or counter-revolution—we must defend Kadar’s present government, we must help it.” But help to and defense of the Hungarian Government can hardly be said to be the sense of the long speech on the Hungarian question made before the National Assembly of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia by Comrade Kardelj, Vice-President of the Federal Executive Council of Yugoslavia. In the interpretation of the Hungarian incident he gave in his speech, Comrade Kardelj not only made no distinction whatsoever between ourselves and the enemy but also told the Hungarian comrades that “a thorough change is necessary in the [Hungarian—*Ed.*] political system.” He also called on them to turn over state power wholly to the Budapest and other regional workers’ councils, “no matter what the workers’ councils have become,” and declared that they “need not waste their efforts on trying to restore the Communist Party.” “The reason,” he said, “was because to the masses the Party was the personification of bureaucratic despotism.” Such is the blueprint of the “anti-Stalinist course” which Comrade Kardelj has designed for brother countries. The comrades in Hungary rejected this proposal of Comrade Kardelj’s. They dissolved the Budapest and other regional workers’ councils, which were controlled by counter-revolutionaries and persisted in building up the Socialist Workers’ Party. We consider that it was entirely right for the Hungarian comrades to act in this way, because otherwise Hungary’s future would belong not to socialism but to counter-revolution.

Clearly, the Yugoslav comrades are going too far. Even if some part of their criticism of brother parties is reasonable, the basic stand and the method they have adopted infringed the principles of comradely discussion. We have no wish to interfere in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia, but the matters mentioned above are by no means internal. For the sake of consolidating the unity of the international communist ranks and avoiding the creation of conditions which the enemy can use to cause confusion and division in our own ranks, we cannot but offer our brotherly advice to the Yugoslav comrades.

III

One of the grave consequences of Stalin's mistakes was the growth of doctrinairism. While criticizing Stalin's mistakes, the communist parties of various countries have been waging a struggle against doctrinairism among their ranks. This struggle is entirely necessary. But by adopting a negative attitude towards everything connected with Stalin, and by putting up the erroneous slogan of "de-Stalinization," some Communists have helped to foster a revisionist trend against Marxism-Leninism. This revisionist trend is undoubtedly of help to the imperialist attack against the communist movement, and the imperialists are in fact making active use of it. While resolutely opposing doctrinairism, we must at the same time resolutely oppose revisionism.

Marxism-Leninism holds that there are common, fundamental laws in the development of human society, but that in various nations there are strongly differentiated features. Thus all nations pass through the class struggle, and will eventually arrive at communism, by roads that are the same in essence but different in specific form. The cause of the proletariat in a given country will triumph only if the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism is properly applied in the light of its special national features. And so long as this is done, the proletariat will accumulate new experience, thus making its contribution to the cause of other nations and to the general treasury of Marxism-Leninism. Doctrinaires do not understand that the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism manifests itself concretely and becomes operative in real life only through the medium of specific national characteristics. They are not willing to make a careful study of the social and historical features of their own countries and nations or to apply in a practical way the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism in the light of these features. Consequently they cannot lead the proletarian cause to victory.

Since Marxism-Leninism is the scientific summing-up of the experience of the working-class movement of various countries, it follows that it must attach importance to the question of applying the experience of advanced countries. Lenin wrote in his book *What Is to Be Done?*:

The Social-Democratic movement is in its very essence an international movement. This means not only that we must combat national chauvinism, but also that a movement that is starting

in a young country can be successful only if it implements the experience of other countries.⁹

What Lenin meant here was that it was necessary for the Russian working-class movement, which was just beginning, to utilize the experience of the working-class movement in Western Europe. His view applies, likewise, to the use of Soviet experience by younger socialist countries.

But there must be a proper method of learning. All the experience of the Soviet Union, including its fundamental experience, is bound up with definite national characteristics, and no other country should copy it mechanically. Moreover, as has been pointed out above, part of Soviet experience is that derived from mistakes and failures. For those who know how best to learn from others, this whole body of experience, both of success and failure, is an invaluable asset, because it can help them avoid roundabout ways in their progress and reduce their losses. On the other hand, indiscriminate and mechanical copying of experience that has been successful in the Soviet Union, let alone that which was unsuccessful there—may lead to failures in another country. Lenin wrote in the passage immediately following the one quoted above:

And in order to implement this experience, it is not enough merely to be acquainted with it, or simply to transcribe the latest resolutions. What it requires is the ability to treat this experience critically and to test it independently. Anybody who realizes how enormously the modern working-class movement has grown and branched out will understand what a reserve of theoretical forces and political (as well as revolutionary) experience is required to fulfill this task.¹⁰

Obviously, in countries where the proletariat has gained power, the problem is many times more complex than that referred to by Lenin here.

In the history of the Communist Party of China between 1931 and 1934, there were doctrinaires who refused to recognize China's specific characteristics, mechanically copied certain experiences of the Soviet Union, and caused serious reverses to the revolutionary forces of our country. These reverses were a profound lesson to our Party. In the period between the

⁹ V. I. Lenin, *What Is to Be Done?*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 25.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

Zunyi Conference of 1935 and the Party's Seventh National Congress held in 1945, our Party thoroughly examined and repudiated this extremely harmful doctrinaire line, united all its members, including those who had made mistakes, developed the people's forces and thus won victory for the revolution. If this had not been done, victory would have been impossible. It is only because we discarded the doctrinaire line that it has become possible for our Party to make fewer mistakes in learning from the experience of the Soviet Union and other brother countries. It is because of this too that we are able to understand fully how necessary and arduous it is for our Polish and Hungarian comrades to correct today the doctrinaire errors of the past.

Errors of doctrinairism, whenever and wherever they occur, must be set right. We shall continue our efforts to correct and prevent such errors in our work. But opposition to doctrinairism has nothing in common with tolerance of revisionism. Marxism-Leninism recognizes that the communist movements of various countries necessarily have their own national characteristics. But this does not mean that they do not share certain basic features in common, or that they can depart from the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism. In the present anti-doctrinaire tide, there are people both in our country and abroad who, on the pretext of opposing the mechanical copying of Soviet experience, try to deny the international significance of the fundamental experience of the Soviet Union and, on the plea of creatively developing Marxism-Leninism, try to deny the significance of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism.

Because Stalin and the former leaders in some other socialist countries committed the serious mistake of violating socialist democracy, some unstable people in the communist ranks, on the pretext of developing socialist democracy, attempt to weaken or renounce the dictatorship of the proletariat, the principles of democratic centralism of the socialist state, and the leading role of the Party.

There can be no doubt that in a proletarian dictatorship, the dictatorship over the counter-revolutionary forces must be closely combined with the broadest scope of people's, that is, socialist, democracy. The dictatorship of the proletariat is mighty and can defeat powerful enemies within the country and outside it and undertake the majestic historic task of building socialism precisely because it is a dictatorship of the working masses over

the exploiters, a dictatorship of the majority over the minority, because it gives the broad working masses a democracy which is unattainable under any bourgeois democracy. Failure to forge close links with the mass of the working people and to gain their enthusiastic support makes it impossible to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, or at any rate impossible to consolidate it. The more acute the class struggle becomes, the more necessary it is for the proletariat to rely, most resolutely and completely, on the broad masses of the people and to bring into full play their revolutionary enthusiasm to defeat the counter-revolutionary forces. The experience of the stirring and seething mass struggles in the Soviet Union during the October Revolution and the ensuing civil war proved this truth to the full. It is from Soviet experience in that period that the “mass line” our Party so often talks about was derived. The acute struggles in the Soviet Union then depended mainly on direct action by the mass of the people, and naturally there was little possibility for perfect democratic procedures to develop. After the elimination of the exploiting classes and the wiping out in the main of the counter-revolutionary forces, it was still necessary for the dictatorship of the proletariat to deal with counter-revolutionary remnants—these could not be wiped out completely so long as imperialism existed—but by then its edge should have been mainly directed against the aggressive forces of foreign imperialism. In these circumstances, democratic procedures in the political life of the country should have been gradually developed and perfected; the socialist legal system perfected; supervision by the people over the state organs strengthened; democratic methods of administering the state and managing enterprises developed; links between the state organs and the bodies administering various enterprises on the one hand, and the broad masses on the other, made closer; hindrances impairing any of these links done away with and a firmer check put on bureaucratic tendencies. After the elimination of classes, the class struggle should not continue to be stressed as though it was being intensified, as was done by Stalin with the result that the healthy development of socialist democracy was hampered. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is completely right in firmly correcting Stalin’s mistakes in this respect.

Socialist democracy should in no way be pitted against the dictatorship of the proletariat; nor should it be confused with bourgeois democracy. The sole aim of socialist democracy, in the political, economic and cultural fields

alike, is to strengthen the socialist cause of the proletariat and all the working people, to give scope to their energy in the building of socialism and in the fight against all anti-socialist forces. If there is a kind of democracy that can be used for anti-socialist purposes and for weakening the cause of socialism, it certainly cannot be called socialist democracy.

Some people, however, do not see things that way. Their reaction to events in Hungary has revealed this most clearly. In the past the democratic rights and revolutionary enthusiasm of the Hungarian working people were impaired, while the counter-revolutionaries were not dealt the blow they deserved, with the result that it was fairly easy for the counter-revolutionaries, in October 1956, to take advantage of the discontent of the masses to organize an armed revolt. This shows that Hungary had not yet made a serious enough effort to build up its dictatorship of the proletariat. Nevertheless, when Hungary was facing its crisis, when it lay between revolution and counter-revolution, between socialism and fascism, between peace and war, how did communist intellectuals in some countries see the problem? They not only did not raise the question of realizing a dictatorship of the proletariat but came out against the righteous action taken by the Soviet Union in aiding the socialist forces in Hungary. They came out with declarations that the counter-revolution in Hungary was a “revolution” and with demands that the Worker-Peasant Revolutionary Government extend “democracy” to the counter-revolutionaries! In certain socialist countries some newspapers, even to this day, are wantonly discrediting the revolutionary measures taken by the Hungarian Communists who are fighting heroically under difficult conditions, while they have said hardly a word about the campaign launched by reactionaries all over the world against communism, against the people and against peace. What is the meaning of these strange facts? They mean that those “Socialists” who depart from the dictatorship of the proletariat to prate about “democracy” actually stand with the bourgeoisie in opposition to the proletariat; that they are, in effect, asking for capitalism and opposing socialism, though many among them may themselves be unaware of that fact. Lenin pointed out time and again that the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the most essential part of Marxism; that acceptance or rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat is “what constitutes the most profound difference between the Marxist and the ordinary petty (as well as

big) bourgeois.”¹¹ Lenin asked the Hungarian proletarian regime of 1919 to use “mercilessly rigorous, swift and resolute force” to suppress the counter-revolutionaries. “Whoever does not understand this,” he said, “is not a revolutionary, and must be removed from the post of leader or adviser of the proletariat.”¹² So if people reject the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles regarding the dictatorship of the proletariat, if they slanderously dub these principles “Stalinism” and “doctrinairism” simply because they have perceived the mistakes committed by Stalin in the latter part of his life and those made by the former Hungarian leaders, they will be taking the path that leads to betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and away from the cause of proletarian revolution.

Those who reject the dictatorship of the proletariat also deny the need for centralism in socialist democracy and the leading role played by the proletarian party in socialist countries. To Marxist-Leninists, of course, such ideas are nothing new. Engels pointed out long ago, when struggling against the anarchists, that as long as there is concerted action in any social organization there must be a certain degree of authority and subordination. The relation between authority and autonomy is relative and the scope of their application changes with different stages of the development of society. Engels said that “it is absurd to speak of the principle of authority as being absolutely evil, and of the principle of autonomy as being absolutely-good,”¹³ and that for anyone to insist on such an absurdity was in fact to “serve the reaction.”¹⁴ In the struggle against the Mensheviks, Lenin brought out most clearly the decisive significance of the organized leadership of the Party for the proletarian cause. When criticizing “Left-wing” communism in Germany in 1920, Lenin stressed that to deny the leading role of the Party, to deny the part played by leaders and to reject discipline, “is tantamount to completely disarming the proletariat in the interest of the bourgeoisie. It is tantamount to that petit-bourgeois diffuseness, instability, incapacity for sustained effort, unity and organized action, which, if indulged in, must inevitably destroy

¹¹ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 34.

¹² V. I. Lenin, “Greetings to the Hungarian Workers” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX.

¹³ K. Marx, F. Engels, “On Authority” in *Selected Works in Two Volumes*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1955, Vol. I, p. 637.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 638.

every proletarian revolutionary movement.”¹⁵ Have these principles become obsolete? Are they inapplicable to the specific conditions in certain countries? Will their application lead to the repetition of Stalin’s mistakes? The answer is obviously “no.” These principles of Marxism-Leninism have stood the test of history in the development of the international communist movement and of the socialist countries, and not a single case that can be called an exception to them has been found so far. Stalin’s mistakes did not lie in the practice of democratic centralism in state affairs, nor in putting leadership by the Party into effect; it lay precisely in the fact that, in certain fields and to a certain degree, he undermined democratic centralism and leadership by the Party. The correct practice of democratic centralism in state affairs and the proper strengthening of leadership by the Party in the socialist cause are the basic guarantees that the countries in the socialist camp will be able to unite their people, defeat their enemies, overcome their difficulties and grow vigorously. It is precisely for this reason that the imperialists and all counter-revolutionaries, bent on attacking our cause, have always demanded that we “liberalize,” that they have always concentrated their forces on wrecking the leading bodies of our cause, and on destroying the Communist Party, the core of the proletariat. They have expressed great satisfaction at the current “instability” in certain socialist countries, which has resulted from the impairment of discipline in the Party and the State organs, and are taking advantage of this to intensify their acts of sabotage. These facts show of what great importance it is, in the basic interests of the masses of the people, to uphold the authority of democratic centralism and the leading role of the Party. There is no doubt that the centralism in the system of democratic centralism must rest on a broad basis of democracy, and that the party leadership must maintain close ties with the masses. Any shortcomings in this respect must be firmly criticized and overcome. But such criticism should be made only for the purpose of consolidating democratic centralism and of strengthening the leadership of the Party. It should in no circumstances bring about disorganization and confusion in the ranks of the proletariat, as our enemies desire.

Among those who are trying to revise Marxism-Leninism on the pretext of combating doctrinairism, some simply deny that there is a demarcation

¹⁵ V. I. Lenin, “*Left-Wing*” *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, p. 31.

line between the proletarian and the bourgeois dictatorships, between the socialist and the capitalist systems and between the socialist and the imperialist camps. According to them, it is possible for certain bourgeois countries to build socialism without going through a proletarian revolution led by the party of the proletariat and without setting up a state led by the party; they think that the state capitalism in those countries is in fact socialism, and that even human society as a whole is “growing” into socialism. But while these people are publicizing such ideas, the imperialists are mobilizing all available military, economic, diplomatic, espionage and “moral” forces, actively preparing to “undermine” and “disrupt” socialist countries which have been established for many years. The bourgeois counter-revolutionaries of these countries, whether hiding at home or living in exile, are still making every effort to stage a comeback. While the revisionist trend serves the interest of the imperialists, the actions of the imperialists do not benefit revisionism but point to its bankruptcy.

IV

It is one of the most urgent tasks of the proletariat of all countries in its fight against imperialist onslaughts to strengthen its international solidarity. The imperialists and reactionaries in various countries are trying in a thousand and one ways to make use of narrow nationalist sentiments and of certain national estrangements among the peoples to wreck this solidarity, there by destroying the communist cause. Staunch proletarian revolutionaries firmly uphold this solidarity, which they regard as being in the common interest of the working class of all countries. Wavering elements have taken no firm, clear-cut stand on this question.

The communist movement has been an international movement from its very inception, because the workers of various countries can throw off joint oppression by the bourgeoisie of various countries and attain their common aim only by joint effort. This international solidarity of the communist movement has been of great help to the proletariat of various countries in developing their revolutionary cause.

The triumph of the Russian October Revolution gave enormous impetus to the fresh advances of the international proletarian revolutionary movement. In the 39 years since the October Revolution, the achievements of the international communist movement have been immense, and it has become

a powerful, world-wide political force. The world proletariat and all who long for emancipation place all their hopes for a bright future for mankind on the victory of this movement.

During the past 39 years the Soviet Union has been the center of the international communist movement, owing to the fact that it is the first country where socialism triumphed, while after the appearance of the camp of socialism the most powerful country in the camp, having the richest experience and the means to render the greatest assistance to other socialist countries and to the peoples of various countries in the capitalist world. This is not the result of anyone's arbitrary decision, but the natural outcome of historical conditions. In the interests of the common cause of the proletariat of different countries, of joint resistance to the attack on the socialist cause by the imperialist camp headed by the United States, and of the economic and cultural upsurge common to all socialist countries, we must continue to strengthen international proletarian solidarity with the Soviet Union as its center.

The international solidarity of the communist parties is a type of relationship entirely new to human history. It is natural that its development cannot be free from difficulties. The communist parties of all countries must seek unity with each other as well as maintain their respective independence. Historical experience proves that mistakes are bound to occur if there is no proper integration of these two aspects, and one or the other is neglected. If the communist parties maintain relations of equality among themselves and reach common understanding and take concerted action through genuine, and not nominal, exchange of views, their unity will be strengthened. Conversely, if, in their mutual relations, one party imposes its views upon others, or if the parties use the method of interference in each other's internal affairs instead of comradely suggestions and criticism, their unity will be impaired.

In the socialist countries, the communist parties have assumed the responsibility of leadership in the affairs of the state, and relations between them often involve directly the relations between their respective countries and peoples, so the proper handling of such relations has become a problem demanding even greater care.

Marxism-Leninism has always insisted upon combining proletarian internationalism with the patriotism of the people of each country. Each

communist party must educate its members and the people in a spirit of internationalism, because the true national interests of all peoples call for friendly cooperation among nations. On the other hand, each communist party must represent the legitimate national interests and sentiments of its own people. Communists have always been true patriots, and they understand that it is only when they correctly represent the interests and sentiments of their nation can they really enjoy the trust and love of the broad mass of their own people, effectively educate them in internationalism and harmonize the national sentiments and interests of the peoples of different countries.

To strengthen the international solidarity of the socialist countries, the communist parties of these countries must respect the national interests and sentiments of other countries. This is of special importance for the Communist Party of a larger country in its relations with that of a smaller one. To avoid any resentment on the part of the smaller country, the Party of a larger country must constantly take care to maintain an attitude of equality. As Lenin rightly said, "It is... the duty of the class-conscious communist proletariat of all countries to treat with particular caution and attention the survivals of national sentiments among countries and nationalities which have been longest oppressed."¹⁶

As we have already said, Stalin displayed certain great-nation chauvinist tendencies in relations with brother parties and countries. The essence of such tendencies lies in being unmindful of the independent and equal status of the communist parties of various lands and that of the socialist countries within the framework of an international bond of union. There are certain historical reasons for such tendencies. The time-worn habits of big countries in their relations with small countries continue to make their influence felt in certain ways, while a series of victories achieved by a party or a country in its revolutionary cause is apt to give rise to a sense of superiority.

For these reasons, systematic efforts are needed to overcome great-nation chauvinist tendencies. Great-nation chauvinism is not peculiar to any one country. For instance, country B may be small and backward compared to country A, but big and advanced compared to country C. Thus country B, while complaining of great-nation chauvinism on the part of country A,

¹⁶ V. I. Lenin, "Draft Theses on National and Colonial Questions for the Second Congress of the Communist International" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

may often assume the airs of a great nation in relation to country C. What we Chinese especially must bear in mind is that China too was a big empire during the Han, Tang, Ming and Ching dynasties. Although it is true that in the hundred years after the middle of the 19th century, China became a victim of aggression and a semi-colony and although she is still economically and culturally backward today, nevertheless, under changed conditions, great-nation chauvinist tendencies will certainly become a serious danger if we do not take every precaution to guard against them. It should, furthermore, be pointed out that some signs of this danger have already begun to appear among some of our personnel. That was why emphasis on fighting the tendency towards great-nation chauvinism was laid both in the resolution of the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China and the statement of the Government of the People's Republic of China issued on November 1, 1956.

But it is not great-nation chauvinism alone that hinders international proletarian unity. In the course of history, big countries have shown disrespect for small countries and even oppressed them; and small countries have distrusted big ones and even become hostile to them. Both tendencies still exist to a greater or lesser extent among the peoples and even in the ranks of the proletariat of various countries. That is why, in order to strengthen the international solidarity of the proletariat, apart from the primary task of overcoming great-nation chauvinist tendencies in bigger countries, it is also necessary to overcome nationalist tendencies in smaller countries. No matter whether their country is big or small, if Communists counterpose the interests of their own country and nation to the general interest of the international proletarian movement, and if they make national interests a pretext for opposing the general interest, and not really upholding international proletarian solidarity in actual practice but on the contrary damaging it, they will be committing a serious mistake of violating the principles of internationalism and Marxism-Leninism.

Stalin's mistakes aroused grave dissatisfaction among people in certain East European countries. But then neither is the attitude of some people in these countries towards the Soviet Union justified. Bourgeois nationalists try their best to exaggerate shortcomings of the Soviet Union and overlook the contributions it has made. They attempt to prevent the people from thinking how the imperialists would treat their countries and their peoples

if the Soviet Union did not exist. We Chinese Communists are very glad to see that the communist parties of Poland and Hungary are already putting a firm check on the activities of evil elements that fabricate anti-Soviet rumors and stir up national antagonisms in relations with brother countries, and also that these parties have set to work to dispel nationalist prejudices existing among some sections of the masses and even among some party members. This is clearly one of the steps urgently needed to consolidate friendly relations among the socialist countries.

As we pointed out above, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has, in the main, conformed to the interests of the international proletariat, the oppressed nations and the peoples of the world. In the past 39 years, the Soviet people have made tremendous efforts and heroic sacrifices in aiding the cause of the peoples of the various countries. Mistakes committed by Stalin certainly cannot detract from these historic achievements of the great Soviet people.

The Soviet Government's efforts to improve relations with Yugoslavia, its declaration of October 30, 1956, and its talks with Poland in November 1956 all manifest the determination of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government to thoroughly eliminate past mistakes in foreign relations. These steps by the Soviet Union are an important contribution to the strengthening of the international solidarity of the proletariat.

Obviously, at the present moment, when the imperialists are launching frenzied attacks on the communist ranks in the various countries, it is necessary for the proletariat of all nations to strive to strengthen its solidarity. Faced as we are with powerful enemies, no word or deed which harms the solidarity of the international communist ranks, no matter what name it goes by, can hope to receive any sympathy from the Communists and working people of the various countries.

The strengthening of the international solidarity of the proletariat, with the Soviet Union as its core, is not only in the interests of world proletariat but also in the interests of the independence movement of all oppressed nations and of world peace. Through their own experience, the broad masses of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America find it easy to understand who are their enemies and who their friends. That is why the imperialist-instigated campaign against communism, against the people and against peace has evoked such a faint response, and that from only a handful among the

more than one thousand million people who inhabit these continents. Facts prove that the Soviet Union, China, the other socialist countries and the revolutionary proletariat in the imperialist countries are all staunch supporters of Egypt's struggle against aggression, and of the independence movement in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The socialist countries, the proletariat in the imperialist countries, and the countries striving for national independence—these three forces have bonds of common interest in their struggle against imperialism and their mutual support and assistance is of the greatest significance to the future of mankind and world peace. Recently the imperialist forces of aggression have again created a certain degree of tension in the international situation. But by the joint struggle of the three forces we have mentioned, plus the concerted efforts of all other peace-loving forces in the world, a new lessening of such tension can be achieved. The imperialist forces of aggression failed to gain anything from their invasion of Egypt; instead, they were dealt a telling blow. Furthermore, thanks to the help given by the Soviet troops to the Hungarian people, the imperialists were frustrated in their plan to build an outpost of war in Eastern Europe and to disrupt the solidarity of the socialist camp. The socialist countries are persisting in their efforts for peaceful coexistence with the capitalist countries, to develop diplomatic, economic and cultural relations with them, to settle international disputes through peaceful negotiations, to oppose preparations for a new world war, to expand the peace area in the world, and to broaden the scope of application of the five principles of peaceful coexistence. All these efforts will certainly win ever more sympathy from the oppressed nations and the peace-loving people throughout the world. The strengthening of the international solidarity of the proletariat will make the warlike imperialists think twice before embarking upon new adventures. Therefore, despite the fact that the imperialists are still trying to resist the efforts described above, the forces for peace will eventually triumph over the forces for war.

The international communist movement has a history of only 92 years, reckoning from the establishment of the First International in 1864. Despite many ups and downs, the progress of the movement as a whole has been very rapid. During the First World War, there appeared the Soviet Union,

covering one-sixth of the earth. After the Second World War, there appeared the camp of socialism, which now has a third of the world's population. When the socialist states commit errors of one kind or another, our enemies are elated while some of our comrades and friends become dejected; a number of them even waver in their confidence as to the future of the communist cause. However, there is little ground for our enemies to rejoice or for our comrades and friends to feel dejected or to waver. The proletariat has begun to rule the state for the first time in history: in some countries this occurred only a few years ago, and in the oldest only a few decades ago. So how could anyone expect that no failures would be encountered? Temporary and partial failures have occurred, are still occurring, and may also occur in the future. But a person with foresight will not feel dejected and pessimistic because of them. Failure is the mother of success. It is precisely the recent temporary, partial failures that have enriched the political experience of the international proletariat and will help to pave the way for great successes in the years to come. Compared with the history of the bourgeois revolutions in Britain and France, the failures in our cause are virtually of no account. The bourgeois revolution in Britain started in 1640. The defeat of the king was followed by Cromwell's dictatorship. Then came the restoration of the old royal house in 1660. It was not until 1688 when the bourgeois party staged a coup d'état inviting to England a king who brought along with him troops and naval forces from the Netherlands that the British bourgeois dictatorship was consolidated. During the 86 years from the outbreak of the French revolution in 1789 to 1875, when the Third Republic was established, the bourgeois revolution in France went through a particularly stormy period, swinging in rapid succession between progress and reaction, republicanism and monarchy, revolutionary terror and counter-revolutionary terror, civil war and foreign war, the conquest of foreign lands and capitulation to foreign states. Although the socialist revolution faces the concerted opposition of the reactionaries throughout the world, its course as a whole is smooth and remarkably steady. This is a true reflection of the unparalleled vitality of the socialist system. Though the international communist movement met with some setbacks recently, we have learned many useful lessons from them. We have corrected, or are correcting, the mistakes in our own ranks which need to be rectified. When these errors are righted, we shall be stronger and more firmly united than ever before. Contrary to the expectation

of our enemies, the cause of the proletariat will not be thrown back but will make ever more progress.

But the fate of imperialism is quite different. There, in the imperialist world, fundamental clashes of interest exist between imperialism and the oppressed nations, among the imperialist countries themselves, and between the government and the people of these imperialist countries. These clashes will grow more and more acute and there is no cure for them.

Of course, in many respects, the newborn system of proletarian dictatorship still faces many difficulties, and has many weaknesses. But, compared with the time when the Soviet Union was struggling alone, the situation is a good deal better. And what new birth is not attended with difficulties and weaknesses? The issue is the future. However many twists and turns may await us on our forward journey, humanity will eventually reach its bright destiny—communism. There is no force that can stop it.

Resolution on the Moscow Meetings of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties ¹⁷

May 23, 1958

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, May 28, 1958, p. 1.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, June 3, 1958, Vol. I, No. 14, pp. 23-26.

The Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China, at its Second Session, having heard the report delivered by Comrade Deng Xiaoping on the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries held in Moscow from November 14 to 16, 1957,¹⁸ and the meeting of representatives of 64 Communist and Workers' Parties held from November 16 to 19,¹⁹ unanimously endorses the Declarations adopted by the two meetings and expresses satisfaction with the work of the delegation of the Communist Party of China headed by Comrade Mao Zedong during the two meetings.

The Moscow meetings of the communist and workers' parties of various countries and the two Declarations they adopted ushered in a new stage in the international communist movement of our time and were a very great inspiration to the laboring people and all forces for peace, democracy and progress throughout the world. The communist parties throughout the world have welcomed and given their support to the two Declarations. The Communist Party of the United States of America, after clearing out the revisionist John Gates, has also endorsed the stand taken by these Declarations. Only the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has not only openly assumed an attitude of opposition to the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries, but has also adopted an anti-Marxist-Leninist and out-and-out revisionist program at its Seventh Congress, and set it against the Declaration of the Moscow meeting. At their Congress, in an effort to defend their anti-Marx-

¹⁷ Adopted on May 23, 1958, by the Second Session of the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China.

¹⁸ See Appendix 1, "Declaration of communist and workers' parties of the Socialist countries," p. 477 of this volume.

¹⁹ See Appendix 2, "Peace Manifesto," p. 493 of this volume.

ist-Leninist and out-and-out revisionist program, Tito and other leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia made a series of vicious attacks against the international communist movement and the socialist camp with the Soviet Union as its center, whereas in regard to US imperialism, that most ferocious enemy of the people in every part of the world, they were sycophantic and deeply grateful.

At present, the international communist movement has the important responsibility to adhere firmly to the viewpoints expressed in the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries, to defend the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and oppose modern revisionism.

The Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries sums up the experience of the international communist movement in the past century, especially in the past forty years; expounds the common principles which the communist parties of all countries must abide by in the socialist revolution and socialist construction; puts forward the basic policy of the communist parties in rallying the broad masses of the people to the struggle for the cause of peace, democracy and socialism; it lays the ideological and political foundation for solidarity among the communist parties and strengthens the unity of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. It is an epoch-making document which is in the nature of a program for the international communist movement.

Analyzing the current international situation, the Declaration points out that "world development is determined by the course and results of the competition between two diametrically opposed social systems," that "while socialism is on the upgrade, imperialism is heading towards decline," that the colonial system is crumbling and that "capitalist economy is bound to encounter new deep slumps and crises." It points out that the question of war or peaceful coexistence has become the basic issue in world politics, while the existence of imperialism is the source of aggressive wars. It points out that the aggressive imperialist circles of the United States have become the center of world reaction, the most deadly enemy of the peoples. It says: "By this policy these anti-popular, aggressive imperialist forces are courting their own ruin, creating their own grave-diggers." At the same time, the Declaration points out that the forces of peace have so grown that there is

a real possibility of averting wars and that at the forefront of the forces of peace is the indestructible socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. The Declaration says: "An alliance of these mighty forces can prevent war, but should the bellicose imperialist maniacs venture, regardless of anything, to unleash a war, imperialism will doom itself to destruction, for the peoples will not tolerate a system that brings them so much suffering and exacts so many sacrifices."

The Peace Manifesto adopted at the meeting of representatives of 64 Communist and Workers' Parties points out that the threat to peace and the security of the people comes from "the capitalist monopolies which have amassed unprecedented riches from the two world wars and the current arms drive." It appeals to people of goodwill throughout the world: Organize and fight for peace!

The correctness of the appraisal of the international situation made in the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries is confirmed by the development of events. In the past six months, in the socialist camp, economic and cultural construction in the Soviet Union, China and many other brother countries has shown a continuous upward trend. In Asia, Africa and Latin America, there has been a fresh advance in the national liberation movement waged against the imperialists and their lackeys, and in some countries fierce struggle is going on. Meanwhile, the imperialist countries have landed in a new, grave and deep economic crisis. This began first in the United States, where capitalism is most developed, and the economic crisis of the United States is now hitting the whole capitalist world. On the issue of peace or war, the Soviet Union, Poland, the German Democratic Republic, Rumania and other brother countries have put forward a series of peace proposals. The Soviet Union has stopped the testing of nuclear weapons before others; the governments of the Korean Democratic People's Republic and of our own country jointly decided to withdraw the Chinese People's Volunteers from Korea. These facts demonstrate to the people throughout the world the determination of the countries in the socialist camp to do all in their power to secure peace. Despite the desire for peace of the people of all countries, the aggressive bloc headed by the US imperialists persists up to now in its refusal to stop nuclear tests, to end the cold war, to reduce armaments and to withdraw its troops from Korea, and it is doing all it can to delay the

convening of a summit conference. The US imperialists have been occupying our Taiwan. They have gone so far as to interfere openly in the internal affairs of Indonesia, aiding and abetting and supplying the rebel clique in that country with materials and now they are interfering in the internal affairs of the Lebanon. We must be awake to the fact that US imperialism and the imperialist bloc headed by it are still actively threatening war, preparing for new wars, stepping up their political, economic and cultural aggression against many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, undermining the internal unity of these countries and even resorting to armed force to suppress national liberation movements. It is our task to rally the peace-loving forces of the whole world to safeguard peace and smash the war schemes of the aggressive imperialist bloc headed by the United States.

The Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries points out that in adhering to the principle of combining the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution and construction in various countries, attention must be paid to overcoming revisionism and doctrinairism. The Declaration lays stress on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism—dialectical materialism—refutes metaphysics and idealism, and holds that “the application of dialectical materialism in practical work and the education of Party functionaries and the broad masses in Marxism-Leninism are urgent tasks of the communist and workers' parties.” To the question of what is the main danger now facing the international communist movement, the Declaration gives this clear-cut answer: “The main danger at present is revisionism, or, in other words, right-wing opportunism, which, as a manifestation of bourgeois ideology, paralyzes the revolutionary energy of the working class and demands the preservation or restoration of capitalism.” The Declaration points out: “The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source.” Making a special note of the emergence of modern revisionism, the Declaration points out: “Modern revisionism seeks to smear the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, declares that it is ‘outmoded’ and alleges that it has lost its significance for social progress. The revisionists try to exorcize the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and the working people in general. They deny the historical necessity for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletar-

iat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, deny the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, reject the principle of proletarian internationalism and call for rejection of the basic Leninist principles of party organization and, above all, of democratic centralism and for transforming the Communist Party from a militant revolutionary organization into some kind of debating society.”

We Chinese Communists, like the Communists of other countries, note with pleasure that since the publication of the Declaration, fresh achievements have been made by the fraternal parties in the countries of the socialist camp in socialist revolution and socialist construction, in ideological and political work and in unity and cooperation. New progress has also been made by the fraternal parties in the capitalist countries in the struggle against revisionism and right-wing renegades, in the work of consolidating their own ranks, defending the Marxist-Leninist unity of the Party and increasing its militant strength, and in the work of establishing close ties with the workers, peasants and the rest of the broad masses of the laboring people.

It is clear that, to wage a joint struggle against imperialism for the common cause of the proletariat of the whole world, the unity and solidarity of the communist parties in all countries on the basis of Marxism-Leninism is of special importance. Brother parties should strengthen their mutual contacts. All talk and action that go against this unity and solidarity are harmful, they must be resolutely opposed.

The truth of the judgment made in the Declaration that the main danger at present is revisionism, that is, right-wing opportunism, has also been confirmed by the facts. On a series of fundamental questions, the Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia recently approved by its Seventh Congress betrays the principles of Marxism-Leninism, sets itself against the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries, and turns against the Peace Manifesto adopted by the meeting of representatives of 64 communist and workers' parties, which bears the signature of the representative of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. Just as the Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has the right to adopt its program, so the communist parties of other countries have the right, as well as the obligation, to criticize

and repudiate this revisionist program in their effort to preserve the purity of Marxism-Leninism.

This program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia asserts, on the one hand, that “the swelling wave of state-capitalist tendencies in the capitalist world is the most obvious proof that mankind is indomitably moving into the era of socialism through a wide variety of different roads,” and that the state apparatus in the capitalist world is “a regulator in the sphere of labor and property relationships, of social rights and social services and other social relations,” which tends increasingly “to restrict the role of private capital” and “deprive the owners of private capital of certain independent functions in the economy and in the society.” On the other hand, the Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia describes ownership by the whole people, that is, ownership by the state, in the socialist countries as “state capitalism,” and they hold that it is directly from the foundation of this so-called “state capitalism” that “bureaucracy and bureaucratic-statist deformities” are produced. In this way the Program smears socialism and glorifies capitalism, smears the proletarian dictatorship and glorifies the bourgeois dictatorship.

The Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia holds that “factors of socialism” are taking shape in the capitalist countries and that provided the working class “exercises incessant pressure” on the bourgeois state apparatus and strives to “win a decisive influence” in it, it will be possible to “secure the development of socialism.” Here, in an attempt to sap the revolutionary energy of the working class in capitalist countries, the Program spreads the erroneous view that there is no need to carry out the proletarian revolution, no need to smash the capitalist state machine, no need to set up a proletarian dictatorship.

The leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia claims to be standing outside the socialist camp and the imperialist camp. In fact this is not so; they have always directed the spearhead of their attack against the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, but have not dared to touch US imperialism in the least. They describe the two fundamentally different world economic-political systems, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, as a “division of the world into two antagonist military-political blocs” and do their utmost to smear the socialist camp and glorify the imperialist camp. It should be pointed out that quite a number of countries,

though they are not socialist countries, have adopted the policy of neutrality which opposes war and supports peace. This is of positive significance to the maintenance of world peace; it is opposed by the aggressive imperialist forces, but has the sympathy of the peace-loving peoples of all countries. On the other hand, the so-called position outside the blocs advocated by the leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, which aims at disrupting the solidarity of the socialist countries, caters to the policy of the imperialists headed by the United States against communism, against the Soviet Union and the socialist camp. That is why it is applauded and rewarded by the US imperialists.

The Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia quotes some phrases of Marxism-Leninism just to disguise itself with a cloak of Marxism-Leninism and thus make it easier to deceive others. In method of thinking, the Program substitutes for revolutionary materialistic dialectics a sophistry which turns the facts upside down and confuses right with wrong; politically, it substitutes the reactionary theory of the state standing above classes for the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, and reactionary bourgeois nationalism for revolutionary proletarian internationalism; in political economy, it defends monopoly capital and obscures the fundamental differences between capitalism and socialism. The Yugoslav revisionists betray the Marxist-Leninist theories concerning the class struggle of the proletariat, the proletarian revolution and the proletarian dictatorship, and thus completely forsake the Marxist-Leninist doctrine about the political party of the proletariat. In a wild attempt to undermine and disintegrate the communist parties of various countries, they propagate a series of absurdities which deny the leading role of the communist party in socialist revolution and socialist construction, attack the communist and workers' parties in the socialist countries, and slander the communist parties in the capitalist countries as "ceasing to act as a revolutionary creative factor and motive power of social development in their respective countries."

This out-and-out revisionist program is put forward for the purpose of splitting the international communist movement. It is propounded at the very time when the general crisis of capitalism is deepening and when the revisionist harangues of the right-wing socialists are daily losing their paralyzing effect on the working class and the laboring masses. That is why the

service rendered by this Program to imperialism, especially US imperialism, is tantamount to “sending it a present of firewood in cold weather.”

The Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party at its Second Session considers as basically correct and necessary the criticism made in 1948 by the Information Bureau of the communist and workers' parties in its resolution “Concerning the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia”²⁰ in regard to the fact that the Yugoslav Communist Party departed from the principles of Marxism-Leninism and took the wrong road of bourgeois nationalism, although there were defects and mistakes in the methods adopted at that time in dealing with this issue. Our Party agreed with and supported that criticism. The second resolution concerning the Yugoslav Communist Party adopted by the Information Bureau of the communist and workers' parties in 1949, however, was incorrect and it was later withdrawn by the communist parties that took part in the Information Bureau meeting. Since 1954, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union headed by Comrade N. S. Khrushchev initiated improvement of relations with Yugoslavia and has adopted a series of measures to this end. This was entirely necessary and correct. This initiative of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had the approval of all socialist countries and the communist parties of various countries. We also look similar steps to those of the Soviet Union and established relations between China and Yugoslavia and between the Chinese and Yugoslav Parties. Starting from the desire for unity, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and some other communist parties concerned made necessary self-criticism of past defects in their relations with Yugoslavia. In order to improve relations with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the communist parties of various countries have since then made their best efforts, waiting patiently for the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia to return to the stand of Marxism-Leninism. But the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia have completely ignored the well-intentioned efforts of the communist parties of various countries; they have failed to realize their own mistakes and have not made any self-criticism. Furthermore, they have continuously attacked and slandered the socialist countries and the communist parties of various countries, and have gone so far as to echo the attacks of

²⁰ “Resolution of the Information Bureau Concerning the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia,” *For A Lasting Peace, For A Peoples Democracy!*, No. 13, July 1, 1948.

the imperialists against the socialist camp and the international communist movement. They played the inglorious role of provocateur and interventionist in the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary. Their schemes failed only because the leading comrades of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party consistently maintained a principled and correct attitude during and after suppressing the counter-revolutionary uprising. And now, when the Moscow meetings have strengthened the solidarity of the communist parties of various countries, they display a stubborn anti-Marxist-Leninist standpoint in their Program and intensive hostility towards the socialist countries and the communist parties of various countries. There is no doubt that by this stand and conduct, the Yugoslav leaders have alienated themselves from the ranks of the international communist movement. This is in no way in the interests of the true Communists of Yugoslavia and of the Yugoslav people.

The Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party at its Second Session fully endorses the decision of the Party's Central Committee not to send a delegation, but only an observer to be present at the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. It is the unanimous opinion of the Congress that a resolute struggle must be waged against the modern revisionism which has emerged in the international communist movement. It is the sacred duty of our Party towards the international working class to work, together with the fraternal parties, for the complete defeat of modern revisionism politically and theoretically, and for the safeguarding of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, at its Second Session, expresses full confidence that the cause of peace, democracy and socialism will win through all obstacles to score fresh and still greater victories throughout the world.

Modern Revisionism Must Be Repudiated

May 5, 1958

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, May 5, 1958, p. 1.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, May 13, 1958, Vol. I, No. 11, pp. 6-8.

Today marks the 140th anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx, founder of scientific communism. Since 1844, Marxism has been carrying on a persistent struggle against reactionary bourgeois and petit-bourgeois ideas of every description and against opportunist ideas of every variety within the ranks of the international workers' movement. Marxism has scored one victory after another in the struggle, because revolutionary practice has testified to its correctness. It was in the course of the struggle in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution that Lenin developed Marxism and carried it forward to a new stage, the stage of Leninism. Now the international workers' movement has placed before Marxism-Leninism a new sacred task: to wage an irreconcilable struggle against modern revisionism or neo-Bernsteinism. This is a struggle between two fundamentally different lines: Marxism-Leninism versus anti-Marxism-Leninism, a great struggle involving the success or failure of the cause of the working class of the world and the cause of socialism.

The Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia which ended recently has adopted a "Draft Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia" which is an anti-Marxist-Leninist, out-and-out revisionist program. To sum it up briefly, the draft program substitutes sophistry for revolutionary materialistic dialectics in method of thinking; politically, it substitutes the reactionary theory of the state standing above classes for the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, and reactionary bourgeois nationalism for revolutionary proletarian internationalism; in political economy, it defends monopoly capital and tries to obscure the fundamental differences between the capitalist and socialist systems. The draft program openly betrays the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, sets itself against the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of socialist countries held in Moscow last November, and at the same time turns against the "Peace Manifesto" adopted by the meeting of repre-

representatives of 64 communist and workers' parties, endorsed by the representatives of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia themselves. The draft program brands all the basic principles of revolutionary theory established by Marx and Engels and developed by Lenin and other great Marxists as "dogmatism," and the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia call themselves "irreconcilable enemies of any dogmatism."

What are the most fundamental things in the "dogmatism" which the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia have chosen to attack? They are proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. But as everybody knows without proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship there can be no socialism. The Draft Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia centers its attacks on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, besmirches the socialist state and the socialist camp, and gilds capitalism, the imperialist state and the imperialist camp. This cannot but give rise to doubts about the "socialism" avowed by the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

Speaking like the reactionaries of all countries and the Chinese bourgeois rightists, the leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia viciously slanders proletarian dictatorship, alleging that it "leads to bureaucratism, the ideology of etatism, separation of the leading political forces from the working masses, stagnation, the deformation of socialist development, and the sharpening of internal differences and contradictions." They maliciously slander the socialist camp, alleging that it also has a policy of "positions of strength and struggle for hegemony." They describe the two fundamentally different world politico-economic systems, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, as "division of the world into two antagonistic military-political blocs." They represent themselves as standing outside the "two blocs" of socialism and imperialism, that is, standing in a so-called position beyond the blocs. They hold that the US-dominated United Nations can "bring about greater and greater unification of the world," that economic cooperation of all countries of the world, including the imperialist countries, is "an integral part of the socialist road to the development of world economy." They maintain that "the swelling flow of state-capitalist tendencies in the capitalist world is the most tangible proof that mankind is irrepressibly and by the most diverse roads deeply entering into the epoch of socialism." These propositions cannot but call to mind the

revisionist preachings about “evolutionary socialism,” “ultra-imperialism,” “organized capitalism,” “the peaceful growing of capitalism into socialism,” etc. made by such right-wing socialists in the late 19th century and early 20th century, as Bernstein, Kautsky, Hilferding and their ilk, which were intended to lure the working class in the various capitalist countries to abandon revolutionary struggle for socialism and uphold bourgeois rule. Now, the preachings of the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia also contain a preposterous design against the working class and other laboring people of various countries, that is, to lure the workers and other laboring people to take the road of surrender to capitalism. In his speech delivered at Pula in November 1956, Tito, leader of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, said: “What is actually involved is whether the new trend will triumph in the Communist parties—the trend which really began in Yugoslavia.” He also said: “It is a question now whether this course [the so-called Yugoslav course—*Ed.*] will be victorious or whether the Stalinist course will prevail again. Yugoslavia must not concentrate on herself, she must work in all directions.” These words fully expose what their true ambition is.

It is no accident that the Draft Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has appeared at the present time. Since the Great October Socialist Revolution, the international communist movement has achieved a series of great historic victories, the socialist system has been successfully established among a population of 900 million and more, and the general crisis of capitalism has broadened out greatly, with the imperialist countries headed by the United States experiencing a new and profound cyclical economic crisis. Therefore the imperialists, led by the United States, are stepping up their sabotage against the international communist movement. There are only two methods to which the bourgeoisie has resorted to undermine the workers’ movement—suppression by brute force and deceit. In the present new international situation, when the revisionist harangues of the right-wing socialists are daily losing their paralyzing effect on the working class and the laboring masses, the program put forward by the Yugoslav revisionists fits in exactly with the need of the imperialists, and particularly the American imperialists.

In his speech “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People,” Comrade Mao Zedong said: “Revisionism, or rightist opportunism, is a bourgeois trend of thought which is even more dangerous than doc-

trinairism. The revisionists, or right opportunists, pay lip service to Marxism and also attack 'doctrinairism.' But the real target of their attack is actually the most fundamental elements of Marxism."²¹ Facts have proven that what Comrade Mao Zedong says here is not only directed to the situation in our country but also fits the international situation well.

The Declaration of the meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties of socialist countries says: "The main danger at present is revisionism or, in other words, right-wing opportunism, which as a manifestation of bourgeois ideology paralyzes the revolutionary energy of the working class and demands the preservation or restoration of capitalism." It further points out with special emphasis:

Modern revisionism seeks to smear the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, declares that it is "outmoded" and alleges that it has lost its significance for social progress. The revisionists try to exorcize the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and the working people in general. They deny the historical necessity for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, deny the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, reject the principles of proletarian internationalism, and call for rejection of the Leninist principles of party organization and, above all, of democratic centralism, and for transforming the Communist party from a militant revolutionary organization into some kind of debating society.

The Declaration clearly depicts the true face of the modern revisionists. The content of the *Draft Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia* shows that face precisely.

It is quite obvious that the series of anti-Marxist-Leninist and out-and-out revisionist views assembled in the Draft Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia must be openly and uncompromisingly criticized and repudiated. If theoretical criticism of the revisionism of Bernstein and Kautsky and their ilk by the Marxists of the late 19th and early 20th centuries was inevitable, then it is even more necessary for us to repudiate

²¹ Mao Zedong, "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. V, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 395.

neo-Bernsteinism now. This is because modern revisionism is set forth as a comprehensive and systematic program by the leading group of a party that wields state power; because modern revisionism is aimed at splitting the international communist movement and undermining the solidarity of the socialist countries, and is directly harmful to the fundamental interests of the Yugoslav people.

We consider as basically correct the criticism made in June 1948 by the Information Bureau of communist parties in its resolution "Concerning the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia" in regard to the mistake of the Yugoslav Communist Party in departing from the principles of Marxism-Leninism and sinking into bourgeois nationalism; but there were defects and mistakes in the method adopted at that time by the Information Bureau in dealing with this question. The resolution concerning Yugoslavia adopted by the Information Bureau in November 1949 was incorrect and it was later withdrawn by the communist and workers' parties that took part in the Information Bureau meeting. Since 1954, the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist camp have done their utmost and taken various measures to improve their relations with Yugoslavia. This was entirely correct and necessary. The communist parties of various countries have adopted an attitude of waiting patiently, hoping that the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia may return to the Marxist-Leninist standpoint in the interest of adherence to the road of socialism by the Yugoslav people. However, the leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has spurned the well-intentioned efforts made by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communists of other countries. Around the time of the Hungarian events, they tried to disrupt the unity of the countries in the socialist camp on the pretext of so-called "opposition to Stalinism"; during the Hungarian events, they supported the renegade Nagy clique; and, in their recent Congress, they have gone further and put forward a systematic and comprehensive revisionist program. The leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia should think soberly: Will the League of Communists of Yugoslavia be able to maintain its solidarity with the communist parties of other countries by abandoning the fundamental viewpoints of Marxism-Leninism and persisting in revisionist viewpoints? Can there be a basis for solidarity without a common Marxist-Leninist viewpoint? Will it be in the interests of the Yugoslav people to

reject friendship with the countries in the socialist camp and with the communist parties of other countries?

We deem it absolutely necessary to distinguish between right and wrong on vital questions in the international workers' movement. As Lenin said: "A policy based on principle is the only correct policy." The world is now at a new historic turning point with the east wind prevailing over the west wind. The struggle between the Marxist line and the revisionist line is nothing but a reflection of the sharpening struggle between the rising class forces and the moribund class forces in society, a reflection of the sharpening struggle between the imperialist world and the socialist world. It is impossible for any Marxist-Leninist to escape this struggle. Historical developments will testify ever more clearly to the great significance of this struggle for the international communist movement!

Modern Revisionism Must Be Fought to the End

June 4, 1958

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, June 4, 1958, p. 1.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, June 10, 1958, Vol. I, No. 15, pp. 7-9.

The Second Session of the Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, in the light of the new situation in the international communist movement, pointed out in its resolution on the Moscow meetings of representatives of communist and workers' parties that "at present, the international communist movement has the important responsibility to adhere firmly to the viewpoints expressed in the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries, to defend the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and oppose modern revisionism." "It is the sacred duty of our Party towards the international working class to work, together with the fraternal parties, for the complete defeat of modern revisionism politically and theoretically, and for the safeguarding of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology." Now the fight against modern revisionism, as represented by the program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, has begun, but this is only the beginning. To smash modern revisionism completely, both politically and theoretically, this fight must be carried through to the very end.

But is it not "going too far" to deal with the Yugoslav revisionists in this way? Might it not have some unfavorable effect on the international workers' movement and the struggle for-peace? These are questions that have to be answered.

Some people may think that even if the Yugoslav program is revisionist and benefits the imperialists, it is best not to say so clearly to avoid pushing the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists to the side of the imperialists. But the fact that the Yugoslav program represents modern revisionism and helps the imperialists, particularly the US imperialists, is determined not by any criticism from any quarter, but by the program itself, which is an objective fact. When the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League was drawing up their program, nobody accused them

of being modern revisionists or prejudged that they would bring forth a document which is such an omnibus of revisionism and levels such attacks on the socialist camp and provides such a shield for US imperialism. On the contrary, even when the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League refused to participate in the Moscow meeting of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries and came out in the open against the Declaration adopted by this meeting, the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries still maintained friendly relations with the Yugoslav Communist League and did not enter into argument with it. But all this did not prevent the Yugoslav Communist League from bringing up and adopting its revisionist program. When the Yugoslav program patently betrays the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, what is the result other than damage to the political consciousness of the working class and the laboring people if you do not call the program revisionist? When the program of the Yugoslav Communist League and the words and deeds of its leading group in fact help the US imperialists, and when even imperialist journals in the United States declare in no uncertain terms that "Tito's interests, as it happens, run parallel to ours for quite a stretch ahead" and that "we are partners in the only inside job," what is the purpose other than to let Dulles and company laugh up their sleeves if you do not say they are serving the imperialists?

The fundamental Marxist-Leninist approach is to see all things for what they really are. We do not favor painting the program of the Yugoslav Communist League and its leading group worse than they are, nor do we have the duty or right to portray them better than they are. It was from this standpoint that the *Renmin Ribao* editorial of May 5 and the resolution of the Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party (Second Session) stated and repeated that, on the one hand, the resolution concerning the Yugoslav Communist Party adopted by the Information Bureau of communist and workers' parties in November 1949 was wrong and there were defects and mistakes in the methods used by the Information Bureau in June 1948 in criticizing the Yugoslav Communist Party, and it was entirely necessary and correct that since 1954 the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union headed by Comrade N. S. Khrushchev corrected these mistakes, initiated improvement of relations with Yugoslavia and adopted a whole series of measures to this end; while on the other hand, the criticism of the mistakes of the Yugoslav Communist Party made by the Information

Bureau in its 1948 resolution was basically correct and necessary. It is unfortunate that the criticism which was necessary and basically correct should have been marred by defects and mistakes in the methods employed; this should be taken as a lesson. But despite an inconsistency between form and content, Marxist-Leninists must of course distinguish between right and wrong on their merits and above all take content into account. The question now is that after the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other communist parties concerned took positive steps to eliminate all the defects and mistakes, the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League is trying to take advantage of the 1949 mistake and the mistakes in methods employed in 1948 to repudiate completely all that was correct in the 1948 criticism and long after the communist parties of all countries had stopped mentioning the 1948 resolution, they launched unbridled attacks on this resolution at the League's Congress. As it is, we cannot help but take another look at what was said after all in the 1948 resolution.

Just see for yourself! This resolution criticized the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party for having "pursued an incorrect line which represents a departure from Marxism-Leninism," and declared that "the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia have taken a stand unworthy of Communists, and have begun to identify the foreign policy of the Soviet Union with the foreign policy of the imperialist powers, behaving towards the Soviet Union in the same manner as they behave to the bourgeois states"; that "the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia are departing from the positions of the working class and are breaking with the Marxist theory of classes and class struggle"; and that "the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia is revising the Marxist-Leninist teachings about the Party." Are not these the facts? Has not the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League by its own deeds over the past ten years provided additional evidence as to the correctness of this resolution? On such a serious question, can they prove themselves right by repeating "any expectation in any quarter that we shall renounce our principled stands both in international and in internal matters, is only a loss of time?" It can be seen from this that it does not help the Yugoslav revisionists to attack the communist parties of various countries by using the 1948 resolution of the Information Bureau; it cannot prevail over the criticism against the leading group of the Yugoslav Commu-

nist League, but can only overwhelm the leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists themselves.

Up to the present, the Yugoslav revisionists have not yet made any serious reply to the criticisms expressed by the communist parties of various countries, nor can they do so. One of their favorite weapons is to describe this criticism as “interference in internal affairs.” This, of course, in no sense represents a serious attitude. For Marxist-Leninists to fight the anti-Marxist-Leninist trend of revisionism is not only unavoidable but a matter of duty. Waging this ideological struggle has nothing to do with whether the countries concerned are large or small, or with whether the Parties concerned are in power or not. Even where Marxist-Leninists are still a small group under the oppression of reactionary rulers, nobody can deprive them of their right to carry on such ideological struggle. Nor has such ideological struggle any relation whatsoever to interference in the internal affairs of other countries, by force or by underhand means, or to so-called big-nation chauvinism and hegemony. To employ such allegations in order to shift the ground of the argument, and to resort to sophistry and slander is ludicrous. And it is doubly so for the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League to hurl charges of so-called interference in internal affairs. Is it not the Yugoslav Communist League which, in its program, started talking at length about the internal policies of all the socialist countries (which are also “binding” on them alone) and pinned a series of malicious labels on them? Since the Yugoslav Communist League maintains that “Yugoslavia must not concentrate on herself,” why should other countries concentrate on themselves alone? Why should the smaller socialist states neighboring on Yugoslavia, such as Albania and Hungary, find that even their right to concentrate on themselves is infringed upon by Yugoslavia? What curious logic! Some people behave as if they could, like the magistrate in the Chinese saying, set houses on fire while forbidding ordinary folk to light lamps. But a rebuff brings immediate whines about “unequal positions”... Enough of this!

The Yugoslav revisionists have yet another miserable weapon—they say the sort of things they are doing have been going on for a long time, why should they be criticized for them now? True enough, the revisionist standpoint of the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League has long been there, and that in fact was the basis of the 1948 resolution of the Information Bureau. However, at that time the leading group of the Yugo-

slav Communist League had not yet systematized its revisionist views. Nor did it, after the socialist countries resumed relations with Yugoslavia, state them as systematically as it has now done. From 1954 to the time preceding the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the communist parties of various countries on many occasions, publicly or in other ways, argued with the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League. As is generally known, these arguments reached a climax after the 1956 counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary. Although the arguments failed to change its stand, the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League repeatedly expressed the desire to end the argument and to maintain and even improve friendly relations with the socialist countries and the communist parties of the various countries. In November 1957, though it did not participate in the Moscow meeting of the communist parties of the socialist countries, the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League joined in the meeting of the 64 Communist and Workers' Parties and in the Peace Manifesto. All this for a time made the communist parties of various countries rather hopeful. But the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League once more broke faith and returned evil for good. Unilaterally it scrapped the agreements between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia reached in the talks held in 1955, 1956 and 1957 on expanding and strengthening cooperation between Yugoslavia and the socialist countries. Unilaterally it forsook the stand taken on matters regarding principles in the international situation expressed in the Peace Manifesto and put forward an out-and-out revisionist program. Prior to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the communist parties of some countries gave comradely advice to the Yugoslav League of Communists and suggested that the analysis of the international situation contained in the draft program, which obviously ran counter to Marxism-Leninism, be deleted, 'the Yugoslav League of Communists turned a deaf ear to the basic points in this advice. So far from heeding this advice, at their Congress they concentrated their attacks on the Soviet Union, which had given them generous fraternal aid and on the socialist countries and the communist parties in various countries; but they fawned on and servilely thanked US imperialism, the most ferocious enemy of the people all over the world. So it was only when their prolonged efforts, characterized by patience and magnanimity, proved fruitless, that the communist parties of various countries gave this shameful

band of renegades the counter-blows it deserves. Now the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League blames others for not adopting a comradely attitude to it and for failing to keep promises. Whom is it trying to fool? What serious-minded person can bear with such fooling?

Nowadays the most urgent task facing the people of the world is the defense of peace. Will the fight against the Yugoslav revisionists hamper the people's cause of defending peace? *The New York Times* editorial of June 1 helpfully provides us with an answer. It said:

Unexpected and now unforeseeable developments may produce situations in the months ahead in which other Communist-ruled nations might request our aid and in which it would be desirable for us to grant such request... Certainly the news from Belgrade and Moscow in recent days suggests that the flexibility shown in the past in regard to American aid to Yugoslavia was wise from the point of view of our own interests.

Those who do not see the danger of Yugoslav revisionism should give careful attention to this. The United States expects the Yugoslav example to encourage new Nagys hidden in the communist parties of the socialist countries, expects that these new Nagys may perhaps bring about "unexpected and now unforeseeable developments" "in the months ahead" and may seize political power and ask for US aid as Yugoslavia has been doing. Although this is an illusion of the US imperialists, it is not difficult to see from it the part played by Yugoslav revisionism in the US imperialists' plans for subversion and the significance of the fight against Yugoslav revisionism for the cause of defending peace. At the same time, it is not difficult to see the difference between Yugoslav revisionism and neutralism in general: ordinary neutral countries cannot serve the purpose of subversion which the United States requires, but often themselves become the target of US subversion. The fight against Yugoslav revisionism is not only to draw a clear-cut line between Marxism-Leninism and anti-Marxism-Leninism, to let all supporters of socialism recognize the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League for what it is, and so serve to consolidate the core of the peace forces—the socialist camp and the international workers' movement. It is also to let all supporters of peace recognize the imperialists, particularly the US imperialists, for what they are and see clearly where the danger of war lies. Naturally this is even more obviously in the interests of peace.

But to draw a dividing line does not mean breaking off diplomatic relations. The leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League complains that to criticize its servility to US imperialism is to force it to sever diplomatic relations with the United States. This is simply deliberate and dishonest confusion of two different things. Similarly it is bluffing people by saying that the criticism of Yugoslav revisionism by the communist parties of the socialist countries means a repetition of the history between 1948 and 1954 and a menace to the diplomatic relations between these countries and Yugoslavia. But this will frighten nobody. The post-1948 history will not be repeated. If the true face of the Yugoslav revisionists is recognized, their sabotage of the socialist camp and the international workers' movement can be stopped more easily. To return to the pre-1954 situation is not right. At any rate, the working people of Yugoslavia hope to take the socialist road and be friendly with the peoples of the socialist countries. Since the socialist countries can maintain diplomatic relations with capitalist countries, why cannot they maintain such relations with Yugoslavia? However, since the Yugoslav leaders themselves do not want fraternal relations with the socialist countries, it is only natural that relations between Yugoslavia and the socialist countries are leveled down to ordinary diplomatic relations, and there is no need for the Yugoslav leaders or anyone else to make a fuss about it. The program of the Yugoslav Communist League in many places shows that Yugoslavia supports peace. Although this does not show that the program is Marxist, yet so long as Yugoslavia is willing to do so, we believe the socialist countries will continue to cooperate with it on the question of safeguarding peace, just as they can cooperate on this question with some capitalist countries and certain political forces of the bourgeoisie. In fighting against the opportunists, Lenin once quoted this saying of Marx: "If you must unite, Marx wrote to the party leaders, then enter into agreements to satisfy the practical aims of the movement, but do not allow any bargaining over principles, do not make 'concessions' in questions of theory."²² This teaching of Marx and Lenin is our guide to action. We hold that modern revisionism must be fought to the end and there can be no room for concession here. But in the future it will still be possible for the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia and the socialist countries, or the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the communist parties of various countries, to "enter into agreements."

²² V. I. Lenin, *What Is to Be Done?*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 24.

Whether this “entering into agreements” will really take place and what kind of “agreements” will be entered into depends primarily on the future attitude of the leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

Yugoslav Revisionism—Product of Imperialist Policy²³

CHEN BODA

June 1, 1958

Source: *Red Flag* (*Hongqi*), 1958, No. 1, pp. 11-18.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, June 17, 1958, Vol. I, No. 16, pp. 8-12.

The struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties of all countries against the revisionism of the Yugoslav leading group headed by Tito is a big event in current international affairs. The Tito group provoked it. The program which it put forward unleashed an attack all along the line against Marxism-Leninism and the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, in the belief that in this way it could weaken the positions of Marxism-Leninism and cause a split in the international communist movement. Marxist-Leninists had no choice but to accept the challenge and have already begun to show the challengers that they are knocking their heads against a brick wall. Contrary to the expectations of the Tito group, the communist parties of all countries have shown great solidarity in this struggle.

It is imperative that we examine this problem in the international political and economic setting as a whole and thus expose the very essence of the revisionism of the Tito group.

The revisionism of the Tito group is in no way accidental; it is a product of the contemporary international class struggle, a product of the policy of the contemporary imperialists, in particular the US imperialists, the fiercest enemy of the people throughout the world.

The revisionism of the period of the Second International, represented by Bernstein, also reflected the policy of the bourgeoisie—the imperialists. But the modern revisionism or neo-revisionism represented by Tito differs from Bernstein's in its function. Bernstein revisionism appeared at the close of the 19th century, when imperialism was still a complete system holding sway the world over, when there was as yet no state under proletarian dictatorship. But what era are we living in today? The great era of successful proletarian revolutions among a population of over 900 million and of socialism

²³ This article appeared in the June 1 issue of *Hongqi* (*Red Flag*), fortnightly theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

established as a new world system, the era in which the colonial system has already disintegrated or is in process of disintegration, and the imperialist system is tottering; it is the great era, as Comrade Mao Zedong has put it, of “the east wind prevailing over the west wind.” In this new era, the struggle between the socialist and the capitalist systems, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in all lands, has become a fierce, life-and-death struggle. This is what inevitably stamps modern revisionism, that is, neo-revisionism, and gives it new features.

Marx and Engels in their time repeatedly pointed out that the British bourgeoisie used a small part of its superprofits to maintain a group of aristocrats of labor. In a letter to Marx, Engels once referred to “those very worst English trade unions which allow themselves to be led by men sold to, or at least paid by the middle class.” It is well known that Lenin—in the course of the relentless battle he waged against revisionism, opportunism, reformism, social chauvinism and social imperialism—time and again referred to this view of Marx and Engels and added new evidence to substantiate it. Lenin said: “Objectively the opportunists are a section of the petit bourgeoisie and of certain strata of the working class who have been bribed out of imperialist superprofits and converted into watchdogs of capitalism and corrupters of the labor movement.”

How does the situation stand today? Since the working class has seized state power in many countries, the imperialists have found that it is not sufficient to buy over traitors to the working class within their own countries. Besides continuing the policy of bribery in their own countries, the imperialists, with the US imperialists in the lead, are at the same time doing their best to find in some socialist countries bourgeois nationalist elements and unstable persons and buy them over and make them tools to undermine the proletarian dictatorship, the socialist system, the international communist movement and the unity of the socialist countries. That being the case the US imperialists have picked on the leading group of Yugoslavia, and carried out a policy of buying it off at a high price.

According to figures published in the newspapers and periodicals of the United States and Yugoslavia, between 1945 and 1957 the United States extended over \$1,700 (USD) million in economic aid to the leading group of Yugoslavia; of which over \$1,000 million were given after 1949. In addition, according to Associated Press reports, the United States gave Yugosla-

via more than \$1,000 million in military aid from 1950 to 1957. This is apart from an estimated \$300 million of economic aid received by Yugoslavia from other capitalist countries. So all in all, the aid given to the leading group of Yugoslavia by the whole capitalist world headed by the United States amounted to about \$3,000 million.

In his report to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Tito disclosed that US aid made up 4 percent of Yugoslavia's national income. It can be estimated from this figure that US aid accounts for a very large proportion of Yugoslavia's national budget, probably amounting to about 20 percent.

The stark fact is that the Yugoslav leading group headed by Tito not only lives on its own people but on a large amount of US aid. At the same time, the so-called "American way of life" of which the US imperialists boast of so loudly has also been imported into Yugoslav society by means of US aid, with the purpose of corrupting the Yugoslav people.

A report published in *The Washington Post* and *Times Herald* of June 6, 1957 says,

Installment-plan buying of American-style electrical gadgets is changing the Yugoslavs from Communists to capitalists, says Pittsburgh's GOP Congressman James F. Fulton, heretofore bitter foe of United States policy toward Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. He has just returned from Tito-land... He said: "The May Day parade had a real American look, American tanks, American equipment. There's tremendous American influence... among the people, Americans are the most popular of all nationalities."

On May 2, 1958, Reuter's correspondent sent a long report from Belgrade in which he said that the Yugoslav press ten years ago was

just as dull and doctrinaire as *Pravda*. [But] nowadays, it often tries to be as racy as the American tabloids... Marxist eyebrows are often raised by "cheesecake" photographs and the American-angled features which regularly appear in the Yugoslav newspapers... The Yugoslav reader is offered a liberal spread of "human stories," including frank and often gory details of crime and disaster.

All this shows that some leading Yugoslav newspapers have been turned into instruments of publicity for the “American way of life.”

Man’s social being determines his consciousness. It is precisely the import of large quantities of US aid and the “American way of life” that has wrought a change in the consciousness of the Yugoslav leading group, caused revisionist ideology to grow up in its midst, and determined its internal and external policies which are directed against the Soviet Union, against communism, against the socialist camp and against socialism in its own country.

What are the main points in the revisionism and the domestic and foreign policies of the leading group in Yugoslavia headed by Tito, as expressed in the program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia?

1. With regard to the over-all political struggle in the world, the Tito group sets forth views which are diametrically opposed to those in the Declaration of the Moscow meeting of the communist and workers’ parties of the socialist countries. It denies that the most fundamental feature of the present world situation is the counterposing of two different social, political and economic world systems and of the two-camps arising from these two different systems. It rejects the point made in the Declaration that “in our epoch world development is determined by the course and results of the competition between two diametrically opposed social systems.” It completely confuses the differences between the two fundamentally different social systems—socialism and capitalism—and describes these two fundamentally different world economic-political systems, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, as “the division of the world into antagonistic military-political blocs,” and it holds that “the division of the world into antagonistic military-political blocs also led to the economic division of the world... and thus obstructs the process of the integration of the world and impedes the social progress of mankind.” According to the sophistry of the Tito group, the world, or the world economy, was originally united under the system of capitalism—imperialism; as though the capitalist countries had never split into blocs contending for world supremacy, arising from the interests of monopoly capital in its drive for superprofits; as though monopoly capital had never engaged in life-and-death global wars for the re-division of the world. The Tito group does not in any way believe that the way out for humanity lies in the ultimate replacement of the capitalist system by the socialist system. Its proposal is for the United Nations, which

is dominated by US imperialism, to “encourage and promote comprehensive cooperation and closer connections between peoples, in short, to assist efforts towards achieving a fuller unity of the world.”

What kind of “unity” is the so-called “unity of the world” that is to be promoted through the US-dominated United Nations? Isn’t this unity which the Tito group hankers after a unity in which US imperialism seeks to dominate the world?

2. The Tito group declares that it does not belong to the camp of socialism. It brags about a so-called position of “standing above blocs.”

What is it all about, after all? The facts have shown: (1) that its purpose in staying outside the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and outside the ranks of the international proletariat is nothing less than substituting reactionary bourgeois nationalism for revolutionary proletarian internationalism; and (2) that its so-called position of “standing above blocs” is nothing but an adaptation to the requirements of the imperialist bloc.

3. On the question of war or peace, Marxists have always held that the root cause of modern wars is monopoly capitalism, i.e., imperialism, and that the socialist countries and the communist parties of all countries are the core of the forces defending world peace. But the Tito group directs the spearhead of its attack against the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and acts as an apologist for the war policy of the imperialist camp. Tito himself has declared:

Owing to Stalin’s inflexible and uncalled for threatening foreign policy, seeing that they would be unable to accomplish their aims by diplomatic means, the big Western powers decided they would be able to do so by displaying force. This was the basic reason for the formation of the Atlantic Pact, for the creation of a military bloc... (Tito’s report to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.)

Apparently the Tito group is trying to lead up to such an absurd, ultra-reactionary conclusion as this: that the danger of war arises not from the imperialist system and the imperialist camp headed, by the United States but from the socialist system and the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union.

4. As scientifically analyzed by Lenin, imperialism is the last stage of capitalism and, with it, mankind has entered the era of proletarian revolution.

Since the October Revolution, the proletarian revolution has triumphed in a number of countries. But imperialism is not yet finally down and out. The era of proletarian revolution is not yet over. Yet according to the Tito group, the world today has already passed beyond the age of imperialism and proletarian revolution, because “the capitalist system in its classical form is increasingly becoming a thing of the past” and socialism is coming into being in the capitalist countries. The Tito group keeps harping on the word “age” in the following manner: “Mankind is indomitably moving into the age of socialism through a wide variety of different roads, into the age in which socialism and socialist relations increasingly become the content and method of everyday life of all mankind”; “the age in which mankind is living today is already, more than anything else, the age of the introduction, forming and strengthening of new social, political and cultural forms based on socialist economic relationships.” From this it comes to the conclusion that “socialist thinking is no longer primarily concerned with questions relating to the overthrow of the old, capitalist system.” In other words, the problem of destroying the capitalist system in various countries of the world no longer exists, the theory of proletarian revolution is “outmoded,” and it has become nothing but a figment of the thinking of so-called “dogmatists.”

5. According to Lenin, monopoly capitalism “introduces everywhere the striving for domination, not for freedom. The result is reaction all along the line, whatever the political system, and an extreme intensification of existing antagonisms in this domain also.” But according to the Tito group, monopoly capital is peacefully growing into socialism in the capitalist countries through the forms of state capitalism, and state capitalism in these countries is in fact “socialism.” In the capitalist countries, it says, “the state increasingly controls the activities of capital, partially restricting the right of private management of capitalist property and depriving the owners of private capital of certain independent functions in the economy and in society.” “In certain fields of activity the top monopoly circles are steadily losing their former completely independent role, while some functions of the monopolies are increasingly being transferred upon the state.” “The state assumes an important role in the economy.” “The role of the state as that of a regulator in the sphere of labor and property relationships, of social rights and social services and other social relations also grows.”

So runs the extraordinary argument of the Tito group: the state apparatus of monopoly capital does not serve monopoly capital; it stands above classes and is fulfilling the task of expropriating monopoly capital.

6. Thus, the Tito group maintains that the working class in the capitalist countries can “make the state apparatus serve the society” without having to smash the bourgeois state apparatus. The task of the working class in the capitalist countries is thus confined to “winning decisive influence in state power and gradually—in keeping with its political strength—securing development of socialism.”

7. Since the Tito group glorifies bourgeois dictatorship in every way, it is no wonder that it exerts itself to smear proletarian dictatorship. Speaking like all reactionaries, it alleges that proletarian dictatorship must inevitably lead to “bureaucracy” and “bureaucratic statism.”

8. Marxists maintain that there are two forms of socialist ownership, i.e., ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, and that ownership by the whole people is the higher form of socialist ownership. But the Tito group describes ownership by the whole people, i.e., state ownership, in the socialist countries as “state capitalism” and “the last echo of old social relations.” Socialist economy, it says, comprises only two kinds of ownership—“collective ownership” and “personal ownership.” By “collective ownership” it means allowing the direct producers to “make decisions pertaining to the creation and the total distribution of products.” The group further alleges that “private land holding” is “a component part of large-scale socialist agricultural production,” and that small proprietors also represent “a component part of the socio-economic forces of socialism.”

In short, the Tito group describes state capitalism in the capitalist countries as “socialism,” and the ownership by the whole people in the socialist countries as “state capitalism.” It is for the former but against the latter. “Socialism” of the Tito brand puts the collective above the whole people, and the individual, in turn, above the collective. Its slogan is “socialism cannot subordinate man’s personal happiness to any kind of ‘higher aims.’” Its logic is that individual interests may stand above the collective interests and the interests of the whole people but should not be subordinated to them, and that, certainly, collective interests may stand above the interests of the whole people and should not be subordinated to the latter.

9. The “socialism” of the Tito brand is so queer a thing that to all intents and purposes it is the “socialism” of the bourgeoisie, the kind of “socialism” that is tolerable to the imperialists. It is fundamentally different from socialism as defined by Marxism-Leninism and practiced in the socialist countries. No wonder the Tito group categorically repudiates the common laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction, sets itself against the common ideology and concerted action of the international proletariat and the international communist movement, and maliciously slanders this common ideology and concerted action as “ideological monopoly” and “political hegemony.”

10. Proceeding from the above-mentioned views, the Tito group is hostile to all communist parties. It declares: “The conception that communist parties have a monopoly over every aspect of the movement of society towards socialism and that socialism can only find its representatives in them and move forward through them—is theoretically wrong and practically, very harmful.” It also asserts: “Some of the communist parties cease to act as the revolutionary creative factor and motive power of social development in their respective countries.”

The Tito group has great contempt for the Communist Party of the United States. But history will ultimately prove that though the US Communist Party, which adheres to the truth, is now small, it is a really vital living force and has a great future; on the other hand, though the Tito group now rules Yugoslavia, who can guarantee that it will not trip over its own revisionism?

11. The Tito group holds that “the development of the international workers’ movement during the last few decades did not advance in step with the social events and the development of material conditions”; and that “during the last few years of the Stalin period, the workers’ movement in the world... not only stagnated but even retrogressed.”

The Tito group seems blind to the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the success of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, the great victories gained in the war against fascism in which the Soviet Union played the chief role, the existence of the new socialist countries, the growth of the workers’ movements in the capitalist countries, and the great Chinese revolution and the People’s Republic of China.

12. The Tito group is of the opinion that “Marxist thought in the course of the last few decades has not kept in step with the advance of contemporary society.” As the editorial of the *Renmin Ribao* (*People’s Daily*), May 5, 1958²⁴ pointed out, the Tito group brands the basic principles of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory as “dogmatism,” and calls itself “irreconcilable enemies of dogmatism”; this being so, how can it possibly understand whether Marxism has developed or not? As it does not see the great world events that have come about under the leadership of the communist parties since the October Revolution, and utters such reactionary twaddle about “humanity,” “personality of man,” “free personality,” “truth about man as a social being,” and “man’s spiritual constitution,” on the pretext of opposing so-called “dogmatism” and “pragmatic revision,” how can this group possibly have a common language with Marxism-Leninism?

These twelve points do not exhaust the revisionist views and the domestic and foreign policies of the Tito group. But they suffice to show how the revisionism of the Tito group serves the interests of the imperialists, particularly the US imperialists.

In his report to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Tito called Djilas a revisionist. “By orders from outside and for Judas’ silver,” Tito said, “these traitors wrote slanderous pamphlets against the socialism and reality in Yugoslavia.” However, as pointed out correctly by an article in the West German *Tagesspiegel* of April 22, 1958: “Here is harsh mockery. For the basic ideas of this program were drafted by no other than Djilas himself who is today behind prison bars.” Of course, there is a difference between Djilas and the Tito group. It is that while Djilas does not bother to don the cloak of Marxism-Leninism, the Tito group still uses Marxism-Leninism as a disguise. But has it ever occurred to Tito that the content of the program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is actually another edition of Djilas’ *New Class*? Tito might well hold up Djilas as a mirror to see his own reflection.

After the war against fascism, the people of Yugoslavia embarked on the road to socialism. But under the dominating influence of the policies of the Tito’ group, Yugoslavia has not yet carried out a serious, thoroughgoing struggle between the capitalist and the socialist roads on the economic, political and ideological fronts, and has not solved the question of which

²⁴ See p. 57 of this volume.

road shall win in the country. In the villages of Yugoslavia, individual economy still accounts for more than 90 percent of the rural economy, and this preserves a seedbed for the return of capitalism.

The question in Yugoslavia is not solely that of ownership. For the people of Yugoslavia, a more serious question is that the dollar policy of US imperialism is exerting influence on the leading group of Yugoslavia and thereby causing confusion among the Yugoslav people as to the road to socialism.

As can be seen from the material quoted above, the dollar policy of US imperialism towards Yugoslavia began in 1945. Even before 1948, the Tito group already began to forsake the road of proletarian internationalism and foster reactionary bourgeois nationalism. This was bound up with the dollar policy of US imperialism and was a product of it in Yugoslavia. But to this very day, a good many of the Yugoslav people, and of the members of the Yugoslav League of Communists, still do not realize this.

Although the program of the Yugoslav League of Communists declares that “personal ownership” and, “private land holding” are also “socialism,” it is understandable that the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists does not necessarily hope to discard immediately the forms of public ownership that came into being in the previous course of the revolution, and it is impossible for them to do so. For if it does, it will not only meet with resistance from the Yugoslav working class and other politically conscious working people, but also lose its political stock-in-trade for deceiving its countrymen and befuddling world opinion, and so eventually lose its political capital for bargaining with US imperialism.

There is an acute contradiction between the degenerate policy of the Tito group and the desire of the Yugoslav people and loyal Communists inside the Yugoslav League of Communists to take the socialist road. This is why, to maintain its rule, the Tito group is willing to preserve certain forms of public ownership. Moreover, as long as the Tito group remains hostile to the international communist movement and to the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, the US imperialists may agree to the preservation of certain forms of public ownership in Yugoslavia and assume an attitude of “non-intervention.” Consider, for instance, what *US News & World Report* wrote in its issue of November 9, 1956: “In urging independent—but not necessarily capitalistic—governments in countries that are now Soviet satellites [the imperialists always talk this nonsense, referring to all the socialist countries

other than the Soviet Union as ‘satellites’—*Author*] the Eisenhower Administration is continuing its support of Titoism.” Discussing Yugoslavia’s function at a press conference on August 6, 1957, John Foster Dulles had this to say: “It is possible to have a communist regime without being dominated by what we call ‘international communism’ or a Soviet-type brand of communism.”

As Marxists see it, there is nothing strange in certain forms of public ownership being tolerated in a particular society which is governed by an exploiting class, so long as they do not harm, and may even help, the fundamental interests of that exploiting class. In feudal society, for instance, it is quite common for certain village communes, or certain forms of public ownership or autonomy to be preserved. In capitalist society, a joint stock company may be considered a kind of capitalist form of “public ownership” and some workers may even hold shares in it. Yet, as we all know, that does not prevent the capitalists from drawing their maximum profits; on the contrary, it adds to the capitalists’ assurance of maximum profits. After the October Revolution, the counter-revolutionaries at one time hoped to make use of the organizational form of Soviets—what they called “Soviets without Communists.” When collective farming was brought about in the Soviet Union, some counter-revolutionaries at one time similarly wanted to make use of the form of collective farms—what they called “collective farms without Communists.” On this point, Stalin rightly said: “Everything depends upon the content that is put into this form.”²⁵ All organizational forms, political or economic, remain mere organizational forms. The question is who runs them, who leads.

As Comrade Mao Zedong said in his speech *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*,²⁶ the revisionists, too, pay lip service to Marxism-Leninism. It is said that, in Yugoslavia, the Tito group permits people to hang up portraits of Marx and Lenin. This point needs to be seen from the same angle. What the Tito group is doing is to preserve a certain amount of Marxist phraseology while getting rid of its revolutionary content. In countries where the working class movement has a Marxist tradition

²⁵ Joseph Stalin, “Work in the Countryside” in *Problems of Leninism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1976, p. 641.

²⁶ Mao Zedong, “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. V, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 395.

behind it, revisionists and opportunists may accept a part of Marxist theory, and even the theory of the class struggle, where this accords with the interests of the bourgeoisie. Lenin said:

Those who recognize only the class struggle are not yet Marxists; they may be found to have gone no further than the boundaries of bourgeois reasoning and bourgeois politics. To limit Marxism to the theory of the class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to something which is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. A Marxist is one who extends the acceptance of the class struggle to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat.²⁷

But the Tito group has gone much further than those opportunists who accept the class struggle. It has even repudiated the class struggle, in order to fit in with the needs of the US imperialists.

The leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia declares that under no circumstances will it abandon its revisionist stand, that any attempt to get it to change its position is illusory and will be of no avail. It also declares that it will not stop its contention, that is to say, it will continue to challenge Marxism-Leninism. It can be seen therefore that it is impossible to cease this struggle. Is this struggle good for Marxism-Leninism? Comrade Mao Zedong has said that under specific conditions “bad things can be turned into good things.”²⁸ Things always develop dialectically. The program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is a concentrated expression of modern revisionism. It will serve as an example in reverse to educate the Yugoslav people and the Communists of the world and enable people to distinguish still more clearly between Marxism-Leninism and anti-Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism has always grown and developed by combating opportunism of every description. So long as Marxist-Leninists wage clear-cut, uncompromising struggle against modern revisionism, the international communist movement is bound to benefit.

²⁷ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, 2020, Paris, p. 34.

²⁸ Mao Zedong, “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People,” *op. cit.*, pp. 400-401.

Yugoslav Revisionism is Just What US Imperialism Needs

KANG SHENG

June 14, 1958

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, June 14, 1958, p. 5.

Translation: *In Refutation of Modern Revisionism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1958, pp. 50-62.

The attack on the Soviet Union and the international communist movement launched by the leading group of the League of Yugoslav Communists by means of the Leagued revisionist program and its Seventh Congress has been rebuffed, rightly and seriously, by the communist and workers' parties of various countries. Now an important struggle to safeguard the purity of Marxism-Leninism is unfolding. This struggle is of immense importance to the international communist movement and the just cause of safeguarding world peace.

To date, the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League has not given any valid answers to the criticisms made by the communist parties of various countries; nor can it do so. Its so-called answers are mere sophistry. For example, it describes its odious action in serving the US imperialists as an effort "to seek joint elements of the line of peace and international cooperation," and even claims this action coincides with the aims of Soviet foreign policy. It arbitrarily links two essentially different things: Yugoslavia's economic dependence on the United States and the Soviet Union's proposal to expand trade with the US. At the same time, it dismisses the serious and justified criticisms made by Marxist-Leninist parties of various countries as "interference in internal affairs" and "unprincipled attacks," "detrimental to world peace." But the facts speak louder than lies. Any objective observer can see that the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists by its policy of serving the US imperialists—planners of a new war—under the mask of socialism is playing a role particularly damaging to the just cause of defending world peace. Precisely for this reason, the US imperialists, who are hostile to the socialist camp and to peace, lavish praise on Yugoslavia.

Yugoslav revisionism has not arisen accidentally. Since the Second World War, socialism has grown into a new world system. To save capitalism from still deeper general crisis the US imperialists have been searching for a new tool from within the socialist countries, to add to the old revisionism—social democracy. They thought it would be ideal to find a “socialist” country with a Marxist-Leninist signboard, which can split the camp of socialism from within. John Foster Dulles has long been highly confident that the policy of the leading group in Yugoslavia fits the needs of the United States. Referring to Yugoslavia at a press conference on August 6 last year, he said: “It is possible to have a communist regime without being dominated by what we call ‘international communism’ or a Soviet-type brand of communism.” What this remark of Dulles means is: 1. The new tool needed by the US imperialists should be one that they do not consider as “international communism,” that is, it should have the “communist” label yet be against international communism. 2. This new tool must not be a “Soviet-type brand of communism,” that is, it should discard the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, depart from the trail blazed by the October Revolution and set itself against the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. 3. This new tool should be a “regime” controlled by a “communism” which embodies the foregoing two characteristics. This is particularly important, because only those revisionists who are in power in what was for a time a socialist country can effectively serve the imperialists today when socialism has become a world system. To Dulles, the ideal tool must fit these “specifications” and Yugoslav revisionism is just the thing.

US Big Business has spared no small investment in building up its Yugoslav revisionist tool. According to Senator Knowland, the US has given Tito’s government aid amounting to 1,500 million dollars (*Associated Press Washington* dispatch, March 20, 1958). It is well known that the Draft Program of the Yugoslav League of Communists, which runs to about 150,000 words, did not dare even once to use the term “US imperialism,” as though this were a “royal taboo.” The same is true of the pronouncements of the leading members of the Yugoslav Communist League. Take, for example, Tito’s version of the US plot of aggression against Syria last year. He said in his report at the Seventh National Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists: “The pressure exercised against Syria last year led to the speeding up of the unification of Egypt with Syria...” And regarding the US aggres-

sion in Indonesia, he said: "Similar developments took place in Indonesia. The young united republic of the peoples of Indonesia has through intrigues and interference in its internal affairs on the part of Western circles become the battlefield of civil war." In short, it seems that there is no such thing in the world as US imperialism. The question arises: If a self-styled Marxist-Leninist party in analyzing the current world situation does not even dare to point to the existence of US imperialism, what does this indicate other than US dollar influence?

A great many statesmen and political commentators in many capitalist countries that stand for peace and neutrality, such as India, Indonesia and the United Arab Republic, it should be pointed out, do not call themselves Marxist-Leninists, yet they dare to condemn the policy of aggression of US imperialism.

The leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League goes to great lengths to deny that its Program fits the needs of the imperialists, particularly the US imperialists. But the facts speak louder than eloquent words. A brief review of some of the historical events in the past few years clearly shows the ugly face of the Yugoslav revisionists and how they play the game of the US imperialists.

Firstly, during the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary, the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists played the role of instigator and interventionist. It openly called the counter-revolutionary uprising a revolution and supported it. It gave encouragement and support to the "Workers' Councils" which were in the hands of the counter-revolutionaries and engaged in activities hostile to the worker-peasant revolutionary government. It maintained close ties with the renegade Nagy group, openly sheltered Nagy and other counterrevolutionaries and made the Yugoslav Embassy in Hungary a haven for these counter-revolutionaries. Only because the leading comrades of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, during and after the suppression of the uprising, maintained a consistently principled, correct stand did its scheming come to nothing and it was compelled to give ostensible support to the Hungarian Government headed by Comrade János Kádár. But to this very day, the attitude of the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists on this question still harmonizes with that of the imperialists, particularly the US imperialists. Time and again, the US imperialists have tried to drag the so-called "Hungarian ques-

tion” on to the agenda of the United Nations, in the vain hope of making a breach in Hungary by means of the United Nations, which is under their control. And Tito too, in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, said that “Yugoslavia exerted efforts in the UN for a settlement of this question.” Is this not enough to show that the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League advocates precisely what the US imperialists need?

Secondly, in the speech he made at Pula in November 1956, Tito joined in the anti-Soviet, anti-communist campaign launched by the imperialists taking advantage of the Hungarian events. In that speech he attacked almost all the socialist countries and the communist parties of many countries, and proclaimed that Yugoslavia would work in various ways for the victory in the communist and workers’ parties of various countries of “the trend” which “began in Yugoslavia,” so as to defeat the so-called “Stalinist course.” In the Yugoslav press, they also attacked the leadership of many communist and workers’ parties and encouraged the revisionist elements to carry out splitting activities. The US imperialists were highly appreciative of these activities. Walter Lippmann, mouthpiece of the US bourgeoisie, stated at the time that it was in the “true interest” of the US to make what he called “Tito-ism” “prevail” in the socialist countries (*Washington Post*, October 30, 1956). At secret talks among leaders of the US Senate, James P. Richards also expressed the view that “it is to the advantage of our country, as well as the entire free world, to encourage Tito and other communist dissenters like him.” (*New York Post*, December 31, 1956.) We would like to ask the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist League: Since the US imperialists describe your “ism” as in their true interests, does this not mean that your “ism” suits their needs? You say this kind of talk by the Americans does not count; if so, why do you never regard it as an “insult” and repudiate it?

Thirdly, in November 1957, the leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists, betraying the agreement reached at the Soviet-Yugoslav talks in Rumania, refused to take part in the Moscow Meeting of the communist and workers’ parties of the Socialist Countries or to sign the Declaration of that meeting. They announced that this was because the Moscow Declaration “contains certain attitudes and appraisals which are contrary to the standpoint of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and which it considers to be incorrect.” For this action, they immediately earned the praise of

the US imperialists. An *Agence France Presse* report of November 22, 1957, said:

There were clear signs that the Yugoslav attitude caused great interest in the State Department. The prevailing impression in Washington was that Yugoslav President Marshal Josip Broz Tito had once again insisted on demonstrating his independence from the communist bloc.

On December 8, 1957 Tito received James W. Riddleberger, US Ambassador to Yugoslavia. *The New York Times* wrote on the following day that Tito “did mention Yugoslavia’s refusal to sign the Declaration as further proof of her continued independence.” This was immediately followed by a huge US loan to Yugoslavia and the signing of an agreement for the supply of 62.5 million dollars’ worth of American surplus farm produce to Yugoslavia.

On the refusal of the League to attend the Moscow Meeting of the communist and workers’ parties of the Socialist Countries and to sign the Declaration of that meeting, there is an article by Immanuel Birnbaum, a bourgeois commentator who has quite a few contacts with the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists. The article appeared in the first number of *The Problems of Communism* this year, a magazine published by the US Information Agency and expressed many views that are well worth noting. Using the statements of the leading group of the League as its basis, the article analyzed the true reasons behind the refusal to attend the Moscow Meeting and sign its Declaration. The writer said:

Belgrade could not agree to the two basic theses put forward in the Declaration, namely that the entire blame for the continuation of international tension rests on the shoulders of the West, and that the only way to prevent a world catastrophe is for all countries under communist rule to stand solidly united in support of the Moscow policy and leadership.

Judging by the Draft Program of the League and the speeches made by the leaders of the League at its Seventh Congress, this appraisal by Birnbaum is true to the facts. The article added: “It is important that, at a time when Moscow is seeking once more to tighten its reins over the other segments of the communist world, at least one country professing to be a disciple of Lenin refuses to submit.” The persistence of the leading group of the Yugo-

slav League of Communists in its “independence from the communist bloc” is just what the US imperialists need; the two “basic theses” opposed by the leading group of the League are exactly what the US imperialists have resolutely opposed. Does not this standpoint of the leading group of the League fit the needs of the US imperialists exactly?

Fourthly, the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists issued its out-and-out revisionist program in opposition to the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting at a time when the east wind prevails over the west wind and the United States is experiencing an acute economic crisis. At the Seventh Congress of the League, it went out of its way to defend and curry favor with the US imperialists, and to unscrupulously attack the socialist camp; and on a series of questions, it issued most absurd statements, counter to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism but suited to the needs of US imperialism. This is true of its analysis of the present international situation, and its statements on the question of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, the question of the leading role of the communist party and the so-called question of “opposing dogmatism.”

For example, Eisenhower defamed the Soviet Union as being a “strongly armed imperialistic dictatorship” (1957 State of the Union message); and the Draft Program of the Yugoslav League of Communists also attacked the Soviet Union as being a “hegemony.” Dulles attacked the foreign policies of the Soviet Union and the camp of socialism as a “major threat” to the entire world (October 1957 issue of the US *Foreign Affairs* quarterly); and in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, Tito similarly slandered them as proceeding from a “power policy” and “big power principles.” Tito went so far as to allege that it was “owing to Stalin’s inflexible and uncalled for threatening foreign policy” that the US had engaged in arms expansion and war preparations, established military blocs and maneuvered to conclude the North Atlantic Treaty. Eisenhower and Dulles have been attacking the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements all the time; the Draft Program of the Yugoslav League of Communists also openly opposes these agreements.

Again, the imperialists have always tried deliberately to confuse the fundamental differences between the two systems of socialism and capitalism in order to benumb the revolutionary consciousness of the working class. Eisenhower said that since the government in a capitalist country “controls”

part of the “economic life” of the bourgeoisie, “such things can, of course, in the long run lead to communism, but we have had this same kind of thing inherent in our form of government for many years.” (Reply to the correspondent of the *New York Herald Tribune* at a press conference on June 5, 1957.) The Draft Program of the Yugoslav League of Communists also stresses so-called “factors of socialism” in the capitalist countries, saying that in this type of country “the specific forms of state capitalist relations may either be the ultimate effort made by capitalism to survive, or the first step towards socialism, or may, at the same time, be both the one and the other.”

Again, the imperialists hold the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular hatred. In a speech delivered at the annual luncheon of the Associated Press on April 22, 1957, Dulles reviled proletarian dictatorship as “despotism,” alleging that “those who are subject to it in vast majority, hate the system and yearn for a free society”; the Draft Program of the Yugoslav League of Communists also attacks the state of proletarian dictatorship as so-called “bureaucracy,” “bureaucratic statism,” and “monopolists,” alleging that it “strives to transform the state apparatus into the master of society instead of being its servant and executive agent,” stresses so-called “antagonisms” between the socialist state and the masses, and trumpets a crudely distorted theory of “the withering away of the state” in order to undermine proletarian dictatorship in the countries of the camp of socialism.

Again, the imperialists, in order to suppress the workers’ movement in their own countries, often smear the communist parties in these countries as being “under the domination of a single power, international communism, acting under the direction of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union” (Dulles’ statement at the Ministerial Council of the Baghdad Pact on January 27, 1958). And in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, Tito also slandered the Marxist parties in various countries as conducting “dependent policies” and being “accustomed to receiving and implementing directives coming from outside.” The Draft Program of the Yugoslav League of Communists even tries to induce the workers in the US and some other capitalist countries to renounce the communist parties. It alleges that:

It is most probable that—in the countries where classical political parties of the working class are practically non-existent, as in

the United States, for example—the working people organized in trade unions [can strengthen] its leading role in the system of government.

Again, the imperialists often attack Marxism-Leninism by making use of so-called “opposition to dogmatism,” twaddling that “international communism has become beset with doctrinaire difficulties” and the label communism as “unimaginative” (Dulles’ address at the annual luncheon of the Associated Press on April 22, 1957) and the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists also does all it can to defame fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism as “dogmas.” Preposterously asserting that “Marxist thought in the course of the last few decades has not kept in step with the advance of contemporary society,” and that some people “attempt to turn it into a static collection of stale dogmas and abstract truths.” The leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists, moreover, style themselves as “uncompromising towards all kinds of dogmatism” and persistently advocate that “the roads leading to socialism differ” in an attempt to negate the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism and the general laws of achieving victories in revolution and construction by the communist parties in all countries.

Even more absurd is the fact that Tito showered praise and eulogy on the United States at the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, although all the ferocity of the US imperialists has been exposed in its true colors. According to him, US relations with Yugoslavia are based on “mutual respect, cooperation on an equal basis and non-interference in internal affairs. If there were certain attempts that were not in line with these principles, they usually came from individuals or groups and not from the US Government.” In tones of profound gratitude, Tito praised US aid as having helped Yugoslavia surmount colossal difficulties. It is indeed a “creative exploit,” unparalleled in history, that people who style themselves Communists and revolutionaries should, at their Party Congress, pay tribute to the US imperialists—the most ferocious enemy of the people throughout the world. This is presumably the “creative contribution” which the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists often boast they have made to the international communist cause!

The US imperialists have warmly applauded the Draft Program of the Yugoslav League of Communists and its Seventh Congress, C. Burke Elbrick, US Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, said at a hearing before

the Foreign Relations Committee of the US Senate that Tito was “doing a pretty good job.” Viewing the recent activities of the Yugoslav Communist League the imperialist, press of the United States went into raptures. “The incident illustrates once more Yugoslavia’s unique value as an independent center of attraction in the communist world,” said the editorial of the *Christian Science Monitor* on April 24, 1958. “His (Tito’s) latest outburst cannot fail to have an upsetting effect on Soviet foreign policy. The West stands to profit from all this,” said the *US Newsweek* on May 5, 1958.

The Yugoslav revisionists are very annoyed to hear others say that they are serving the US imperialists. Of course, they will be welcomed if they really come round to a revolutionary standpoint against US imperialism. But they have no intention whatever of changing their stand, though they accuse people who are telling the truth of having “abused” and “insulted” them. Yugoslav papers have recently repeated what Tito said at the Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists showing stubborn adherence to the revisionist standpoint, that “any expectation in any quarter that we shall renounce our principled stands both in international and in internal matters, is only a loss of time.” The modern revisionists have curried favor with the US imperialists by this kind of reactionary stubbornness.

The struggle against modern revisionism has just begun. It is essential that the banner we raise in this serious struggle stands out clearly. We stand firmly on principle and shall carry the struggle to the end. The leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists shall not be allowed to impair the great cause of Marxism-Leninism.

In Refutation of Modern Revisionism's Reactionary Theory of the State

WANG JIAXIANG

June 16, 1958

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, 1958, No. 2, pp. 9-16.

Translation: *In Refutation of Modern Revisionism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1958, pp. 63-81.

The *Renmin Ribao* editorial "Modern Revisionism Must Be Repudiated"²⁹ pointed out that one of the fundamental points in modern revisionism, as typified by the program put forward by the leading group in Yugoslavia, is its substitution of the reactionary theory of the state standing above classes for the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state.

The imperialists have always sought to cover up the nature of the state as a class dictatorship in order to wreck the revolutionary working-class movement. They describe the state under bourgeois dictatorship as "standing above classes," "belonging to the whole people" and "democratic," and slander the state under proletarian dictatorship as "totalitarian" and undermining democracy. Now that socialism and imperialism stand out in sharp contrast, with socialism in the ascendant like the sun rising and imperialism in murky decline, the working people under capitalist rule are turning towards socialism increasingly, the imperialists' lies are more than ever losing their power to deceive and the anticommunist nonsense of the Social Democrats is proving more and more incapable of helping the imperialists. It is at such a time that the Yugoslav revisionists, donning the cloak of Marxism-Leninism, have come forward to serve imperialism, particularly US imperialism, by peddling the bourgeois theory of the state standing above classes, so as to repay US imperialism for its reward of large sums of American dollars.

State power in an imperialist country is a means of serving the handful of monopoly capitalists and exercising dictatorship over the overwhelming majority of the people. Yet the Yugoslav revisionists are at great pains to conceal the dictatorship character of the imperialist state power. They say

²⁹ See p. 57 of this volume.

that in the capitalist world “the state increasingly controls the activities of capital” and “restricts the role of private capital,” that “the role of the state as that of a regulator also grows” (Draft Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia) and that “the state is no longer the apparatus of a certain class in capitalist society; it no longer reflects or upholds the special interests of that class” (“Has Capitalism Changed?” by R. I., October 1956 issue of the Yugoslav magazine *The Truth About Us*). Glorifying imperialist state power in such a fashion, are they not toeing the line of the imperialists?

The outstanding feature of our age is the transition from capitalism to socialism. Through revolution in one form or another, the working class must smash the bourgeois state apparatus, set up the proletarian state apparatus and replace bourgeois dictatorship by proletarian dictatorship. Marxist-Leninists, therefore, have always held that seizure of state power is the crucial question in the proletarian revolution. Using sophistry, the Yugoslav revisionists insist that state capitalism in the capitalist countries is a “factor of socialism,” that socialism is taking form within the capitalist system, and that the bourgeois state apparatus is also changing in this direction. Consequently, there is no need for the working class to carry out proletarian revolution, to smash the bourgeois state apparatus or to set up its own state apparatus. They claim that by “exercising incessant pressure” on the bourgeois state apparatus and working to “exert a decisive influence” in it, the working class will be able to “secure the development of socialism.” They are spreading this nonsense about “peaceful evolution” from capitalism to socialism in order to create ideological confusion within the ranks of the revolutionary working-class movement, to paralyze, corrode and sap the revolutionary will-power of the working class and communist parties in the capitalist countries, and to prevent proletarian revolution. This being so, what trace of Marxism-Leninism do they show, what markings other than those of an accomplice of the imperialists?

Since the Great October Revolution, one-third of mankind has smashed the bourgeois state apparatus and established their own states of proletarian dictatorship. The proletarian dictatorship in these countries is fundamentally different in nature from dictatorship by all exploiting classes. It is the dictatorship of the exploited class, the dictatorship of the many over the few, dictatorship for the building of socialist society free from exploitation of man by man. It is the most progressive, and also the last, dictatorship in human

history which is undertaking the greatest and most difficult historic task of eliminating classes, and it is forging ahead in conditions of most complex struggle, along the most tortuous road ever known in human history. With a history of only forty years, it is impossible for the dictatorship of the proletariat to avoid making some partial mistake or another, in the course of its advance. Whatever the mistakes, since proletarian dictatorship is the system of the people themselves, it will learn from mistakes and correct them by itself. But the Yugoslav revisionists, following the imperialist reactionaries, venomously attack the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. They call the state system of the socialist countries "bureaucracy and bureaucratic statism." They fiercely attack the communist parties in the socialist countries for holding the leading position and exercising the leading role in the life of the state and slander direct leadership and supervision by the communist parties in these countries over the work of the state as giving rise to "the growth of bureaucracy in the Party" and "statism." A mere glance shows that the weapons used by the Yugoslav revisionists against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries come from the arsenals of the imperialists. It is just because they brandish these antiquated weapons in the name of "Communists," with the status of a "socialist country," and under the cloak of Marxism-Leninism, that they win special approval and plaudits from the US imperialists.

All the classical writings of Marxism-Leninism show that socialist state power is the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e. the proletariat organizing itself as the ruling class. After seizing power, the proletariat must exercise dictatorship through its own state apparatus over the vanquished exploiting classes, carry on the class struggle in the new conditions and solve the problem of whether the socialist road or the capitalist road will win out, so as to eliminate classes. But the Yugoslav revisionists maintain that socialist state power should not be an instrument of force, should not exercise dictatorship over the class enemy and should not conduct struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads. At the same time, they make no little fuss about the so-called question of democracy, attacking the socialist countries under the pretext of promoting "democracy." Tito has manufactured the pretext that "we are always emphatically against regarding the proletarian dictatorship as mere force," as though there were only dictatorship and no democracy in the socialist countries. Since the class enemy still exists in the period of tran-

sition, and there are antagonistic contradictions between them and the proletariat, contradictions between the enemy and ourselves, dictatorship must be exercised if such contradictions are to be resolved. As to democracy, all democracy is merely a form of class rule. Democracy that is divorced from proletarian dictatorship can never be democracy under the socialist system. In essence, bourgeois democracy is dictatorship by the few over the great majority, the working people, while proletarian dictatorship means democracy for the great majority, the working people. Either the enemy wipes us out or vice versa; either bourgeois democracy or proletarian democracy. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a unity of dictatorship and democracy. Comrade Mao Zedong once said: "Democracy for the people and dictatorship over the reactionaries, when combined, constitutes the people's democratic dictatorship;"³⁰ "dictatorship does not apply in the ranks of the people. The people cannot possibly exercise dictatorship over themselves; nor should one section of them oppress another section"; "under the people's democratic dictatorship, two different methods—dictatorial and democratic—should be used to resolve the two kinds of contradiction of different nature—those between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people."³¹ By opposing democracy to dictatorship while chattering about abstract democracy, denying the necessity of dictatorship over the class enemy, the necessity of struggle between the socialist and the capitalist roads, the Yugoslav revisionists are simply trying to create confusion within the socialist countries in coordination with the subversive activities conducted against these countries by the imperialist countries.

Under the pretext that Stalin had made individual mistakes on the question of proletarian dictatorship, the Yugoslav revisionists exultantly exaggerated these mistakes to attack the proletarian dictatorship in the socialist countries. It never occurs to them that in doing so they are simply showing their revisionist colors. True, Stalin once made the appraisal that, as a rule, class struggle in the transitional period "grows increasingly acute," and this appraisal, interpreted as continuous expansion of the class struggle, can bring detrimental results to the socialist cause. But this does not mean that

³⁰ Mao Zedong, "On People's Democratic Dictatorship" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 420.

³¹ Mao Zedong, "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. V, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 371, 375.

to correct this mistake one must deny the class struggle in the transitional period, the struggle to decide whether socialism or capitalism will win. The facts show that the class struggle to decide which will win out continues not only throughout the initial stage of the proletarian dictatorship when capitalist ownership is being eliminated and socialist ownership established, but also on the political and ideological fronts, after the question of ownership has been completely solved. In the struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism, there are contradictions between the enemy and ourselves and contradictions among the people. Sometimes, of course, the class struggle in the transitional period is tense and at other times relaxed, marked by ups and downs. At one stage, the situation may tend for a while to relaxation after the proletariat wins a round in battle and the class enemy is forced to retreat. But the class enemy is never resigned to extinction and will, in given conditions, launch fresh attacks on socialism. These ups and downs in the class struggle will repeat themselves many times over a period. Nevertheless, with the advance of the socialist revolution and socialist construction, the general trend is towards the gradual weakening of the class struggle until it dies out. The Yugoslav revisionists deny this objective law and spread the slander that the socialist countries aggravate the social contradictions by means of the power of the state. What interpretation can be placed on this other than that they are helping the imperialists and opposing proletarian dictatorship and the elimination of classes?

The Yugoslav revisionists particularly attack as the source of all evils, the democratic centralism practiced in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. They deceitfully drag in the experience of the "Paris Commune" and distort the lessons drawn from it by Karl Marx as being the elimination of centralism. This is an insult to Marx and to the French proletariat who raised the banner of the Paris Commune. As Lenin said, "there is no departure whatever from centralism," in Marx's summing up of the experience of the Paris Commune.³² In the socialist countries it is democracy, i.e. democratic centralism, not dictatorship, that is practiced among the people. Among the people, democracy and centralism, decentralization and centralization of power—these are unities of opposites. Democracy means democracy under centralized guidance, not extreme democratization; centralism means centralism based on democracy, not absolute centralization.

³² V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 53.

Decentralization means apportionment of power under unified leadership, not anarchy; centralization means concentration of power on the basis of bringing into play the activity and initiative of the lower organizations and the rank and file, not absolute centralization which restricts and hampers this activity and initiative. It is wrong to emphasize one aspect to the denial of the other. True, over-centralization or over-decentralization may occur in the course of socialist construction owing to lack of experience. But this is only a question of how democratic centralism is applied, not an inevitable result of proletarian dictatorship. In slandering centralism in the proletarian states, the Yugoslav revisionists merely reveal their ulterior motives in attacking the socialist countries. As to the so-called "social self-government," which they assert to be an absolute boon, it is enough to quote what Engels said: "It is absurd to speak of the principle of authority as being absolutely evil, and of the principle of autonomy as being absolutely good."³³ And, as Engels pointed out, whoever sticks to this absurd concept is actually serving the reactionaries.

The Yugoslav revisionists are particularly energetic in attacking the management of economic affairs by the socialist state. According to them, if the proletarian state authority manages the national economy, the state becomes a means of hamstringing the development of socialism. This is extraordinary logic. Has there ever existed a state that does not manage economic affairs? So long as the state exists it must manage economic affairs in one way or another. The queerest part of the logic is this—when the Yugoslav revisionists talk about the tightening of economic control exercised by the state authority in the imperialist countries they see nothing wrong in this. On the contrary, they spare no words to eulogize and glorify this as a "factor of socialism." Yet when they come to the economic control exercised by the state authority in the socialist countries, they roundly condemn it and smear it as "the source of bureaucracy and bureaucratic statism." Is this not revealing as to the reactionary nature of the Yugoslav revisionists' attack on state management of the economy in the socialist countries? In the classical works of Marxism-Leninism it is pointed out, time and again, that the proletarian state, as the representative of society, must organize the socialist economy. Why must the proletarian state manage the economy? The reasons

³³ K. Marx, F. Engels, "On Authority" in *Selected Works in Two Volumes*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1955, Vol. I, p. 637.

are: 1—to wage the struggle between the two roads to secure the triumph of the socialist road over the capitalist road; 2—to carry through the class line and the class policies of the proletariat in all economic work; and 3—taking the interests of the whole country and all the people into consideration, to ensure the planned, proportionate development of the socialist national economy in accordance with the objective laws of socialist economic development. Precisely as a result of planned state management of the national economy, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have made tremendous achievements in their economic construction. It goes without saying that in the state management of the economy there should be a proper division of function and coordination between the central and local authorities. Unified control and planning by the central authorities must be correctly linked with the activity and initiative of the local authorities and the masses. But whatever the way in which the central and local authorities divide their work of economic management, and however the working people play their part in this management, this is a question of concrete forms of economic management. It is not a question of whether to abolish the proletarian state's function of economic management. What meaning can there be in the Yugoslav revisionists' talk about abolishing the economic function of the proletarian state? Apart from its trickery to mislead people, it simply means undermining and abolishing the economic foundations of the proletarian state, i.e. socialist ownership by the whole people; doing away with planned economy; throwing overboard the proletarian class line and class policy of socialist economic development; abolishing the unified leadership and supervision which the proletariat exercises over the socialist economy through the communist party and the state apparatus; restoring capitalist methods of administration and management; and preserving and restoring freedom for the bourgeoisie to facilitate its comeback.

In repudiating the Yugoslav revisionist theory of the state it is necessary to touch on the contradictions within socialist society. Some of our comrades at one time held that in socialist society there were no contradictions between the relations of production and productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic base; and so they denied the existence of contradictions among the people in socialist society, or contradictions between the people's government as the apparatus of the state power and the masses. This was a metaphysical viewpoint. If this viewpoint guides national

construction in the socialist countries, it is impossible to overcome these contradictions in good time, to make the socialist relations of production conform better to the growth of the productive forces and the socialist state structure conform better to the development of the economic base; and it becomes impossible to further develop the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state in the light of the rich experience gathered from practice. But the Yugoslav revisionists regard the contradictions within socialist society as primarily those between the state power and the working people; they then allege that these contradictions are antagonistic and maintain that the existence of the state is the source of these antagonistic contradictions. In fact, contrary to the Yugoslav revisionist nonsense, the antagonistic contradictions which exist in the socialist countries are those between the masses of the people led by the proletariat and their class enemies who oppose socialism. It is not that proletarian dictatorship breeds antagonistic contradictions, but that proletarian dictatorship is necessary to resolve them. To attack the socialist countries, the Yugoslav revisionists mix up contradictions among the people in the socialist countries with contradictions between ourselves and the enemy; they also mix up contradictions in the socialist system with those in the capitalist social system. Comrade Mao Zedong, in his essay *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, creatively developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state. He pointed out that the internal contradictions in the socialist system of society are fundamentally different from those in the capitalist system of society. In socialist society, contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic base, are non antagonistic. The people's government representing the people's interests and the masses of the people are united as one. By contrast, irreconcilable and antagonistic class contradictions exist between a government of the exploiting class and the people. The contradictions between the people's government and the masses are those within the ranks of the people; underlying them is the basic identity of the interests of the people; and therefore they are non antagonistic. They can be overcome and resolved by the socialist system itself. By magnifying them and labelling them antagonistic contradictions, the Yugoslav revisionists serve no purpose other than to besmirch proletarian dictatorship.

For the purpose of attacking the socialist countries, the Yugoslav revisionists, on grounds of their own fabrication, describe the socialist state sys-

tem as the source of “bureaucracy” and maintain that as long as the socialist state system exists, bureaucracy will “continue to manifest itself as a tendency.” Everyone knows that bureaucracy is a product of the state apparatus of exploiting class rule. The bureaucracy that exists in the party and state organizations in a socialist country is a hangover from the old society rather than a product of the socialist system or of the communist party. Such bureaucracy is totally incompatible with the political party of the working class and with the socialist state system. The history of proletarian dictatorship proves that only the socialist state system can effectively overcome bureaucracy; because only it can bring into full play the initiative and activity of the masses, and only when this is done can there be elimination of bureaucracy, a product of the influence of the old society. In other words, the conquest of bureaucracy demands reliance on the masses and resolute struggle against the influence of bourgeois ideology. This struggle needs on the one hand leadership from above to help the government functionaries carry out continuous ideological remolding, to correct their erroneous ways of thinking and doing things and to improve their methods of work; on the other hand, the struggle requires mobilization of the masses from the bottom up, the raising of their cultural level and political consciousness, the application of effective mass supervision over the state organs, and leading the masses to fight against bureaucracy. Our country's experience also gives proof of this point. In the nation-wide rectification campaign, we have found the method suited to the conditions of our country, during which we mobilize the masses fully to practice criticism and self-criticism, according to the “unity—criticism—unity” formula, by encouraging a full and frank airing of views, great debates and the posting of dazibao.³⁴ As a result, the democratic life of our socialist society has achieved a mighty leap forward. Here we may well ask: Dare the Yugoslav revisionists practice democracy on so broad a scale?

The Yugoslav revisionists also attack the leading role of the communist parties in the socialist countries. They deny that the communist party is the highest form of organization of the working class and, on the pretext of opposing “a fusion of the organizations of Communists with the state apparatus,” insist that it is not right for the party to exercise direct leadership

³⁴ Opinions and criticisms written in bold Chinese characters on large sheets of paper, publicly posted for all to see.—*Ed.*

and supervision over the state. They maintain that the inevitable outcome of “an ever closer merging of the party and state apparatus” is the “growth of bureaucracy” in the party. Lenin’s doctrine on party building stresses that the communist party is the highest form of organization of the working class and only the political party of the working class, that is, the communist party, can give political leadership to the proletariat and, through the proletariat, unite all the working masses to carry out proletarian dictatorship; “without this the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible.” (Lenin: *Preliminary Draft of the Resolution of the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party on the Syndicalist and Anarchist Deviation in Our Party*)³⁵ This truth has been borne out by practice in the socialist states. The primary lesson taught by the history of proletarian dictatorship is that the proletarian cause of revolution and construction cannot advance a step without a communist party that takes Marxism-Leninism as its guide to action, builds itself on the principle of democratic centralism, establishes close ties with the masses, strives to become the very heart of the working people and educates its members and the masses of the people in Marxism-Leninism. In the course of socialist revolution and socialist construction, the Party must play the leading role, as regards both the general line and policy of building socialism and the line and policy for the socialist state; there must therefore be no separation between the Party and the government. It would be absolutely wrong to separate the Party from the government and thus leave the government outside the leadership of the Communist Party. Of course, the Party and the government must do their work in different ways; the Party does not have to take on the routine work of the government organizations. But in all circumstances, the fundamental guarantee that the countries of our socialist camp will unite the people to vanquish the enemy is the strengthening of leadership by the communist Party in the cause of socialism and over the organs of the State. The Yugoslav revisionists flagrantly reject Lenin’s doctrine on party building and do their utmost to attack the communist parties of the socialist countries; yet they still call themselves communists to parade before and deceive people. What impudence!

Externally, the leading group in Yugoslavia follows a foreign policy of praising the United States and slandering the Soviet Union, which suits the needs of the imperialists; internally, it follows a policy of dispensing with

³⁵ V. I. Lenin, “Tenth Congress of the RCP(B)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXII.

the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads, undermining the economic foundations of socialism and allowing capitalist relations and the American way of life to overrun the country freely. These are clear indications of the degeneration and betrayal on the part of the leading group in Yugoslavia. In this way, an irreconcilable contradiction arises between this leading group and the Yugoslav people. The leading group in Yugoslavia has neither the desire nor the courage to take down their signboard of "socialists" and "communists" altogether; for if they did, they would encounter strong opposition from the Yugoslav people, their usefulness as saboteurs of the socialist camp would come to an end and they would no longer receive rewards from the US imperialists. This is why they go on, as the Chinese saying puts it, selling dog's meat under a sheep's head, trying to get rewards from the imperialists while endeavoring to hoodwink the people at home and smooth away their discontent, and cover up their degeneration and betrayal. This is also why they have patched up many Marxist phrases into their hocus-pocus theory of the "withering away of the state."

This out-and-out revisionist theory of the withering away of the state argues that it is necessary for the role of the state under proletarian dictatorship to wither away in all fields of social life; but in actual fact, it aims to "wither away" the function of the socialist state in the exercise of dictatorship over the class enemy, the system of democratic centralism among the people, the role of the state in managing the socialist economy, and the leading role of the Communist Party in the State. In short, what they hope 'to wither away is socialism and communism. In their opinion, if the socialist countries fail to do this, it means "pragmatic revision" in the theory of the withering away of the state, and will give rise to "manifestations of bureaucratic-statist tendencies" and "fetter the development of social and economic factors." But, if the socialist countries really do as they suggest, it will simply facilitate the imperialist sabotage and subversive activities against the socialist countries, it will simply lead to a repetition of the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary and the restoration of capitalism. This indeed is the real motive behind the efforts by the modern revisionists of Yugoslavia to sell abroad the theory of the "withering away of the state."

It is reasonable to ask how this out-and-out anti-Marxist-Leninist theory of the "withering away of the state" is applied inside Yugoslavia. There, the main apparatus of the state—the police, the law courts, the armed forces

and the other punitive organs—so far from being weakened and withered away, are being greatly strengthened. As the Yugoslav leading group wants to maintain and consolidate its dictatorial rule, it is using the state apparatus to oppress those in opposition. Last year, more than thirty thousand Yugoslav workers (constituting 4,3 percent of all the workers in the country) were victimized and expelled for criticizing the leadership. Reuter reported recently that mass arrests are being made in Yugoslavia of people opposed to the reactionary policies of the leading group. At the same time, the leading group is trying to deceive the people with such stuff as “social self-government” and “workers’ self-government,” falsely claiming that the state is in the course of “withering away.” In fact, its perverted measures have driven the socialist cause of the Yugoslav people to the dangerous brink of “withering away.” For home consumption, the modern revisionists’ theory of the “withering away of the state” is nothing but a fig-leaf to cover up their degeneration and betrayal.

We Chinese Communists, like other Marxists throughout the world, genuinely advocate the theory of the withering away of the state. Basing himself on Marxist-Leninist theory, Comrade Mao Zedong has said that the conditions for the withering away of the state are, internally, the elimination of classes and class influence and, externally, the elimination of the imperialist system. As the internal class struggle grows gradually weaker until it finally dies out, the suppressive function of the state will naturally diminish and move in the direction of withering away. This is a long-term, natural course of development. At the same time, the external conditions should not be overlooked; moreover, external and internal conditions act on each other. Lenin said:

The economic basis for the complete withering away of the state is such a high stage of development of communism that the antithesis between mental and physical labor disappears when there, consequently, disappears one of the principal sources of modern social inequality—a source, moreover, which cannot on any account be removed immediately by the mere conversion of the means of production into public property, by the mere expropriation of the capitalists.³⁶

³⁶ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

Therefore, the duration of the process during which the state withers away “depends upon the rapidity of development of the higher phase of communism.” (Ibid.)³⁷ There is nothing in common between the Marxist-Leninist theory of the withering away of the state and the reactionary fallacy of the Yugoslav revisionists concerning the withering away of the state.

While harping on their so-called theory of the “withering away of the state,” the Yugoslav revisionists center their attack on Stalin by means of every venomous invective at their disposal. They vilify Stalin for making a “pragmatic revision” in the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state and turning the Marxist-Leninist theory of the withering away of the state into the thesis that the state “does not wither away, but keeps strengthening in all fields of social life.” The rich experience of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Communist Party in proletarian dictatorship and in building the socialist state is of world significance. Stalin was entirely correct in setting forth the functions of the state in regard to suppression, economic management and the education of the small producers, and also in saying that the withering away of the state will begin with the natural and gradual withering away of the function of suppression, while the economic function will go on as a social function. As the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party has pointed out, he was mistaken on some particular aspects of the question of the state, yet Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist, a staunch, indomitable fighter in the struggles against the enemy. The modern revisionists of Yugoslavia, who have become traitors to the working class, are utterly incapable of making a fair and just appraisal of Stalin. They make the calumny that a so-called “rule of one man” was practiced in the Soviet Union. To this we may answer in Lenin’s words: “To contrast, in general, dictatorship of the masses to dictatorship of the leaders is ridiculously absurd and stupid. What is particularly curious is that actually, new leaders are put forth (under cover of the slogan: ‘Down with the leaders!’) who talk unnatural stuff and nonsense.”³⁸ The new leader that the Yugoslav revisionists want to put forth is no other than a new Bernstein who has betrayed Marxism-Leninism and capitulated to US imperialism.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 95.

³⁸ V. I. Lenin, *“Left-Wing” Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, pp. 30-31.

From what has been said above, it is clear that the fallacies of the Yugoslav revisionists concerning the nature of the bourgeois state, the transition from capitalism to socialism, the nature and functions of the socialist state and the “withering away” of the state are out-and-out reactionary. We must resolutely smash this revisionism in order to defend the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state.

The More They Try to Hide, the More They Are Exposed—On Tito's Speech of June 15³⁹

“*RENMIN RIBAO*” COMMENTATOR

June 26, 1958

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, June 26, 1958, p. 1.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, July 1, 1958, Vol. I, No. 18, pp. 6-9.

Tito delivered a speech on June 15 at Labin. Aside from new slanders against the communist parties of various countries, this speech provided no answer whatever to the serious criticisms and repudiations of Yugoslav revisionism they have made. Tito was completely silent on such basic questions as: On what grounds did the League of Communists of Yugoslavia betray the Peace Manifesto it signed and put forward entirely contrary viewpoints about the international situation in its program? What made it necessary for the League of Communists of Yugoslavia to defame in its program and at its Congress the socialist system and glorify the capitalist system, to attack the Soviet Union, the socialist countries and the communist parties of various countries, to attack the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam Agreements while defending and lauding US imperialism, the common enemy of all the peoples of the world? When the socialist countries were exerting every effort to improve their relations with Yugoslavia (in fact such efforts continued right up to the eve of the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav Communist League, and the Hungarian-Yugoslav talks, for instance, were held in March 1958), why was the Yugoslav Communist League so keen on repaying good with evil?

No doubt there are reasons for this. But it is difficult to state them. So the only explanation Tito could offer to the Yugoslav people was that the communist parties of other countries oppose the program of the Yugoslav Communist League not because it is an out-and-out revisionist and anti-Marxist-Leninist program, but because of certain schemes organized long ago, because the Yugoslav Communist League refused to participate in the meet-

³⁹ This commentary appeared in *Renmin Ribao* on June 26, 1958. In addition to the commentary, the same issue of *Renmin Ribao* published the full text of Tito's Labin speech of June 15.

ing of the communist parties of twelve countries and in the socialist camp, and because, getting to the root of the problem, it is “against division of the world into camps.” In this way, it seemed as if all arguments of principle concerning their revisionist program could be written off at one stroke.

This is precisely the characteristic tactic of all opportunists.

But this method of Tito’s, to evade the point at issue, has not been successful. The principle at issue still cannot be avoided and to cover the matter up by “stuffing the ears while stealing a bell” only makes it more obvious. The Yugoslav Communist League refused to participate in the meeting of communist parties of twelve nations, but dressing this up as an explanation doesn’t help Tito in any way. Why should Tito tear up the agreement he endorsed at the Bucharest talks? Why doesn’t Tito say a word about this question which was put to him by Comrade Khrushchev in Sofia? Of course it is sheer nonsense for Tito to allege that Yugoslav refusal to participate in the socialist camp is the main reason why the communist parties of various countries are struggling against revisionism. Non-participation in the socialist camp does not make it necessary to give revisionism wide publicity and to launch an all-out attack against the socialist countries. In any case it is curious that a country calling itself a socialist state should refuse to line up with the socialist countries, to stand explicitly on the anti-imperialist side, should place the imperialist countries and the socialist countries on the same footing and keep the same distance from each and maintain the same “cooperation” with them. What pretext on earth can they find to justify themselves?

We are against division of the world into camps.

In the present tense international situation it is more useful to pursue a constructive peaceful policy, together with other peace-loving countries which also do not belong to any bloc, rather than to enter the camp and thereby aggravate even more the already tense situation in the world.

We consider that relations of cooperation must be established with all countries, and not limit ourselves to two camps, which will clash and because of which war might one day break out.

What a typical voice of a traitor! How similar the statement “against division of the world into camps...” sounds to the statement “against division of society into classes” repentantly made by deserters from the Communist

Party who have surrendered to the enemy! Since a number of imperialist countries and a number of socialist countries exist in the world at the same time, the existence of camps is inevitable. Even the nations striving for independence, such as those in North Africa and the Near East, have formed ties of association in one way or another on certain basis. This historic inevitability does not change in accordance with the subjective desire of Tito or any other person. It is true that the imperialist countries cannot possibly unite as one, but this does not mean that all the socialist countries, which are struggling for the common interests and ideals of the international proletariat, should fail to rally together closely. The socialist camp and the imperialist camp are diametrically opposed in nature and cannot be mentioned in the same breath. The comradely solidarity that exists among the socialist countries is not possible between capitalist countries, and this is precisely one of the important factors that make the victory of socialism inevitable. The countries in the socialist camp have insisted throughout on the dissolution of all military blocs and on peaceful coexistence with all capitalist countries. But why is it necessary to break our own unity in order to disband the military blocs and bring about coexistence? Isn't the truth exactly contrary to this? According to Tito's logic, participation of the socialist countries in the socialist camp will aggravate world tension while non-participation of the socialist countries in the socialist camp will ease the world situation. According to that logic, the more countries in which socialism is victorious, the more inevitable war becomes. And in order to bring about a thorough easing of the world situation and to avert war, it is of course necessary for all socialist countries to refrain from participating in the socialist camp and to disband that camp. Before World War II, however, there was certainly no socialist camp. Why then did Hitler Germany launch an aggressive war against the Soviet Union? Was this "owing to Stalin's inflexible and uncalled for threatening foreign policy" which made the Hitlerites "unable to accomplish their aims by diplomatic means?" Wasn't Yugoslavia invaded by Hitler in April 1941 when it had not even put up the signboard of socialism? Tito has completely ignored these basic facts and alleges that in order to obtain peace, we must keep away from any association opposed by the imperialists. In this, Tito not only lacks the slightest semblance of a communist but also lacks the slightest semblance of a nationalist revolutionary opposed to imperialism.

The argument Tito spreads that if the socialist countries rally together this will create tension and war danger, translated into simple language, actually means this: Working people, oppressed people, revolutionaries, socialists, you must never split the world into camps, never “limit” yourselves to camps! You should establish “relations of cooperation” with all political forces (never mind what forces)! This will be to your great benefit. This, according to the program of the Yugoslav League of Communists, is the Yugoslav-type “policy of active coexistence.” It is “an expression of the powerful development of the productive forces which has brought about the actual inter-connection of the whole world, the close inter-dependence of the economies of different countries. This policy expresses the objective needs of the contemporary world for the broadest economic cooperation as well as for comprehensive cultural, scientific and other cooperation. The policy of active coexistence, accordingly, also creates the necessary pre-conditions for the integration of the world economy. And one of the goals of socialism must be the economic unity of the world.” This is all very nice. But if you are ignorant of the present state of affairs and don’t break up your unity, the situation will become tense. And, what is supremely important is that once conflict breaks out (which is unavoidable if the camps are retained!) you cannot hope to keep out of the trouble!

We do not intend to discuss here the stand of various types of neutralists. Many peaceful, neutral countries, far from having engaged in sabotage against the socialist countries, have, on the contrary, formed good relations with them. They can, therefore, have full confidence in the friendship of the socialist countries in their struggle to safeguard peace, resist aggression and develop their own national economies. In contrast to the neutralists in general, the Tito elements, having put out the signboard of Marxism-Leninism and a socialist country, mix in the ranks of the international proletariat to corrode, disintegrate and subvert. This has forced us to show them up firmly in their true colors. Some people say: “Why is it necessary to drive Tito to the side of the imperialists?” But the present facts show that Tito persists in his revisionist, pro-imperialist stand not because he has been driven to do so. Moreover, it appears that in any event he will not give up his neutralist or socialist signboard and go directly over to the side of imperialism without pretenses, because he “knows” how to hold on to his bargaining position. Therefore, no good to the cause of socialism will come from worrying about

his going over to the West and so relaxing the efforts to expose him. Similarly, to be afraid to “embitter” imperialism and thus not to rally the forces of peace and not to expose the machinations of the warmongers will do no good to the cause of peace.

Now, to return to the question of peace: We have at all times taken the view that peace must be defended resolutely and that it can be defended. But this can be achieved only if all the forces of peace unite and wage a staunch struggle against the machinations of the war plotters. Here the question is not only that war must be firmly opposed. It should also be made clear that the people really have the strength to overcome the threat of war. The people should be called on to prepare, should the war maniacs force war on them, to use their united strength to wipe out all aggressors, and eradicate imperialism, which breeds war. Without this determination, it would be impossible to prevent war and the people would be thrown into panic and dismay should the aggressors venture to unleash war. But what is the road that Tito and his followers have indicated to the peoples of various countries? To try to make people “clear the snow away only from their own doorsteps,” as the Chinese saying goes, they threaten them with the danger of war; they call for the dissolution of the unity of all the forces of socialism, of all the anti-imperialist and anti-war forces; they call on the peoples to cooperate with the US and all other imperialists, in order to bring about “the integration of the world” and build up “socialism!” Any objective observer can readily see that the stand of the Tito elements cannot safeguard world peace, nor offer any support to the struggle of Korea and Vietnam, or of Egypt, Syria, Indonesia, Algeria and the Lebanon, against aggression.

In his efforts to confuse right and wrong still further, Tito has gone so far as to mix up arbitrarily his own surrender policy with the peace policy of the Soviet Union. He even compares US aid to Yugoslavia with the relief given by the US to the famine in the Soviet Union in 1921. What was the situation in 1921? Even under the extremely difficult conditions at that time, the Soviet Government waged a firm struggle against the US relief administration, headed by Hoover, which had obvious political designs, and prevented US relief activities from getting out of the control of the Soviet Government. At that time, Lenin described the extreme ferocity of the imperialists who took advantage of the famine in the Soviet Union to carry out anti-Soviet activities, in these words: “I don’t know whether the dev-

il is more terrible than modern imperialism.” Precisely because the Soviet Union, adopting a revolutionary proletarian attitude towards the imperialist states, never entertained any illusion of relying on the imperialist states, the imperialists have all along regarded the Soviet Union as a thorn in their side. The imperialists have done everything possible to oppose and disrupt the Soviet Union and have stubbornly rejected the various proposals put forward by the Soviet Union to relax international tension. But what is the attitude of Tito and his ilk to US aid? Tito openly eulogizes US wheat and dollars, and takes pride in the fact that he “knows” how to depend forever on US aid to “safeguard independence” and “build socialism.” Similarly, the US imperialists also take pride in the fact that they “know” how to disrupt the cause of socialism with their aid to Yugoslavia. Tito said: “The Americans do not give us assistance so that socialism might triumph in Yugoslavia.” But the question is not so simple. Eisenhower made it very clear on the 18th of this month that he would “give any kind of aid to Soviet bloc countries which would contribute to the weakening of the bloc’s solidarity.” Have the Americans fulfilled their aims then? Evidently, whether it was during the uprising of the counter-revolutionary Nagy group in Hungary in 1956, or in the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists and the program it adopted, or in the so-called protest made by Yugoslavia following the recent verdict on the counter-revolutionary Nagy group in Hungary, the Tito elements acted as the anti-Soviet and anti-communist vanguard for the imperialist reactionaries. Nonetheless, Tito still persists in stating that he has never set himself against the Soviet Union, that he has never supported imperialism, and, what is more, that his policy is the same as the policy of the Soviet Union. To use Tito’s own words, this is “the height of cynicism!”

In his speech Tito frantically attacked the Chinese Communist Party. For us, this is merely a cause for pride. The ancient Chinese poet Qu Yuan expressed it well: “How can the square exactly fit the circle? With views opposed, who can live in harmony?”⁴⁰ The struggle of Marxist-Leninists against the revisionists is unavoidable and it is the praise of revisionists or imperialists that is to be dreaded. The criticism that the Chinese Communists made of the Yugoslav revisionists has obviously hit them where it hurts. Since they could find no way to stir up nationalist hatred among the people

⁴⁰ Qu Yuan, *The Lament* [*Li Sao*].

on pretexts deriving from past Sino-Yugoslav relations, they were compelled to cook up some particularly preposterous—and therefore particularly clumsy—lies in their fight. Tito said that we criticized them because we were bothered by their “peaceable policy, policy of peace, policy of coexistence,” because we were opposed to the relaxation of world tension and thus occupied “the same platform as the most reactionary warmongering elements in the West.” But one may ask: If we, rather than Tito, are standing on the side of the warmongers, how is it that the most reactionary warmongers in the West, such as Dulles, are in no way “bothered” about Tito’s “peaceable policy, policy of peace, policy of coexistence” and have even rewarded it handsomely? Tito said further that we oppose revisionism because we have encountered internal difficulties and are in need of some sort of loan. This is really a good example of “talking about one’s own trade at the outset of a conversation,” as the Chinese saying goes! A dwarf kneeling in a muddy pond can try as desperately as possible to spit at a giant on a high mountain, but he will find his saliva falling back on his own face. Those few utterances of Tito’s provide a superb sketch of the very features of the Tito elements.

Tito’s painstakingly prepared speech consists of so many lies that they are too numerous to be refuted.. He said that we had not made public any of their materials. This is perhaps the most stupid of these lies. We do not consider it necessary for the socialist press to publish long-winded tirades by revisionists, but still facts are facts. In 1956, we published the full texts of Tito’s notorious Pula speech and Kardelj’s speech before parliament. Not long ago we published the full texts of the two draft programs of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, and now we have printed the full text of Tito’s speech delivered at Labin, while the Yugoslav press has rarely published full texts of our articles. But Tito still brags that “it is obvious that we are morally much superior to them.”

Tito boasted that the Yugoslav people were one with him and issued slanders from many angles to sow dissension between the Yugoslav people and the peoples of the socialist countries. But he cannot explain why the Yugoslav state organs of force, which are supposed to have been “withering away” for a long time, suddenly arrested a large number of true Communists recently. Of course while the imperialists can still keep a group of labor aristocrats at home and abroad, these aristocrats can still carry out their activities to a considerable extent and there are still people who pin their hopes on

them. But the sun is setting in the West. Do the Tito elements and all other revisionists who look to the West have any bright future?

Long Live Leninism!

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT OF “*HONGQI*”

April 16, 1960

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, 1960, No. 8, pp. 1-29.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, April 26, 1960, Vol. III, No. 17, pp. 6-23.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF LENIN

I

April 22 of this year is the 90th anniversary of the birth of Lenin.

1871, the year after Lenin's birth, saw the heroic uprising of the Paris Commune. The Paris Commune was a great, epoch-making revolution, the first dress rehearsal of worldwide significance in the proletariat's attempt to overthrow the capitalist system. When the Commune was on the verge of defeat as a result of the counter-revolutionary attack from Versailles, Marx said:

If the Commune should be destroyed, the struggle would only be postponed. The principles of the Commune are eternal and indestructible; they will present themselves again and again until the working class is liberated.⁴¹

What is the most important principle of the Commune? According to Marx, it is that the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and use it for its own purposes. In other words, the proletariat should use revolutionary means to seize state power, smash the military bureaucratic machine of the bourgeoisie, and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat to replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Anyone familiar with the history of the struggle of the proletariat knows that it is precisely this fundamental question which forms the dividing line between Marxists on the one hand and opportunists and revisionists on the other, and that after the death of Marx and Engels it was none other than Lenin who waged

⁴¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Record of Marx's Speech on the Paris Commune” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXII, Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, p. 595.

a thoroughly uncompromising struggle against the opportunists and revisionists in order to safeguard the principles of the Commune.

The cause in which the Paris Commune did not succeed finally triumphed 46 years later in the Great October Revolution under Lenin's direct leadership. The experience of the Russian Soviets was a continuation and development of the experience of the Paris Commune. The principles of the Commune continually expounded by Marx and Engels and enriched by Lenin in the light of the new experience of the Russian revolution first became a living reality on one-sixth of the earth. Marx was perfectly correct in saying that the principles of the Commune are eternal and indestructible.

In their attempt to strangle the newborn Soviet state, the imperialist jackals, acting in league with the counter-revolutionary forces in Russia at the time, carried out armed intervention against it. But the heroic Russian working class and the people of the various nationalities of the Soviet Union drove off the foreign bandits, put down the counter-revolutionary rebellion at home and thus consolidated the world's first great socialist republic.

Under the banner of Lenin, under the banner of the October Revolution, a new world revolution began, with the proletarian revolution playing the leading role, and a new era dawned in human history.

Throughout the October Revolution, the voice of Lenin quickly resounded throughout the world. The Chinese people's anti-imperialist, anti-feudal May 4 Movement in 1919, as Comrade Mao Zedong put it, "came into being at the call of the world revolution of that time, of the Russian revolution and of Lenin."⁴²

Lenin's call is powerful because it is correct. Under the historical conditions of the epoch of imperialism, Lenin revealed a series of irrefutable truths concerning the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin pointed out that the oligarchy of finance capital in a small number of capitalist powers, that is, the imperialists, not only exploit the masses of people in their own countries, but oppress and plunder the whole world, turning most countries into their colonies and dependencies. Imperialist war is a continuation of imperialist politics. World wars are started by the

⁴² Mao Zedong, "On New Democracy" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. II, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 350.

imperialists because of their insatiable greed in scrambling for world markets, sources of raw materials and fields for investment, and because of their struggle to re-divide the world. So long as capitalist-imperialism exists in the world, the source and possibility of war will remain. The proletariat should guide the masses of people to understand the source of war and to struggle for peace and against imperialism.

Lenin asserted that imperialism is monopolistic, parasitic or decaying, moribund capitalism, that it is the final stage in the development of capitalism and therefore is the eve of the proletarian revolution. The emancipation of the proletariat can be arrived at only by way of revolution, and certainly not by way of reformism. The liberation movements of the proletariat in the capitalist countries should ally themselves with the national liberation movements in the colonies and dependent countries; this alliance can smash the alliance of the imperialists with the feudal and comprador reactionary forces in the colonies all dependent countries, and will therefore inevitably put a final end to the imperialist system throughout the world.

In the light of the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism, Lenin came to the conclusion that, because capitalism developed extremely unevenly in different countries, socialism would achieve victory first in one or several countries but could not achieve victory simultaneously in all countries. Therefore, in spite of the victory of socialism in one or several countries, other capitalist countries still exist, and this gives rise not only to friction but also to imperialist subversive activities against the socialist states. Hence the struggle will be protracted. The struggle between socialism and capitalism will embrace a whole historical epoch. The socialist countries should maintain constant vigilance against the danger of imperialist attack and do their best to avert this danger.

The fundamental question of all revolutions is the question of state power. Lenin discussed in a comprehensive and penetrating way the fundamental question of the proletarian revolution, that is, the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat, established by smashing the state machine of the bourgeois dictatorship by revolutionary means, is an alliance of a special type between the proletariat on the one hand and the peasantry and all other working people on the other; it is a continuation of the class struggle in another form under new conditions; it involves a persistent struggle, both sanguinary and bloodless, violent and

peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative, against the resistance of the exploiting classes, against foreign aggression and against the forces and traditions of the old society. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat, without its full mobilization of the working people on these fronts to wage these unavoidable struggles stubbornly and persistently, there can be no socialism, nor can there be any victory for socialism.

Lenin considered it of prime importance for the proletariat to establish its own genuinely revolutionary political party which completely breaks with opportunism, that is, a communist party, if the proletarian revolution is to be carried through and the dictatorship of the proletariat established and consolidated. This political party is armed with the Marxist theory of dialectical materialism and historical materialism. Its program is to organize the proletariat and all oppressed working people to carry on class struggle, to set up proletarian rule and passing through socialism to reach the final goal of communism. This political party must identify itself with the masses and attach great importance to their creative initiative in the making of history; it must closely rely on the masses in revolution as well as in socialist and communist construction.

These truths were constantly set forth by Lenin before and after the October Revolution. The world reactionaries and philistines of the time thought these truths revealed by Lenin terrifying. But we see these truths winning victory after victory in the actual life of the world.

II

In the forty years and more since the October Revolution, tremendous new changes have taken place in the world.

Through its great achievements in socialist and communist construction, the Soviet Union has transformed itself from an economically and technically very backward country in the days of tsarist Russia into a country with the best and most advanced technology in the world. By its economic and technological leaps the Soviet Union has left the European capitalist countries far behind and left the United States behind, too, in technology.

The great victory of the anti-fascist war, in which the Soviet Union was the main force, broke the chain of imperialism in Central and Eastern Europe. The great victory of the Chinese people's revolution broke the chain of imperialism on the Chinese mainland. A group of new socialist countries

was born. The whole socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union has one quarter of the earth's land space and over one-third of the world's population. The socialist camp has now become an independent world economic system, standing opposed to the capitalist world economic system. The gross industrial output value of the socialist countries now accounts for nearly 40 percent of the world's total, and it will not be long before it surpasses the gross industrial output value of all the capitalist countries put together.

The imperialist colonial system has been and is disintegrating. The struggle naturally has its twists and turns, but on the whole the storm of the national liberation movement is sweeping over Asia, Africa and Latin America on a daily broadening scale. Things are developing towards their opposites: there the imperialists are going step by step from strength to weakness, while the people are going step by step from weakness to strength.

The relative stability of capitalism, which existed for a time after World War I, ended long ago. With the formation of the socialist world economic system after World War II, the capitalist world market has greatly shrunk. The contradiction between the productive forces and relations of production in capitalist society has sharpened. The periodic economic crises of capitalism no longer occur as before once every ten years or so, but come almost every three or four years. Recently, some representatives of the US bourgeoisie have admitted that the United States has suffered three "economic recessions" in ten years, and they now have premonitions of a new "economic recession" just after it has pulled through the one in 1957-58. The shortening of the interval between capitalist economic crises is a new phenomenon. It is a further sign that the world capitalist system is drawing nearer and nearer to its inevitable doom.

The unevenness in the development of the capitalist countries is worse than ever before. With the imperialists squeezed into their ever-shrinking domain, US imperialism is constantly grabbing markets and spheres of influence away from the British, French and other imperialists. The imperialist countries headed by the United States have been expanding armaments and making war preparations for more than ten years, while West German and Japanese militarism, defeated in World War II, have risen again with the help of their former enemy—the US imperialists. Imperialist West Germany and Japan have come out to join in the scramble for the capitalist world market, are now blabbing once again about their "traditional friendship"

and are engaging in new activities for a so-called “Bonn-Tokyo axis with Washington as the starting point.” West German imperialism is looking brazenly around for military bases abroad. This aggravates the bitter conflicts within imperialism and at the same time heightens the threat to the socialist camp and all peace-loving countries. The present situation is very much like that after World War I when the US and British imperialists fostered the resurgence of German militarism, and the outcome will again be their “picking up a rock only to drop it on their own feet.” The US imperialists’ creation of world tension after World War II is a sign not of their strength but of their weakness and precisely reflects the unprecedented instability of the capitalist system.

The US imperialists, in order to realize their ambition for world domination, not only avidly resort to all kinds of sabotage and subversion against the socialist countries, but also, under the pretext of opposing “the communist menace,” in their self-appointed role of world gendarme for suppressing the revolution in various countries, set up their military bases all around the world, seize the intermediate areas and carry out military provocations. Like a rat running across the street while everyone shouts “Throw something at it!” the US imperialists run into bumps and bruises everywhere and, contrary to their intentions, everywhere arouse a new upsurge of the people’s revolutionary struggle. Now, even they themselves are becoming aware that, in contrast with the growing prosperity of the socialist world headed by the Soviet Union, “the influence of the United States as a world power is declining.” In their country, one “can only see the decline and fall of ancient Rome.”

The changes that have taken place in the world in the past forty years and more indicate that imperialism is rotting with each passing day while with socialism things are getting better and better. It is a great, new epoch that we are facing, and its main characteristic is that the forces of socialism have surpassed those of imperialism, and that the forces of the awakening peoples of the world have surpassed those of reaction.

The present world situation has obviously undergone tremendous changes since Lenin’s lifetime; but all these changes, far from proving that Leninism is obsolete, have more and more clearly confirmed the truths revealed by Lenin and all the theories he advanced during the struggle to defend revolutionary Marxism and develop Marxism.

In the historical conditions of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, Lenin carried Marxism forward to a new stage and showed all the oppressed classes and peoples the path along which they could really shake off capitalist imperialist enslavement and poverty.

These forty years have been forty years of victory for Leninism in the world, forty years in which Leninism has found its way ever deeper into the hearts of the world's people. Leninism not only has won and will continue to win great victories in countries where the socialist system has been established, but is also constantly achieving new victories in the struggles of all oppressed peoples.

The victory of Leninism is acclaimed by the people of the whole world, and at the same time cannot but incur the enmity of the imperialists and all reactionaries. The imperialists, to weaken the influence of Leninism and paralyze the revolutionary will of the masses, have launched the most barbarous and despicable attacks and slanders against Leninism, and, moreover, bought up and utilized the vacillators and renegades within the workers' movement, directing them to distort and emasculate the teachings of Lenin. At the end of the nineteenth century when Marxism was putting various anti-Marxist trends to rout, spreading widely throughout the workers' movement and gaining a predominant position, the revisionists represented by Bernstein advanced their revisions of the teachings of Marx to meet the needs of the bourgeoisie. Now, when Leninism has won great victories in guiding the working class and all oppressed classes and nations of the world in onslaughts against imperialism and all kinds of reactionaries, the modern revisionists represented by Tito have advanced their revisions of the teachings of Lenin (that is, modern Marxist teachings), to meet the needs of the imperialists. As pointed out in the Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries held in Moscow in November 1957, "The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source." While the old revisionism attempted to prove that Marxism was outmoded, modern revisionism attempts to prove that Leninism is outmoded. The Moscow Declaration said:

Modern revisionism seeks to smear the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, declares that it is "outmoded" and alleges that it has lost its significance for social progress. The revisionists try

to kill the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and the working people in general.

This passage of the Declaration has put it correctly; such is exactly the situation.

Are the teachings of Marxism-Leninism now “outmoded?” Does the integrated whole of Lenin’s teachings on imperialism, on proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, on war and peace, and on the building of socialism and communism still retain its full vitality? If it is still valid and does retain its full vitality, does this refer only to a certain portion of it or to the whole? We usually say that Leninism is Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, Marxism of the epoch of the victory of socialism and communism. Does this statement remain correct? Can it be said that Lenin’s original conclusions and our usual conception of Leninism have lost their validity and correctness, and that therefore we should turn back and accept those revisionist and opportunist conclusions which Lenin long ago smashed to smithereens and which have long since gone disgracefully bankrupt in actual life? These questions now confront us and must be answered. Marxist-Leninists must thoroughly expose the absurdities of the imperialists and modern revisionists on these questions, eradicate their influence among the masses, awaken those they have temporarily hoodwinked and further arouse the revolutionary will of the masses.

III

The US imperialists, the open representatives of the bourgeoisie in many countries, the modern revisionists represented by the Tito clique, and the right-wing social-democrats, in order to mislead the people of the world, do all they can to paint an utterly distorted picture of the contemporary world situation in an attempt to confirm their ravings that “Marxism is outmoded,” and that “Leninism is outmoded too.”

A speech by Tito at the end of last year referred repeatedly to what the modern revisionists call the “new epoch.” He said, “Today the world has entered an epoch in which nations can relax and tranquilly devote themselves to their internal construction tasks.” Then he added, “We have entered an epoch when new questions are on the agenda, not questions of war and peace but questions of cooperation, economic and otherwise, and when

economic cooperation is concerned, there is also the question of economic competition.”⁴³

This renegade completely writes off the question of class contradictions and the class struggle in the world, in an attempt to negate the consistent interpretation of Marxist-Leninists that our epoch is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, the epoch of the victory of socialism and communism.

But how do things really stand in the world?

Can the exploited and oppressed people in the imperialist countries “relax?” Can the peoples of all the colonies and semi-colonies still under imperialist oppression “relax?”

Has the armed intervention led by the US imperialists in Asia, Africa and Latin America become “tranquil?” Is there “tranquility” in our Taiwan Straits when the US imperialists are still occupying our country’s Taiwan? Is there “tranquility” on the African continent when the people of Algeria and many other parts of Africa are subjected to armed repressions by the French, British and other imperialists? Is there “tranquility” in Latin America when the US imperialists are trying to wreck the people’s revolution in Cuba by means of bombing, assassination and subversion?

What kind of “construction” is meant by saying “(nations) devote themselves to their internal construction tasks?” Everyone knows that there are different types of countries in the world today, and principally two types of countries with social systems fundamentally different in nature. One type belongs to the socialist world system, the other to the capitalist world system. Is Tito referring to the “internal construction” of armament expansion which the imperialists are carrying out in order to oppress the peoples of their own countries and oppress the whole world, or to the “internal construction” carried out by socialism for the promotion of the people’s happiness and in the pursuit of lasting world peace?

Is the question of war and peace no longer an issue? Is it that imperialism no longer exists, the system of exploitation no longer exists, and therefore the question of war no longer exists? Or is it that there can be no question of war even if imperialism and the system of exploitation are allowed to survive forever? The fact is that since World War II there has been continuous and unbroken warfare. Do not the imperialist wars to suppress national liber-

⁴³ Tito’s speech in Zagreb, December 12, 1959.

ation movements and the imperialist wars of armed intervention against revolutions in various countries count as wars? Even though these local wars do not develop into world wars, do they not still count as wars? Even though they are not fought with nuclear weapons, do wars using what are called conventional weapons not still count as wars? Does not the US imperialists' allocation of nearly 60 percent of their 1960 budget outlay to arms expansion and war preparations count as a bellicose policy on the part of US imperialism? Will the revival of West German and Japanese militarism not confront mankind with the danger of a new world war?

What kind of "cooperation" is meant? Is it "cooperation" of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie to protect capitalism? Is it "cooperation" of the peoples in the colonies and semi-colonies with the imperialists to protect colonialism? Is it "cooperation" of socialist countries with capitalist countries to protect the imperialist system in its oppression of the peoples in the capitalist countries and its suppression of national liberation wars?

In a word, the assertions of the modern revisionists about the so-called "epoch" challenge Leninism on the foregoing issues. It is their aim to obliterate the contradiction between the masses of people and the monopoly capitalist class in the imperialist countries, the contradiction between the peoples in the colonies and semi-colonies and the imperialist aggressors, the contradiction between the socialist system and the imperialist system, and the contradiction between the peace-loving people of the world and the warlike imperialist bloc.

There have been various ways of defining the distinctions between different "epochs." Generally speaking there is one way which is merely drivel, concocting and playing around with vague, ambiguous phrases to cover up the essence of the epoch. This is the old trick of the imperialists, the bourgeoisie and the revisionists in the workers' movement. Then there is another way, which is to make a concrete analysis of the specific circumstances with regard to the overall situation of class contradictions and class struggle, put forward strict scientific definitions, and thus bring the essence of each epoch into full light. This is what every serious-minded Marxist does.

On the features that distinguish an epoch, Lenin said:

We are speaking here of big historical epochs; in every epoch there are, and there will be, separate, partial movements, sometimes forward, at other times backwards, there are, and there

will be, various deviations from the average type and average tempo of the movements.

We cannot know how fast and how successfully certain historical movements of the given epoch will develop. But we can and do know which class occupies a central position in this or that epoch and determines its main content, the main direction of its development, the main characteristics of the historical situation in the given epoch, etc.

Only on this basis, i.e., by taking into consideration first and foremost the fundamental distinctive features of different “epochs” (and not of individual episodes in the history of different countries) can we correctly work out our tactics...⁴⁴

An epoch, as referred to here by Lenin, presents the question of which class holds the central position in it and determines its main content and the main direction of its development.

Faithful to Marx’s dialectics, Lenin never for a single moment departed from the standpoint of analyzing class relations. He held that: “Marxism judges ‘interests’ by the class antagonisms and the class struggles which manifest themselves in millions of facts of everyday life.”⁴⁵ He stated:

The method of Marx consists first of all, in taking into consideration the objective content of the historical process at the given concrete moment, in the given concrete situation, in order to understand first of all which class it is whose movement constitutes the mainspring of possible progress in this concrete situation.⁴⁶

Lenin always demanded that we examine the concrete process of historical development on the basis of class analysis, instead of talking vaguely about “society in general” or “progress in general.” We Marxists must not base proletarian policy merely on certain passing events or minute political changes, but on the overall situation of the class contradictions and class struggle of a whole historical epoch. This is a basic theoretical position of Marxists. It was by taking a firm stand on this position that Lenin, in the

⁴⁴ V. I. Lenin, “Under a False Flag” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

⁴⁵ V. I. Lenin, “The Collapse of the Second International” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

⁴⁶ V. I. Lenin, “Under a False Flag,” *op. cit.*

new period of class changes, in the new historical period, came to the conclusion that the hope of humanity lies entirely in the victory of the proletariat and that the proletariat must prepare itself to win victory in this great revolutionary battle and thus establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. After the October Revolution, at the Seventh Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in 1918, Lenin stated:

We must begin with the general basis of the development of commodity production, the transition to capitalism and the transformation of capitalism into imperialism. Thereby we shall be theoretically taking up and consolidating a position from which nobody who has not betrayed socialism will dislodge us. From this follows an equally inevitable conclusion: the era of social revolution is beginning.⁴⁷

This is Lenin's conclusion, a conclusion which up to the present still requires deep consideration by all Marxists.

The formulation of revolutionary Marxists that ours is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, the epoch of the victory of socialism and communism is irrefutable, because it grasps with complete correctness the basic features of our present great epoch. The formulation that Leninism is the continuation and development of revolutionary Marxism in this great epoch and that it is the theory and policy of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat is also irrefutable, because it is precisely Leninism that exposes the contradictions in our great epoch—the contradiction between the working class and monopoly capital, the contradiction among the imperialist countries, the contradiction between peoples in the colonies and semi-colonies and imperialism, and the contradiction between the socialist countries, where the proletariat has triumphed, and the imperialist countries. Leninism has, therefore, become our banner of victory. Contrary, however, to this series of revolutionary Marxist formulations, in what the Titoists call the “new epoch,” there is actually no imperialism, no proletarian revolution and, needless to say, no theory and policy of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In short, with them, the fundamental focal points of the class contradictions and class struggles

⁴⁷ V. I. Lenin, “Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the RCP(B)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII.

of our epoch are nowhere to be seen, the fundamental questions of Leninism are missing and Leninism is missing.

The modern revisionists claim that in what they call the “new epoch,” because of the progress of science and technology, the “old conceptions” advanced by Marx and Lenin no longer apply. Tito said: “We are not dogmatists, for Marx and Lenin did not predict the rocket on the moon, atomic bombs and the great technical progress.”⁴⁸ Not dogmatists, that’s fine. Who want them to be dogmatists? But one may oppose dogmatism in the interests of Marxism-Leninism or one may actually oppose Marxism-Leninism in the name of opposing dogmatism. The Titos belong to the latter category. On the question of what effect scientific and technological progress has on social development, there are people who hold incorrect views because they are not able to approach the question from the viewpoint of the materialist conception of history. This is understandable. But the modern revisionists, on the other hand, are deliberately creating confusion on this question in a vain attempt to make use of the progress in science and technology to throw Marxism-Leninism to the winds.

In the past few years, the achievements of the Soviet Union in science and technology have been foremost in the world. These Soviet achievements are products of the Great October Revolution. These outstanding achievements mark a new era in man’s conquest of nature; and at the same time they have played a very important role in defending world peace. But, in the new conditions brought about by the development of modern technology, has the ideological system of Marxism-Leninism been shaken, as Tito says, by the “rocket on the moon, atomic bombs and the great technical progress” which Marx and Lenin “did not predict?” Can it be said that the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, social-historical outlook, moral outlook and other basic conceptions have therefore become so-called stale “dogmas” and that the law of class struggle henceforth no longer holds good?

Marx and Lenin did not live to the present day, and of course could not see the specific details of technological progress in the present-day world. But what, after all, does the development of natural science and the advance of technology augur for the capitalist system? Marx and Lenin held that this could only augur a new social revolution, and certainly not the fading away of social revolution.

⁴⁸ Tito’s speech in Zagreb, December 12, 1959.

We know that both Marx and Lenin rejoiced in the new discoveries and progress of natural science and technology in the conquest of nature. Engels said in his “Speech at the Graveside of Karl Marx”:

Science was for Marx a historically dynamic, revolutionary force. However great the joy with which he welcomed a new discovery in some theoretical science whose practical application perhaps it was as yet quite impossible to envisage, he experienced quite another kind of joy when the discovery involved immediate revolutionary changes in industry, and in historical development in general.⁴⁹

Engels added: “For Marx was before all else a revolutionist.”⁵⁰ Well said! Marx always regarded all new discoveries in the conquest of nature from the viewpoint of a proletarian revolutionist, not from the viewpoint of one who holds that the proletarian revolution will fade away.

Wilhelm Liebknecht wrote in *Reminiscences of Marx*:

Marx made fun of the victorious European reaction which imagined that it had stifled the revolution and did not suspect that natural science was preparing a new revolution. King Steam, who had revolutionized the world in the previous century, was coming to the end of his reign and another incomparably greater revolutionary would take his place, the electric spark.

The consequences are unpredictable. The economic revolution must be followed by a political one, for the latter is only the expression of the former.

In the manner in which Marx discussed this progress of science and mechanics, his conception of the world, and especially what has been termed the materialist conception of history, was so clearly expressed that certain doubts which I had hitherto still maintained melted away like snow in the sunshine of spring.⁵¹

⁴⁹ F. Engels, “Speech at the Graveside of Karl Marx” in *On Marx*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1975, p. 17.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ W. Liebknecht, p. Lafargue, *Reminiscences of Karl Marx*, People’s Publishing House, Bombay, 1944, p. 22.

This is how Marx felt the breath of revolution in the progress of science and technology. He held that the new progress of science and technology would lead to a social revolution to overthrow the capitalist system. In Marx's opinion, the progress of natural science and technology further strengthens the position of the entire Marxist conception of the world and the materialist conception of history, and certainly does not shake it. The progress of natural science and technology further strengthens the position of the proletarian revolution and of the oppressed nations in their fight against imperialism, and certainly does not weaken it.

Like Marx, Lenin also viewed technological progress in connection with the question of revolution in the social system. Thus Lenin held that "the age of steam is the age of the bourgeoisie, the age of electricity is the age of socialism."⁵²

Please note the contrast between the revolutionary spirit of Marx and Lenin and the modern revisionists' shameful attitude of betraying the revolution!

In class society, in the epoch of imperialism, Marxist-Leninists can only approach the question of the development and use of technology from the viewpoint of class analysis.

Inasmuch as the socialist system is progressive and represents the interests of the people, the socialist countries seek to utilize such new techniques as atomic energy and rocketry to serve peaceful domestic construction and the conquest of nature. The more the socialist countries master such new techniques and the more rapidly they develop them, the better will they attain the aim of high-speed development of the social productive forces to meet the needs of the people, and the more will they strengthen the forces for checking imperialist war and increase the possibility of defending world peace. Therefore, for the welfare of their peoples and in the interest of peace for people the world over, the socialist countries should, wherever possible, master more and more of such new techniques serving the well-being of the people.

At the present time, the socialist Soviet Union clearly holds the upper hand in the development of new techniques. Everybody knows that the rocket that hit the moon was launched by the Soviet Union and not by the

⁵² V. I. Lenin, "Report on the Work of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

United States, the country where capitalism is most developed. This shows that only in the socialist countries can there be unlimited prospects for the large-scale development of new techniques.

On the contrary, inasmuch as the imperialist system is reactionary and against the people, the imperialist countries seek to use such new techniques for military purposes of aggression against foreign countries and intimidation against their own people for making lethal weapons. To the imperialist countries, the emergence of such new techniques only means pushing to a new stage the contradiction between the development of the social productive forces and the capitalist relations of production. What this will bring about is not by any means the perpetuation of capitalism, but the further rousing of the revolution of the people in those countries and the destruction of the old, criminal, cannibalistic system of capitalism.

The US imperialists and their partners use weapons like atom bombs to threaten war and blackmail the whole world. They declare that anyone who does not submit to the domination of US imperialism will be destroyed. The Tito clique echoes this line; it takes up the US imperialist refrain to spread terror of atomic warfare among the masses. US imperialist blackmail and the chiming in of the Tito clique can only temporarily dupe those who do not understand the real situation, but cannot cow the people who have awakened. Even those who for the time being do not understand the real situation will gradually come to understand it with the help of the advanced elements.

Marxist-Leninists have always maintained that in world history it is not technique but man, the masses of people, that determine the fate of mankind. There was a theory current for a time among some people in China before and during the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression, which was known as the theory of “weapons decide everything”; from this theory they concluded that since Japan’s weapons were new and its techniques advanced while China’s weapons were old and its techniques backward, “China would inevitably be subjugated.” Comrade Mao Zedong in his work *On the Protracted War*⁵³ published at that time refuted such nonsense. He made the following analysis: The Japanese imperialists’ war of aggression against China was bound to fail because it was reactionary, unjust, and being unjust

⁵³ Mao Zedong, “On Protracted War” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. II, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021.

lacked popular support; the Chinese people's war of resistance against Japan would certainly win because it was progressive, just, and being just enjoyed abundant support. Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out that the most abundant source of strength in war lay in the masses, and that a people's army organized by awakened and united masses of people would be invincible throughout the world. This is a Marxist-Leninist thesis. And what was the outcome? The outcome was that the Marxist-Leninist thesis triumphed and the "theory of national subjugation" ended in defeat. After World War II, the triumph of the Korean and Chinese peoples in the Korean war over the US aggressors far superior in weapons and equipment once again bore out this Marxist-Leninist thesis.

An awakened people will always find new ways to counteract the reactionaries' superiority in arms and win victory for themselves. This was so in past history, it is so at present, and it will remain so in the future. As a result of the supremacy gained by the socialist Soviet Union in military techniques, and the loss of their monopoly of atomic and nuclear weapons by the US imperialists, and as a result of the awakening of the people the world over and of the people in the United States itself, there is now in the world the possibility of concluding an agreement on the banning of atomic and nuclear weapons. We are striving for the conclusion of such an agreement. In contrast to the bellicose imperialists, the socialist countries and peace-loving people the world over actively and firmly stand for the banning and destruction of atomic and nuclear weapons. We are always struggling against imperialist war, for the banning of atomic and nuclear weapons and for the defense of world peace. The more broadly and intensively this struggle is waged and the more fully and thoroughly the brutish faces of the bellicose US and other imperialists are exposed the more will we be able to isolate these imperialists before the people of the world, the greater will be the possibility of tying their hands and the more will it benefit the cause of world peace. If, on the contrary, we lose our vigilance against the danger of the imperialists launching a war, do not strive to arouse the people of all countries to oppose imperialism but tie the hands of the people, then imperialism can prepare for war just as it pleases and the inevitable result will be an increase in the danger of the imperialists launching a war and, once war breaks out, the people may not be able quickly to adopt a correct attitude towards it because of complete lack of preparation or inade-

quate preparation, thus being unable to effectively check the war. Of course, whether or not the imperialists will unleash a war is not determined by us; we are, after all, not their chief-of-staff. As long as the people of all countries enhance their awareness and are fully prepared, with the socialist camp also possessing modern weapons, it is certain that if the US or other imperialists refuse to reach an agreement on the banning of atomic and nuclear weapons and should dare to fly in the face of the will of all the peoples by launching a war using atomic and nuclear weapons, the result will only be the very speedy destruction of these monsters themselves encircled by the peoples of the world, and certainly not the so-called annihilation of mankind. We consistently oppose the launching of criminal wars by imperialism, because imperialist war would impose enormous sacrifices upon the peoples of various countries (including the peoples of the United States and other imperialist countries). But should the imperialists impose such sacrifices on the peoples of various countries, we believe that, just as the experience of the Russian revolution and the Chinese revolution shows, those sacrifices would be rewarded. On the debris of imperialism, the victorious people would create very swiftly a civilization thousands of times higher than the capitalist system and a truly beautiful future for themselves.

The conclusion can only be this: whichever way you look at it, none of the new techniques like atomic energy, rocketry and so on has changed, as alleged by the modern revisionists, the basic characteristics of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution pointed out by Lenin. The capitalist-imperialist system definitely will not crumble of itself. It will be overthrown by the proletarian revolution within the imperialist country concerned, and the national revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies. Contemporary technological progress cannot save the capitalist-imperialist system from its doom but only rings a new death knell for it.

IV

The modern revisionists, proceeding from their absurd arguments on the current world situation and from their absurd argument that the Marxist-Leninist theory of class analysis and class struggle is obsolete, attempt to totally overthrow the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism on a series of questions like violence, war, peaceful coexistence, etc.

There are also some people who are not revisionists, but well-intentioned persons who sincerely want to be Marxists, but get confused in the face of certain new historical phenomena and thus have some incorrect ideas. For example, some of them say that the failure of the US imperialists' policy of atomic blackmail marks the end of violence. While thoroughly refuting the absurdities of the modern revisionists, we should also help these well-intentioned people to correct their erroneous ideas.

What is violence? Lenin said a great deal on this question in his book *The State and Revolution*. The emergence and existence of the state is in itself a kind of violence. Lenin introduced the following elucidation by Engels:

It (this public power) consists not merely of armed men, but of material appendages, prisons and coercive institutions of all kinds⁵⁴

Lenin tells us that we must draw a distinction between two types of states different in nature, the state of bourgeois dictatorship and the state of proletarian dictatorship, and between two types of violence different in nature, counter-revolutionary violence and revolutionary violence; as long as there is counter-revolutionary violence, there is bound to be revolutionary violence to oppose it. It would be impossible to wipe out counter-revolutionary violence without revolutionary violence. The state in which the exploiting classes are in power is counter-revolutionary violence, a special force for suppressing the exploited classes in the interest of the exploiting classes. Both before the imperialists had atomic bombs and rocket weapons, and since they have had these new weapons, the imperialist state has always been a special force for suppressing the proletariat at home and the people of its colonies and semi-colonies abroad, has always been such an institution of violence; even if the imperialists are compelled not to use these new weapons, the imperialist state will of course still remain an imperialist institution of violence until it is overthrown and replaced by the people's state, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat of that country.

Never since the dawn of history have there been such large scale, such utterly brutal forces of violence as those created by the present-day capitalist-imperialists. Throughout the past ten years and more, the US imperialists have, without any scruples, adopted means of persecution a hundred times

⁵⁴ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 10.

more savage than before, trampling upon the outstanding sons of the country's working class, upon the Negro people, upon all progressives; and moreover, they have all along been declaring brazenly that they intend to put the whole world under their rule of violence. They are continuously expanding their forces of violence, and at the same time the other imperialists are also taking part in the race to strengthen their forces of violence.

The bloated military build-up of the imperialist countries headed by the United States has appeared during the unprecedentedly grave general crisis of capitalism. The more frantically the imperialists carry the expansion of their military strength to a peak, the more it signifies that they are drawing near to their own doom. Now even some representatives of the US imperialists have premonitions of the inevitable extinction of the capitalist system. But will the imperialists themselves put an end to their violence and will those in power in the imperialist countries abandon of their own accord the violence they have set up, just because imperialism is drawing near to its doom?

Can it be said that, compared with the past, the imperialists are no longer addicted to violence, or that there has been a lessening in the degree of their addiction?

Lenin answered such questions on many occasions long ago. He pointed out in his book *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*:

For politically imperialism is always a striving towards violence and reaction.⁵⁵

After the October Revolution, in his book *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* he made a special point of recounting history, comparing the differences between pre-monopoly capitalism and monopoly capitalism, i.e., imperialism. He said:

Pre-monopoly capitalism, which reached its zenith in the seventies of the nineteenth century, was, by virtue of its fundamental *economic* traits (which were most typical in England and America) distinguished by its relative attachment to peace and freedom. Imperialism, *i.e.*, monopoly capitalism, which finally matured only in the twentieth century, is, by virtue of its fun-

⁵⁵ V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 94.

damental *economic* traits, distinguished by the least attachment to peace and freedom, and by the greatest and universal development of militarism everywhere.⁵⁶

Of course, these words of Lenin were said in the early period of the October Revolution, when the proletarian state was newly born, and its economic forces still young and weak, while with the lapse of forty years and more, the face of the Soviet state itself, and of the whole world has undergone a tremendous change, as we have already described. Then, can it be said that the nature of imperialism has changed because of the might of the Soviet Union, the might of the forces of socialism and the might of the forces of peace, and that, as a result, the foregoing theses of Lenin have become obsolete? Or, can it be said that imperialism will no longer resort to violence although its nature has not changed? Do these views conform to the real situation?

The socialist world system has obviously gained the upper hand in its struggle with the capitalist world system. This great historic fact has weakened the position of imperialist violence in the world. But will this fact cause the imperialists never again to oppress the people of their own countries, never again engage in external expansion and aggressive activities? Can it make the warlike circles of the imperialists from now on “lay down the butcher’s cleaver” and “sell swords to buy oxen?” Can it make the groups of munitions makers and dealers in the imperialist countries henceforth change over to peaceful pursuits?

All these questions confront every serious Marxist-Leninist and require deep consideration. It is obvious that whether these questions are viewed and handled correctly or not has a close bearing on the success or failure of the proletarian cause and the destiny of humanity.

War is the most acute form of expression of violence. One type is civil war, another is foreign war. Violence is not always expressed by war, its most acute form. In capitalist countries, bourgeois war is the continuation of the bourgeois politics of ordinary times, while bourgeois peace is the continuation of bourgeois wartime politics. The bourgeoisie always alternately adopt the two forms, war and peace, to carry on their rule over the people and their external struggles. In what is called peacetime, the imperialists

⁵⁶ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, pp. 14-15.

rely on armed force to deal with the oppressed classes and nations by such forms of violence as arrest, imprisonment, hard labor, massacre and so forth, while at the same time, they are also prepared to use the most acute form of violence—war—to suppress the revolution of the people at home, to carry out plunder abroad, to overwhelm foreign competitors and to stamp out revolutions in other countries. Or, peace at home may exist side by side with war abroad.

In the initial period of the October Revolution, the imperialists resorted to violence in the form of war against the Soviet Union, which was a continuation of their imperialist politics; in World War II, the German imperialists used violence in the form of large-scale war to attack the Soviet Union, which was a continuation of their imperialist politics. But on the other hand, the imperialists also established diplomatic relations of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union in different periods, which was also, of course, a continuation of imperialist politics in another form under specific conditions.

True, some new questions have now arisen concerning peaceful coexistence. Confronted with the powerful Soviet Union and the powerful socialist camp, the imperialists must at any rate carefully consider whether, contrary to their wishes, they would hasten their own extinction, as Hitler did, or bring about the most serious consequences for the capitalist system itself, if they should attack the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

“Peaceful coexistence”—this is a new concept which arose only after the emergence of the socialist state in the world following the October Revolution. It is a new concept formed under the circumstances Lenin had predicted before the October Revolution, when he said:

Socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously *in all* countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois for some time.⁵⁷

This new concept is one advanced by Lenin after the great Soviet people defeated the imperialist armed intervention. As was pointed out above, at the outset the imperialists were not willing to coexist peacefully with the Soviet Union. The imperialists were compelled to “coexist” with the Sovi-

⁵⁷ V. I. Lenin, “The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution” in *On War and Peace*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1970, p. 60.

et Union only after the war of intervention against the Soviet Union had failed, after there had been several years of actual trial of strength, after the Soviet state had planted its feet firmly on the ground, and after a certain balance of power had taken shape between the Soviet state and the imperialist countries. Lenin said in 1920:

We have won conditions for ourselves under which we can exist alongside the capitalist powers, which are now forced to enter into trade relations with us.⁵⁸

It can be seen that the peaceful coexistence for a certain period between the world's first socialist state and imperialism was achieved entirely through struggle. Before World War II, the 1920-1940 period prior to Germany's attack on the Soviet Union was a period of peaceful coexistence between imperialism and the Soviet Union. During all those twenty years, the Soviet Union kept faith with peaceful coexistence. However, by 1941, Hitler no longer wanted to maintain peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union; the German imperialists perfidiously launched a savage attack on the Soviet Union. Owing to the victory of the anti-fascist war in which the great Soviet Union was the main force, the world saw once again a situation of peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist countries. Nevertheless, the imperialists have not given up their designs. The US imperialists have set up networks of military bases and guided missile bases everywhere around the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp. They are still occupying our territory Taiwan and continually carrying out military provocations against us in the Taiwan Straits. They carried out armed intervention in Korea, conducting a large-scale war against the Korean and Chinese peoples on Korean soil, which resulted in an armistice agreement only after their defeat—and up to now they are still interfering with the reunification of the Korean people. They gave aid in weapons to the French imperialist occupation forces in their war against the Vietnamese people, and up to now they are still interfering with the reunification of the Vietnamese people. They engineered the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary, and up to now they are continually making all sorts of attempts at subversion in the socialist countries in East Europe and elsewhere. The facts are still just as Lenin presented them to a US correspondent in February 1920: on the question of peace, “there

⁵⁸ V. I. Lenin, “Our Foreign and Domestic Position and Party Tasks” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

is no obstacle on our side. The obstacle is the imperialism of American (and all other) capitalists.”⁵⁹

The foreign policy of socialist countries can only be a policy of peace. The socialist system determines that we do not need war, absolutely will not start a war, and absolutely must not, should not and cannot occupy one inch of a neighboring country’s territory. Ever since its founding, the People’s Republic of China has consistently adhered to a foreign policy of peace. Our country together with two neighboring countries, India and Burma, jointly initiated the well-known Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence;⁶⁰ and at the Bandung Conference of 1955, our country together with various countries of Asia and Africa adopted the Ten Principles of Peaceful Coexistence.⁶¹ The Communist Party and government of our country have in the past few years consistently supported the activities for peace carried out by the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union headed by Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, considering that these activities on the part of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union have further demonstrated before the peoples of the world the firmness of the socialist countries’ peaceful foreign policy as well as the need for the peoples to prevent the imperialists from launching a new world war and to strive for a lasting world peace.

⁵⁹ V. I. Lenin, “In Reply To Questions Put By Karl Wiegand” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

⁶⁰ 1) Mutual respect for each other’s territorial integrity and sovereignty; 2) Mutual non-aggression; 3) Mutual non-interference in each other’s internal affairs; 4) Equality and mutual benefit; 5) Peaceful coexistence.

⁶¹ 1. Respect for fundamental human rights and for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.; 2. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations.; 3. Recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations large and small.; 4. Abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of another country.; 5. Respect for the right of each nation to defend itself singly or collectively, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.; 6. (a) Abstention from the use of arrangements of collective defense to serve the particular interests of any of the big powers. (b) Abstention by any country from exerting pressures on other countries.; 7. Refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country.; 8. Settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, such as negotiation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement as well as other peaceful means of the parties’ own choice, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.; 9. Promotion of mutual interests and cooperation.; 10. Respect for justice and international obligations.

The Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of 1957 states:

The cause of peace is upheld by the powerful forces of our era: the invincible camp of socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union; the peace-loving countries of Asia and Africa taking an anti-imperialist stand and forming, together with the socialist countries, a broad peace zone; the international working class and above all its vanguard—the communist parties; the liberation movement of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies; the mass peace movement of the peoples; the peoples of the European countries who have proclaimed neutrality, the peoples of Latin America and the masses in the imperialist countries themselves are firmly resisting plans for a new war. An alliance of these mighty forces could prevent war.

So long as these mighty forces are continuously developed, it is possible to maintain the situation of peaceful coexistence, or even to formally reach some sort of agreement on peaceful coexistence, up to and including the conclusion of an agreement on the prohibition of atomic and nuclear weapons. That would be a fine thing in full accord with the aspirations of the peoples of the world. However, even in that case, as long as the imperialist system still exists, war, the most acute form of violence, will not disappear from the world. The fact is not as described by the Yugoslav revisionists, who declare⁶² obsolete Lenin's definition that "war is the continuation of politics," a definition which he repeatedly explained and upheld in combating opportunism.

We believe in the absolute correctness of Lenin's thinking: War is an inevitable outcome of the systems of exploitation and the imperialist system is the source of modern wars. Until the imperialist system and the exploiting classes come to an end, wars of one kind or another will still occur. They may be wars among the imperialists for redivision of the world, or wars of aggression and anti-aggression between the imperialists and the oppressed nations, or civil wars of revolution and counter-revolution between the exploited and exploiting classes in the imperialist countries, or, of course, wars in which the imperialists attack the socialist countries and the socialist countries are forced to defend themselves. All kinds of war represent the continuation of

⁶² Cf. "Active Coexistence and Socialism," Narodna Armija of Yugoslavia, November 28, 1958.

the politics of definite classes. Marxist-Leninists absolutely must not sink into the mire of bourgeois pacifism, and can only adopt the method of concrete class analysis to appraise all kinds of war and accordingly draw conclusions on policies to be followed by the proletariat. As Lenin put it in his article *The Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution*: “theoretically, it would be quite wrong to forget that every war is but the continuation of politics by other means.”⁶³

To attain its aim of plunder and oppression, imperialism always has two tactics: the tactics of war and the tactics of “peace”; therefore, the proletariat and the people of all countries must also use two tactics to deal with imperialism: the tactics of exposing imperialism’s peace fraud and striving energetically for a genuine world peace, and the tactics of being prepared to use a just war to end the imperialist unjust war if and when imperialism should unleash it.

In a word, in the interests of the peoples of the world, we must thoroughly shatter the falsehoods of the modern revisionists and uphold the Marxist-Leninist viewpoints on the questions of violence, war and peaceful coexistence.

The Yugoslav revisionists deny the inherent class character of violence and thereby obliterate the fundamental difference between revolutionary violence and counter-revolutionary violence; they deny the inherent class character of war and thereby obliterate the fundamental difference between just wars and unjust wars; they deny that imperialist war is a continuation of imperialist politics, deny the danger of imperialism unleashing another world war, deny that only after doing away with the exploiting classes will it be possible to do away with war, and even shamelessly call the chieftain of US imperialism Eisenhower “the man who laid the cornerstone for eliminating the cold war and establishing lasting peace with peaceful competition between different political systems;”⁶⁴ they deny that under the conditions of peaceful coexistence there are still complicated, acute struggles in the political, economic and ideological fields, and so on. All these arguments of the Yugoslav revisionists are aimed at poisoning the minds of the proletariat and the people of all countries, and are helpful to the imperialist policy of war.

⁶³ V. I. Lenin, “The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution,” *op. cit.*, p. 62.

⁶⁴ Cf. “Eisenhower Arrives in Rome,” *Borba* of Yugoslavia, December 4, 1959.

V

The modern revisionists seek to confuse the peaceful foreign policy of the socialist countries with the domestic policy of the proletariat in the capitalist countries. They thus hold that peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems means that capitalism can peacefully grow into socialism, that the proletariat in countries ruled by the bourgeoisie can renounce class struggle and enter into “peaceful cooperation” with the bourgeoisie and the imperialists, and that the proletariat and all the exploited classes should forget about the fact that they are living in a class society, and so on. All these arguments are also diametrically opposed to Marxism-Leninism. The aim of the modern revisionists is to protect imperialist rule, and they attempt to hold the proletariat and all the rest of the working people perpetually in capitalist enslavement.

Peaceful coexistence of different countries and people’s revolutions in various countries are in themselves two different things, not one and the same thing; two different concepts, not one; two different kinds of question, and not one and the same kind of question.

Peaceful coexistence refers to relations between countries; revolution means the overthrow of the oppressing classes by the oppressed people within each country, while in the case of the colonies and semi-colonies, it is first and foremost a question of overthrowing alien oppressors, namely, the imperialists. Before the October Revolution the question of peaceful coexistence between socialist and capitalist countries simply did not exist in the world, as there were as yet no socialist countries at that time; but there did exist the questions of the proletarian revolution and the national revolution, as the peoples in various countries, in accordance with the specific conditions in their own countries, had long ago put revolutions of one kind or another on the order of the day to determine the destinies of their countries.

We are Marxist-Leninists. We have always held that revolution is each nation’s own affair. We have always maintained that the working class can only depend upon itself for its emancipation, and that the emancipation of the people of any given country depends on their own awakening, and on the ripening of revolution in that country. Revolution can neither be exported nor imported. No one can forbid the people of a foreign country to carry out a revolution, nor can one make a revolution in a foreign country

by using the method of “helping the rice shoots to grow by pulling them up.”

Lenin put it well when he said in June 1918:

There are people who believe that the revolution can break out in a foreign country to order, by agreement. These people are either mad or they are provocateurs. We have experienced two revolutions during the past twelve years. We know that revolutions cannot be made to order, or by agreement; they break out when tens of millions of people come to the conclusion that it is impossible to live in the old way any longer.⁶⁵

In addition to the experience of the Russian revolution, is not the experience of the Chinese revolution also one of the best proofs of this? We Chinese people, under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, have also experienced several revolutions. The imperialists and all the reactionaries, like lunatics, have always asserted that our revolutions were made to order from abroad, or in accordance with agreements. But people all over the world know that our revolutions were not imported from abroad, but were brought about because our people found it impossible to continue to live in the old China and because they wanted to create a new life of their own.

When a socialist country, in the face of imperialist attack, is compelled to wage a defensive war and launch counter-attacks, is it justified in going beyond its own border to pursue and eliminate its enemies from abroad, as the Soviet Union did in the war against Hitler? Certainly it is completely justified, absolutely necessary and entirely just. In accordance with the strict principles of communists, such operations by the socialist countries must absolutely be limited to the time when imperialism launches a war of aggression against them. Socialist countries never permit themselves to send, never should and never will send their troops across their borders unless they are subjected to aggression from a foreign enemy. Since the armed forces of the socialist countries fight for justice, when these forces have to go beyond their borders to counter-attack a foreign enemy, it is only natural that they should exert an influence and have an effect wherever they go; but even then, the emergence of people's revolutions and the establishment of the socialist sys-

⁶⁵ V. I. Lenin, “Fourth Conference of Trade Unions and Factory Committees Of Moscow” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII.

tem in those places and countries where they go will still have to depend on the will of the masses of the people there.

The spread of revolutionary ideas knows no national boundaries. But it is only through the efforts of the masses of people under the specific circumstances in a given country that these ideas will yield revolutionary fruit. This is not only true in the epoch of proletarian revolution but also invariably true in the epoch of bourgeois revolution. The bourgeoisie of various countries in the epoch of their revolution took Rousseau's *Social Contract* as their gospel, while the revolutionary proletariat in various countries take as their gospel Marx's *Communist Manifesto* and *Capital* and Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* and *The State and Revolution*, and so on. Times vary, the classes vary, the ideologies vary and the character of the revolutions varies. But no one can hold back a revolution in any country if there is a desire for that revolution and when the revolutionary crisis there has matured. In the end the socialist system will replace the capitalist system. This is an objective law independent of human will. No matter how hard the reactionaries may try to prevent the advance of the wheel of history, revolution will take place sooner or later and will surely triumph. This applies to the replacement of one society by another throughout human history. The slave system was replaced by the feudal system which, in its turn, was replaced by the capitalist system. These, too, follow laws independent of human will. And all these changes were carried out through revolution.

That notorious old revisionist Bernstein once said, "Remember ancient Rome, there was a ruling class that did no work, but lived well, and as a result, this class weakened. Such a class must gradually hand over its power."⁶⁶ That the slaveowners as a class "weakened" was a historical fact that Bernstein could not conceal, any more than the present US imperialists can conceal the hard fact of their own steady decline. Yet Bernstein, shameless, self-styled "historian" that he was, chose to cover up the basic fact of ancient Roman history that the slave-owners never "handed over power" of their own accord and that their rule was overthrown by protracted, repeated, continuous slave revolutions.

Revolution means the use of revolutionary violence by the oppressed class, it means revolutionary war. This is true of the slave revolution as well as of the bourgeois revolution. Lenin has put it well:

⁶⁶ Cf. article by E. Bernstein: *Different Forms of Economic Life*.

History teaches us that no oppressed class ever achieved power, nor could achieve power, without going through a period of dictatorship, i.e., the conquest of political power and suppression by force of the most desperate, frenzied resistance always offered by the exploiters... The bourgeoisie... came to power in the advanced countries through a series of insurrections, civil wars, the suppression by force of kings, feudalists, slave-owners and their attempts at restoration.⁶⁷

Why do things happen this way?

In answering this question, again we have to quote Lenin. In the first place, as Lenin said: “No ruling class in the world ever gave way without a struggle.”⁶⁸

Secondly, as Lenin explained: “The reactionary classes themselves are usually the first to resort to violence, to civil war; they are the first to ‘place the bayonet on the agenda.’”⁶⁹

In the light of this how shall we conceive of the proletarian socialist revolution?

In order to answer this question we must quote Lenin again. Let us read the following passage by him:

Not a single great revolution in history has ever been carried out without a civil war and no serious Marxist will believe it possible to make the transition from capitalism to socialism without a civil war.⁷⁰

These words of Lenin here explain the question very clearly. And here is another quotation from Lenin:

If socialism had been born peacefully—but the capitalist gentlemen did not wish to let it be born thus. It is not quite enough to put it this way. Even if there had been no war, the capitalist gentlemen would still have done all they could to prevent such

⁶⁷ V. I. Lenin, “First Congress of the Communist International” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVIII.

⁶⁸ V. I. Lenin, “Speech at Presnya District Workers’ Conference” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVIII.

⁶⁹ V. I. Lenin, *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 141.

⁷⁰ V. I. Lenin, “Prophetic Words” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII.

a peaceful development. Great revolutions, even when they began peacefully, like the great French Revolution, have ended in desperate wars which have been started by the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.⁷¹

This is also very clearly put.

The Great October Revolution is the best material witness to the truth of these propositions of Lenin.

So is the Chinese revolution. No one will ever forget that it was only after going through twenty-two years of bitter civil war that the Chinese people and the Chinese proletariat won nationwide victory and captured state power under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party.

The history of the proletarian revolution in the West after World War I teaches us: even when the capitalist gentlemen do not exercise direct, open control of state power, but rule through their lackeys—the treacherous social-democrats, these despicable renegades will surely be ready at any time, in accordance with the dictates of the bourgeoisie, to cover up the violence of the bourgeois White Guards and plunge the proletarian revolutionary fighters into a bloodbath. This is just the way it was in Germany at that time. Vanquished, the big German bourgeoisie handed over state power to the social-democrats. The social-democratic government, on coming to power, immediately launched a bloody suppression of the German working class in January 1919. Let us recall how Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, whom Lenin called “outstanding representatives of the world proletarian International” and “the immortal leaders of the international socialist revolution,” shed their blood as a result of the violence of the social-democrats of the day. Let us also recall, in Lenin’s words, “the vileness and shamelessness of these murders”⁷² perpetrated by these renegades—these so-called “socialists”—for the purpose of preserving the capitalist system and the interests of the bourgeoisie! Let us, in the light of all these bloody facts both of the past and of the present capitalist world, examine all the nonsense about the “peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism” mouthed by the old revisionists and their modern counterparts.

⁷¹ V. I. Lenin, “First All-Russia Congress on Adult Education” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX.

⁷² V. I. Lenin, “Speech at Presnya District Workers’ Conference” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVIII.

Does it follow, then, that we Marxist-Leninists will refuse to adopt the policy of peaceful transition even when there exists the possibility of peaceful development? No, decidedly not.

As we all know, Engels, one of the great founders of scientific communism, in the famous work *Principles of Communism* answered the question: “Can private property be eliminated by peaceful means?” He wrote:

One would wish that it could be thus, and communists, of course, would be the last to object to this. Communists know very well that all plots are not only futile, but even pernicious. They know very well that revolutions cannot be thought up and made arbitrarily as one wishes and that revolutions have always and everywhere been the necessary result of existing conditions, which have absolutely not depended on the will and leadership of separate parties and whole classes. But at the same time, they see that the development of the proletariat in nearly all civilized countries is being violently suppressed and that in this way the opponents of the communists are working as hard as they can for the revolution.⁷³

This was written over a hundred years ago, yet how fresh it is as we read it again!

We also know that for a time following the Russian February Revolution, in view of the specific conditions of the time, Lenin did adopt the policy of peaceful development of the revolution. He considered it “an extraordinarily rare opportunity in the history of revolutions”⁷⁴ and grasped tight hold of it. The bourgeois Provisional Government and the White Guards, however, destroyed this possibility of peaceful development of the revolution and drenched the streets of Petrograd in the blood of the workers and soldiers marching in a peaceful mass demonstration in July. Lenin, therefore, pointed out:

The peaceful course of development has been rendered impossible. A non-peaceful and most painful course has begun.⁷⁵

⁷³ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party & Principles of Communism*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 87.

⁷⁴ V. I. Lenin, “The Tasks of the Revolution” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI.

⁷⁵ V. I. Lenin, “On Slogans” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXV.

We know too that when there was a widespread and ardent desire for peace among the people throughout the country after the conclusion of the Chinese War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression, our Party conducted peace negotiations with the Kuomintang, seeking to institute social and political reforms in China by peaceful means, and in 1946 an agreement on achieving internal peace was reached with the Kuomintang. The Kuomintang reactionaries, however, defying the will of the whole people, tore up this agreement and, with the support of US imperialism, launched a civil war on a nationwide scale. This left the Chinese people with no option but to wage a revolutionary war. As we never relaxed our vigilance or gave up the people's armed forces in our struggle for peaceful reform but were fully prepared, the people were not cowed by the war, but those who launched the war were made to eat their own bitter fruit.

It would be in the best interests of the people if the proletariat could attain power and carry out the transition to socialism by peaceful means. It would be wrong not to make use of such a possibility when it occurs. Whenever an opportunity for "peaceful development of the revolution" presents itself, Communists must firmly seize it, as Lenin did, so as to realize the aim of socialist revolution. However, this sort of opportunity is always, in Lenin's words, "an extraordinarily rare opportunity in the history of revolutions." When in a given country a certain local political power is already encircled by revolutionary forces or when in the world a certain capitalist country is already encircled by socialism—in such cases, there might be a greater possibility of opportunities for the peaceful development of the revolution. But even then, the peaceful development of the revolution should never be regarded as the only possibility and it is therefore necessary to be prepared at the same time for the other possibility, i.e., non-peaceful development of the revolution. For instance, after the liberation of the Chinese mainland, although certain areas ruled by slave-owners and serf-owners were already surrounded by the absolutely predominant people's revolutionary forces, yet, as an old Chinese saying goes, "Cornered beasts will still fight," a handful of the most reactionary slave-owners and serf-owners there still gave a last kick, rejecting peaceful reforms and launching armed rebellions. Only after these rebellions were quelled was it possible to carry out the reform of the social systems.

At a time when the imperialists in the imperialist countries are armed to the teeth as never before in order to protect their savage man-eating system, can it be said that imperialism has become very “peaceable” towards the proletariat and the people at home and the oppressed nations, as the modern revisionists claim, and that therefore, the “extraordinarily rare opportunity in the history of revolutions” that Lenin spoke about after the February Revolution, will henceforth become a normal state of affairs for the proletariat and all the oppressed people the world over, so that what Lenin referred to as a “rare opportunity” will hereafter be easily available to the proletariat in the capitalist countries? We hold that these views are completely groundless.

Marxist-Leninists should never forget this truth: the armed forces of all ruling classes are used in the first place to oppress their people at home. Only on the basis of oppression of the people at home can the imperialists oppress other countries, launch aggression and wage unjust wars. In order to oppress their own people they need to maintain and strengthen their reactionary armed forces. Lenin once wrote in the course of the Russian revolution of 1905: “A standing army is used not so much against the external enemy as against the internal enemy.”⁷⁶ Is this proposition valid for all countries where the exploiting classes dominate for all the capitalist countries? Can it be said that it was valid then but has become incorrect now? In our opinion, this truth remains irrefutable and the facts are confirming its correctness more and more. Strictly speaking, if the proletariat of any country fails to see this clearly it will not be able to find the way to its own liberation.

In *The State and Revolution* Lenin centered the problem of revolution on the smashing of the bourgeois state machine. Lenin quoted the most important passages from Marx’s *The Civil War in France*, in which it is stated: “After the Revolution of 1848-49, the State power became ‘the national war engine of capital against labor.’”⁷⁷ The main machine of the bourgeois state power to wage an anti-labor war is its standing army. Therefore, “The first decree of the Commune... was the suppression of the standing army, and the substitution for it of the armed people.”⁷⁸

⁷⁶ V. I. Lenin, “The Armed Forces and the Revolution” in *Collected Works*, Vol. X.

⁷⁷ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

So in the last analysis, in tackling our question we have to go back to the principles of the Paris Commune which, as Marx put it, are eternal and indestructible.

In the seventies of the nineteenth century Marx took Britain and the United States to be exceptions, holding that as far as these two countries were concerned there existed the possibility of “peaceful” transition to socialism, because militarism and bureaucracy were not yet much developed in these two countries at that time. But in the epoch of imperialism, as Lenin put it, “this qualification made by Marx is no longer valid,” for these two countries “have today completely sunk into the all-European filthy, bloody morass of bureaucratic-military institutions which subordinate everything to themselves and trample everything underfoot.”⁷⁹ This was one of the focal points of the debate Lenin had with the opportunists of the day. The opportunists represented by Kautsky distorted this “no longer valid” proposition of Marx, in an attempt to oppose the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, to oppose the revolutionary armed forces and armed revolution which are indispensable to the liberation of the proletariat. The reply Lenin gave to Kautsky was as follows:

The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is violence against the bourgeoisie; and the necessity for such violence is particularly created, as Marx and Engels have repeatedly explained in detail, by the existence of militarism and bureaucracy. But it is precisely these institutions that were nonexistent in England and America in the seventies of the nineteenth century, when Marx made his observations (they do exist in England and in America now).⁸⁰

It can thus be seen that the proletariat is compelled to resort to the means of armed revolution. Marxists have always been willing to bring about the transition to socialism by the peaceful way. As long as the peaceful way is there to adopt, Marxist-Leninists will never give it up. But the aim of the bourgeoisie is precisely to block this way when it possesses a powerful, militarist-bureaucratic machine of suppression.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 39.

⁸⁰ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, p. 14.

The above quotation was written by Lenin in November 1918. How do things stand now? Is it that Lenin's words were historically valid, but are no longer so under present conditions, as the modern revisionists allege? As everybody can see, the present situation is that the capitalist countries, particularly the few imperialist powers headed by the United States, with hardly an exception, are frantically strengthening their militarist-bureaucratic machines of suppression, and especially their military machines.

The Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of the Representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the Socialist Countries of November 1957, states:

Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or another stage of the struggle for socialism.

This is a new summing up of the experience of the struggle of the international proletariat in the few decades since Lenin's death.

The question is not whether the proletariat is willing to carry out a peaceful transformation; it is rather whether the bourgeoisie will accept such a peaceful transformation. This is the only way in which followers of Lenin should approach this question.

So, contrary to the modern revisionists who seek to paralyze the revolutionary will of the people by empty talk about peaceful transition, Marxist-Leninists hold that the question of the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism can be raised only in the light of the specific conditions obtaining in each country at a given period. The proletariat must never allow itself to one-sidedly and groundlessly base its thinking, policy and its whole work on the assumption that the bourgeoisie is willing to accept peaceful transformation. It must, at the same time, prepare for alternatives: one for the peaceful development of the revolution and the other for the non-peaceful development of the revolution. Whether the transition will be carried out through armed uprising or by peaceful means is a question that is fundamentally different from that of peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist countries; it is an internal affair of each country, one to be

determined only by the relative strength of class forces in that country in a given period, a matter of policy to be decided only by the Communists of that country themselves.

VI

After the October Revolution, in 1919, Lenin discussed the historical lessons to be drawn from the Second International. He said that the growth of the proletarian movement during the period of the Second International “was in breadth, at the cost of a temporary fall in the revolutionary level, a temporary increase in the strength of opportunism, which in the end led to the disgraceful collapse of this International.”⁸¹ What is opportunism? According to Lenin, “Opportunism consists in sacrificing fundamental interests in order to gain temporary, partial benefits.”⁸²

And what does a fall in the revolutionary level mean? It means that the opportunists try by all means to induce the masses to focus their attention on their day-to-day, temporary and partial interests, and forget their long-term, fundamental and overall interests.

Marxist-Leninists hold that the question of parliamentary struggle should be considered in the light of long-term, fundamental and overall interests.

Lenin told us about the limitations of parliamentary struggle, but he also warned communists against narrow-minded, sectarian errors. In his well-known work *“Left-Wing” Communism, an Infantile Disorder* Lenin elucidated the experience of the Russian revolution, showing under what conditions a boycott of parliament is correct and under what other conditions it is incorrect. Lenin held that every proletarian party should make use of every possible opportunity to participate in necessary parliamentary struggles. It was fundamentally wrong and would only harm the cause of the revolutionary proletariat for a communist party member to engage only in empty talk about the revolution, while being unwilling to work perseveringly and painstakingly and shunning necessary parliamentary struggles. At that time

⁸¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Third International and Its Place in History” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX.

⁸² V. I. Lenin, “Speech Delivered at a Meeting of Activists of the Moscow Organization of the RCP(B)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

Lenin criticized the mistakes of the Communists in some European countries in refusing to participate in parliament. He said:

The childishness of those who “repudiate” participation in parliament consists precisely in the fact that they think it possible to “solve” the difficult problem of combating bourgeois-democratic influences within the working-class movement by such “simple,” “easy,” supposedly revolutionary methods when in reality they are only running away from their own shadow, only closing their eyes to difficulties and only trying to brush them aside with mere words.⁸³

Why is it necessary to engage in parliamentary struggle? According to Lenin, it is for the purpose of combating bourgeois influences within the ranks of the working-class movement, or, as he pointed out elsewhere, “*precisely* for the purpose of educating the backward strata of *its own class*, precisely for the purpose of awakening and enlightening the undeveloped, downtrodden, ignorant rural *masses*.”⁸⁴

In other words, it is to enhance the political and ideological level of the masses, to coordinate parliamentary struggle with revolutionary struggle, and not to lower our political and ideological standards and divorce parliamentary struggle from the revolutionary struggle.

Identity with the masses but no lowering of revolutionary standards—this is a fundamental principle which Lenin taught us to firmly adhere to in our proletarian struggle.

It is necessary to take part in parliamentary struggles, but not place a blind faith in the bourgeois parliamentary system. Why? Because so long as the militarist-bureaucratic state machine of the bourgeoisie remains intact, parliament is nothing but an adornment for the bourgeois dictatorship even if the working-class party commands a majority in parliament or becomes the biggest party in it. Moreover, so long as such a state machine remains intact, the bourgeoisie is fully able at any time, in accordance with the needs of its own interests, either to dissolve parliament when necessary, or to use various open and underhand tricks to turn a working-class party which is the biggest party in parliament into a minority, or to reduce its seats in par-

⁸³ V. I. Lenin, “*Left-Wing*” *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, p. 121.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

liament, even when it has polled more votes than before in an election. It is, therefore, difficult to imagine that changes will take place in the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie itself as a result of votes in parliament and it is just as difficult to imagine that the proletariat can adopt measures in parliament for a peaceful transition to socialism just because it has won a certain number of votes in parliament. The experience in a series of capitalist countries long ago proved this point fully and the experience in various European and Asian countries since World War II has provided fresh proof of it.

Lenin said:

The proletariat cannot be victorious unless it wins over to its side the majority of the population. But to limit or condition this to the gathering of a majority of votes at elections while the bourgeoisie remains dominant is the most utter stupidity or simply swindling the workers.⁸⁵

The modern revisionists hold that these words of Lenin are out of date. But the living realities before our eyes bear witness to the fact that these words of Lenin are still the best medicine, though bitter tasting, for proletarian revolutionaries in any country.

Lowering revolutionary standards means lowering the theoretical standards of Marxism-Leninism. It means lowering political struggles to the level of economic ones and lowering revolutionary struggles to the level of restricting them entirely within the limits of parliamentary struggles. It means bartering away principles for temporary benefits.

At the beginning of the 20th century Lenin in *What Is to Be Done?* already drew attention to the question that “the spread of Marxism was accompanied by a certain lowering of theoretical standards.”⁸⁶ Lenin cited Marx’s opinion contained in a letter on “The Gotha Program” that we may enter into agreements to attain the practical aims of the movement, but we must never trade in principles and make “concessions” in theory. Then, Lenin added the following words, which by now are well known to almost all Communists:

⁸⁵ V. I. Lenin, “The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

⁸⁶ V. I. Lenin, *What Is to Be Done?*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 24.

Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism is combined with absorption in the narrowest forms of practical activity.⁸⁷

What an important revelation this is to revolutionary Marxists! The entire revolutionary movement in Russia gained victory in October 1917 precisely under the guidance of this revolutionary Marxist thought, which was firmly upheld by the Bolshevik Party headed by the great Lenin. The Chinese Communist Party also gained experience in regard to the above-mentioned question on two occasions. The first was during the 1927 revolutionary period. The policy adopted at that time by Chen Duxiu's opportunism towards the Communist Party's united front with the Kuomintang was a departure from the principles and stand which a communist party should uphold. It advocated that the Communist Party should in principle be reduced to the level of the Kuomintang. The result was defeat for the revolution. The second occasion was during the period of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression. The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party firmly upheld the Marxist-Leninist stand, exposed the differences in principle between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang in their attitudes towards the war against Japan, and held that the Communist Party must never make concessions in principle to the Kuomintang on such attitudes. But the right opportunism represented by Wang Ming repeated the mistakes made by Chen Duxiu ten years earlier and wanted to reduce the Communist Party in principle to the level of the Kuomintang. Therefore, our entire Party carried out a great debate with the right opportunists. Comrade Mao Zedong said:

If Communists forget this difference in principle, they will not be able to direct the Anti-Japanese War correctly, they will be powerless to correct the Kuomintang's one-sided approach to resistance, and they will debase themselves to the point of abandoning their principles and debase their Party to the level of the Kuomintang. That would be a crime against the sacred cause

⁸⁷ Ibid.

of the national revolutionary war and the defense of the homeland.⁸⁸

It was precisely because the Central Committee of our Party refused to make the slightest concessions on questions of principle, and adopted a policy of both unity and struggle in our Party's united front with the Kuomintang, that our Party's positions in the political and ideological fields were consolidated and expanded, as was the national revolutionary united front. As a result, the forces of the people were strengthened and expanded in the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression, and we were thus enabled to smash the large-scale attacks launched by the Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries after the conclusion of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression and win nationwide victory in the great people's revolution.

Judging by the experience of the Chinese revolution, mistakes of right deviation are likely to occur in our Party when the proletariat enters into political cooperation with the bourgeoisie, whereas mistakes of "left" deviation are likely to occur in our Party when these two classes break away from each other politically. In the course of leading the Chinese revolution, our Party also waged struggles on many occasions against "left" adventurism. The "left" adventurists were unable to correctly handle the complex class relations in China from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint; they failed to understand how to adopt different correct policies towards different classes at different historical periods, but simply followed the erroneous policy of struggle without unity. Had this mistake of "left" adventurism not been overcome, it would have been equally impossible for the Chinese revolution to achieve victory.

In line with the Leninist viewpoint, the proletariat in any country, if it is to gain victory in the revolution, must have a genuinely Marxist-Leninist party which is skilled at integrating the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution in its own country and which is able at different periods to correctly determine whom the revolution should be directed against and settle the question of organizing the main force and its allies and the question of whom it should rely on and unite with. The revolutionary proletarian party must rely closely on the masses of its own class

⁸⁸ Mao Zedong, "The Situation and Tasks in the Anti-Japanese War After the Fall of Shanghai and Taiyuan" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. II, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 49-50.

and on the semi-proletariat in the rural areas, namely, the broad masses of poor peasants, and establish the worker-peasant alliance led by the proletariat. Only then is it possible, on the basis of this alliance, to unite with all the social forces that it is possible to unite with and to establish, in accordance with specific conditions in the different countries at different periods, the united front of the working people with all the non-working people that it is possible to unite with. If it fails to do so, the proletariat will not be able to achieve its purpose of gaining victory in the revolution at different stages.

The modern revisionists and certain representatives of the bourgeoisie try to make people believe that it is possible to achieve socialism without a revolutionary party of the proletariat and without the above-mentioned series of correct policies of such a party. This is sheer nonsense and pure deception. The *Communist Manifesto* by Marx and Engels pointed out that there were at that time different kinds of “socialism”: petit-bourgeois “socialism,” bourgeois “socialism,” feudal “socialism,” etc. Now, as a result of the victory of Marxism-Leninism and the decay of the capitalist system, more and more of the mass of the people in various countries are turning to socialism and a still more motley variety of “socialisms” have emerged from among the exploiting classes in certain countries. Just as Engels said, these so-called “socialists” also “wanted to eliminate social abuses through their various universal panaceas and all kinds of patchwork, without hurting capital and profit in the least,” they “stood outside the labor movement” and “looked for support rather to the ‘educated’ classes.”⁸⁹ They only put up the signboard of “socialism” but actually practice capitalism. In these circumstances it is of extremely great significance to adhere firmly to the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism and to wage an irreconcilable struggle against any tendency to lower the revolutionary standards, especially against revisionism and right opportunism.

In regard to the question of safeguarding world peace at the present time there are also certain people who declare that ideological disputes are no longer necessary, or that there is no longer any difference in principle between Communists and social-democrats. This is tantamount to lowering the ideological and political standards of the Communists to those of the bourgeoisie and social-democrats. Those who make such statements have

⁸⁹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party & Principles of Communism*, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

been influenced by modern revisionism and have thus departed from the position of Marxism-Leninism.

The struggle for peace and the struggle for socialism are two different kinds of struggle. It is a mistake not to make a proper distinction between these two kinds of struggle. The social composition of those taking part in the peace movement is, of course, much more complex; it also includes bourgeois pacifists. We Communists stand right in the forefront in defending world peace, right in the forefront in opposing imperialist wars, in advocating peaceful coexistence and opposing nuclear weapons. In this movement we shall work together with many complex social groups and enter into necessary agreements for the attainment of peace. But at the same time we must uphold the principles of the working-class party and not lower our political and ideological standards or reduce ourselves to the level of the bourgeois pacifists in our struggle for peace. It is here that the question of alliance and criticism arises.

“Peace” in the mouths of modern revisionists is intended to whitewash the war preparations of imperialism, to play again the tune of “ultra-imperialism” of the old opportunists, which was long since refuted by Lenin, and to distort the policy of us Communists concerning peaceful coexistence of countries with two different systems into elimination of the people’s revolution in various countries. It was that old revisionist Bernstein who made this shameful and notorious statement: “The movement is everything, the final aim is nothing.” The modern revisionists have a similar statement: The peace movement is everything, the aim is nothing. Therefore, the “peace” they talk about is entirely limited to the “peace” which may be acceptable to the imperialists under certain historical conditions and it is designed to lower the revolutionary standards of the peoples of various countries and destroy their revolutionary will.

We Communists fight in defense of world peace, for the realization of the policy of peaceful coexistence. At the same time we support the anti-imperialist revolutionary wars of the oppressed nations and the revolutionary wars of the oppressed peoples for their own liberation and social progress, because all these revolutionary wars are just wars. Naturally, we must continue to explain to the masses Lenin’s thesis that the capitalist-imperialist system is the source of modern war; we must continue to explain to the masses the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the replacement of capitalist-imperialism

by socialism and communism is the final goal of our struggle. We must not conceal our principles from the masses.

VII

We are living in a great new epoch in which the collapse of the imperialist system is being further accelerated, while the victory of the people throughout the world and their awakening are constantly advancing.

The peoples of the various countries are now in a much more fortunate situation than ever before because of the fact that in the forty-odd years since the October Revolution, one-third of mankind have freed themselves from capitalist-imperialist oppression and founded a number of socialist states where a life of lasting internal peace has really been established. They are exerting their influence on the destiny of mankind and will greatly speed the day when universal, lasting peace will reign throughout the world.

Marching in the forefront of all the socialist countries and till the whole socialist camp is the great Soviet Union, the first socialist state created by the Soviet workers and peasants led by Lenin and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Lenin's ideals have been realized in the Soviet Union; socialism has long since been built and now, under the leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government headed by Comrade Khrushchev, a great period of the extensive building of communism is already beginning. The valiant and enormously talented Soviet workers, peasants and intellectuals have brought about a great, new labor upsurge in their struggle for the grand goal of building communism.

We, the Chinese Communists and the Chinese people, cheer every new achievement of the Soviet Union, the native land of Leninism.

The Chinese Communist Party, integrating the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution, has led the people of the entire country in winning the victory of the great people's revolution, and carrying the socialist revolution to full completion along the broad common road of socialist revolution and socialist construction charted by Lenin, and they have already begun to win great victories on the various fronts of socialist construction. The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party creatively set forth for the Chinese people, in accordance with Lenin's principles and in the light of conditions in China,

the correct principles of the general line for building socialism, the big leap forward and the people's communes, which have inspired the initiative and revolutionary spirit of the masses throughout the country and are thus day after day bringing about new changes in the face of our country.

Under our common banner of Leninism, the socialist countries in Eastern Europe and the other socialist countries in Asia have also attained progress by leaps and bounds in socialist construction.

Leninism is an ever victorious banner. For the working people throughout the world, taking firm hold of this great banner means taking hold of truth and opening up for themselves a road of continuous victory.

Lenin will always live in our hearts. And when modern revisionists endeavor to smear Leninism, the great banner of the international proletariat, our task is to defend Leninism.

All of us remember what Lenin wrote in his famous work *The State and Revolution*, about what happened to the teachings of revolutionary thinkers and leaders in the past struggles of various oppressed classes for liberation. Lenin wrote that after the death of these revolutionary thinkers and leaders, distortions ensued, "emasculating the essence of the revolutionary teaching, blunting its revolutionary edge and vulgarizing it." Lenin continued,

At the present time, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists within the working-class movement concur in this "doctoring" of Marxism. They omit, obliterate and distort the revolutionary side of this teaching, its revolutionary soul. They push to the foreground and extol what is or seems acceptable to the bourgeoisie.⁹⁰

Just so, at the present time we are again confronted by certain representatives of US imperialism who, once again assuming the pious mien of preachers, even declare that Marx was "a great thinker of the nineteenth century" and even acknowledge that what Marx predicted in the nineteenth century about the days of capitalism being numbered, was "well-grounded" and "correct"; but, these preachers continue, after the advent of the twentieth century, and especially in recent decades, Marxism has become incorrect, because capitalism has become a thing of the past and has ceased to exist, at least in the United States. After hearing such nonsense from these impe-

⁹⁰ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

rialist preachers, we cannot but feel that the modern revisionists are talking the same language as they do. But the modern revisionists do not stop at distorting the teachings of Marx, they go further to distort the teachings of Lenin, the great continuer of Marxism who carried Marxism forward.

The Declaration of the Moscow Meeting pointed out that "...the main danger at present is revisionism, or, in other words, Right-wing opportunism." Some say that this judgement of the Moscow Meeting no longer holds good under today's conditions. We hold this view to be wrong. It makes the people overlook the importance of the struggle against the main danger—revisionism, and is very harmful to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat. Just as from the seventies of the nineteenth century there was a period of "peaceful" development of capitalism during which the old revisionism of Bernstein was born, so under the present circumstances when imperialism is compelled to accept peaceful coexistence and when there is still some sort of "internal peace" in many capitalist countries, it is most easy for revisionist ideas to grow and spread. Therefore, we must always maintain a high degree of vigilance against this main danger in the working-class movement.

As pupils of Lenin and as Leninists, we must utterly smash the attempts of the modern revisionists to distort and carve up the teachings of Lenin.

Leninism is the complete and integrated revolutionary teaching of the proletariat; it is a complete and integrated revolutionary world outlook which, following Marx and Engels, continues to express the thinking of the proletariat. This complete and integrated revolutionary teaching and revolutionary world outlook must not be distorted or carved up. We hold the view that the attempts of the modern revisionists to distort and carve up Leninism are nothing but a manifestation of the last-ditch struggle of imperialism facing its doom. In face of continuous victories in building communism in the Soviet Union, in face of continuous victories in building socialism in the socialist countries, in face of the growing consolidation of the unity of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and of the steadfast and valiant struggles being waged by the increasingly awakened peoples of the world to free themselves from the shackles of capitalist-imperialism, the revisionist endeavors of Tito and his ilk are completely futile.

Long live great Leninism!

Forward Along the Path of the Great Lenin!

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT OF “*RENMIN RIBAO*”

April 22, 1960

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, April 22, 1960, pp. 1-2.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, April 26, 1960, Vol. III, No. 17, pp. 23-33.

Today, the awakened working people of the whole world are commemorating the 90th anniversary of the birth of V. I. Lenin, great revolutionary teacher of the proletariat.

Lenin was the founder of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the architect of the world's first socialist state—the Soviet Union—and the greatest leader of the international communist movement after Marx and Engels. In the sphere of philosophy, political economy and the theory of scientific socialism, Lenin developed Marxism to a new stage—the stage of Leninism. Leninism is Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

The victory of the October Socialist Revolution under the guidance of Lenin freed one-sixth of the earth from capitalist rule. Some 30 years later, a series of new socialist countries were born in Europe and Asia, forming the powerful socialist camp. With the victory of the Chinese revolution, the socialist camp has more than one-quarter of the earth and over one-third of the world's population. The relative strength of class forces in the world has altered much to the advantage of the proletariat and the working people.

The theory and the cause of Lenin are dear to the Chinese people because it was precisely in Leninism that the Chinese people found their way to liberation. At a time when Lenin was still little known in China, he repeatedly pointed out in his writings the great significance and prospects of the revolutionary struggle in China. As early as 1913, Lenin in his *The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx* set forth his well-known proposition that Asia was “a new source of great world storms.” Later, as Comrade Mao Zedong said “The salvoes of the October Revolution brought us Marxism-Lenin-

ism.”⁹¹ With Marxism-Leninism and with a Marxist-Leninist proletarian revolutionary party the Chinese revolution entered upon a new stage.

Lenin pointed out: Imperialism is the eve of the proletarian revolution, and will inevitably perish in the combined struggles of the international proletariat and the oppressed nations; the state is an organ of violence at the service of class rule and the proletariat must use revolutionary violence to overthrow counter-revolutionary violence, smash the militarist-bureaucratic state machine of the bourgeoisie and set up a new state of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the proletariat must endeavor to consolidate its alliance with the peasants, thoroughly solve the agrarian question, strive to secure the leadership in the democratic revolution and must maintain its own independent position in forming an alliance with the national bourgeoisie (or in the popular Chinese expression, both uniting with and struggling against it); it must establish a proletarian revolutionary party of a new type, which must oppose revisionism that betrays Marxism, overcome “left” adventurism in the communist movement, firmly trust the masses and rely on them. These teachings of Lenin have armed the proletariat of the world as well as the proletariat of China. The universal truths of Marxism-Leninism were readily accepted by the proletariat and revolutionary people of China chiefly because the long-suffering Chinese people had no way out except to fight resolutely for liberation. In the old China under the most brutal and barbarous rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, how could the proletariat and the masses of people entertain any illusions about the “kind-heartedness” of imperialism? How could they entertain any illusions about the reactionary ruling class handing over state power to the people of its own accord?

The political party of the Chinese proletariat—the Communist Party—and its leader Comrade Mao Zedong have creatively applied the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism, integrated them with the concrete reality of the Chinese Revolution and ceaselessly pushed forward the revolutionary struggle in China. When the bourgeois reactionaries represented by Chiang Kai-shek betrayed the revolution and plunged the people into a bloodbath, the Chinese proletariat and its political party could not but use revolutionary violence to resist the counter-revolutionary violence. After 22 years of

⁹¹ Mao Zedong, “On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 415.

revolutionary war, they finally overthrew the dark rule of imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionaries, established the people's democratic dictatorship led by the proletariat and guided the Chinese people onto the broad path of socialism.

The victory of the Chinese revolution is the victory of Marxism-Leninism in China. The many victories won by Marxism-Leninism all over the world and in China have made it increasingly clear that the truths of Marxism-Leninism are irrefutable and that they are the guide to action for all the world's oppressed classes and oppressed people in winning liberation and for the people throughout the world in marching towards socialism and communism.

What are the chief tasks of the Chinese people, as we commemorate the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth? We hold that there are three chief tasks, namely, to build socialism, to strive for world peace and to unite with our international friends.

The first task before the Chinese people at present is to develop our socialist construction at high speed, to build our country in not too long a period into a great socialist power with a highly developed modern industry, modern agriculture, modern science and culture. The accomplishment of this task will not only be of decisive significance to the Chinese people but will also be of pronounced and tremendous significance to the cause of peace and socialism of the people of the world.

The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Comrade Mao Zedong, integrating the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete reality of China's socialist revolution and socialist construction, put forward the general line of going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism. The general line is the most important guarantee for the Chinese people's successful accomplishment of this great task.

To accomplish this great task our people must, as the first step, strive to catch up with and outstrip Britain in the output of major industrial products in less than ten years, and basically set up a complete industrial system; strive to realize ahead of schedule the National Program for Agricultural Development (1956-1967), carry out in the main agricultural mechanization, build water conservancy works on an extensive scale and achieve a considerable degree of electrification in agriculture; strive to carry out the cul-

tural revolution, to introduce in not too long a period universal elementary and secondary school education and spare-time education in the main and strive to fulfil ahead of schedule the Long-Term Plan for the Development of Science and Technology (1956-1967). At the same time, it is necessary to continue carrying through the socialist revolution on the economic, political and ideological fronts, bring about the complete victory of socialism over capitalism in every sphere and greatly raise the socialist and communist consciousness of the masses. At present, for the fulfillment and over-fulfillment of the 1960 National Economic Plan, the Chinese people are unfolding a rousing campaign to increase production and practice economy centering around technical innovations and the technical revolution, striving to raise this year's output of pig iron to 27.5 million tons; steel to 18.4 million tons; coal to 425 million tons; electric power to more than 55,500 million kilowatt hours and striving to increase the output of grain and cotton by around 10 percent respectively. Thus, the gross value of industrial and agricultural output this year will be 23 percent higher than last year.

The US imperialists spare no slander and ridicule on the question of whether the Chinese people can build their country into a powerful socialist state at high speed. Taking a distant example, in November 1958, the late US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said that "it is hard to believe that this effort will succeed, or be enduring" Taking a recent example, the present US Assistant Secretary of State Parsons said in February of this year that China's campaign to speed up its industrialization "might bring about the violent destruction of the regime from within." But oddly enough, the more malicious the imperialists' slanders, the higher the revolutionary enthusiasm of the Chinese people and the greater their drive in construction. China's economic situation and the political unity of our people have grown better and better year by year. No one today among the broad masses of people doubts that we shall certainly be able to fulfil ahead of schedule and over-fulfill our great construction plan.

Marxism-Leninism has always pointed out that under the socialist system a great emancipation of the productive forces of society and a great emancipation of the initiative and creativeness of the people can be brought about. Lenin held that life in socialist society is a genuinely mass movement never before known in history, in which the great majority of the population or even the entire population takes part. He held that such vigorous

creative power of the masses is the basic factor in socialist society and that there is an inexhaustible supply of creative talents among the workers and peasants. Lenin described one of the “most profound and at the same time most explicit” Marxist principles in the following terms:

The greater the scope and extent of historical actions, the greater is the number of people who participate in these actions, and, contrariwise, the more profound is the transformation we wish to accomplish, the more must we arouse an interest and an intelligent attitude towards this transformation and the more must we convince millions and tens of millions of people that it is necessary. In the last analysis, the reason why our revolution has left all other revolutions far behind is that, through the Soviet form of government, it aroused tens of millions of people who were formerly not interested in state development to take an active part in state development.⁹²

We are convinced that the speed of development in our country, like that in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, will far surpass any ever attained by the capitalist countries. As Chinese Communists put it, it is possible to advance at leap-forward speed. That is because we have, as Lenin said, most extensively mobilized millions upon millions of people to take part in the construction of our country with the highest degree of activity and creativeness by means of the following: our Party’s general line of going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism; the whole set of policies we are now carrying out and known as “walking on two legs”—simultaneous development of industry and agriculture, of heavy and light industries, of national and local industries, of large, medium-sized and small enterprises and of both modern and indigenous methods of production; the present surging mass movement for technical innovations and technical revolution to bring about mechanization, semi-mechanization, automation and semi-automation; the consolidation and development of our rural people’s communes and the present establishment of urban people’s communes on an extensive scale. Like the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, China is pushing forward its economic construction in accordance with the common laws of

⁹² V. I. Lenin, “Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, Report on the Work of the Council of People’s Commissars December 22” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

socialist construction, and the series of concrete policies adopted by China in regard to the problems of socialist construction are precisely the product of integrating the universal truths of Leninism with the concrete reality of China.

The ignorant bourgeois in the Western countries once kicked up a great deal of fuss about the Soviet Union's high-speed socialist construction. Now they are doing the same about China's high-speed socialist construction, general line, big leaps forward and people's communes. The great Lenin dealt a mortal blow to these idiots long ago, in his famous essay *Our Revolution*, written a year before his death. Lenin pointed out:

Russia—standing as she does on the border line between the civilized countries and the countries which this war⁹³ had for the first time definitely brought into the orbit of civilization, that is, all the Oriental, non-European countries—might therefore and was indeed bound to reveal certain peculiar features which, while of course in keeping with the general line of world development, distinguish her revolution from all previous revolutions in West-European countries, and which introduce certain partial innovations in passing to the Oriental countries.⁹⁴

Lenin countered with the question:

What if the complete hopelessness of the situation, by increasing the strength of the workers and peasants tenfold, offered us the possibility of creating the fundamental requisites of civilization in a different way from that of the West-European countries?⁹⁵

Lenin predicted once again:

Our European philistines never even dream that the subsequent revolutions in Oriental countries, which possess much vaster populations and a much vaster diversity of social conditions, will undoubtedly display even greater peculiarities than the Russian revolution.⁹⁶

⁹³ World War I—*Ed.*

⁹⁴ V. I. Lenin, "Our Revolution" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

Is that not borne out exactly by the facts? Has not the Soviet Union, using a different way from all Western countries, already, in a very short period of time and at flying speed, surpassed all the capitalist countries of Western Europe in the level of economic development, and is it not overtaking and in certain aspects already beginning to surpass the United States? Likewise, in China, have not the fact of its being “poor and blank,” the complete hopelessness of the situation, decades of tempering in struggle and accumulated experience, plus the assistance of the mighty socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and the benefits derived from the experience of the 40 years’ construction in the Soviet Union—have not all these things also increased the strength of the Chinese workers and peasants tenfold, enabling us to use a different way from all Western countries to forge forward at flying speed towards a modern industry, modern agriculture, modern science and culture? The Western bourgeoisie damn us to failure, and there are actually a handful of their parrots in our ranks who say that our general line, big leaps forward and people’s communes are products of “petit-bourgeois fanaticism,” failing to see that they are precisely products of the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Just let them wait and see, wait for ten years, say, and they should be able to see how things will turn out. In short, the foreign and Chinese philistines with their heads stuffed with metaphysics, as Lenin said, know only to regard the “normalcy” of bourgeois relations as an untouchable golden rule and “have completely failed to understand what is decisive in Marxism, namely, its revolutionary dialectics.” Therefore, just as in the past they were incapable of understanding the great changes taking place in the Soviet Union, so today they are incapable of understanding all the vigorous and vital things happening in China.

The second great task of the Chinese people in commemorating the 90th anniversary of the birth of Lenin is to safeguard world peace and oppose imperialist war together with all the socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union, with all the world’s peace-loving forces, and with all the world’s anti-imperialist and anti-aggression forces.

Marxism-Leninism has always been opposed to imperialist war. On the eve of and during World War I, the revolutionary slogan put forward by Lenin and the other left-wing leaders of the working class who firmly maintained the Marxist stand, was to transform the imperialist war into civil war so as to put an end to the imperialist war and attain peace. One of the main

slogans of the October Revolution was peace. After the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin immediately promulgated the Decree on Peace, advocating a just peace. Afterwards, Lenin repeatedly put forward the policy of peaceful coexistence between the Soviet state and other countries. The Soviet Union, as is well known, has made tremendous efforts both before and after World War II to safeguard world peace, and to bring about collective security and peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems.

Since the day of its founding, the People's Republic of China, together with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, has actively striven to safeguard world peace. From 1950 to 1953, the Chinese people sent their Volunteers to the Korean front to fight heroically, together with the Korean people, to stop US aggression, forcing the US army of aggression in Korea to accept an armistice agreement, and thus safeguarding peace in the Far East. In 1954, the Chinese Government actively participated in the Geneva Conference, at which an agreement was concluded on the restoration of peace in Indo-China. In the same year, the leaders of the Chinese Government with the leaders of the Indian and Burmese Governments one after the other, jointly initiated the well-known Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, which have all along been the foundation-stone of China's foreign policy towards all countries with differing social systems. In 1955, the Chinese Government actively participated in the Bandung Conference of Asian and African countries held in Indonesia, which proclaimed the Ten Principles governing relations between Asian and African countries based on the Five Principles. In 1958, China withdrew all its People's Volunteers from Korea. The Chinese people have all along actively participated in the peace movement of the world and of Asia, and have repeatedly advocated the establishment of collective security and an atom-free zone in the Asian and Pacific region. The Chinese Government has consistently advocated the settlement of disputes with other countries (including the United States) by peaceful means instead of war, and right up to the present is still holding talks on this question with the United States which is occupying China's territory of Taiwan.

The socialist countries and the communist parties of the various countries of the world have been waging unflinching struggles to secure and preserve world peace.

The Moscow Declaration adopted at the meeting of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries held in Moscow in November 1957 and the Peace Manifesto adopted by 64 Communist and Workers' Parties both call on the working class and all the peace-loving people of the world to take action to safeguard peace, and point out that this is at present the most important struggle for the whole world. It is pointed out in both Moscow declarations that there now exist in the world powerful forces for safeguarding peace, and the alliance of these powerful forces has already provided the practical possibility of preventing the outbreak of war. Since the Moscow meeting, the peace forces have been further strengthened. This is first of all because the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union has grown more powerful; the Soviet Union has gone even more markedly ahead of the United States militarily and in the most important aspects of science and technology; Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, paid a series of peace visits to the United States and other capitalist countries; the Soviet Government has made important new efforts on the questions of disarmament, stopping nuclear weapon tests, etc.; the peace efforts of the Soviet Union, China and the other socialist countries are winning ever increasing support among the people. At the same time, the national independence movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the struggles of the people in capitalist countries for democracy and socialism have also shown important new developments. The internal contradictions in the imperialist camp are continuing to grow, the broad masses of people in the United States itself are everywhere showing dissatisfaction and uneasiness about the anti-peace foreign policy of their government, and US imperialism is facing increasing difficulties and isolation. All these circumstances have forced US imperialism, the chief plotter of new war, to accept the proposal for East-West summit talks and change its tune on certain occasions, claiming that it also has a "desire for peace." Facts have proved that the world peace forces are triumphing over the forces of war, which is a manifestation of the fact that "the East wind prevails over the West wind" as Comrade Mao Zedong puts it.⁹⁷

The East wind prevails over the West wind—that is how the new world situation stands today. This new situation fundamentally differs from that

⁹⁷ Mao Zedong, "The East Wind Prevails Over the West Wind" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. VII, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, pp. 416-417.

in Lenin's lifetime, and from that on the eve of World War II. It is entirely necessary to take this new situation into consideration in waging the struggle against the imperialist plans for new war. This new situation has brought unprecedented confidence and courage to all the world's peace-loving forces, all the world's antiimperialist, anti-aggression forces. But that does not in the least mean that this change in the relative strength of forces has changed the nature of imperialism and therefore altogether eliminated the possibility of any war from the life of modern society and that mankind has already entered an epoch of everlasting peace.

Leninism has always held that imperialism is the source of modern war. Lenin said that "modern war is a product of imperialism"⁹⁸ and that war "arises out of the very nature of imperialism."⁹⁹ This proposition of Lenin's which has fundamental significance in principle is the result of a profound scientific analysis of imperialism and innumerable historical facts have proved it to be unshakable truth. The Moscow Meeting of the communist and workers' parties held more than two years ago adduced the latest facts to substantiate this proposition of Lenin's. The Declaration of the Moscow Meeting says:

So long as imperialism exists there will always be soil for aggressive wars. Throughout the post-war years the American, British, French and other imperialists and their stooges have conducted, or are conducting, wars in Indo-China, Indonesia, Korea, Malaya, Kenya, Guatemala, Egypt, Algeria, Oman and Yemen. At the same time the aggressive imperialist forces flatly refuse to cut armaments, to prohibit the use and production of atomic and hydrogen weapons, to agree on immediate discontinuation of the tests of these weapons; they are continuing the "cold war" and arms drive, building more military bases and conducting the aggressive policy of undermining peace and creating the danger of a new war. Were a world war to break out before agreement on prohibition of nuclear weapons is reached,

⁹⁸ V. I. Lenin, "The Draft Resolution of the Left Wing at Zimmerwald" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

⁹⁹ V. I. Lenin, "Eighth Congress of the RCP(B), Speech Closing the Debate on the Party Program" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX.

it would inevitably become a nuclear war unprecedented in destructive force.

In West Germany militarism is being revived with US help, thus creating a hotbed of war in the heart of Europe.

Simultaneously, the imperialists are trying to impose on the freedom-loving peoples of the Near and Middle East the notorious "Eisenhower-Dulles Doctrine" thereby creating the danger of war in this area.

The SEATO aggressive bloc is a source of war danger in South-East Asia.

The Peace Manifesto of the 64 Communist and Workers' Parties says:

The peace forces are legion. They can prevent war and safeguard peace. However, we, the Communists, believe that it is our duty to warn all the people of the world that the danger of a monstrous and annihilating war has not passed.

Where does the threat to peace and the security of the peoples come from? From the capitalist monopolies who have a vested interest in war and amassed unprecedented riches from the two world wars and the current arms drive. The arms drive, which brings huge profits to the monopolies, weighs more and more heavily on the working people and seriously worsens the economy of the countries. The ruling circles of some capitalist countries, under pressure of the monopolies and especially those of the US, have rejected proposals for disarmament, prohibition of nuclear weapons, and other measures aimed at preventing a new war.

Peace can be preserved if only all to whom it is dear combine their forces, sharpen their vigilance in relation to the machinations of the war-instigators and become fully conscious that their sacred duty is to intensify the struggle for peace, which is threatened.

From this it can be seen that the Leninist theory that imperialism is the source of modern war definitely is not and will not be "outmoded." As long as imperialism exists, vigilance against the war danger can never be relaxed. It is from this basic position that the Chinese people carry out the struggle

to safeguard world peace and oppose imperialist war. We welcome every step in the relaxation of the international situation, welcome sincere peace efforts on the part of any country (including the United States), while at the same time we tell the whole nation and the world public in good time about the vicious activities of imperialism in continuing to plot new wars, arouse their attention, and point out to them that so long as all the world's peace forces unite together, they will surely be able to overwhelm the forces of war, and that our struggle has a bright future. We have done this in the past and will continue to do so in the future.

US imperialism holds nothing but venom for all the peace efforts of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. It openly proclaims a policy of hostility to the People's Republic of China, and brazenly attacks the just stand of the Chinese people in safeguarding world peace and opposing imperialist war. The Chinese people have made a timely exposure of the fact that the US Government headed by Eisenhower has, since the Camp David talks between Comrade Khrushchev and Eisenhower last September, been continuing to actively carry out armament expansion and war preparations and extend its aggression. Because of this, the spokesmen of US imperialism spread the slander that the Chinese people do not seem enthusiastic about relaxing international situation. But this monstrous lie is really too brazen for words. Since the US Government and Eisenhower himself are in actual fact engaged in armament expansion, war preparations and extending aggression, and this runs counter to the demand for easing the international situation, how would it help the international situation if this should be concealed or even whitewashed, prettified and extolled? On the contrary, that would only make the tension-makers all the more reckless and unbridled.

Facts speak louder than eloquence. Just have a look at the following briefest summary of the words and deeds of the US Government and Eisenhower against peace since the Camp David talks last September:

On October 16, 1959, US Assistant Secretary of State Andrew H. Berding said in a speech that the United States could not accept peaceful coexistence because it would mean accepting the status quo of the socialist camp.

On October 21, the United States railroaded an illegal resolution on the so-called "Tibet question" through the United Nations General Assembly interfering in China's internal affairs and slandering the putting down by the

Chinese Government of the rebellion of a reactionary group of serf-owners in the Tibet region.

On October 22, the US State Department issued a statement on the third anniversary of the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary, slandering the Hungarian and Soviet Governments and “honoring” the counter-revolutionary elements who launched the rebellion.

On November 3, when the people of the Panama Canal Zone demonstrated for the restoration of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone, the US occupation forces resorted to suppression, wounding over 120 Panamanians.

On November 13, US Vice-President Nixon said, “The Western powers cannot accept what the Soviets call peaceful coexistence.”

On November 22, US Secretary of State Hurter published an article in the American magazine *Parade*, smearing the Soviet Union as having “aggressive intentions” and carrying on an “expansionist drive.”

On November 27, the US State Department issued a statement, slandering Albania as being “subjected to Soviet domination.”

On December 1, US Defense Secretary McElroy said, “By 1963 the United States will have an even greater variety of means of delivering hydrogen warheads against Russia.”

From December 4 to 22, Eisenhower visited eleven countries of Europe, Asia and Africa for the purpose of extending the cold war. During his visits, he beat the drums with all his might for the strengthening of the Western military blocs, saying that “the North Atlantic alliance remains the cornerstone of our foreign policy,” and that the United States could not abandon CENTO, and actively working to expand the network of US missile bases abroad.

On December 9, the United States forced a resolution on the Korean question through the United Nations General Assembly. Despite the call issued by the Supreme People’s Assembly of the Korean Democratic People’s Republic on October 27 it refused to withdraw US troops from the southern part of Korea and bring about the peaceful reunification of Korea, and furthermore insisted on the holding of so-called “free elections” in Korea under the “supervision” of the United Nations, which was one of the beligerents.

On the same day, the United States forced through the United Nations General Assembly another resolution on the so-called “Hungarian question,” constituting interference in Hungary’s internal affairs.

On December 15, Herter presented a “ten-year plan” to the NATO Council meeting, demanding that the NATO bloc have the “deterrent strength” to wage large-scale warfare and “sufficient flexibility” for waging local wars.

On December 24, the United States directed a handful of extreme pro-US. elements in Laos to stage a military coup d’état and further expand the civil war in Laos.

On December 29, Eisenhower declared that beginning from January 1, 1960, the United States was “free to resume nuclear weapons testing.”

On January 7 and 18, 1960, Eisenhower presented his State of the Union and Budget Messages, demanding of the United States “the dedication of whatever portion of our resources” was necessary in order to provide “a real deterrent...” He set military expenditures for fiscal year 1961 at more than 45,500 million dollars, or 57.1 percent of the total budget. In his State of the Union Message, he smeared the socialist countries as “police states,” the Soviet Union as “imperialistic communism,” and the socialist camp as “a system of sullen satellites.”

On January 15, Nixon said, “Under no circumstances should the United States and its allies reduce their strength.”

On January 19, the “Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security” between Japan and the United States was signed in Washington. This aggressive treaty of military alliance is directed against China, the Soviet Union and the Korean Democratic People’s Republic, and menaces the peace and security of all Asian countries.

On February 3, Eisenhower declared at a press conference, “I wasn’t aware of any spirit of Camp David.” He also indicated that the United States was going to provide its allies with secret information on nuclear weapons.

On February 5, the US State Department issued a statement rejecting once again the proposal of the meeting of Warsaw Pact member states that the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the NATO bloc sign a treaty of mutual non-aggression.

On February 15, Herter issued a statement in which he went so far as to raise the demand that three Union republics of the USSR namely Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, “again enjoy national independence.”

On February 16 Eisenhower said in his “mutual security” message that “the fact, if it is a fact, of reductions in Soviet military manpower, does not alter the need for the maintenance of our collective defense.” “It would be most foolish to abandon or to weaken our posture of common deterrent strength.” He also said that for the United States “... the need is for steadfast, undramatic and patient persistence in our efforts to maintain our mutual defenses.” He announced 2,000 million dollars as foreign military aid appropriations for the new fiscal year, an increase of 700 million dollars over the previous year.

On February 17, Eisenhower stated in his report on the situation in the Middle East that the United States would continue to carry out the congressional resolution of 1957 on the Middle East question (that is, the so-called “Eisenhower Doctrine”).

On February 19, US Assistant Secretary of State Graham Parsons indicated in a speech that the United States would continue to occupy China’s territory Taiwan, and still “hoped” that New China would “collapse.” He stated, moreover, that the United States would carry out “a policy which seeks to offset” the growth of China’s strength, and “must adhere to measures designed to cope with that strength.”

From February 22 to March 3, Eisenhower visited South America, advocating the strengthening of the “inter-American system,” praising the Santiago Foreign Ministers Conference of the Organization of American States in August last year, which was aimed at intervention in Cuba. He indicated, furthermore, that the United States would continue to adhere to the so-called Monroe Doctrine which regards the Americas as belonging to the United States.

On February 26, after continually bringing missile weapons into south Korea in violation of the Korean armistice agreement, the United States openly launched a “Matador” guided missile at Usan in south Korea.

On February 29, in a note replying to the Cuban Government, the United States rejected the Cuban Government’s demand that as a necessary condition for resuming the US-Cuban talks the United States refrain from adopting measures which might be harmful to the Cuban people, and went

on to threaten, saying that the United States remained free to take “whatever steps” it deemed necessary. Before and after this, US planes continuously bombed Cuba. According to the March 14 statement of Cuban Prime Minister Castro, US planes had raided Cuba over forty times.

On March 9, J. C. Satterthwaite, US Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, said that the United States had “special political and military interests” in North Africa. He said, “It is also essential for the United States to retain its rights to operate certain key bases in Africa, and that the United States and its allies have continued access to a wide range of important materials in Africa, principally minerals.” He also stated that there was a need “for reconciling the present upsurge of nationalism (in Africa) with the means for an orderly transition from the past to the future.”

On March 16, the United States and the Chiang Kai-shek clique began large-scale military maneuvers in the Taiwan Straits, with the participation of 50,000 US troops.

On the same day, the day after he issued a joint communique with Adenauer, Eisenhower said, “We agreed that there was no change of policy on either side.” “We would not abandon our position with respect to our rights in Berlin.”

On March 21, US warships again encroached on China’s territorial waters, and the Chinese Government issued its 93rd serious warning to the United States. In the period since October 1959, the United States intruded 21 times into China’s territorial air and waters.

On March 30, Eisenhower asserted that even if the United States now agreed to sign an accord for temporarily suspending nuclear tests, this would not be binding on the next US President. He said that “any successor would have the right to exercise his own judgement in the matter.” Herter explained further on April 8 that from the legal point of view Eisenhower’s “ability to bind the United States for a longer period of time” “still remains within his own term.”

On April 4, Herter made a speech in which he rejected the Soviet proposal for general disarmament and attacked Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Khrushchev for his talk on the German question, saying that his words “complicate the situation.” Herter then said, “If anyone looks for dramatic achievements at the summit he may be disappointed.” He expressed “satisfaction” with the speeding up of the rearming of West Ger-

many, and declared “The ground, sea and air forces of NATO require still further strengthening.”

On April 6, Eisenhower formally approved the program for the accelerated development of intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear submarines firing the “Polaris” ballistic missile. It is reported that the US Government is preparing to increase the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles to be manufactured within three years from 270 to 312, and to increase the number of nuclear submarines from 7 to 40.

On April 9, R. S. Benson, Commander of the US Pacific Fleet’s Submarine Force, clamored that the United States would employ 30 “Polaris” nuclear submarines to encircle the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

On April 14, US Delegate Eaton at the meeting of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee opposed the proposal put forward by the socialist countries for all nations possessing nuclear weapons to commit themselves not to be the first to use them. He asserted once again that the United States could not accept the Soviet proposal for general and complete disarmament.

On April 20, US Under-Secretary of State Dillon made a speech attacking Soviet foreign policy. He slandered the Soviet Union as harboring “expansionist ambitions.” He said that “the very phrase ‘coexistence’ is both weird and presumptuous” and should be relegated “to the scrapheap.” He raved about “maintaining and reinforcing” US military strength and its system of aggressive military blocs.

On the same day, US-supported rebels in Venezuela launched an armed rebellion, attempting to overthrow the Venezuelan Government.

The facts listed above are, of course, far from exhaustive, and are limited to data issued openly by the US Government and US publications. Nevertheless, we should like to ask: Are these not facts? Are these not the principal facts of present US policy? Can it be said that all these have been fabricated by the Chinese Communists? Can it be said that these are only insignificant, trifling survivals of former times in US policy? Naturally, the facts do not bear this out. The fact is, even after the Camp David talks and even on the eve of the East-West summit conference, we see no essential change at all in US imperialist war policy, or in the policy carried out by the US Government and by Eisenhower personally. US imperialism is not only

doing its utmost to expand its aggressive military strength, but is also hastily fostering the militarist forces of West Germany and Japan and turning these countries into sources of new war. Let it be clearly understood that all this is affecting the fate of all mankind. It is absolutely necessary to oppose West German and Japanese militarisms and other militarisms fostered by the United States. But now it is, first of all, the war policy of US imperialism that plays the decisive role in all this. Getting away from this point means getting away from the heart and essence of the matter. Therefore, if the peace-loving people of the world do not concentrate their strength on continuing to resolutely expose this war policy of the US authorities and wage a serious struggle against it, the result will inevitably be a grievous calamity.

What right have the Chinese people, standing in the foremost ranks of the struggle for peace together with the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, to keep silent on all these facts? By what right are the Americans allowed to do, say and know about all these things, while the peoples of China and other countries are not allowed to know the true state or affairs? Will it be bad for peace, will it aggravate tension, if we explain the true state of affairs to the Chinese and world public, or will concealing the truth help peace and help relax tension? Will it be that, according to the logic of US imperialism, that is how peace is to be “preserved?” Or is this the “peace in freedom” referred to by Eisenhower and his ilk?

The US imperialists who actively plan for new war do indeed hope that we will conceal the true state of affairs; hope that we will abandon the standpoints of Marxism-Leninism; hope that we will believe the nature of imperialism can change or even that it has already changed; hope that in the struggle to safeguard world peace we, just like the bourgeois pacifists, will not mobilize and rely on the broadest masses of people who are against imperialism, against imperialist war, and against imperialist aggression; hope that we will exaggerate as much as possible the peace gestures which the aggressive imperialist forces are compelled to make and thus put the masses off their guard; or hope that we will exaggerate as much as possible the military might of the aggressive imperialist forces, and so throw the masses of the people into a panic. In short, the plotters of new war hope that we, like them, will pretend to want peace or want a false peace, so that they can suddenly force war on the peoples, just as they did in the First and Second World Wars.

But listen, plotters of new war! Your hopes will never be realized. Since we do really want peace and do want real peace, we will never fall into your trap. We must continue to expose all the plots and schemes of US and other imperialism that endanger peace, do our utmost to mobilize the broad masses who are against imperialism, imperialist war and imperialist aggression to carry on a stubborn struggle against the plotters of new war, and see to it that in this struggle they maintain both ample vigilance and ample confidence, fighting to the end to prevent a new war. Only thus will we be really wanting peace and so get real peace. Otherwise, we would be pretending to want peace or only getting a false peace.

Although, as said above, the nature of imperialism cannot change, we are fully confident that, provided they wage a united and persistent struggle, the mighty forces in defense of peace can certainly set up an array of barriers preventing imperialism from doing as it pleases according to the dictates of its nature. Moreover, in case of contingency, as the Moscow Declaration puts it:

Should the bellicose imperialist maniacs venture, regardless of anything, to unleash a war, imperialism would doom itself to destruction, for the peoples would no longer tolerate a system that brings them so much suffering and exacts so many sacrifices.

It was absolutely necessary for the Moscow Declaration to point this out; this was not to weaken but precisely to strengthen the perspective of peace. For only thus will the people of all countries not mentally disarm themselves, not submit to intimidation and blackmail by the war maniacs, and not be thrown into panic and confusion in the unfortunate event that war should break out after all.

For peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems, flexibility and patience and certain understandings and compromises are necessary. The Chinese people, in their struggles against domestic and foreign enemies, never refused to make compromises which did not damage the basic interests of the people, and will not refuse to do so in the future. The Chinese people warmly support the efforts of Comrade Khrushchev and the Soviet Government in connection with the East-West summit conference and hope that the US Government will change the die-hard attitude it has adopted so far, thus making it possible for the conference to arrive at

the agreements the peoples are expecting on the questions of disarmament, stopping nuclear weapon tests, the West Berlin and German questions, and relaxation of the international situation.

But the struggle for world peace is a protracted one. Imperialism will not readily accept any agreement favorable to peace. Furthermore, innumerable historical facts prove that whatever agreements imperialism has entered into it can also repudiate at any time. Therefore, struggle is necessary both to secure agreements favorable to peace and to uphold them. Lenin put it very well:

Now, the struggle for peace has unfolded. This is a difficult struggle. Whoever thinks peace is easily obtained, whoever thinks that we have only to mention peace and the bourgeoisie will present it to us on a platter, is quite a naïve person. Whoever tries to attribute this viewpoint to the Bolsheviks is practicing deception. The capitalists carry out frantic butchery so that they can divide up the spoils. Obviously, to smash war means to overcome capital, and it is precisely in this sense that the Soviet Government has begun the struggle.¹⁰⁰

Precisely because modern war is a product of the very nature of imperialism, and because the nature of imperialism cannot change, the struggle for the realization and maintenance of world peace is necessarily a protracted anti-imperialist struggle. Therefore, repeatedly publicizing Lenin's theory on imperialism, exposing the essence of imperialism and all its deceitful tricks, becomes an urgent task at present in the cause of peace.

Inasmuch as imperialism is the source of modern war, in the struggle for world peace it is necessary to rally all forces that are against imperialism, imperialist war and imperialist aggression. The Moscow Declaration states:

The cause of peace is upheld by the powerful forces of our era: the invincible camp of socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union; the peace-loving countries of Asia and Africa taking an anti-imperialist stand and forming, together with the socialist countries, a broad peace zone; the international working class

¹⁰⁰ V. I. Lenin, "Speech at the First All-Russia Congress of the Navy" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI.

and above all its vanguard—the communist parties; the liberation movement of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies; the mass peace movement of the peoples; the peoples of the European countries who have proclaimed neutrality, the peoples of Latin America and the masses in the imperialist countries themselves are firmly resisting plans for a new war. An alliance of these mighty forces could prevent war.

The imperialists, particularly the US imperialists, leave no stone unturned in their efforts to disrupt this united struggle. They dream of putting the struggle for world peace in opposition to the national independence movements of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the struggles of the peoples for freedom, democracy and socialism. They argue that since peace is wanted, the oppressed nations should not resist aggression and the exploited peoples should not rise up in revolution. They even hold that the socialist countries are in duty bound to forbid the people of other countries to carry out a revolutions. All this is sheer nonsense. As everyone knows, Marxist-Leninists have always maintained that as far as either oppressed nations or exploited peoples are concerned, revolution cannot be exported. Likewise, no one either can or has a right to forbid revolution. Modern revolutions basically originate from imperialist aggression, oppression and plunder of the backward nations and of the laboring masses in the imperialist countries. Therefore, so long as the imperialists do not give up this aggression, oppression and plunder, so long as imperialism remains imperialism, the oppressed peoples of various countries will not give up their national revolutions and social revolutions.

The imperialist countries have up to this moment not ceased to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, including the socialist countries, and yet they are spreading the lie that the socialist countries are interfering in other countries' internal affairs. The socialist countries, of course, never interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, including the imperialist countries. Nevertheless, the imperialist powers are trying to force or induce the socialist countries to help them interfere in other countries' internal affairs. Isn't this preposterous?

As long as imperialism remains and continues to pursue its policies of aggression, oppression and plunder by means of violence, the socialist countries will always adopt an attitude of sympathy and support for the

oppressed nations and exploited people in their resistance struggle. This is because their struggle represents the will of the people, weakens the imperialist forces and is favorable to world peace. Is it not extremely absurd to think that the development of this struggle and the support extended to it are unfavorable to peace?

The socialist countries and the anti-imperialist, peace-loving peoples of the world are all striving to avert war. The greater the strength of the socialist countries and that of the anti-imperialist, peace-loving forces of the world, the greater becomes the possibility of preventing war. Therefore, the strengthening of the socialist countries, of the national liberation movement, of the emancipation movement of the proletariat in capitalist countries and of the peace-loving forces of the world will make it possible to more effectively prevent imperialist war and defend world peace.

In commemorating the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth, the third great task of the Chinese people is to consolidate and strengthen their friendship and solidarity with the other peoples, and in the first place with the socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union.

Marxism-Leninism is true proletarian internationalism. From its very beginning, it has been an international phenomenon. The victory of the Chinese revolution and the advance of the socialist construction of the People's Republic of China are inseparably connected with proletarian internationalist support. The Chinese people are forever grateful for this support and will never forget their duty to support, with their own efforts, the international proletariat and oppressed nations. Precisely for this reason, Comrade Mao Zedong emphatically pointed out on the eve of the founding of the People's Republic of China:

To sum up our experience and reduce it to one essential point: The people's democratic dictatorship led by the working class (through the Communist Party) and based upon the alliance of workers and peasants. This dictatorship must unite completely with all international revolutionary forces. This is our formula, our principal experience, our main program.

Precisely for this reason too there are, as is well known, two slogans on the wall of Tiananmen in Beijing, one reading "Long Live the People's Republic of China!" the other "Long Live the Great Unity of the Peoples of the World!"

The Chinese people need to uphold friendship and solidarity with all other peoples at all times. The Chinese people are happy to see that the fraternal unity between us and the other countries in the socialist camp headed by the great Soviet Union is daily growing, that our friendship with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who love peace and oppose imperialist aggression is expanding from day to day, and that our friendly contacts with the people in the other capitalist countries are also increasing with each passing day. The Chinese people will on this basis make untiring efforts to strengthen our friendship and solidarity with all other peoples, so as to wage a joint struggle for the common interests of all peoples.

Attempting to undermine the solidarity of the peoples of the world, imperialism, and particularly US imperialism, is frantically inciting anti-Chinese campaigns in certain countries. These campaigns, however, have not obtained and will never obtain support from the peoples of the various countries, because they are utterly unjustifiable. The Chinese people are industriously building a peaceful new life at home and doing their best to live in friendship with their neighbors; they have not gone abroad to any foreign territory to set up military bases and guided missile bases. Why then should they be opposed? As we know, the Soviet Union which was created by Lenin has always been a peaceable country, and yet it was also slandered and attacked for a long time by some people who were anti-Soviet for certain domestic reasons in some big and small countries (including some it had helped, for instance, China during Kuomintang rule). But this succeeded neither in inflicting damage on the Soviet Union, nor in obstructing the development of friendship between the Soviet people and other peoples, but only exposed the anti-Soviet elements as being against peace and the people. The anti-Chinese campaigns incited by imperialism and the reactionaries in certain countries can only end up in the same predicament.

At present, the imperialists and their accomplices, the modern revisionists and a handful of reactionaries in various countries, are particularly frenzied in their attempt to disrupt by various vile means the unbreakable fraternal unity between China and the other socialist countries. These provocateurs are extremely stupid as well as vicious. They can never understand that the unity of the socialist countries was formed and has grown under the banner of great and unshakable Marxism-Leninism. The Moscow Declaration says:

The socialist countries are united in a single community by the fact that they are following the common socialist road, by the common class essence of the social and economic system and state authority, by the need for mutual aid and support, by common interests and aims in the struggle against imperialism, for the victory of socialism and communism, by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, which is common to them all.

The fact that the imperialists, modern revisionists and a handful of reactionaries in various countries are wildly attempting such disruption by no means indicates the strength of their position; rather it shows that they are nearing their doom. The swift victories of Leninism in the past half century, and particularly in the 15 years since World War II, have put them on tenterhooks. In face of these earth-shaking victories which are supported by the broadest masses, imperialism which vainly seeks world domination, is in fact no more than a “giant of clay,” as Lenin described it in his article “Summary of the Party Member Recruitment Week in Moscow and Our Tasks.”¹⁰¹ It is only natural that they are hostile to the sweeping development and firm solidarity of the socialist movement and the national independence movement under the banner of Lenin. But the more they curse, the more clearly is it proven that Leninism will certainly triumph. Lenin felt exulted whenever he was attacked by the enemies of the revolution, because this precisely proved that he was correct. He more than once quoted in his writings the following lines by the great Russian poet Nekrasov:

In swift pursuit comes false detraction.

He hears the voice of approbation

Not in the dulcet sounds of praise,

*But in the roar of irritation!*¹⁰²

Should the correctness of Leninism be proved not by the enemy’s furious curses, but by their praise?

¹⁰¹ V. I. Lenin, “Results of Party Week in Moscow and Our Tasks” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

¹⁰² Nikolay Nekrasov, *On the Day of Gogol’s Death* (1852). A more precise translation: “He is reviled at every step: / He catches sounds of admiration / Not in sweet murmurings of praise / But in wild cries of enmity.”

In their efforts to build socialism, safeguard peace and oppose war and strengthen the unity of the international revolutionary forces, the Chinese people have always been frantically attacked by the enemies of the revolution. But all this shows precisely that the road chosen by the Chinese people is the correct one. The Chinese people will always advance bravely along the road of the great Lenin towards the victory of China's socialist cause, the victory of the cause of world peace and the victory of the cause of socialism throughout the world!

There can be no doubt at all that Marxism-Leninism will score even greater victories not only in the Soviet Union, China and the other socialist countries, but also in all other countries of the world. Of course, history develops unevenly, yet twists and turns and stagnations are after all only partial and temporary phenomena in the long course of development of human history.

At the beginning of this article we referred to the essay *The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx* written by Lenin in 1913. In this essay, Lenin specifically pointed out that Asia was a new source of world storms, because there was at that time a relative stagnation in the development of the revolution in Europe. Lenin then concluded that this stagnation was only a transient and superficial phenomenon, and that in the ensuing period of history still greater triumphs awaited Marxism, the doctrine of the proletariat Lenin wrote:

But the opportunists had scarcely congratulated themselves on "social peace" and the needlessness of storms under "democracy" when a new source of great world storms opened up in Asia.

After Asia, Europe has also begun to stir, although not in the Asiatic way... Feverish armaments and the policy of imperialism are turning modern Europe into a "social peace" which is more like a barrel of gunpowder than anything else. And at the same time the decay of all the bourgeois parties and the maturing of the proletariat are steadily progressing.¹⁰³

¹⁰³ V. I. Lenin, "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx" in *Marx, Engels, Marxism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1978, pp. 78-79.

This scientific prediction of Lenin came true in Russia in 1917, and subsequently on an even larger scale after the conclusion of World War II. Now, new sources of world storms have opened up not only in Asia, but also in Africa and Latin America. There is no longer any secure rear for imperialism on this earth. There is now still a certain degree of “social peace” in some countries of Western Europe and North America. But owing to the feverish arms race and imperialist policies of these countries, owing to the might of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and the upsurge of the national independence and people’s revolutionary movements, owing to the increasing popularity of the peace movement, the “social peace” in these Western countries is in substance turning more and more into a barrel of gunpowder, as Lenin described it. Let the Chinese people and other peoples of the world strive in unison to secure even greater victories in the coming historical period for Leninism, the Marxist theory of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution!

Unite Under Lenin's Revolutionary Banner!¹⁰⁴

LU DINGYI

April 22, 1960

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, April 23, 1960, pp. 1-2.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, April 26, 1960, Vol. III, No. 17, pp. 33-39.

Comrades, Friends:

Today, April 22, is the 90th anniversary of the birth of the great Lenin.

Lenin, following on Marx and Engels, was a great revolutionary teacher of the proletariat, the working people and the oppressed nations of the whole world. Under the historical conditions of the epoch of imperialism and in the flames of the proletarian socialist revolution, Lenin resolutely defended and developed the revolutionary teachings of Marx and Engels. Leninism is Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution. In the eyes of the working people of the world, the name of Lenin is the symbol of the triumph of the proletarian revolution, the symbol of the triumph of socialism and communism.

Ninety years ago, when Lenin was born, mankind was still under the dark rule of capitalism. Lenin and the Russian Bolshevik Party led the Russian proletariat and working people to break the chain of world imperialism, overthrow the bourgeois rule of violence by using revolutionary violence, win victory in the Great October Socialist Revolution, found the first state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and open up a new era in the history of mankind. The October Revolution made real the age-old dream of the working people and progressive humanity, setting up for the first time in history a society free from the exploitation of man by man over one-sixth of the earth. Imperialism vainly attempted to strangle this newborn Soviet state. Fourteen capitalist countries carried out armed intervention in league with the counter-revolutionary forces in Russia at the time. Lenin and the Bolsheviks led the heroic Soviet working class and working people to smash the imperialist armed intervention and put down the counter-revolution-

¹⁰⁴ Report Delivered at the Meeting Held by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party in Beijing on April 22, 1960 to Commemorate the 90th Anniversary of the Birth of Lenin.

ary rebellion at home. Lenin pointed out the road of socialist construction, the road of socialist industrialization and the collectivization of agriculture. After Lenin died, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government, headed by Stalin, led the Soviet people in carrying out Lenin's instructions, so that the Soviet Union, once backward economically and technically, was speedily, in a brief historical period, built into a powerful socialist country. In World War II, the Soviet Union constituted the main force in defeating fascist aggression and helped the peoples of the least European countries win their own liberation and the peoples of Asian countries defeat Japanese imperialism, thereby greatly furthering the cause of the proletarian revolution and the cause of national liberation, and making an exceptionally great contribution to world peace. Now, the Soviet Union has entered the historical period of the extensive building of communism. Under the leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government, headed by Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, brilliant achievements have been scored in Soviet economic construction and Soviet science and technology have advanced by leaps and bounds. The Soviet Union launched the world's first batch of artificial earth satellites and space rockets, opening up a new era in man's conquest of nature. These great achievements have greatly inspired the people of the world in their struggles against imperialism, for national liberation, people's democracy and socialism and for a lasting world peace.

The life of Lenin was the life of a great proletarian revolutionary, spent in bitter struggle against imperialism, against all sorts of reactionaries and opportunists. Leninism developed in the struggles against imperialism and opportunism. The special characteristic, the essence, of Leninism lies in its thorough proletarian revolutionary character. Leninism not only wholly revived the revolutionary content of Marxism which had been emasculated by the revisionists of the Second International, and restored the revolutionary keenness of Marxism once dulled by them, but further developed the revolutionary content and sharpened the revolutionary keenness of Marxism in the light of new historical experience under new historical conditions.

By the end of the 19th century, capitalism had developed to a new stage, that of monopoly capitalism, or imperialism. In this stage, all the contradictions of capitalism showed up further, more fully and more comprehensive-

ly. This set a new task for Marxists, requiring that they make a new analysis of this new stage of capitalism. And it was none other than the great Lenin who accomplished this task.

Lenin made a profound analysis of the essential nature of imperialism and thoroughly refuted the whitewashing and apologizing for imperialism by renegades to the working class like Bernstein and Kautsky. Lenin scientifically expounded the fact that imperialism is monopolistic, decaying, and moribund capitalism; that it is the eve of the proletarian socialist revolution. In the epoch of imperialism, the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the same country, the contradiction between capitalist countries, and the contradiction between the capitalist colonialist powers and the colonies and semi-colonies have all developed to an unprecedented acuteness, and these contradictions can be resolved only by revolutions. Imperialism attempts to eliminate the above-mentioned series of contradictions by plunging millions upon millions of people into a sea of blood in wars among imperialist powers, wars of aggression against colonies and semi-colonies and wars of repression against the proletariat and the working people in the imperialist countries. Contrary to the desire of imperialism, however, the imperialist counter-revolutionary wars are unable to eliminate the contradictions of imperialism, but precisely further aggravate them and precipitate the outbreak of revolution.

It is well known, in 1917 after the Russian February Revolution, in his famous "Letters from Afar," Lenin pointed out in connection with the question of the Russian revolution that the world-wide imperialist war of the time had become an "all-powerful director": it was vastly accelerating the course of world history, engendering world-wide crises of unparalleled intensity—economic, political, national and international, and abruptly overturning the filthy and blood-stained cart of the Russian tsarist system at this particularly abrupt turn in world history.¹⁰⁵

Marxist-Leninists are opposed to the imperialist system and imperialist wars under any circumstances. They hold that the contradictions inherent in the capitalist-imperialist system will necessarily, inevitably give rise to proletarian revolution and to revolutions in the colonies and semi-colonies. Scared stiff by the outward "powerfulness" of imperialism, the opportunists of the Second International let themselves be bought up by the bourgeoisie

¹⁰⁵ V. I. Lenin, "Letters From Afar" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII.

and worked for imperialism. In keeping with the interests of imperialism, they spread reformist and capitulationist influences among the masses of workers and people, and opposed the path of revolution. When the imperialist war broke out, they descended to the shameful position of supporting the imperialist war. Contrary to the opportunists, Lenin always took the stand of a proletarian revolutionary and stood at the forefront against imperialist war. Lenin exposed the opportunists in their true colors as accomplices of imperialism and firmly opposed imperialist war; and when the imperialist war broke out, he advocated putting an end to it by waging a revolutionary war. Lenin pointed out that “only the socialist system can free man from war.”¹⁰⁶

The revolutionary spirit of Leninism finds its outstanding expression in the doctrine of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. In order to shatter the revisionist “theories” of Kautsky and his like designed to whitewash bourgeois democracy and paralyze the revolutionary spirit of the proletariat, Lenin repeatedly pointed out that the proletarian revolution must smash the bourgeois state machine and replace it with the dictatorship of the proletariat. He said:

The latter (the bourgeois state) cannot be superseded by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) in a process of “withering away”; as a general rule, this can happen only by means of a violent revolution... This... lies at the root of the whole of Marx's and Engels' doctrines.¹⁰⁷

Lenin pointed out further that the proletarian dictatorship is a continuation of the class struggle in another form under new conditions and it is a persistent struggle against the resistance of the exploiting classes, against foreign aggression and against the forces and traditions of the old society. Without the proletarian dictatorship there can be no victory of socialism. The proletarian dictatorship is a political system a million times more democratic than the bourgeois dictatorship.

Lenin brilliantly applied and developed the Marxist idea of uninterrupted revolution, regarding it as a fundamental guiding principle of the proletarian revolution. Lenin set forth the principle that the proletariat should

¹⁰⁶ V. I. Lenin, “Tasks of the Left Zimmerwaldists in the Swiss Social-Democratic Party” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII.

¹⁰⁷ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, pp. 21-22.

obtain the leadership in the bourgeois democratic revolution and transform the bourgeois democratic revolution without interruption into the socialist revolution Lenin further pointed out that the socialist revolution is not the final goal and that it is necessary to continue advancing, to accomplish the transition to the higher stage of communism. Lenin said:

In beginning the socialist transformation, we should clearly set forth the ultimate objective of this transformation, that is, the establishment of communist society.¹⁰⁸

Basing himself on the absolute law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism, Lenin came to the conclusion that socialism will achieve victory first in one or several countries. The progress from the victory of socialism in one or several countries to the victory of socialism in all countries of the world will embrace a whole historical epoch. Lenin had full confidence in the future of the world revolution. He said in his final article "Better Fewer, But Better":

In the last analysis, the outcome of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, etc., account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And it is precisely this majority that, during the past few years, has been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity, so that in this respect there cannot be the slightest shadow of doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the complete victory of Socialism is fully and absolutely assured.¹⁰⁹

The capitalist system will surely perish and will inevitably be replaced by the socialist and communist system. This is an objective law independent of human will. After Marx and Engels, Lenin further expounded this law, and highly extolled the revolutionary initiative of the masses of people. The victory of the Great October Revolution led by Lenin pointed out to all mankind the road to thorough liberation and the brilliant prospect of socialism and communism. As Comrade Mao Zedong has said:

¹⁰⁸ V. I. Lenin, "Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the RCP(B), Report on the Review of the Program and on Changing the Name of the Party" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII.

¹⁰⁹ V. I. Lenin, "Better Fewer, But Better" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXIII.

Fundamentally speaking, the road of the Soviet Union, the road of the October Revolution, is the common bright road of development for all humanity.¹¹⁰

The Chinese revolution is a continuation of the October Revolution. The Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao Zedong integrated the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. Consequently, the Chinese revolution took the right direction and took on a completely new appearance.

Comrade Mao Zedong gives full play to the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism and, under our conditions, has defended and developed Marxism-Leninism. Along the revolutionary path pointed out by Comrade Mao Zedong, our Party has led the Chinese revolution to advance continuously from victory to victory.

Our country's new democratic revolution was a revolution led by the proletariat, participated in by the great masses of people, against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The victory of this revolution came about only after more than twenty long years of revolutionary war.

In the long course of the revolution, imperialism has been the biggest enemy confronting the Chinese people. Before the Chinese revolution attained victory, China had been subjected to oppression and domination by all the imperialist countries in the world. After the victory of the Chinese revolution, US imperialism launched an armed attack against the Korean Democratic People's Republic to menace the security of our country, occupied our territory of Taiwan by armed force, resorted to blockade and embargo and tried to make use of so-called "democratic individualism"; all this was designed to destroy the Chinese revolution. The Chinese Communist Party, with a high Marxist-Leninist revolutionary spirit, brought into action the broadest masses of people, eradicated the "pro-America, worship America and fear America" feelings cultivated by imperialism and its servants, waged a firm struggle against imperialism and its lackeys in China, and finally overthrew imperialist oppression and domination in China, firmly safeguarding the fruits of our revolution.

Our Party twice cooperated and twice broke with the Kuomintang—political party of the bourgeoisie—and therefore has extremely rich experi-

¹¹⁰ Mao Zedong, "Speech at Moscow Celebration Meeting" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. VII, *op. cit.*, p. 411.

ence on the question of uniting with and struggling against the bourgeoisie. Our Party has rich experience not only in armed struggle but in peaceful struggle as well.

The Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong correctly and concretely applied the ideas, expounded by Lenin, of the proletariat taking the leadership in the bourgeois democratic revolution, of the proletariat leading the peasant masses to carry out a thoroughgoing democratic revolution, of the democratic revolution being a peasant war and an agrarian revolution, and of uninterrupted revolution in turning the democratic revolution into a socialist revolution. These ideas have played a guiding role in winning continuous victories in our revolution.

Lenin taught us that without a proletarian revolutionary party tempered in repeated struggles, it is impossible to vanquish powerful enemies. Such a party should take Marxism-Leninism as its ideological basis; it should have a proletarian revolutionary program and have close links with the broad masses of laboring people. Our Chinese Communist Party is exactly such a proletarian revolutionary party. Our Party grew to maturity in the struggles against powerful enemies, at home and abroad, and against right and "left" opportunism. It was after repeated struggles against right and "left" opportunism that the Marxist-Leninist leadership of our Party's Central Committee headed by Comrade Mao Zedong was firmly established. Precisely because our Party has such a leadership, it has been able, in the period of the democratic revolution, to firmly secure proletarian leadership, carry the democratic revolution to thorough Victory, and quickly turn the victory of the democratic revolution into that of the socialist revolution.

In our Party's struggles against right and "left" opportunism, such works of Lenin as *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, *The State and Revolution*, *"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder* and *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* have been our most important ideological weapons.

Our Party applied in the practice of the Chinese revolution the Marxist-Leninist doctrines of uninterrupted revolution and the development of revolution by stages, and correctly and concretely solved a series of problems in turning the democratic revolution in our country into a socialist revolution. Speaking of the relationship between the democratic revolution and the socialist revolution, Lenin pointed out:

The first grows into the second. The second, in passing, solves the problems of the first. The second consolidates the work of the first. Struggle, and struggle alone decides how far the second succeeds in outgrowing the first.¹¹¹

He also said:

The more complete the democratic revolution, the sooner, the more widespread, the purer and the more determined will be the development of this new struggle [referring to the socialist revolution].¹¹²

Circumstances in our country fully prove that the more thoroughgoing the democratic revolution, the more rapid and smooth is the development of the Socialist revolution; the more thoroughgoing the socialist revolution, the more rapid and smooth is socialist construction; and the speeding up of socialist construction will inevitably promote the realization of communism.

To carry the socialist revolution to completion means that we must win victory in the socialist revolution not only on the economic front but also on the political and ideological fronts, constantly clearing out bourgeois political and ideological influence, continually resolving contradictions arising in the course of socialist construction between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base. In this way it will be possible to mobilize fully the revolutionary initiative of the masses and to bring about in socialist construction “a genuine, really mass forward movement, embracing first the *majority* and then the whole of the population,”¹¹³ as described by Lenin, and so promote tremendously the leap forward of the social productive forces.

There is a kind of theory which holds that there exist in human society only contradictions between ourselves and the enemy but no contradictions among the people; that in socialist society, between the relations of production and the productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic base, there is only the aspect of mutual conformity and no aspect of

¹¹¹ V. I. Lenin, “Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXIII.

¹¹² V. I. Lenin, *Two Tactics of the Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 137.

¹¹³ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

contradiction; that in socialist construction, we need only rely on technique, and not on the masses; that there is no need to develop the socialist system, but only to consolidate it, and even if it is to be developed, to go forward to communism, still there is no need to undergo a struggle and to pass through a qualitative leap; and thus the process of the uninterrupted revolution of human society goes up to this point and no farther. This, in terms of philosophic thought, is a metaphysical viewpoint, and not a dialectical materialist viewpoint.

In his book *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People* Comrade Mao Zedong applies Marxist-Leninist dialectical materialism to the period of socialist construction in our country, raising the question of drawing a line between our contradictions with the enemy and contradictions among the people, the question of correct handling of contradictions among the people, and the question of correct handling of contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base under the socialist system. This Marxist-Leninist theory is fundamentally different from the above-mentioned metaphysical viewpoint. It was precisely on the basis of this theory and in accordance with the experience gained in the practice of socialist construction in our country that our Party's general line was formulated—the general line of going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism.

Under the guidance of our Party's general line for socialist construction, our country has seen big leaps forward in industrial and agricultural production, the emergence of the rural and urban people's communes, the movement for technical innovations and technical revolution, the combining of education with productive labor, and big leaps forward in the work of commerce, scientific research, culture and art, public health and physical culture. Our Party's general line for socialist construction has not only been attacked by the imperialists and modern revisionists, but has also been slandered by some philistines as "petit-bourgeois fanaticism." But facts remain facts. Our general line for socialist construction is a Marxist-Leninist general line. With the advance of our cause of socialist construction under the guidance of this general line, the face of our country is undergoing a rapid change in all its aspects.

Lenin analyzed the transitional character of socialist society in *The State and Revolution* and other works. He pointed out that economically, politically and ideologically socialism could not as yet be entirely free from the traditions or traces of capitalism, that it was not yet a full-fledged, mature communist society, that it was still the lower stage of communism and would have to make the transition to the higher stage of communism, to full-fledged, mature communism. These ideas of Lenin are of extremely great significance to us. As communists, we must, in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist doctrines of uninterrupted revolution and the development of revolution by stages, actively create conditions for the realization of communism as we carry on socialist construction. The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party has listed the necessary conditions for our country's future realization of communism. They are:

The social product will become extremely abundant; the communist consciousness and morality of the entire people will be elevated to a very much higher degree; universal education will be achieved and the level raised; the differences between worker and peasant, between town and country, between mental and manual labor—the legacies of the old society that have inevitably been carried over into the socialist period—and the remnants of unequal bourgeois right which is the rejection of these differences will gradually vanish; and the function of the state will be limited to protecting the country from external aggression, and it will play no role internally. At that time Chinese society will enter the era of communism in which the principle of “from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs” will be practiced.¹¹⁴

The victories scored by our people in the new democratic revolution, socialist revolution and socialist construction have all been achieved under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Comrade Mao Zedong and under the guidance of Mao Zedong's thinking which integrates the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. We have received help from the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government and the Soviet people, from all

¹¹⁴ “Greet the Upsurge in Forming People's Commune,” *Beijing Review*, September 2, 1958, Vol. I, No. 28, p. 7.

the socialist countries and from the communist and workers' parties, laboring people and progressives of all countries. The Chinese people will always cherish this great spirit of internationalism and never forget it.

We are living in the great new epoch in which the collapse of the imperialist system is being further accelerated, and there is a constant growth in the victories and awakening of the people throughout the world.

On this situation, the Marxist-Leninists and the modern revisionists, starting from fundamentally different stands and viewpoints, draw fundamentally different conclusions. The Marxist-Leninists regard this as an unprecedentedly favorable new epoch for the proletarian revolution in the various countries of the world and for the national revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies. The forces of peace have grown greatly, and there is already a practical possibility of preventing war. The people of the whole world must further intensify the struggle against imperialism, promote the development of revolution, and defend world peace. The modern revisionists, on the other hand, regard this as a "new epoch" in which the proletarian revolution in various countries and the national revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies have disappeared from the world agenda. They think that imperialism will step down from the stage of history of its own accord, without a revolution; and that a lasting peace will come of itself, without waging anti-imperialist struggles. Thus, whether or not to carry out revolution and whether or not to oppose imperialism have become the fundamental difference between the Marxist-Leninists and the modern revisionists.

The main arguments of the modern revisionists in revising, emasculating and betraying revolutionary Marxism-Leninism are based on their allegations that under the historical conditions of the new epoch, Lenin's analysis of imperialism has become "outmoded," that the nature of imperialism has "changed" and that imperialism has "renounced" its policies of war and aggression. Under the pretext of a so-called "historical, non-dogmatic" approach to the theoretical legacy left by Lenin, they have attacked the revolutionary content and revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

In the circumstances in which the East wind has prevailed over the West wind and the forces of socialism and peace have got the upper hand over the imperialist forces of war, there is a multitude of difficulties within the ranks or the imperialists who are falling on harder and harder times. The imperialists are putting up all sorts of desperate struggles in an attempt to save

themselves from their doom. Recently, the imperialists, especially the US imperialists, have tried hard to use even more cunning and deceptive tactics to pursue their aggressive and predatory policies, and numb the people of the world. Even the US imperialists themselves sometimes make no secret of their intention to adopt what they call more “flexible” tactics. They have employed multifarious means, adopting alternately tactics of war and tactics of peace. While stepping up arms expansion and war preparations and carrying out nuclear-war blackmail, they have at the same time spread a smoke-screen of “peace” and used “sugar-coated cannon balls,” in an attempt to create the false impression that imperialism advocates peace. They have on the one hand resorted to ruthless suppression of revolutionary movements, and on the other, resorted to deception and bribery, in an attempt to soften and split the revolutionary movements. The imperialists have resorted to these deceptive methods for the sole purpose of concealing their predatory and aggressive nature and covering up their war preparations, in order to disintegrate the revolutionary movements in various countries, the revolutionary movements of the colonies and semi-colonies and the struggle of the people of all countries for world peace, to enslave the people of various countries and to subvert the socialist countries.

To cope with the different tactics adopted by imperialism against the people, the peoples of the world also have to use various tactics and methods of revolutionary struggle in fighting imperialism. Marxist-Leninists have always maintained that in revolutionary struggle there should be firmness in principle and flexibility in tactics. The various means of revolution and forms of struggle, including the illegal and the “legal,” extra-parliamentary and parliamentary, sanguinary and bloodless, economic and political, military and ideological—all these are for the purpose of unmasking imperialism to a fuller extent, showing it up for the aggressor it is, constantly raising the revolutionary consciousness of the people, achieving broader mobilization of the masses of people to oppose imperialism and reactionaries, developing the struggle for world peace, and preparing for and winning victory in the people's revolution and the national revolution.

Marxist-Leninists have always maintained, too, that the proletariat should ally itself with its reserves in order to win victory in the revolution. The proletariat should enter into firm alliance with the peasantry, the other working people and the broad masses of the oppressed people of the colonies and

semi-colonies, who are its basic allies. In addition, the proletariat should, in different periods, unite with other people that it is possible to unite with. In the interests of the people, of course, the proletariat should take full advantage of the contradictions among the imperialists, even though they are only temporary and partial contradictions. All this is for the purpose of overthrowing imperialism and reactionaries.

In the struggle against imperialism and its policy of aggression, it is entirely permissible and necessary and in the interests of the people of various countries that, wherever possible, the socialist countries conduct peaceful negotiations and exchange visits with the imperialist countries, strive to settle international disputes by peaceful means instead of war, and endeavor to sign agreements of peaceful coexistence or treaties of mutual non-aggression.

The Soviet Government has made great efforts to ease international tension and defend world peace. The Chinese Communist Party, the Chinese Government and the Chinese people actively support the peace proposals put forward by the Soviet Government headed by Comrade N. S. Khrushchev for convening an East-West meeting of the heads of government, general disarmament, prohibition of nuclear weapons, and so on.

The modern revisionists have completely betrayed the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism, betrayed the interests of the people of the world, and submitted and surrendered to the bourgeoisie and imperialism. They maintain that the nature of imperialism has changed and that imperialism has abandoned the war policy of its own accord, and that therefore there is no need for anti-imperialist struggles or revolutions. They are doing their utmost to camouflage the US imperialist policies of aggression and war, to prettify imperialism and Eisenhower, the chieftain of US imperialism. As described by them, Eisenhower has become a "peace emissary," US imperialism is no longer the enemy of peace no longer the enemy of the national liberation movements of the colonies and semi-colonies, and no longer the most vicious enemy of the people of the entire world. In a word, according to the modern revisionists, there seems to be no longer any difference between socialism and imperialism, and whoever persists in fighting against imperialism and in revolution is hindering peace and peaceful coexistence and is a "rigid dogmatist."

We Marxist-Leninists know very well what dogmatism is and have constantly fought against it. Our Chinese Communist Party has rich experience in combating dogmatism. The dogmatists want revolution, but they do not know how to integrate the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution in their own countries, how to exploit the concrete contradictions of the enemy, how to concentrate forces on fighting against the chief enemy, how to enter into proper alliance with the various middle forces, or how to apply flexibly the tactics and methods of struggle, thus leaving the proletariat in a position in which it fights single-handedly. We oppose such dogmatism because it is harmful to the revolution. We oppose dogmatism in order to push ahead the revolution and to overthrow the enemy. Modern revisionists are doing just the opposite. Under the pretext of opposing “dogmatism,” they oppose revolution, seeking to do away with it, and distort and adulterate Marxism-Leninism. In Lenin’s words, “they omit, obliterate and distort the revolutionary side of this teaching, its revolutionary soul. They push to the foreground and extol what is or seems acceptable to the bourgeoisie.”¹¹⁵ Modern revisionists slander Marxism-Leninism as “dogmatism”—this is a despicable trick of these renegades to the working class to corrode the revolutionary soul of Marxism-Leninism.

Revolution is the soul of Marxism-Leninism. Marx and Engels set before the proletariat of the whole world the great historic task of wiping out the capitalist system and emancipating all mankind. Under new historical conditions Lenin aroused the world proletariat and all oppressed peoples for fiery revolutionary struggle. Marxism-Leninism was born in the proletarian revolutionary struggle and is continuously developed in that struggle. Marxist-Leninist formulations on some individual questions may change with the passage of time and the changed situation, but the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism absolutely will not change. In the light of the historical conditions of his time, Lenin changed the formulations of Marx and Engels on individual questions, and raised questions which Marx and Engels could not have raised in their days. Far from weakening the revolutionary spirit of Marxism in the slightest, however, these changes further increased the revolutionary fighting power of Marxism. Revolution is the locomotive of history, the motive force of the progress of human society. This is so in class

¹¹⁵ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

society and it will remain so in the future communist society, only the revolution of that time will be different in nature and method.

We know that US imperialism is the most vicious and cunning enemy of the people's revolution in various countries, of the national liberation movement and of world peace, and that Eisenhower is now the chieftain of US imperialism. Lenin pointed out long ago that US imperialism is the most vicious enemy of the people or the whole world playing the role of gendarme. Now, US imperialism has gone even further, appointing itself world gendarme, everywhere strangling the revolution, suppressing the national liberation movement and the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in the capitalist countries, and sabotaging the movement of the people of the world for peace. US imperialism is not only attempting every minute to subvert and wipe out the socialist countries but, under the pretext of opposing communism and socialism, is also doing its utmost to expand into the intermediate areas, in the vain hope of achieving world domination. These policies of aggression and war of US imperialism have not changed to this day. No matter what deceptive tactics US imperialism may adopt at any time, its aggressive and predatory nature will never change till its death. US imperialism is the last pillar of international imperialism. If the proletariat in the capitalist countries is to win emancipation, if the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies are to achieve national liberation, if the people of the world are to defend world peace, they must direct the spearhead of their struggle against US imperialism. Whether or not one dares to expose imperialism, and especially US imperialism, whether or not one dares to struggle against it, is the touchstone of whether or not one wants to carry out the people's revolution, to win the complete emancipation of the oppressed nations and to win a genuine world peace.

In order to oppose the aggressive policy of US imperialism, it is necessary to unite all the world's revolutionary forces and peace-loving forces. World peace can be further defended and effectively defended only by linking up the struggle of the peoples of the socialist countries, the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in the capitalist countries and the struggle of all peoples for peace, forming them into a mighty anti-imperialist front and dealing firm blows at the US imperialist policies of aggression and war. The socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union is the main force in defense of

world peace. The national liberation struggles of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies, and the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and working people in the capitalist countries are also great forces in defense of world peace. Separation from the national liberation struggles of the colonies and semi-colonies and from the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and working people in the capitalist countries will greatly weaken the forces in defense of world peace and serve the interests of imperialism.

No force on earth can hinder or restrain the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies from rising in revolution and smashing the yoke they are under. Their revolutionary struggles play the role of shaking the very foundation of the imperialist system. All revolutionary Marxist-Leninists should support these just struggles, resolutely and without the slightest reservation. Similarly, no force on earth can hinder or restrain the proletariat and working people in the capitalist countries from rising in revolution to overthrow the reactionary rule of monopoly capital. Their revolutionary struggles can tie the hands of imperialism and prevent it from unleashing aggressive war. All revolutionary Marxist-Leninists should likewise support these just revolutionary struggles, resolutely and without the slightest reservation. Firm support to these two types of struggle constitutes an effective strengthening of the struggle to defend world peace. Lenin maintained that the proletariat in the socialist countries must, with the assistance of the world proletariat and the working masses of the oppressed nations, defend the fruits of victory which the proletarian revolution has already achieved, and at the same time support the continuous advance of the cause of proletarian revolution in other countries and continuously weaken the strength of imperialism until capitalism has perished and socialism has triumphed throughout the world. As Leninists, we must always bear in mind these basic theses of Lenin.

Modern revisionism is a product of imperialist policy. The modern revisionists are panic-stricken by the imperialist policy of nuclear-war blackmail. They develop from fear of war to fear of revolution, and proceed from not wanting revolution themselves to opposing other people's carrying out revolution. To meet the needs of imperialism, they try to obstruct the development of the national liberation movement and the proletarian revolutionary movement in various countries. Imperialism attempts to make the socialist countries degenerate into capitalist countries. And modern revisionists like Tito have adapted themselves to this need of imperialism.

It is important to oppose modern revisionism, because the modern revisionists can play a role that the bourgeoisie and the right-wing social democrats cannot play among the masses of workers and the working people. They are the agents of imperialism and the enemies of the proletariat and working people of all countries.

The Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the Socialist Countries held in Moscow in November 1957 points out the necessity of defending Marxism-Leninism in the present situation.

The Declaration points out:

The imperialist bourgeoisie attaches increasing importance to the ideological molding of the masses; it misrepresents socialism and smears Marxism-Leninism, misleads and confuses the masses. Therefore it is extremely important to intensify Marxist-Leninist education of the masses, combat bourgeois ideology, expose the lies and slanderous fabrications of imperialist propaganda against socialism and the communist movement and widely propagate in simple and convincing fashion the ideas of socialism, peace and friendship among nations.

The Declaration further says:

Modern revisionism seeks to smear the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, declares that it is "outmoded" and alleges that it has lost its significance for social progress. The revisionists try to kill the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and the working people in general. They deny the historical necessity for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, deny the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, reject the principles of proletarian internationalism and call for rejection of the Leninist principles of party organization and, above-all, of democratic centralism, for transforming the Communist Party from a militant revolutionary organization into some kind of debating society.

Modern revisionism is at present the chief danger to the international communist movement. It is our sacred duty to bring into full play the revo-

lutionary spit it of Lenin, and thoroughly reveal the true colors of the agent of imperialism—modern revisionism.

The Declaration of the Moscow Meeting is the program of the international communist movement of our time accepted by the communist and workers' parties of various countries. Our Chinese Communist Party, along with the communist and workers' parties of other countries, faithfully abide by and are faithfully carrying out this great program.

The communist movement has from the very outset been an international movement. The international solidarity of the proletariat is the fundamental guarantee for the victory of the people's revolutionary cause in all the countries of the world, of the cause of the national liberation of the oppressed nations, and of the peoples' struggle for world peace. In the interests of the socialist countries, of the proletariat and working people of all countries, of the liberation of the oppressed nations, and of the defense of world peace, we must at all times strengthen the international solidarity of the proletariat. Marxist-Leninists have always guarded as the apple of their eye the unity of the Socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, the unity of the international communist ranks, the unity of the world proletariat, and the unity of the people of the whole world. The imperialists and modern revisionists regard this great international unity as the greatest obstacle to their attempt to disintegrate the revolutionary movement of various countries. Scheming day and night in the vain hope of undermining this unity, they are carrying on the most despicably dirty work of sowing discord and spreading lies and slanders. But these base intrigues are doomed to complete bankruptcy.

Under the guidance of the revolutionary doctrines of Marxism-Leninism, the socialist cause of the proletariat certainly can and will win complete victory throughout the world. Lasting peace will certainly come to humanity.

Let us unite and advance bravely under the revolutionary banner of the great Lenin!

Long live Marxism-Leninism!

Workers of all Countries Unite, Oppose Our Common Enemy!

December 15, 1962

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, December 15, 1962, p. 1.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, December 21, 1962, Vol. V, No. 51, pp. 5-10.

At the very time when imperialism and the reactionaries of all countries are using every conceivable method to oppose the socialist countries, to disrupt the inter-national communist movement and to suppress the revolutionary struggles of all peoples, and when the Communists of all countries urgently need to strengthen their unity and oppose the enemy together, it is distressing to find an adverse current appearing in the ranks of the international communist movement, a current which is opposed to Marxism-Leninism, opposed to the Communist Party of China and other Marxist-Leninist parties, and which is disrupting the unity of the international communist movement.

In the past month or so, the Eighth Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Eighth Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Tenth Congress of the Italian Communist Party and the Twelfth Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party were held in Europe one after another. Unfortunately, the rostrums of these party congresses were used as platforms for attacking fraternal parties. This adverse current, which is disrupting unity and creating splits, reached a new high at the Italian and Czechoslovak Communist Party Congresses. Comrades of certain fraternal parties not only continued their attacks on the Albanian Party of Labor but also openly attacked the Communist Party of China by name, and they even censured the Korean Workers' Party for disagreeing with the attacks on the Chinese Communist Party. This is an utterly outrageous violation of the 1957 Moscow Declaration and the 1960 Moscow Statement, which had been unanimously adopted by the communist and workers' parties of all countries. It is an event of the utmost gravity in the international communist movement.

The Chinese Communist Party Delegation which was invited to attend the Czechoslovak Communist Party Congress solemnly pointed out in its statement of December 8:

A practice of this kind is not in conformity with the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, is not in the interest of the unity of the socialist camp and the unity of the international communist movement, is not in the interest of the struggle against imperialism, is not in the interest of the struggle for world peace, and is not in conformity with the fundamental interests of the people of the socialist countries... An erroneous practice of this kind can only deepen differences and create splits; it can only grieve those near and dear to us and gladden the enemy.

The Communist Party of China has consistently held that the unity of the socialist camp and the unity of the international communist movement are fundamental interests of the people of the whole world. It is at all times the sacred duty of all Communists to defend and strengthen this internationalist unity unswervingly. The occurrence of different opinions among fraternal parties is often unavoidable, because the problems of common concern are extremely complicated and the circumstances of various parties very different, and also because the objective situation is constantly changing. And the occurrence of such differences of opinion is not necessarily a bad thing. In order that unity may be securely guaranteed, the important thing is that we must start from the position of defending and strengthening internationalist unity and of standing together against the enemy, we must abide by the guiding principles for relations among fraternal parties and countries, as set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, and we must reach unanimity through consultation.

The erroneous practice of using the congress of one party to launch an attack on another fraternal party first emerged a year ago at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Chinese Communist Party resolutely opposed this erroneous practice at that time. At that congress and subsequently, too, the Chinese Communist Party made many earnest appeals to the fraternal parties having disagreements and differences to reunite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and on the basis of respect for each other's independence and equality, and made the special point that the

party which launched the first attack ought to take the initiative. However, it is to be regretted that this sincere effort on our part has not succeeded in preventing a continued deterioration in the situation. Instead of giving thought to changing this erroneous practice, the leaders of certain fraternal parties have intensified it and gone further along the road towards a split, and as a result this erroneous practice recently occurred at four successive congresses of fraternal parties in Europe.

Here we wish to say something about what happened at the Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party.

At that congress, some comrades of the Czechoslovak Party and comrades from certain other fraternal parties wantonly vilified and attacked the Communist Party of China for its “adventurism,” “sectarianism,” “splittism,” “nationalism” and “dogmatism.” The Chinese Communist Party Delegation in its statement resolutely opposed this practice that creates splits. The statement pointed out that “this erroneous practice has already produced serious consequences, and if continued, it is bound to produce even more serious consequences.” However, the attitude of the Chinese Communist Party, an attitude treasuring unity, has not yet succeeded in causing a change of heart in those persons who are persisting in this erroneous practice. Certain leaders of the Czechoslovak Communist Party stated that they “cannot agree” with the view of the Chinese Communist Party Delegation, insisted on “going further” in this practice, even went so far as to ask the Chinese Communist Party to “reconsider” its position on major international problems, and they made their slanders and attacks on China public to the whole world. In these circumstances, we have no alternative but to make the necessary reply.

Some comrades of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and comrades from certain fraternal parties attacked the Chinese Communist Party for having committed what they called errors of “adventurism.” They charged that on the Cuban question China had opposed a “sensible compromise” and wanted the whole world “plunged into a thermonuclear war.” Are matters really as they charged?

Like the peoples of all the socialist countries and all countries in the world, the Chinese people love peace. China has always followed a foreign policy of peace. We have vigorously and unswervingly fought for the relaxation of international tension and in defense of world peace. China was an initiator of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. We have consistently

advocated the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems in accordance with the Five Principles, we have advocated the settlement of international disputes through negotiation, and we have opposed recourse to force.

The Communist Party of China has always maintained that in order to preserve world peace, to realize peaceful coexistence and to relax international tension, it is necessary, above all, to oppose resolutely the US imperialist policies of aggression and war and to mobilize the masses of the people to wage a tit-for-tat struggle against US imperialism. We believe, as the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement point out, that the US imperialist plans for aggression and war can be frustrated and that world war can be prevented by the joint struggle of the forces of socialism, the forces of national liberation, the forces of democracy and all the forces of peace.

On the question of how to deal with imperialism and all reactionaries, the Chinese Communist Party has always maintained that one should despise them strategically but take full account of them tactically. That is to say, in the final analysis, strategically, with regard to the long term and to the whole, imperialism and all reactionaries are sure to fail, and the masses of the people are sure to triumph. Without this kind of understanding, it would not be possible to encourage the masses of the people to wage resolute revolutionary struggles against imperialism and the reactionaries with full confidence; nor would it be possible to lead the revolution to victory. On the other hand, tactically, on each immediate, specific problem, it is necessary to deal seriously with imperialism and the reactionaries, be prudent and carefully study and perfect the art of struggle. Without such understanding, it is impossible to wage successful revolutionary struggles; there is the danger of incurring setbacks and defeats and, again, it is impossible to lead the revolution to victory. This viewpoint of despising the enemy strategically and taking full account of him tactically, which the Chinese Communist Party has adhered to throughout its history, is precisely our oft-stated viewpoint that the imperialists and all reactionaries are paper tigers; it is entirely Marxist-Leninist. We are opposed both to capitulationism and to adventurism. Everyone who wants to make a revolution and win victory must adopt this attitude, and no other, when dealing with the enemy. The reason is that if one does not dare despise the enemy strategically, one will inevitably commit the error of capitulationism. And if one is heedless and reckless tactically

in any specific struggle, one will inevitably commit the error of adventurism. If one dares not despise the enemy strategically and at the same time, one is heedless and reckless tactically, then one will commit both the error of capitulationism in strategy and the error of adventurism in tactics.

As far as the question of how to cope with nuclear weapons is concerned, we Chinese Communists have always stood for a complete ban on nuclear weapons, which are enormously destructive, and have always opposed the imperialists' criminal policy of nuclear war. We have always held that in a situation in which the socialist camp enjoys great superiority, it is possible to reach an agreement on banning nuclear weapons through negotiations and through the constant exposure of and struggle against US imperialism. But Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people have never been paralyzed with fear by the nuclear weapons in the imperialists' hands and so abandoned their struggle against imperialism and its lackeys. We Marxist-Leninists do not believe either in the theory that weapons decide everything, nor do we believe in the theory that nuclear weapons decide everything. We have never believed that nuclear weapons can determine man's fate. We are convinced that it is the masses of the people who are the decisive force in history. It is they alone who can decide the course of history. We are firmly opposed to the imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail. We also hold that there is no need whatsoever for socialist countries to use nuclear weapons as counters for gambling or as means of intimidation. To do so is really committing the error of adventurism. If one blindly worships nuclear weapons, does not recognize or trust in the strength of the masses of people, and so becomes scared out of one's wits when confronted by the imperialists' nuclear blackmail, then one may jump from one extreme to the other and commit the error of capitulationism.

We maintain that in their struggle against US imperialism the heroic Cuban people have committed neither the error of capitulationism nor the error of adventurism. Like all other peoples in the world, the Cuban people ardently love peace and are working energetically for it. But, as Comrade Fidel Castro has said: "The way to peace is not the way of sacrifice of or infringement upon the people's rights, because that is precisely the way leading to war." The National Directorate of the Cuban Integrated Revolutionary Organizations and the Cuban Revolutionary Government solemnly declared in their joint statement of November 25:

The best form of settlement is through peaceful channels and discussions between governments. But we reiterate at the same time that we will never defect in the face of the imperialists. We will oppose the imperialist position of strength with our firmness. We will resist the imperialist attempt to humiliate us with our dignity. We will oppose the imperialist aggression with our determination to fight to the last man.

Under the firm leadership of the Cuban Integrated Revolutionary Organizations and the Cuban Government headed by Fidel Castro, the Cuban people have waged in unity a resolute struggle against US imperialism under the most complex and difficult conditions; far from being terrified by US nuclear blackmail, they have insisted on their five just demands; and, with the righteous support of the people of the whole world, they have won another great victory in the struggle against US aggression.

The Communist Party, the Government and the people of China resolutely support the correct line of the Cuban Integrated Revolutionary Organizations and Government, the five just demands, and the heroic struggle of the Cuban people. In so doing, China is fulfilling her bounden duty under proletarian internationalism. If China's support for the Cuban people's just struggle against the US aggressors is "adventurism," we would like to ask: Does this mean that the only way for the Chinese people not to be called "adventurist" is to abstain from doing everything in their power to support Cuba in her struggle against US imperialist aggression? Does this mean that the only way to avoid being called adventurist and capitulationist would have been to force Cuba to surrender her sovereignty and independence and to give up her five just demands? The whole world has seen that we neither requested the transport of nuclear weapons to Cuba nor obstructed the withdrawal of "offensive weapons" from that country. Therefore, as far as we are concerned, there can be absolutely no question of "adventurism," still less of "plunging (the whole world) into a thermonuclear war."

Some people have censured China's correct position on the Sino-Indian boundary question as if China had precipitated a disaster. But what are the facts?

China has consistently stood for the settlement of boundary questions with her neighbors through peaceful negotiation and, on the basis of the Five Principles, has successfully settled her boundary questions with Burma,

Nepal and others through friendly consultation and in a spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. As far as the Sino-Indian boundary question is concerned, it has been clear for a long period who in fact has rejected peaceful negotiations, who has occupied whose territory, who has conducted armed provocations and who has mounted massive attacks. In dealing with the vain attempts of the Indian reactionary group to alter the situation on the Sino-Indian frontier by force and in dealing with their ever-increasing encroachment on China's border territories, the Chinese people have for years exercised forbearance, striving time and time again to find a fair and reasonable solution through peaceful negotiation. Nevertheless, the Nehru government has completely rejected negotiations. They have taken China's forbearance as a sign that she is weak and can be bullied. On October 12, Prime Minister Nehru of India brazenly gave orders that an attack should be launched on China and that Chinese territory should be "freed" of Chinese frontier forces. It was at this point that the Chinese frontier forces were compelled to strike back in self-defense. China is a peace-loving socialist country, but we will never allow others to bully us at will. Confronted with the massive attacks of the Indian troops, China launched a counter-attack in self-defense; this was a minimum, legitimate measure that any other sovereign state would have taken. Having repulsed the attacks of the Indian forces, China immediately proposed the cessation of fighting, disengagement and the reopening of negotiations, and then, on her own initiative, ceased fire and withdrew her troops. Facts have proved that it was precisely because the Chinese people waged the necessary struggle against the expansionist ambitions of the reactionary Indian nationalists that the situation on the Sino-Indian frontier has begun to ease and a de facto ceasefire has been realized.

China's consistent and sincere efforts for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question are universally acknowledged. But what is truly strange is that some self-styled Marxist-Leninists have cast Marxism-Leninism to the winds; they never use the Marxist-Leninist class standpoint to analyze the Nehru government's reactionary policy of provoking the Sino-Indian boundary conflict and stubbornly refusing conciliation. These people shut their eyes to the fact that this policy arises from the need of India's big bourgeoisie and big landlords to oppose the Indian people and progressive movement; they are likewise blind to the fact that this pol-

icy perfectly suits the needs of the imperialists, and especially of the US imperialists, and enjoys their support. As a matter of fact, in recent years the Nehru government has repressed the people at home with increasing brutality and become more and more obsequious towards US imperialism, acting as its accomplice in many important international issues, as in the Congo. The Nehru government's persistent opposition to China is the precise outcome of its domestic and foreign policies, which have become more and more reactionary. Those who accuse China of having pushed the Nehru government to the West are exactly reversing cause and effect. Throughout the Sino-Indian boundary dispute, these people have failed to distinguish right from wrong, have pretended to be "neutral," and have called China "brother" in words, while actually regarding the Indian reactionary group as their kinsmen. Should not these people examine their conscience and ask themselves what has become of their Marxism-Leninism and what has become of their proletarian internationalism?

At the Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, some people made many violent attacks on the Albanian Party of Labor again, alleging that its leaders were "anti-Soviet," that they were disrupting unity, and that they were "splittists" and "sectarians." These people also condemned the Chinese Communist Party for its correct stand in opposing attacks on the Albanian Party of Labor and in upholding the guiding principles for relations among fraternal parties, and they charged the Chinese Communist Party too with the crimes of "splittism," "sectarianism" and "nationalism." But slanders and attacks of this kind, calling white black, can be of no avail whatsoever.

The criteria for deciding who upholds unity and who is guilty of splittism and sectarianism consist of the principles for guiding the mutual relations among fraternal parties and among fraternal countries which were set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement unanimously adopted at the Meetings of the Representatives of the communist and workers' parties. These are the principle of complete equality, the principle of uniting with each other while retaining independence and autonomy, and the principle of reaching unanimity through comradesly consultation on the basis of equality. Experience has proved that so long as these correct principles are followed, the unity of the fraternal parties and of the fraternal countries can be consolidated, and that even when this or that kind of difference occurs,

a reasonable settlement can be reached. Conversely, if these principles are violated and if, in the mutual relations among fraternal parties and countries, pressure is used to impose one's own views on others, or if the method of slander and attack is substituted for that of reaching unanimity through consultation, then unity will inevitably be impaired and mistakes of splittism and sectarianism will be committed.

A year ago, at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Delegation of the Chinese Communist Party stated:

We hold that should a dispute or difference unfortunately arise between fraternal parties or fraternal countries, it should be resolved patiently in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and according to the principles of equality and of unanimity through consultation. Public, one-sided censure of any fraternal party does not help unity and is not helpful in resolving problems. To bring a dispute between fraternal parties or fraternal countries into the open in the face of the enemy cannot be regarded as a serious Marxist-Leninist attitude.

It is precisely for the sake of upholding the principles which guide the relations among fraternal parties and fraternal countries and of upholding the unity of these parties and countries that the Chinese Communist Party is firmly opposed to attacks at the congress of one party on another fraternal party. What is wrong with our taking such a stand? Is it possible that it is we, who have done everything in our power to defend unity and to oppose actions that are not in the interest of unity, who are guilty of "splittism" and "sectarianism," and that on the contrary, it is those who launched the first attack and disrupted unity who are not guilty of splittism and sectarianism? At the Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, the Delegation of the Korean Workers' Party was censured for disagreeing with the attacks certain people made on the Chinese Communist Party. Is it possible that the position of the Korean Workers' Party in upholding unity is a crime? Is it possible that those who uphold the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement are in the wrong and that those who violate the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement are in the right?

The principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement did not grant to any party, large or small, any right whatsoever to launch an attack

at its own congress on another fraternal party. If such an erroneous practice is accepted, then one party can attack another party—this party today and that party tomorrow. If this continues, what will become of the unity of the international communist movement?

The principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement are the very embodiment of the principles of proletarian internationalism concerning relations among fraternal parties and fraternal countries. If these guiding principles are violated, one will inevitably fall into the quagmire of great-power chauvinism or other forms of bourgeois nationalism. But have those very people who have accused the Chinese Communist Party of committing the error of “nationalism” ever given a thought to the question of the position in which they have been placing themselves in their relations with fraternal parties and countries? It is obviously they who have violated the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries, who have launched attacks on another fraternal party and fraternal country and have followed the erroneous practices of nationalism and great-power chauvinism. Yet they insist that everybody else should do as they do, and those who do not listen and follow the conductor’s baton are accused of “nationalism.” Can it be that this conforms with the principles of proletarian internationalism? Is not such an erroneous practice exactly what splittism and sectarianism are? Is not this erroneous practice the worst manifestation of nationalism and great-power chauvinism?

Those who accuse the Albanian Party of Labor of being “anti-Soviet” and of disrupting unity should ask themselves who it was who first provoked the dispute; who first attacked the Albanian Party of Labor at their own congress? Why does one give only oneself the right to wanton attacks on another fraternal party, while that party does not even have the right to reply? If the Albanian comrades are said to be “anti-Soviet” because they answered the attacks leveled at them, what should one call those who first launched the attack on the Albanian Party of Labor and have attacked it time and time again? And what should one call those who have arbitrarily attacked the Communist Party of China?

For a Communist the minimum requirement is that he should make a clear distinction between the enemy and ourselves, that he should be ruthless towards the enemy and kind to his own comrades. But there are people

who just turn this upside-down. For imperialism it is all “accommodation” and “mutual concessions,” for the fraternal parties and fraternal countries it is only implacable hostility. These people are able to adopt an attitude of “sensible compromise” and “moderation” towards the saber-rattling enemy, but are unwilling to adopt a conciliatory attitude towards fraternal parties and fraternal countries. To be so “kind” to the enemy and so “ruthless” towards fraternal parties and countries is certainly not the stand a Marxist-Leninist should take.

The Moscow Statement affirms that revisionism is the main danger in the world communist movement at the present time. It points out:

After betraying Marxism-Leninism... the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY)... set the (LCY) against the international communist movement as a whole... carry on subversive work against the socialist camp and the world communist movement.

In addition, the Statement calls on the Communists of all countries actively to combat the influence of the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav modern revisionists. Certain Communists, however, praise the renegade Tito to the skies, and they are carrying on so intimately with the Tito group. At the recent Czechoslovak Communist Party Congress, some people even opposed the Chinese Communist Party’s exposure of the Yugoslav modern revisionists. In a word, these persons want to unite with those one should oppose and they oppose those one should unite with. May we ask, isn’t this an open and crass violation of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement? Where will such a line lead to?

All the facts show that the Chinese Communists, like true Communists everywhere in the world, have consistently abided by Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. Those who are attacking the Chinese Communist Party are pressing the label of “dogmatism” on us. This only proves that the “dogmatism” they oppose is the very bastion of Marxist-Leninist theory and the revolutionary principles of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, which the Chinese Communists and all other true Communists are steadfastly upholding. These people think that if they just put up the sign-board of “anti-dogmatism” and bellow about what they call “creativity,” they can distort Marxism-Leninism and tamper with the Moscow Declara-

tion and the Moscow Statement as they like. This is absolutely impermissible. We would like to question these people: Are these two historic documents of the international communist movement, unanimously adopted and signed by all the communist and workers' parties, still valid? Do they still have to be observed?

Some people say: "We are the majority and you are the minority. Therefore, we are creative Marxist-Leninists and you are dogmatists; we are right and you are wrong." But anyone with a little common sense knows that the question of who is right and who is wrong, and who represents the truth, cannot be determined by the majority or minority at a given moment. Truth exists objectively. When all is said and done, the majority at a given moment cannot turn falsehood into truth; nor can the minority at a given moment make truth turn into falsehood. History abounds with instances in which, at certain times and on certain occasions, truth was not on the side of the majority, but on the side of the minority. In the period of the Second International, Lenin and the Bolsheviks were in the minority in the international workers' movement, but truth was on the side of Lenin and the Bolsheviks. In December 1914, after the outbreak of World War I, when a vote was taken on the war budget in the German Reichstag, the majority of the deputies of the German Social Democratic Party voted for it, and only Karl Liebknecht voted against it, but truth was on the side of Liebknecht. Those who dare to uphold truth are never afraid of being in the minority for the time being. Conversely, those who persist in error cannot avoid ultimate bankruptcy even though they are temporarily in the majority.

Marxism-Leninism holds that the one and only majority that is reliable in this world is the people who decide the course of history and who constitute more than ninety percent of the world's population. Those who go against the interests of more than ninety percent of the world's population may raise a hue and cry at a certain place or meeting for a while, but they definitely do not represent a genuine majority. Their "majority" is only a fictitious, superficial phenomenon, and in essence they are in the minority, while the "minority" they are attacking is, in essence, the majority. Marxist-Leninists always penetrate phenomena in order to see a problem in its essence. We submit only to truth and to the fundamental interests of the people of the world; we will never obey the baton of an anti-Marxist-Leninist. However much the imperialists, the reactionaries and the modern

revisionists curse and oppose us, we will never be shaken in our stand of upholding Marxism-Leninism and truth.

We would like to remind those attacking the Chinese Communist Party that unjustified abuse serves no useful purpose. Abuse, however scurrilous or violent, cannot detract from the glory of a Marxist-Leninist Party. From the very first day that a communist party came into existence, no one has ever heard of a genuine Communist Party which was not subjected to abuse, nor has anyone ever heard of a genuine Communist Party which was toppled by abuse. The Chinese Communist Party has grown, tempered itself and won victory after victory amid the curses of the imperialists, the reactionaries, the revisionists and all kinds of opportunists. Their curses have never hurt us in the least. On the contrary, this abuse merely shows that we are doing the right thing, that we are upholding Marxist-Leninist principles, and that we are defending the fundamental interests of the people of the world.

We also wish to remind those persons who are attacking the Chinese Communist Party that US imperialism is now conducting an anti-China chorus, and Kennedy has come out in person to declare that a major problem now facing the Western world is how to cope with "the regime of Communist China." At a time like this, don't you think you should draw a line of demarcation between yourselves and US imperialism and its lackeys?

The erroneous practice of creating splits which has appeared in the international communist movement can be beneficial only to the imperialists and the reactionaries. Don't you see that the imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the modern revisionists of Yugoslavia are applauding, gloating over misfortunes and looking forward to a split in the international communist movement? Recently Dean Rusk said publicly that the disagreements between the Communists "are very serious and very far-reaching... the confusion that has been thrown into communist parties all over the world... has been helpful to the free world." Those persons who are attacking the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties should think this over: the enemy is hailing this practice as a great help to the "free world"; is this something to be proud of?

It is not at all surprising that there should be twists and turns of one kind or another in the road along which the international communist movement is advancing. From the beginning Marxism-Leninism has continuously developed through struggles to overcome opportunism of every type.

From the beginning the international communist movement has constantly advanced by surmounting all sorts of difficulties. All imperialists, reactionaries and modern revisionists are destined to become the debris of history amid the torrent of the international communist movement and the torrent of great revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the whole world.

Communists of all countries share the same great ideal and the same noble cause and face a common enemy; we have a thousand and one reasons to unite, but not a single reason to create splits. Those comrades who are creating splits should come to their senses! The Communist Party of China sincerely hopes that the communist parties of all countries, who should value highly the interests of the international communist movement and of the common struggles of the international proletariat and the peoples of the world against the enemy, and who should value highly our glorious historic tasks and the ardent expectations of the revolutionary peoples of the world, will abide by the principles guiding the relations among fraternal parties and countries, set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, and will adopt the correct method for eliminating differences and safeguarding unity.

If only we all have the desire to settle problems, it is not difficult to find the correct method for doing so. The Statement of the Delegation of the Chinese Communist Party at the Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party says:

With the object of settling the differences in the international communist movement on certain important questions of principle, the Communist Party of China and a number of other fraternal parties have proposed the convening of a Meeting of Representatives of the communist and workers' parties of all countries of the world in order to clarify what is right from what is wrong, to strengthen unity and to stand together against the enemy. We consider that this is the only correct method of settling problems.

The Communist Party of China desires to do its utmost—together with the fraternal parties of other countries and on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism—to strengthen unity and to oppose splits, and to strive for new victories in the cause of world peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism. Let us unite and spare no effort to fight

unremittingly in defense of the great unity of the international communist movement, the great unity of the socialist camp, and the great unity of the revolutionary peoples of the world and of all peace-loving peoples! Let us raise once again the great slogan of Marx and Engels.

Workers of All Countries, Unite!

The Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us

December 31, 1962

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, December 31, 1962, pp. 1-3.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, January 4, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 1, pp. 9-21.

The Communist Party of Italy is a party with a glorious history of struggle in the ranks of the international communist movement. In their valiant struggles both during the dark years of Mussolini's rule and during the difficult years of World War II and after, the Italian Communists and the Italian proletariat have had admirable achievements to their credit. The Chinese Communists and the Chinese people have always held the comrades of the Italian Communist Party and the Italian people in high esteem.

In accordance with its consistent stand of strengthening friendship with fraternal parties, the Communist Party of China sent its representative to attend the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Italy, which was held in early December, at the latter's invitation. We had hoped that this congress would help to strengthen not only the common struggle against imperialism and in defense of world peace, but also the unity of the international communist movement.

But, at this congress, to our regret and against our hopes, Comrade Togliatti and certain other leaders of the CPI rudely attacked the Communist Party of China and other fraternal parties on a series of important questions of principle. They did so in violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, and in disregard of the interests of the united struggle of the international communist movement against the enemy.

The representative of the Communist Party of China at the congress was thus compelled to declare solemnly in his address that we disagreed with the attacks and slanders leveled at the Communist Party of China by Togliatti and certain other leaders of the CPI. Nevertheless, Togliatti and certain other leaders of the CPI "very firmly rejected" the views put forward by the representative of the CPC, continued their attacks upon the CPC and other fraternal parties, and persisted in conducting the "debate in public."

Thus, the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Italy became a salient part of the recently emerged adverse current which runs counter to Marxism-Leninism, and which is disrupting the unity of the International communist movement.

In such circumstances, we cannot remain silent but must publicly answer the attacks on us by Comrade Togliatti and other comrades. Nor can we remain silent about the views they expressed in contravention of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and of the revolutionary principles of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, but we must publicly comment on these views. We wish to say frankly that on a number of fundamental questions of Marxism-Leninism there exist differences of principle between Comrade Togliatti and certain other CPI leaders on the one hand and ourselves on the other.

After reading Togliatti's general report and his concluding speech at the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Italy and the theses of the congress, one cannot help feeling that he and certain other CPI leaders are departing further and further from Marxism-Leninism. Although Comrade Togliatti and certain others have, as usual, covered up their real views by using obscure, ambiguous and scarcely intelligible language, the essence of their views becomes clear once this flimsy veil is removed.

They cherish the greatest illusions about imperialism, then deny the fundamental antagonism between the two world systems of socialism and capitalism and the fundamental antagonism between the oppressed nations and oppressor nations, and, in place of international class struggle and anti-imperialist struggle, they advocate international class collaboration and the establishment of a "new world order." They have profound illusions about the monopoly capitalists at home, they confuse the two vastly different kinds of class dictatorship, bourgeois dictatorship and proletarian dictatorship, and preach bourgeois reformism, or what they call "structural reform" as a substitute for proletarian revolution. They allege that the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism have become "outmoded," and they tamper with the Marxist-Leninist theories of imperialism, of war and peace, of the state and revolution, and of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. They discard the revolutionary principles of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, they repudiate the common laws of proletarian revolution or, in other words, the universal significance of the

road of the October Revolution, and they describe the “Italian road,” which is the abandonment of revolution, as a “line common to the whole international communist movement.”

In the final analysis, the stand taken by Togliatti and certain other CPI leaders boils down to this—the people of the capitalist countries should not make revolutions, the oppressed nations should not wage struggles to win liberation, and the people of the world should not fight against imperialism. Actually, all this exactly suits the needs of imperialists and the reactionaries.

In this article we do not propose to discuss all our differences with Comrade Togliatti and certain other CPI comrades. Here we shall set forth our views on only a few of the important questions at issue.

I

Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades differ with us, first of all, on the question of war and peace. In his general report to the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Italy, Togliatti declared:

This problem was widely discussed at the Conference of the communist and workers’ parties held in Moscow in the autumn of 1960. The Chinese comrades put forward some views, which were rejected by the meeting.

He spoke in deliberately vague terms and did not mention what were the views put forward by the Chinese comrades, but went on to speak of the inevitability of war as the source of the disputes, which made it apparent that he was accusing the Chinese Communists of having no faith in the possibility of averting a new world war, and accusing China of being “war-like.”

This accusation leveled against the Communist Party of China by Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades is completely groundless and trumped up.

The Communist Party of China has consistently taken the stand of opposing the imperialist policies of aggression and war, of preventing imperialism from launching a new world war, and of defending world peace. We have always held that as long as imperialism exists there will be soil for wars of aggression. The danger of imperialism starting a world war still exists. However, because of the new changes that have taken place in the interna-

tional balance of class forces, it is possible for the peace forces of the world to prevent imperialism from launching a new world war, provided that they stand together, form a united front against the policies of aggression and war pursued by the imperialists headed by the United States, and wage resolute struggles. Should imperialism dare to take the risk of imposing a new world war on the peoples of the world, such a war would inevitably end in the destruction of imperialism and the victory of socialism. We stated these views at the 1957 and 1960 Moscow meetings. The two Moscow meetings included these views of ours in the joint documents, which were adopted, and did not reject them as Togliatti alleged.

Since Togliatti and certain other comrades know perfectly well where the Communist Party of China stands on the problem of war and peace, why do they keep on distorting and attacking this stand? What are the real differences between them and us?

They are manifested mainly in the following three questions:

Firstly, the Communist Party of China holds that the source of modern war is imperialism. The chief force for aggression and war is US imperialism, the most vicious enemy of all the peoples of the world. In order to defend world peace, it is necessary to expose the imperialist policies of aggression and war unceasingly and thoroughly, so as to make the people of the world to maintain a high degree of vigilance. The fact that the forces of socialism, of national liberation, of people's revolution and of world peace have surpassed the forces of imperialism and war has not changed the aggressive nature of imperialism and cannot possibly change it. The imperialist bloc headed by the United States is engaged in frenzied arms expansion and war preparations and is menacing world peace.

Those who slanderously attack the CPC allege that our unremitting exposures of imperialism, and especially of the policies of aggression and war of US imperialism, show our disbelief in the possibility of averting a world war; actually what these people oppose is the exposure of imperialism. On many occasions they have publicly opposed the exposure of imperialism. Although they admit in words that the nature of imperialism has not changed, in fact, they prettify imperialism in a hundred and one ways and spread among the masses of the people illusions about imperialism, and especially about US imperialism.

It will be recalled that three years ago, following the “Camp David talks,” some persons in the international communist movement talked a great deal about Eisenhower’s sincere desire for peace, saying that this ringleader of US imperialism was just as concerned about peace as we were. It will also be recalled that when Eisenhower arrived in Italy on his European tour in December 1959, certain comrades of the CPI went so far as to put up posters, distribute leaflets and organize a gala welcome, urging all Italian political parties and people from all walks of life to “salute” him. One of the welcoming slogans ran as follows:

We Communists of Rome salute Dwight Eisenhower and, in the name of 250,000 electors in the capital of the Italian Republic, express our confidence and our determination that the great hopes for peace which were aroused in the hearts of all peoples, hopes created by the meeting between the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, shall not end in disappointment.¹¹⁶

Now we again hear some people saying that Kennedy is even more concerned about world peace than Eisenhower was and that Kennedy showed his concern for the maintenance of peace during the Caribbean crisis.

One would like to ask: Is this way of embellishing US imperialism the correct policy for defending world peace? The intrusion into the Soviet Union of spy planes sent by the Eisenhower Administration, the aggression against Cuba by the Kennedy Administration, the hundred and one other acts of aggression around the world by US imperialism, and its threats to world peace—have these not repeatedly confirmed the truth that the ring-leaders of US imperialism are no angels of peace but monsters of war? And are not those people who try time and again to prettify imperialism deliberately deceiving the people of the world?

It is crystal-clear that if one went by what these people say, US imperialism would have ceased to be the enemy of world peace, and therefore, there would be no need to fight against its policies of aggression and war. This erroneous view, which openly runs counter to the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, can only make the peace-loving people of the world

¹¹⁶ *L'Unita*, December 4, 1959.

lose their bearing, damage the fight for world peace and assist US imperialism in carrying out its policies of aggression and war.

Secondly, the Communist Party of China holds that world peace can only be securely safeguarded in the resolute struggle against imperialism headed by the United States, by constantly strengthening the socialist camp, by constantly strengthening the national and democratic movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and by constantly strengthening the people's revolutionary struggles in various countries and the movement to defend world peace. In order to achieve world peace it is necessary to rely mainly on the strength of the masses of the people of the world and on their struggles. In the course of the struggle to defend world peace, it is necessary to enter into negotiations on one issue or another with the governments of the imperialist countries, including the government of the United States, for the purpose of easing international tension, reaching some kind of compromise and arriving at certain agreements, subject to the principle that such compromises and agreements must not damage the fundamental interests of the people. However, world peace can never be achieved by negotiations alone, and in no circumstances must we pin our hopes on imperialism and divorce ourselves from the struggles of the masses.

Those who attack the Communist Party of China misrepresent this correct viewpoint of ours as showing lack of faith in the possibility of averting a world war. As a matter of fact, they themselves have no faith in the possibility of preventing a world war by reliance on the strength of the masses and their struggles, and they are opposed to relying on the masses and their struggles. They want the people of the world to believe in the "sensibleness," the "assurances" and the "good intentions" of imperialism, and to place their hopes for world peace on "mutual conciliation," "mutual concessions," "mutual accommodation" and "sensible compromises" with imperialism. To beg imperialism for peace, these persons do not scruple to impair the fundamental interests of the people of various countries, throw overboard the revolutionary principles and even demand that others also should sacrifice the revolutionary principles.

Innumerable historical facts prove that genuine peace can never be attained by begging imperialism for peace at the expense of the fundamental interests of the people and at the expense of revolutionary principles. On the contrary, this can only help to inflate the arrogance of the imperialist aggres-

sors. Comrade Fidel Castro has rightly said that “the way to peace is not the way of sacrifice of, or infringement upon, the people’s rights, because that is precisely the way leading to war.”

Thirdly, the Communist Party of China holds that the struggle for the defense of world peace supports, is supported by, and indeed is inseparable from, the national-liberation movements and the peoples’ revolutionary struggles in various countries. The national-liberation movements and the peoples’ revolutionary struggles are a powerful force weakening the imperialist forces of war and defending world peace. The more the national-liberation movements and the peoples’ revolutionary struggles develop, the better for the defense of world peace. The socialist countries, the Communists of all countries and all the peace-loving people of the world must resolutely support the national-liberation movements and the revolutionary struggles of the peoples in various countries, and must resolutely support wars of national-liberation and peoples’ revolutionary wars.

In branding this correct view of ours as “warlike,” those who attack the Communist Party of China are, in fact, placing the struggle in defense of world peace in opposition to the movements of national liberation and to the peoples’ revolutionary struggles, and in opposition to wars of national-liberation and peoples’ revolutionary wars. According to them, all that the oppressed nations and the oppressed peoples can do is to receive what is “bestowed” by imperialism and the reactionaries, and they should not wage struggles against imperialism and the reactionaries, or they would be disturbing world peace. These persons assert that if oppressed nations and oppressed peoples were to oppose counter-revolutionary war with revolutionary war when confronting armed suppression by imperialism and the reactionaries, this would have “irreparable consequences.” This erroneous view of theirs can only mean that they are opposed to revolution by oppressed nations and peoples, and demand that these nations and peoples abandon their revolutionary struggles and revolutionary wars and forever submit to the dark rule and enslavement of imperialism and reaction.

Facts have shown that every victory for the national-liberation movement and for the revolutionary struggle of the people hits and weakens the imperialist forces of war and strengthens and augments the peace forces of the world. To take the stand of fearing revolution, of opposing revolution, results in setbacks and defeats for the national-liberation movements and

the peoples' revolutionary cause, and this will only damage the peace forces and heighten the danger of imperialists starting a world war.

To sum up, on the question of how to avert world war and safeguard world peace, the Communist Party of China has consistently stood for the resolute exposure of imperialism, for strengthening the socialist camp, for firm support of the national-liberation movements and the peoples' revolutionary struggles, for the broadest alliance of all the peace-loving countries and people of the world, and at the same time, for taking full advantage of the contradictions among our enemies, and for utilizing the method of negotiation as well as other forms of struggle. The aim of this stand is precisely the effective prevention of world war and preservation of world peace. This stand fully conforms with Marxism-Leninism and with the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. It is the correct policy for preventing world war and defending world peace. We persist in this correct policy precisely because we are deeply convinced that it is possible to prevent world war by relying on the combined struggle of all the forces mentioned above. How then can this stand be described as lacking faith in the possibility of averting world war? How can it be called "warlike?" It would simply result in a phony peace or bring about an actual war for the people of the whole world if you prettify imperialism, pin your hopes of peace on imperialism, take an attitude of passivity or opposition towards the national-liberation movements and the peoples' revolutionary struggles and bow down and surrender to imperialism, as advocated by those who attack the Communist Party of China. This policy is wrong and all Marxist-Leninists, all revolutionary people, all peace-loving people must resolutely oppose it.

II

On the question of war and peace, the differences which Togliatti and certain other comrades have with us find striking expression in our respective attitudes to nuclear weapons and nuclear war.

The Communist Party of China has consistently held that nuclear weapons have unprecedented destructive power and that it would be an unprecedented calamity for mankind if nuclear war should break out. It is precisely for this reason that we have always called for a complete ban on nuclear weapons, that is, a total ban on the testing, manufacture, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons. Time and again the Chinese Government has pro-

posed the establishment of an area free from atomic weapons embracing all the countries of the Asian and Pacific region, the United States included. Besides, we have always actively supported all the just struggles waged by the peace-loving countries and peoples of the world for the outlawing of nuclear weapons and the prevention of a nuclear war. The allegations that the Communist Party of China underestimates the destructiveness of nuclear weapons and wants to drag the world into a nuclear war are absurd slanders.

On the question of nuclear weapons and nuclear war, the first difference between us and those who attack the Communist Party of China is whether or not the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles on war and peace have become “out of date” since the emergence of nuclear weapons.

Togliatti and certain others believe that the emergence of nuclear weapons “has changed the nature of war” and that “one should add other considerations to the definition of the just character of a war.” Actually, they hold that war is no longer the continuation of politics, and that there is no longer any distinction between just and unjust wars. Thus they completely deny the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles on war and peace. We hold that the emergence of nuclear weapons has not changed and cannot change the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles with regard to war and peace. In reality, the numerous wars that have broken out since the appearance of nuclear weapons have all been the continuation of politics, and there still are just and unjust wars. In practice, those who hold there is no longer any distinction between just and unjust wars either oppose waging just wars or refuse to give them support, and they have lapsed into the position of bourgeois pacifism, which is opposed to all wars.

On the question of nuclear weapons and nuclear war, the second difference between us and those who attack the Communist Party of China is whether one should view the future of mankind with pessimism or with revolutionary optimism.

Togliatti and certain others talk volubly about “the suicide of mankind” and the “total destruction” of mankind. They believe that “it is idle even to discuss what might be the outlook for such remnants of the human race with regard to the social order.” We are firmly opposed to such pessimistic and despairing tunes. We believe that it is possible to attain a complete ban on nuclear weapons in the following circumstances: the socialist camp has a great nuclear superiority, the peoples’ struggles in various countries

against nuclear weapons and nuclear war become broader and deeper; having further forfeited their nuclear superiority, the imperialists are compelled to realize that their policy of nuclear blackmail is no longer effective and that their launching of a nuclear war would only accelerate their own extinction. There are precedents for the outlawing of highly destructive weapons. One such precedent is the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, concluded by various nations in 1925 in Geneva.

If, after we have done everything possible to prevent a nuclear war, imperialism should nevertheless unleash nuclear war, without regard to any of the consequences, it would only result in the extinction of imperialism and definitely not in the extinction of mankind. The Moscow Statement points out that “should the imperialist maniacs start war, the peoples will sweep capitalism out of existence and bury it.” All Marxist-Leninists firmly believe that the course of history necessarily leads to the destruction of nuclear weapons by mankind, and will definitely not lead to the destruction of mankind by nuclear weapons. The advocates of the “total destruction” of mankind contradict the theses contained in the joint documents of the international communist movement, and this only serves to show that they have lost all faith in the future of mankind and in the great ideal of communism and have fallen into the quagmire of defeatism.

On the question of nuclear weapons and nuclear war, the third difference between us and those who attack the Communist Party of China concerns the policy to be adopted in order successfully to reach the goal of outlawing nuclear weapons and preventing a nuclear war.

Togliatti and certain others zealously advertise the dreadful nature of nuclear weapons and blatantly declare that “it is justified” to “shudder” with fear in the face of the nuclear blackmail when US imperialism parades it. Togliatti has also said that “war must be avoided at any cost.” According to what he and certain others say, should not the only way of dealing with the US imperialist policy of nuclear threats and blackmail be unconditional surrender and the complete abandonment of all revolutionary ideals and all revolutionary principles? Can this be the kind of stand a Communist should take? Can a nuclear war really be prevented in this way?

It is unthinkable that “shudders of fear” will move US imperialism to become so benevolent that it will abandon its policies of aggression and war

and its policy of nuclear blackmail. Facts prove the opposite. The more one “shudders” with fear, the more unbridled and the greedier US imperialism becomes, and the more it persists in using threats of nuclear warfare and raising ever greater demands. Have there not been enough object-lessons of this kind?

We hold that in order to mobilize the masses of the people against nuclear war and nuclear weapons it is necessary to inform them of the enormous destructiveness of these weapons. It would be patently wrong to underestimate this destructiveness. However, US imperialism is doing its utmost to disseminate dread of nuclear weapons in pursuit of its policy of nuclear blackmail. In these circumstances, while Communists should point out the destructiveness of nuclear weapons, they should counter the US imperialist propaganda of nuclear terror by stressing the possibility of outlawing them and preventing nuclear war; they should try to transmute the people’s desire for peace into righteous indignation at the imperialist policy of nuclear threats and lead the people to struggle against the US imperialist policies of aggression and war. In no circumstances must Communists act as a voluntary propagandist for the US imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail. We hold that the US imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail must be thoroughly exposed and that all peace-loving countries and people must be mobilized on the most extensive scale to wage an unrelenting fight against every move made by the US imperialists in their plans for aggression and war. We are deeply convinced that, by relying on the united struggle of all forces defending peace, it is possible to frustrate the US imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail. This is the correct and effective policy for achieving a ban on nuclear weapons and preventing a nuclear war.

We would like to advise those who attack the Communist Party of China to discard their fallacious pessimistic arguments, to have confidence in the truth of Marxism-Leninism, to pull themselves together and take an active part in the great struggle of the masses against the imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail and for the defense of world peace.

III

Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades have strongly opposed the Marxist-Leninist proposition of the Chinese Communist Party that “imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers.” In his report to the recent

congress of the Italian Communist Party Comrade Togliatti said that it “was wrong to state that imperialism is simply a paper tiger which can be overthrown by a mere push of the shoulder.” Then there are other persons who assert that today imperialism has nuclear teeth, so how can it be called a paper tiger?

Prejudice is further from the truth than ignorance. In the case of Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades, if they are not ignorant, then they are deliberately distorting this proposition of the Chinese Communist Party.

In comparing imperialism and all reactionaries to paper tigers, Comrade Mao Zedong and the Chinese Communists are looking at the problem as a whole and from a long-term point of view and are looking at the essence of the problem. What is meant is that, in the final analysis, it is the masses of the people who are really powerful, not imperialism and the reactionaries.

Comrade Mao Zedong first put forward this proposition in August 1946, in his talk with the American correspondent Anna Louise Strong. That was a difficult time for the Chinese people. The Kuomintang reactionaries, backed to the hilt by US imperialism and enjoying immense superiority in men and equipment, had unleashed a nation-wide civil war. In the face of the frenzied enemy attacks and the myth of the invincibility of US imperialism, the most important question for the Chinese revolution and the fate of the Chinese people was whether we would dare to struggle, dare to make a revolution, and dare to seize victory. It was at this crucial moment that Comrade Mao Zedong armed the Chinese Communists and the Chinese people ideologically with the Marxist-Leninist proposition that “imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers.” With great lucidity he said:

All reactionaries are paper tigers. In appearance, the reactionaries are terrifying, but in reality they are not so powerful. From a long-term point of view, it is not the reactionaries but the people who are really powerful.

Chiang Kai-shek and his supporters, the US reactionaries, are all paper tigers too. Speaking of US imperialism, people seem to feel that it is terrifically strong. Chinese reactionaries are using the “strength” of the United States to frighten the Chinese peo-

ple. But it will be proved that the US reactionaries, like all the reactionaries in history, do not have much strength.¹¹⁷

In his speech at the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of socialist countries in Moscow, November 1957, Comrade Mao Zedong expounded the same proposition. He said:

All the reputedly powerful reactionaries were merely paper tigers... For struggle against the enemy, we formed over a long period the concept that strategically we should despise all our enemies, but that tactically we should take them all seriously. This also means that in regard to the whole we should despise the enemy but that in regard to each and every concrete question we must take them seriously. If with regard to the whole we do not despise the enemy we shall be committing the error of opportunism. Marx and Engels were only two persons. Yet in those early days they declared that capitalism would be overthrown all over the world. But in dealing with concrete problems and particular enemies we shall be committing the error of adventurism if we do not take them seriously.¹¹⁸

This scientific proposition of Comrade Mao Zedong's was confirmed long ago by the great victory of the Chinese people's revolution; and it has inspired all oppressed nations and oppressed peoples engaged in revolutionary struggles. Let us ask Comrade Togliatti and those who have attacked this proposition: On what particular point is Comrade Mao Zedong's proposition wrong?

Comrade Mao Zedong's analysis of imperialism and all reactionaries is completely in accord with Lenin's analysis. In 1919 Lenin compared the "all-powerful" Anglo-French imperialism to a "colossus with feet of clay." He said:

It seemed at that time that world imperialism was such a tremendous and invincible force that it was stupid of the workers of a backward country to attempt an uprising against it. Now...

¹¹⁷ Mao Zedong, "Talk With the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 90-91.

¹¹⁸ Mao Zedong, "All Reactionaries are Paper Tigers" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. V, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 501-502.

we see that imperialism, which seemed such an insuperable colossus, has proved before the whole world to be a colossus with feet of clay.

that all these seemingly huge and invincible forces of international imperialism are unreliable, and hold no terrors for us, that at the core they are rotten.¹¹⁹

Isn't the reasoning of Lenin in his description of the "colossus with feet of clay" the same as that of Comrade Mao Zedong in his reference to the "paper tiger?" We ask, what is wrong with Lenin's proposition? Is this proposition of Lenin's "outmoded?"

In history there have been countless instances proving that imperialism and reactionaries are all paper tigers. In 1917, before the February and October Revolutions the opportunists said that because the tsar and the bourgeois government were so formidable it would be sheer madness for the people to take up arms. But Lenin and the other Bolsheviks resolutely combated this opportunist view and firmly led the masses of the workers, peasants and soldiers to overthrow the tsar and the bourgeois government. History proved that the tsar and the bourgeois government were nothing but paper tigers. On the eve of and during World War II, the adherents of the policy of appeasement and capitulation said that Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese imperialists were invincible. But the people of various countries resolutely combated appeasement and capitulation and in the end they won the war against fascism. Again, history proved that Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese imperialists were nothing but paper tigers.

We hold that the question of whether one treats imperialism and all reactionaries strategically as the paper tigers they really are is of great importance for the question of how the forces of revolution and the forces of reaction are to be appraised, is of great importance for the question of whether the revolutionary people will dare to wage struggle, dare to make revolution, dare to seize victory, and is of great importance for the question of the future outcome of the world-wide struggles of the people and for the question of the future course of history. Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries should never be afraid of imperialism and the reactionaries. The days are now gone forever when imperialism could ride roughshod over the world, and it is

¹¹⁹ V. I. Lenin, "Results of Party Week in Moscow and Our Tasks" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

imperialism and the reactionaries who should be afraid of the forces of revolution and not the other way round. Every oppressed nation and every oppressed people should above all have the revolutionary confidence, the revolutionary courage and the revolutionary spirit to defeat imperialism and the reactionaries, otherwise there will be no hope for any revolution. The only way to win victory in revolution is for the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries resolutely to combat every trace of weakness and capitulation, and to educate the masses of the people in the concept that “imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers,” thereby destroying the arrogance of the enemy and enhancing the spirit of the great masses of the people so that they will have revolutionary determination and confidence, revolutionary vision and staunchness.

The possession of nuclear weapons by imperialism has not changed by one iota the nature of imperialism, which is rotten to the core and declining, inwardly weak though outwardly strong; nor has it changed by one iota the basic Marxist-Leninist principle that the masses of the people are the decisive factor in the development of history. When in his talk with Anna Louise Strong Comrade Mao Zedong first put forward the proposition that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers, the imperialists already had atomic weapons. In this talk Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out:

The atom bomb is a paper tiger which the US reactionaries use to scare people. It looks terrible, but in fact it isn't. Of course, the atom bomb is a weapon of mass slaughter, but the outcome of a war is decided by the people, not by one or two new types of weapon.¹²⁰

History has proved that even when imperialism is armed with nuclear weapons it cannot frighten into submission a revolutionary people who dare to fight. The victory of the Chinese revolution and the great victories of the peoples of Korea, Viet Nam, Cuba, Algeria and other countries in their revolutionary struggles were all won at a time when US imperialism possessed nuclear weapons. Imperialism has always been armed to the teeth and has always been out for the blood of the people. No matter what kind of teeth imperialism may have, whether guns, tanks, rocket teeth, nuclear teeth or any other kind of teeth that modern science and technology may provide, its

¹²⁰ Mao Zedong, “Talk With the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong,” *op. cit.*, p. 90.

rotten, decadent and paper-tiger nature cannot change. In the final analysis, neither nuclear teeth nor any other kind of teeth can save imperialism from its fate of inevitable extinction. In the end the nuclear teeth of imperialism, and whatever other teeth it may have, will be consigned by the people of the world to the museum of history, together with imperialism itself.

Those who attack the proposition that “imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers” have obviously lost every quality a revolutionary ought to have and instead have become as short-sighted and timid as mice. Our advice to these people is, better not tie your fate to that of the imperialists!

IV

The differences Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades have with us are also manifest on the question of peaceful coexistence.

The Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government have always stood for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. China was an initiator of the well-known Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. On the basis of those Five Principles, China has established friendly relations with many countries, concluded treaties of friendship or treaties of friendship and mutual non-aggression with Yemen, Burma, Nepal, Afghanistan, Guinea, Cambodia, Indonesia and Ghana, and achieved a satisfactory settlement of boundary questions with Burma, Nepal and other countries. No one can deny these facts.

Yet there are persons in the international communist movement who vilify and attack China as being opposed to peaceful coexistence. The reason they do this is to cover up their own erroneous and anti-Marxist-Leninist views on this question.

On the question of peaceful coexistence, our differences with those who attack us are the following. We believe that socialist countries should strive to establish normal international relations with countries with different social systems on the basis of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, mutual non-interference in domestic affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. So far as the socialist countries are concerned, this presents no difficulties whatsoever. The obstacles come from imperialism and from the reactionaries of various countries. It is inconceivable that peaceful coexistence can be achieved without struggle. It is still less conceivable that the establishment of peaceful

coexistence can eliminate class struggles in the world arena and can abolish the antagonism between the two systems, socialism and capitalism, and the antagonism between oppressed nations and oppressor nations. The Moscow Statement of 1960 points out:

Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle as the revisionists claim. The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism.

But Comrade Togliatti and those who attack China hold that through “peaceful coexistence” it is possible to “renovate the structure of the whole world” and to establish “a new world order,” to construct throughout the world “an economic and social order capable of satisfying all the aspirations of men and peoples towards freedom, well-being, independence and the full development of and respect for the human personality, and towards peaceful cooperation of all states” and “a world without war.” This means that it is possible through “peaceful coexistence” to change a “world structure” in which there exists antagonism between the systems of socialism and capitalism and between oppressed and oppressor nations, and that it is possible to eliminate all wars and to realize “a world without war” while imperialism and reactionaries still exist.

In taking this stand, Comrade Togliatti and other comrades have completely revised Lenin’s principles for peaceful coexistence and discarded the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of class struggle; in reality they are substituting class collaboration for class struggle on a world scale, advocating a fusion of the socialist and capitalist systems. US imperialism is now making a lot of noise about establishing a “world community of free nations,” and vainly hopes to absorb the socialist countries into the “free world” through “peaceful evolution.” The Tito group is helping US imperialism by beating the drums for “economic integration” and “political integration” of the world. Shouldn’t those who advocate “renovating the structure of the whole world” in peaceful coexistence draw a line of demarcation between themselves and US imperialism? Shouldn’t they draw a line of demarcation between themselves and the Tito group?

Even more absurd is the allegation that “a world without war” can be achieved through peaceful coexistence. In the present situation, it is possible to prevent imperialism from launching a new world war if all the peace-lov-

ing forces of the world unite into a broad international anti-imperialist united front and fight together. But it is one thing to prevent a world war and another to eliminate all wars. Imperialism and the reactionaries are the source of war. In conditions where imperialism and reactionaries still exist, it is possible that wars of one kind or another may occur. The history of the 17 postwar years shows that local wars of one kind or another have never ceased. Oppressed nations and oppressed people are bound to rise in revolution. When imperialism and the reactionaries employ armed force to suppress revolution, it is inevitable that civil wars and national-liberation wars will occur. Marxist-Leninists have always maintained that only after the imperialist system has been overthrown and only after all systems of oppression of man by man and of exploitation of man by man have been abolished, and not before, will it be possible to eliminate all wars and to reach “a world without war.”

On peaceful coexistence we have another difference with those who are attacking us. We hold that the question of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems and the question of revolution by oppressed nations and oppressed classes are two different kinds of questions, and not questions of the same kind. The principle of peaceful coexistence can apply only to relations between countries with different social systems, not to relations between oppressed and oppressor nations nor to relations between oppressed and oppressing classes. For an oppressed nation or people the question is one of waging a revolutionary struggle to overthrow the rule of imperialism and the reactionaries; it is not, and cannot be, a question of peaceful coexistence with imperialism and the reactionaries.

But Togliatti and those attacking China extend their idea of “peaceful coexistence” to cover relations between the colonial and semi-colonial people on the one hand and the imperialists and colonialists on the other. They say, “the problem of starvation which still afflicts a billion people,” and “the problem of developing the productive forces and democracy in the underdeveloped areas” “must be solved through negotiations, seeking reasonable solutions and avoiding actions which might worsen the situation and cause irreparable consequences.” They do not like sparks of revolution among the oppressed nations and peoples. They say that a tiny spark may lead to a world war.

Such a way of speaking is really asking the oppressed nations to “coexist peacefully” with their colonial rulers, and asking them to tolerate colonial rule rather than to resist or wage struggles for independence, much less to fight wars of national liberation. Doesn't this kind of talk mean that the Chinese people, the Korean people, the Vietnamese people, the Cuban people, the Algerian people and the people of other countries who rose in revolution have all violated the principle of “peaceful coexistence” and done wrong? It is very difficult for us to see any real difference between such talk and the preachings of the imperialists and colonialists.

Even more astounding is the fact that Togliatti and certain other persons extend their idea of class collaboration in the international arena to cover “joint intervention” in the underdeveloped areas. They have said that “states of diverse social structure” can through mutual cooperation “jointly intervene” to bring about progress in the underdeveloped areas. To talk like this is obviously to spread illusions in the interest of neo-colonialism. The policy of imperialism towards the underdeveloped areas, whatever its form or pattern, is bound to be a policy which is of colonialist plunder, and can never be a policy concerned for the progress of the underdeveloped areas. The socialist countries should of course support the people of the underdeveloped areas; first of all, they should support their struggles for national independence, and when independence has been won, they should support them in developing their national economies. But the socialist countries should never second the colonialist policy of the imperialists towards the underdeveloped countries, much less “jointly intervene” with them in the underdeveloped areas. For anyone to do so would be to betray proletarian internationalism and to serve the interests of imperialism and colonialism.

Is it really possible to have “peaceful coexistence” between the oppressed nations and peoples on the one hand and the imperialists and colonialists on the other? What does “joint intervention” in the underdeveloped areas really mean? The Congo incident is the best answer. When the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted its resolution for international intervention in the Congo, there were some people in the international communist movement who believed this to be a shining example of international cooperation. They believed that colonialism could be wiped out through the intervention of the UN, which would enable the Congolese people to obtain their freedom and independence. But what was the outcome? Lumumba,

the national hero of the Congo, was murdered; Gizenga, his successor, was imprisoned; many Congolese patriots were murdered or thrown into jail; and the vigorous Congolese struggle for national independence was seriously set back. The Congo not only continues to be enslaved by the old colonialists, but has also become a colony of US imperialism, sinking into ever deeper suffering. We ask those who are clamoring for “peaceful coexistence” between the oppressed nations and peoples on the one hand and the imperialists and colonialists on the other, and for “joint intervention” in the underdeveloped areas: Have you forgotten the tragic lesson of the Congo incident?

Those who slander China as being against peaceful coexistence attack her with the charge that she has committed mistakes in her relations with India. Disregarding the true facts and failing to discriminate between right and wrong, they invariably blame China for having clashed with India. On this question, Togliatti said, “We know all that is reasonable and right in the claims of the People’s Republic of China. We also know that the military actions began with an attack from the Indian side.” This was a little fairer than the attitude of some self-styled Marxist-Leninists who invariably make the false charge that China started the clashes on the border. Nevertheless, Togliatti, making no distinction between black and white, still asserts that the Sino-Indian armed clashes were “unreasonable and absurd.” We ask Comrade Togliatti, confronted with the preposterous territorial claims and the large-scale armed attacks of the reactionary clique in India, what should China have done in order to be called “reasonable” and not “absurd?” Is it possible that the only way that China could prove herself “reasonable” and not “absurd” was to submit to the unreasonable demands and the armed attacks of the Indian reactionary clique? Is it possible that the only way socialist China could prove herself “reasonable” and not “absurd” was to hand over with a bow large tracts of her own territory?

The position taken by Comrade Togliatti and certain Other comrades on the Sino-Indian boundary question reflects their point of view on peaceful coexistence, which is that in carrying out this policy the socialist countries should make one concession after another to the capitalist countries, should not fight even in self-defense when subjected to armed attacks, but should surrender their territorial sovereignty. May we ask, is there anything in com-

mon between this point of view and the principle of peaceful coexistence which a socialist country ought to follow?

Those who accuse China of opposing peaceful coexistence also attack the Chinese people for supporting the just stand of the Cuban people in their struggle against US imperialism. When the heroic Cuban people and their revolutionary leader, Premier Fidel Castro, resolutely rejected international inspection as an infringement on Cuba's sovereignty and advanced their five just demands, the Chinese people held gigantic mass demonstrations and parades throughout the country in accordance with their consistent stand for proletarian internationalism, and firmly supported the Cuban people's struggle in defense of their independence, sovereignty and dignity. Was there anything wrong in that? Yet some people have repeatedly charged China with creating difficulties in the Caribbean situation and with wanting to plunge the world into a thermonuclear war. This slander against China is most malicious and most despicable.

How can one possibly interpret the resolute support which the Chinese people gave to the Cuban people in their struggle against international inspection and in defense of their sovereignty as meaning that China was opposed to peaceful coexistence or wanted to plunge others into a thermonuclear war? Does this mean that China, also, should have applied pressure on Cuba to force her to accept international inspection, and that only by so doing would China have conformed to this so-called "peaceful coexistence?" If there are people who give verbal support to Cuba's five demands but are actually opposed to the Chinese people's support for Cuba, are they not merely exposing the hypocrisy of their own support for Cuba's five demands?

The CPC and the Chinese people have always maintained that the course of history is decided by the great strength of the masses of the people and not by any weapons. On more than one occasion we have made it clear that we neither called for the establishment of missile bases in Cuba nor obstructed the withdrawal of the so-called "offensive weapons" from Cuba. We have never considered that it was a Marxist-Leninist attitude to brandish nuclear weapons as a way of settling international disputes. Nor have we ever considered that the avoidance of a thermonuclear war in the Caribbean crisis was a "Munich." What we did strongly oppose, still strongly oppose and will strongly oppose in the future is the sacrifice of another country's

sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. A compromise of this sort can only be regarded as one hundred percent appeasement, a “Munich” pure and simple. A compromise of this sort has nothing in common with the socialist countries’ policy of peaceful coexistence.

V

In fact, not only do Comrade Togliatti and certain other CPI comrades call for class collaboration in place of class struggle in the international arena, they also extend their concept of “peaceful coexistence” to relations between the oppressed and the oppressing classes within the capitalist countries. Togliatti has said:

All our actions within the sphere of the internal situation of our country are none other than the translation into Italian terms of the great struggle for renovating the structure of the whole world.

Here the phrase “all our actions” means what they call the “advance towards socialism in democracy and in peace,” or the road to socialism through “structural reform,” as they describe it.

Although the present line of the Italian Communist Party on the question of socialist revolution is incorrect in our opinion, we have never attempted to interfere because, after all, this is a matter for the Italian comrades alone to decide. But now since Comrade Togliatti claims that his theory of “structural reform” is a “line common to the whole international communist movement” and unilaterally declares that peaceful transition has “become a principle of world strategy of the workers’ movement and the communist movement,” and since this issue involves not only the fundamental Marxist-Leninist theory of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, but also the fundamental problem of the emancipation of the proletariat and the people in all the capitalist countries, as members of the international communist movement and as Marxist-Leninists, we cannot but express our opinions on the subject.

The fundamental problem in every revolution is that of state power. In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels declared: “The first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of

ruling class.”¹²¹ This idea runs through the entire works of Lenin. In *The State and Revolution*, Lenin laid stress on the need to break up and smash the bourgeois state machine and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. He said, “The working class must break up, smash the ‘ready-made state machinery’, and not confine itself merely to laying hold of it”; and that “only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” He further said, “All is illusion, except power.”¹²²

In elucidating the common laws of socialist revolution the 1957 Moscow Declaration first states that to embark on the road to socialism it is necessary for the working class, the core of which is the Marxist-Leninist Party, to guide the working masses in effecting a proletarian revolution in one form or another and establishing one form or another of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

There is not the slightest doubt that the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, and the common laws of socialist revolution enunciated in the Moscow Declaration, are universally applicable and, of course, applicable also to Italy.

However, Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades of the Italian Communist Party maintain that Lenin’s analysis in *The State and Revolution* is “no longer sufficient,” and that the content of proletarian dictatorship is now different. According to their theory of “structural reform,” there is no need for present-day Italy to have a proletarian revolution, there is no need to smash the bourgeois state machine, and there is no need to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat; they can arrive at socialism “progressively” and “peacefully” merely through a “succession of reforms,” through the nationalization of the big enterprises, through economic planning and through the extension of democracy within the framework of the Italian Constitution. In fact, they take the state to be an instrument above class and believe that the bourgeois state, too, can carry out socialist policies; they take bourgeois democracy to be democracy above class and believe that the proletariat can rise to be the “leading class” in the state by relying on such democracy. This

¹²¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party & Principles of Communism*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 55.

¹²² V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, pp. 38, 34.

theory of “structural reform” is a complete betrayal of the Marxist-Leninist theories of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship.

Present-day Italy is a capitalist country ruled by the monopoly capitalist class. Although the Italian Constitution incorporates some of the gains achieved by the Italian working class and the Italian people through their valiant struggles over the years, it is still a bourgeois constitution with the protection of capitalist ownership as its core. Like the democracy practiced in all other capitalist countries, democracy as practiced in Italy is bourgeois democracy, i.e., bourgeois dictatorship. Nationalization as practiced in Italy is not state capitalism under the socialist system, but a state capitalism which serves the interests of the monopoly capitalist class. In order to maintain its exploitation and its rule, the monopoly capitalist class may at times adopt certain measures of reform. It is entirely necessary for the working class in capitalist countries to wage day-to-day economic struggles and struggles for democracy. However, the purpose of waging these struggles is to achieve partial improvements in the living conditions of the working class and working people and, what is more important, to educate the masses and organize them, enhance their political consciousness and accumulate revolutionary strength for the seizure of state power when the time is ripe. Marxist-Leninists, while favoring struggle for reforms, resolutely oppose reformism.

Facts have proved that whenever the political and economic demands of the working class and working people have exceeded the limits permitted by the monopoly capitalists, the Italian government, which represents the interests of monopoly capital, has resorted to repression. Have not innumerable historical facts proved this to be an unalterable law of class struggle? How is it conceivable that the monopoly capitalist class will abandon its interests and its rule and step down from the stage of history of its own accord?

Togliatti himself is not completely unaware of this. Although he has energetically advocated the possibility of “breaking the power of the big monopoly groups” within the framework of the bourgeois constitution, his answer to the question, “How can this be done?” is, “We don’t know.” It can thus be seen that the theory of “structural reform” held by Togliatti and certain other leaders of the Italian Communist Party stems not from historical materialism and the scientific study of objective reality, but from idealism and illusion. Yet they have been energetically propagating views which they themselves know are unreliable and describing them as a “line common to

the whole international communist movement.” Such a practice on their part serves only to vitiate and attenuate the proletarian revolutionary struggle, preserve capitalist rule and completely negate the socialist revolution. Isn't this a new kind of social-democratic trend?

Recently in capitalist countries, some Communists who have degenerated politically and some Right-wing social-democrats have successively advertised the theory of “structural reform,” using it to attack communist parties. This fact in itself is sufficient to show how closely the theory of “structural reform” resembles social democracy and how remote it is from Marxism-Leninism!

The Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement point out that socialist revolution may be realized through peaceful or non-peaceful means. Some people have tried in vain to use this thesis to justify the theory of “structural reform.” It is also erroneous to quote peaceful transition one-sidedly as “a principle of world strategy of the communist movement.”

From the Marxist-Leninist point of view, it would naturally be in the interests of the proletariat and the entire people if peaceful transition could be realized. Whenever the possibility for peaceful transition appears in a given country, the Communists should strive for its realization. But possibility and reality, the wish and its fulfillment, are two different things. Hitherto, history has not witnessed a single example of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. Communists should not pin all their hopes for the victory of the revolution on peaceful transition. The bourgeoisie will never step down from the stage of history of its own accord. This is a universal law of class struggle. Communists must not in the slightest degree relax their preparedness for revolution. They must be prepared to repel the assaults of counter-revolution and to overthrow the bourgeoisie by armed force at the critical juncture of the revolution when the proletariat is seizing state power and the bourgeoisie resorts to armed force to suppress the revolution.

That is to say, Communists should be prepared to employ dual tactics, namely, while preparing for the peaceful development of the revolution, they should be fully prepared for its non-peaceful development. Only in this way can they avoid being caught unawares when a situation favorable to the revolution emerges, and when the bourgeoisie resorts to violence in order to suppress the revolution. Even when it is possible to secure state power through peaceful means, one must be prepared to deal immediately

with armed intervention by foreign imperialists and with counter-revolutionary armed rebellions supported by the imperialists. Communists should concentrate their attention on the accumulation of revolutionary strength through painstaking efforts and must be ready to fight back against armed attacks by the bourgeoisie whenever necessary. They should not lay one-sided stress on peaceful transition and concentrate their attention on this possibility; otherwise they are bound to benumb the revolutionary will of the proletariat, disarm themselves ideologically, be utterly passive and unprepared politically and organizationally, and end up by burying the cause of the proletarian revolution.

The thesis of Comrade Togliatti and certain other leaders of the Italian Communist Party concerning “the advance towards socialism in democracy and in peace” is reminiscent of some of the statements of the old revisionist K. Kautsky. Kautsky said more than forty years ago:

I anticipate... that it will be possible to carry it [the social revolution of the proletariat] out by peaceful, economic, legal and moral means, instead of by physical force, in all places where democracy has been established.¹²³

Should Communists not draw a clear line of demarcation between themselves and such social-democrats as Kautsky?

VI

The extent to which Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades have departed from Marxism-Leninism and from the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement is more clearly revealed by their recent ardent flirtation with the Yugoslav revisionist group.

A representative of the Tito group, who are renegades from Marxism-Leninism, was invited to the recent Congress of the Italian Communist Party and was given a platform from which to denounce China. At the same congress, Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades publicly defended the Tito group and lavishly praised them for “the value of what they have done and are doing.”

¹²³ Karl Kautsky, *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, Greenwood Press Publishers, Westport, 1964, pp. 37-38.

We wish to ask Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades: Do you still recognize the Moscow Statement as binding on you? The 1960 Moscow Statement states unequivocally:

The communist parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist “theories” in concentrated form. After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist program to the Declaration of 1957; they set the League of Communists of Yugoslavia against the international communist movement as a whole.

Can it be that this condemnation of the Tito group is a mistake? Is the resolution which was unanimously adopted by the communist parties of all countries to be thrown overboard at the whim or will of any individual or individuals?

After all, facts are facts and renegades to communism remain renegades to communism. The judgement arrived at in the Moscow Statement cannot be overturned by anyone, whoever he may be.

Far from giving up their thoroughly revisionist program, the Titoites have stuck to it in the draft Yugoslav Constitution which they published not long ago.

The Tito group have not changed their “unique road” of building “socialism” through selling themselves to imperialism. On the contrary, they are working harder and harder in the service of the US imperialist policies of aggression and war. Recently US imperialism has tipped the Tito group with extra “aid” amounting to more than 100 million dollars. Under the same old camouflage of “being outside blocs” and of “positive coexistence,” the Tito group are doing everything they can to sabotage the national and democratic movements of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and to undermine the unity of the socialist camp and of all the peace-loving countries.

With the development of the Tito group’s revisionist line and their increasing dependence upon US imperialism, Yugoslavia has long ceased to be a socialist country, and the gradual restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia began long ago.

The restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia has occurred not through any counter-revolutionary coup d’état by the bourgeoisie, nor through any inva-

sion by imperialism, but gradually, through the degeneration of the Tito group. In this connection, as Lenin pointed out long ago, “the main question of every revolution is, undoubtedly, the question of state power. In the hands of which class power is—this decides everything.”¹²⁴ The character of a state depends on what class wields state power and on what policy it carries out. In Yugoslavia today state power is in the hands of the Tito group, a group who have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and the cause of communism, betrayed the fundamental interests of the Yugoslav working class and the Yugoslav people, and who are enforcing a whole set of out-and-out revisionist policies. In the Yugoslav countryside, the rich peasant and other capitalist forces are rapidly growing, and class differentiation is being accelerated. The capitalist laws of free competition and of profit are playing the dominant role in all spheres of Yugoslav economic life, and capitalist anarchy is rampant.

It may not be unprofitable to listen to what the imperialists have to say in their appraisal of the Tito group. The US imperialists have likened the Tito group to a “bellwether,” that is to say, they aim at inducing certain socialist countries to leave the socialist camp and enter Kennedy’s “world community of free nations” through the influence of the Yugoslav revisionists. The Yugoslav example makes it clear that the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads is still going on and the danger of the restoration of capitalism continues to exist even in a country which has embarked on the road of socialism.

The phenomena of political degeneration and of the emergence of new bourgeois elements after the victory of a proletarian revolution are not difficult to understand. Lenin once said that historically various kinds of degeneration had occurred and that in given conditions it was possible for a handful of new bourgeois elements to emerge from among Soviet functionaries. It is precisely the new bourgeois elements such as Lenin referred to who have occupied the ruling positions in Yugoslavia.

In his concluding speech Comrade Togliatti said:

When you say that capitalism has been restored in Yugoslavia—
and everybody knows that this is not true—nobody believes the

¹²⁴ V. I. Lenin, “One of the Fundamental Questions of the Revolution” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXV.

rest of what you say, and everyone thinks that it is all simply an exaggeration.

He seemed to think this a complete refutation of the Marxist-Leninist theses of the Chinese Communist Party. But sophistry does not alter the truth. The only reason advanced in support of the arbitrary assertion that Yugoslavia is a socialist country was that one could not find a single capitalist there. It is always hard for people to see the truth when they wear colored spectacles. Since there are many points of similarity between Togliatti et al. and the Tito group in their understanding of proletarian revolution, proletarian dictatorship and socialism, it is small wonder that they fail to see the restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia, and that they fail to see the new bourgeois elements in Yugoslavia.

It is particularly surprising that certain people, while loudly boasting of their intimate relations with the renegade Tito group, vigorously attack the Chinese Communist Party, asserting that our unity with the Albanian Party of Labor, which is based on Marxism-Leninism, is "impermissible." These people stop at nothing in their attempt to eject the Albanian Party of Labor, a Marxist-Leninist Party, from the international communist movement, and at the same time, they are seeking ways to inject the renegade Tito group, which the Moscow Statement unequivocally condemns, into the international communist movement. What are they really after? As the old Chinese saying has it, "Things of one kind come together; different kinds of people fall into different groups." Should not those who treat the Tito group like brothers and who cherish such bitter hatred for a fraternal Marxist-Leninist Party stop and think for a moment where they now stand?

VII

In the final analysis our differences on a whole series of problems with Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades who hold similar views involve the fundamental question of whether the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism are outmoded, and whether the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement are out of date.

Using the pretext that the epoch has changed and that nations have special characteristics, Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades hold that Marxism-Leninism is "outmoded" and that the common laws governing socialist revolution, as set forth in the Moscow Declaration, do not apply

to Italy. Gian Carlo Pajetta, one of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, has gone even further. He has said, "How different is Marxism from Leninism, and how different is the Marxism of Marx from the Leninism of Lenin." It is on such pretexts that they have revised and discarded the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, and have put forward and are peddling what they call the "Italian road," which is contrary to Marxism-Leninism.

Scientific socialism founded by Marx and Engels is a summing-up of the laws governing the development of human society and it is a truth that is universally applicable. The development of history, far from "outmoding" Marxism, has further proved its boundless vitality. Marxism has continuously developed in the course of the struggle of the international proletariat to know and to change the objective world. On the basis of the characteristics of the epoch of imperialism, Lenin creatively developed Marxism in the new historical conditions. In the years since his death, the proletarian parties of various countries have enriched the treasury of Marxism-Leninism by their own revolutionary struggles. Nevertheless, all these new developments proceeded from the basic principles of Marxism, and definitely did not depart from these basic principles.

The path of the October Revolution charted by Lenin, and the common laws governing socialist revolution and socialist construction as set forth in the Moscow Declaration of 1957, are the common path along which the peoples of the world are advancing towards the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of socialism. In spite of the great changes in the world since the October Revolution, the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, which are illustrated by the path of the October Revolution, shine forth today with ever greater brilliance.

In defending his erroneous point of view Togliatti said that the line pursued by the Chinese Communist Party "actually did not correspond to the strategical and tactical line pursued, for example, by the Bolsheviks in the course of the revolution from March to October (1917)." This definitely does not conform with the historical reality of the Chinese revolution. In its long revolutionary struggle, in its struggle against dogmatism and empiricism as well as against "Left" and Right opportunism, the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong has creatively developed Marxism-Leninism by integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete reality of the Chinese revolution. Despite the fact that the

Chinese revolution, like the revolutions of other countries, has many special characteristics, the Chinese Communists have always regarded the Chinese revolution as a continuation of the Great October Revolution. It was by following the path of the October Revolution that the Chinese revolution was won. Togliatti's distortions about the Chinese revolution only show that he is trying to find pretexts for his own peculiar line, which runs counter to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and the common laws governing the socialist revolution.

It is necessary for a Marxist-Leninist party to integrate the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution in its own country and for it to apply the common laws of socialist revolution creatively in the light of the specific conditions in its own country. Marxism-Leninism develops continuously with practice. Certain propositions advanced by a Marxist-Leninist party during a certain period and under certain conditions have to be replaced by new propositions, because of changed circumstances and times. Failure to do so will result in the error of dogmatism and losses to the cause of communism. But under no circumstances is a Marxist-Leninist party allowed to use the pretext of certain new social phenomena to negate the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, to substitute revisionism for Marxism-Leninism and to betray communism.

At a certain stage in the development of a communist party, dogmatism and sectarianism may become the main danger. The Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement are fully correct in pointing out the necessity of opposing dogmatism and sectarianism. Nevertheless, under present conditions modern revisionism is the main danger to the international communist movement as a whole, just as the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement point out. Modern revisionism "which mirrors the bourgeois ideology in theory and practice, distorts Marxism-Leninism, emasculates its revolutionary essence, and thereby paralyzes the revolutionary will of the working class, disarms, and demobilizes the workers, the masses of the working people, in their struggle against oppression by imperialists and exploiters, for peace, democracy and national liberation, for the triumph of socialism." At present, the modern revisionists are opposing Marxism-Leninism under the pretext of opposing dogmatism, are renouncing revolution under the pretext of opposing "Left" adventurism, and are advocating unprincipled compromise and capitulationism under the pretext of flexibil-

ity in tactics. If a resolute struggle is not waged against modern revisionism, the international communist movement will be seriously harmed.

The recent appearance of an adverse current which is contrary to Marxism-Leninism and which is disrupting the unity of the international communist movement furnishes additional proof of the correctness of the theses in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. Concerning the major features of revisionism, Lenin once said:

To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chops and changes of petty politics, to forget the basic interests of the proletariat, the main features of the capitalist system as a whole and of capitalist evolution as a whole; to sacrifice these basic interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment—such is the policy of revisionism.¹²⁵

The revolutionary proletariat and the revolutionary people are sure to march along the correct road charted by Marxism-Leninism. Difficult and tortuous though it may be, it is the only road to victory. The historical development of society will follow neither the “theories” of imperialism nor the “theories” of revisionism. However much they may have done for the workers’ movement in the past, no person, no political party and no group can avoid becoming the servant of the bourgeoisie and being cast aside by the proletariat, once they depart from the road of Marxism-Leninism, step onto and slide down the road of revisionism.

* * *

We have been forced into a public discussion of the major differences between ourselves and Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades in the Italian Communist Party. It has occurred against our wishes and would not have occurred if they had not publicly challenged us first and insisted on a public debate. But even though we are obliged to enter into public debate, we still sincerely hope it will be possible to eliminate our differences through comradely discussion. Although, to our regret, we find that Togliatti and the comrades who share his views are increasingly departing from Marxism-Leninism, we still earnestly hope they will not plunge further, but will recover

¹²⁵ V. I. Lenin, “Marxism and Revisionism” in *Marx, Engels, Marxism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1978, p. 259.

their bearings and return to the stand of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. We desire to look ahead. On several occasions, we have suggested the holding of a representative conference of the communist and workers' parties of all countries to settle the current differences in the international communist movement. We hold that Communists of all countries should take to heart the common interests of the struggle against the enemy and the cause of proletarian revolution, should abide by the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, and should eliminate their differences and strengthen their unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. This is the hope of the working class and of people throughout the world.

The history of the working-class movement in all countries during the past century and more is replete with sharp struggles between Marxism and all kinds of opportunism. From the very beginning, the international communist movement has steadily advanced by struggling against and overcoming reformism, social democracy and revisionism. Today, the revisionists of various brands may bluster for a time, but this indicates not strength but weakness on their part. The revisionist and new social-democratic trends, which have now appeared in the international communist movement and which suit the needs of monopoly capitalism and US imperialism, are substantially the product of the policies of monopoly capital and US imperialism. But the various kinds of revisionism can neither block the victorious advance of the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples, nor save imperialism from its final doom.

In 1913, in the course of his struggle against opportunism, Lenin pointed out, in expounding the historical destiny of the doctrines of Karl Marx, that although Marxism had been subjected to distortions by the opportunists, the development of the revolutionary struggles of the people in all countries had continuously brought it new confirmation and new triumphs. Lenin correctly predicted, "a still greater triumph awaits Marxism, as the doctrine of the proletariat, in the period of history that is now ensuing."¹²⁶ Now we feel that Marxism-Leninism is at a new and important historical juncture. The struggle between the Marxist-Leninist trend and the anti-Marxist-Le-

¹²⁶ V. I. Lenin, "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx" in *Marx, Engels, Marxism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1978, p. 78.

minist revisionist trend is once again being placed on the Communist agenda in all countries in an acute form. We are profoundly convinced that however complicated the course of the struggle, the Marxist-Leninist trend will eventually triumph.

More than a century ago, in the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels made the courageous and gallant call to the whole world “Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.”¹²⁷ This great call inspires all revolutionaries dedicated to the cause-of communism and the proletariat the world over, and imbues them with full confidence about the future, so that they will resolutely break through all obstacles and boldly advance. At the present time, the ranks of the international proletariat are growing stronger and stronger, the political consciousness of the people of all countries is constantly rising, the struggles for world peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism are gaining victory after victory, and the great ideas of socialism and communism are attracting ever greater numbers among the oppressed nations and peoples who find themselves in a difficult and bitter plight. Let imperialism and the reactionaries tremble before the great revolutionary tide of the working class and of all oppressed nations and peoples of the world! Marxism-Leninism will finally triumph! The revolutionary cause of the working class and of the people the world over will finally triumph!

¹²⁷ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party & Principles of Communism*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 70.

Leninism and Modern Revisionism

HONGQI EDITORIAL

January 1963

Source: *Red Flag* (*Hongqi*), No. 1, 1963, pp. 1-8.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, January 11, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 2, pp. 5-10.

Leninism, the fundamental revolutionary principles of Marxism expounded by the great Lenin, which represents a new stage in the development of Marxism, is being assailed, distorted and adulterated by the modern revisionists more viciously than ever before.

The essential thing about Leninism is the fact that it has carried the teachings of Marx and Engels further, providing a scientific analysis of capitalism's sharpening contradictions in its development to the stage of imperialism, and further enriching Marxist theory and tactics on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. The Great October Revolution achieved victory under the direct leadership of Lenin. Carrying on the cause of the October Revolution, the Chinese people and the people of many other countries have also won a series of victories. These are victories for Marxism, victories for Leninism.

Lenin once said that "this doctrine [of Marx] had to fight at every step in its course."¹²⁸ Similarly, Leninism developed in the course of struggle against the revisionism of the Second International. Every new confirmation and victory of Leninism has unavoidably been accompanied by "one battle after another against political stupidity, vulgarity, opportunism, etc."¹²⁹

The old-line revisionists of the Second International often used what they called "new data on economic development" to confuse the masses and cut the revolutionary soul out of Marxism, while falsely displaying the colors of "Marxism." History is repeating itself under different circumstances, in different forms. The modern revisionists, displaying the false colors of "Leninism" and talking glibly about being "faithful to Lenin," are actually repeating

¹²⁸ V. I. Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism" in *Marx, Engels, Marxism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1978, p. 251.

¹²⁹ V. I. Lenin, "Letter to Inessa Armand (December 18, 1916)" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXV.

the same process of using certain “new data” on historical development to confuse people, undermine the revolutionary teachings of Lenin-ism and assail the essentials of Leninism, i.e., Lenin’s teachings on imperialism and his theory and tactics on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship.

Like the revisionism-opportunism of the Second International, modern revisionism is trying hard to cover up the contradictions of capitalism and imperialism and to deny that imperialism is moribund, decaying capitalism whose days are numbered. It has gone so far as to describe modern imperialism as “peaceful” and “democratic” “supra-imperialism.” The modern revisionists rep-resented by the Tito group of Yugoslavia have gone out of their way to make the imperialist monopoly-capitalist state machine look attractive. They describe the so-called policy of nationalization, state-monopoly capitalism and state economic intervention in the imperialist countries and capitalist countries in general in such terms as “the growth of socialist factors,” “the realization of planned economy,” “the beginning of the process of socialist transformation” and so on. They prate about “gradual change,” “the integration of revolution and reform,” “entering deeply into the socialist era,” and so on. But they never have a single word to say about the need, in the transition from capitalism to socialism, to make a revolution that will smash the bourgeois state machine and to replace bourgeois dictatorship with proletarian dictatorship. It is well known that the fundamental Marxist standpoint which Lenin took great pains to expound was precisely that of the revolution to smash the bourgeois state machine and the replacement of bourgeois dictatorship by proletarian dictatorship. For without such a revolution, all talk about socialist transformation will be meaningless, and state-monopoly capitalism will remain capitalism and nothing else. Lenin well said that the existence and growth of monopoly capitalism, including state-monopoly capitalism, can only demonstrate the maturing of the material prerequisites for socialism and the impending approach and inevitability of the socialist revolution, but cannot at all serve “as an argument in favor of tolerating the repudiation of such a revolution and the efforts to make capitalism look more attractive, an occupation in which all the reformists are engaged.”¹³⁰

¹³⁰ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 67.

Herein lies a fundamental difference in the appraisal of our epoch. When Marxist-Leninists say that “the main content of our epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism which was begun by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia,”¹³¹ they base themselves on the viewpoint of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, and on the fundamental experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution. But the modern revisionists, shunning this viewpoint like the plague, distort the experience of the October Revolution and avoid referring to the road of the October Revolution as the common road leading to the emancipation of mankind. As a matter of fact, they regard our epoch as one of “capitalism peacefully growing into socialism.”

Marxism-Leninism has always attached importance to the struggle for democracy. In countries where the bourgeois-democratic revolution has not yet been accomplished, the proletariat must mobilize the masses, make every effort to lead the bourgeois-democratic revolution and fight for its victory. In countries where bourgeois democracy exists, the proletariat should utilize the democratic rights already won to fight for more democratic rights in order to educate, arouse and organize the masses to fight the bourgeois system of exploitation and violence. After the seizure of power, the proletariat should solidify and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and at the same time give effect to widespread democracy under highly centralized guidance. In other words, it must enforce dictatorship over the enemy and practice people’s democracy within the ranks of the people in order to ensure the successful building of socialism and communism. Democracy invariably has a class character. Marxist-Leninists have always treated the problem of democracy in its historical context and have never talked about “democracy in the abstract” or “democracy in general.”

Lenin emphasized that under the conditions of capitalism, the proletariat can retain its independence only if it makes its struggle for democracy serve its over-all objective of proletarian dictatorship.¹³² He went on to point out that the replacement of bourgeois dictatorship by proletarian dictatorship means an extension of democracy which is of world-wide historic signifi-

¹³¹ See Appendix 2, p. 493.

¹³² V. I. Lenin, “The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination” in *On the National and Colonial Questions*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1970, pp. 9-10.

cance; it means a change from bogus democracy to genuine democracy; and it means depriving the exploiting few of democratic rights and enabling the working people, the overwhelming majority, to enjoy democracy. To think that the dictatorship of the proletariat implies the rejection of democracy is a degenerate “liberal and false assertion” which loses sight of the class struggle.¹³³ Like the old-line revisionists, the modern revisionists use every kind of pretext to obliterate the class character of democracy and the difference between bourgeois and proletarian democracy. In championing “democracy in general” or “democracy of the whole people,” they are actually making a fetish of bourgeois democracy, i.e., of bourgeois dictatorship. Proceeding from this viewpoint, they do their utmost to confound revolution with reform and to limit and confine all their work to the scope permitted by bourgeois dictatorship. Lenin long ago repudiated this extremely wrong point of view. He said:

It would be very absurd to think that the most profound revolution in human history—one which for the first time transfers power from the exploiting minority to the exploited majority—could be performed within the old framework of bourgeois, parliamentary democracy, without drastic changes, without the creation of new forms of democracy, new institutions employing the new conditions for its application, etc.¹³⁴

This proposition of Lenin’s has proved correct in relation to the October Revolution and also completely correct in relation to the victories subsequently won by a number of other countries in their socialist revolution. Yet what the modern revisionists persist in is precisely the absurd theory which Lenin had refuted. Under the conditions of socialism, the modern revisionists, again on the pretext of “democracy in general,” deny the class character of democracy and strive to achieve step by step their objective of eliminating the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to facilitate the gradual restoration of capitalism in a certain form.

¹³³ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, p. 10.

¹³⁴ V. I. Lenin, “First Congress of the Communist International” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVIII.

On the question of the fight for world peace and peaceful coexistence, too, the modern revisionists have vulgarized Leninism in the extreme and have completely adulterated it.

Ever since the first socialist state made its appearance in the world, all Marxist-Leninists, from Lenin onward, have considered it a major task for socialist countries to work for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems and to oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war. The Communist Party of China headed by Comrade Mao Zedong has always held that disputes between nations should be settled by peaceful means and not by force. This view of the Chinese Communist Party is not only constantly reiterated in our statements but is firmly expressed in our policies and actions. All the world knows that the People's Republic of China was an initiator of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and has steadfastly put them into practice. All the attempts of the imperialists, reactionaries and modern revisionists to try to obliterate these facts are vain.

Of course, the policy of peace pursued by the socialist countries has not eliminated the various contradictions objectively existing in the world, namely, the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist countries, the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the capitalist countries, the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations, the contradictions between the imperialist powers and the contradictions between the various monopoly groups inside each imperialist country. Marxist-Leninists take the view that, whether in the past, present or future, there can be no ignoring or covering up of these contradictions, as such political philistines as the modern revisionists are trying to do, if world peace is to be secured and peaceful coexistence between the socialist countries and countries with different social systems is to be achieved. Marxist-Leninists, including the Chinese Communists, have always held that peaceful coexistence between the socialist countries and countries with different social systems can be attained, and the world war which the imperialists are seeking to kindle can be prevented, provided the socialist countries persist in their policy of peace, and provided the people's revolutionary forces in various countries and all the peace-loving countries and people of the world unite in resolute and effective struggle against the imperialist forces of aggression and war, manacle the imperialists in various ways and narrow down their sphere of operation. At the same time, Marxist-Leninists

have consistently held that the strivings for peaceful coexistence between the socialist countries and countries with different social systems on the one hand, and the class struggle within the capitalist countries and the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggles of the oppressed nations on the other, are not in the same category but are two different kinds of problem, and the former cannot replace or negate the latter. The struggle waged by the oppressed people in the capitalist countries and the struggle of the oppressed nations are helpful to the strivings for world peace and for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. The attempt of the modern revisionists to restrict, weaken and even negate the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations by hypocritical appeals for “peace” and “peaceful coexistence” fits in entirely with the wishes of the imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries and is most damaging to the struggle for peace and for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems.

Just as the old-line revisionists attacked Marxism under the pretext of opposing dogmatism, so also the modern revisionists use the same pretext to attack Leninism. As far back as the beginning of the 20th century, Lenin wrote that the reformists and revisionists in the working-class movement in various countries “all belong to the same family, all extol each other, learn from each other, and together come out against ‘dogmatic’ Marxism.”¹³⁵ Has not the picture Lenin drew sixty years ago re-appeared today in new historical conditions? The only difference is that the modern revisionists are more unscrupulous in their attacks on Marxism-Leninism. For example, some persons indulging in sheer fabrication say that the “dogmatists” want “to demonstrate the superiority of socialism and communism over capitalism by means of war.” What is this if not an extremely absurd slander leveled at Marxist-Leninists and a contemptible attempt to curry favor with imperialism and the reactionaries of various countries?

Moreover, the modern revisionists give voice to pure inventions such as that the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists, whom they label “dogmatists,” “reject” certain necessary compromises. We would like to tell these modern revisionists that no serious-minded Marxist-Leninist rejects all compromises indiscriminately. In the course of our protracted revolutionary struggle, we Chinese Communists reached compromises on many occasions with our

¹³⁵ V. I. Lenin, *What Is to Be Done?*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 7.

enemies, internal and external. For example, we came to a compromise with the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek clique. We came to a compromise, too, with the US imperialists, in the struggle to aid Korea and resist US aggression. For Marxist-Leninists, the question is what kind of compromise to arrive at the nature of the compromise, and how to bring about a compromise. Lenin had rightly said that “to reject compromises ‘on principle’, to reject the admissibility of compromises in general, no matter of what kind, is childishness, which it is difficult even to take seriously.”¹³⁶ Just as Lenin also told us, a political leader who desires to be useful to the revolutionary proletariat must know how to distinguish compromises that are permissible and in the interests of the people’s cause from those compromises that are impermissible and are an expression of treachery. It is precisely in accordance with Lenin’s teachings that we Chinese Communists distinguish between different kinds of compromise, favoring compromises which are in the interests of the people’s cause and of world peace, and opposing compromises that are in the nature of treachery. It is perfectly clear that only those guilty now of adventurism, now of capitulationism, are the ones whose ideology is Trotskyism, or Trotskyism in a new guise.

In April 1946, Comrade Mao Zedong wrote in his article *Some Points in Appraisal of the Present International Situation* that it was possible for the socialist countries to reach agreement with the imperialist countries through peaceful negotiation and make necessary compromise on some issues, including certain important ones. Comrade Mao Zedong holds that “such compromise... can be the outcome only of resolute, effective struggles by all the democratic forces of the world against the reactionary forces of the United States, Britain and France.” He adds, “Such compromise does not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in those countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions.”¹³⁷ This analysis advanced by Comrade Mao Zedong is scientific; it is a Marxist and Leninist analysis. The policy of us Chinese Communists in relation to

¹³⁶ V. I. Lenin, “*Left-Wing*” *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, p. 23.

¹³⁷ Mao Zedong, “Some Points in Appraisal of the Present International Situation” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 77-78.

international affairs has all along been formulated according to this proposition of Comrade Mao Zedong's.

However, the imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries and the modern revisionists always attempt to do us harm through every kind of slander. We should be aware that there has never been a revolutionary party in history which was not vilified by the enemy and his agents. The great Bolsheviks were subjected to countless enemy calumnies. "They fulminated against the Bolsheviks who were consistently described as 'sectarians, dogmatists, Blanquists, anarchists, etc.'"¹³⁸ All revolutionary Marxist-Leninists the world over are now being subjected to attacks by the modern revisionists, and it is a matter for deep regret that Comrade Togliatti should have joined in such attacks.

The modern revisionists have made many charges against the Chinese Communist Party. Why? Is it not because we resolutely defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism? Is it not because we categorically refuse to bargain over principles and categorically refuse to make concessions as regards theory? Is it not because we stand firm against both modern revisionism and dogmatism, against both Right and "Left" opportunism, against both capitulationism and adventurism, against both unprincipled accommodation and sectarianism which alienates one from the masses, and against both great-power chauvinism and the various kinds of reactionary nationalism?

Some people go to great lengths to attack, at every available opportunity and with shameless misrepresentation, the thesis of the Chinese Communist Party that "imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers." This thesis is derived from Lenin's scientific proposition that imperialism is moribund and decaying capitalism, from the many years of China's revolutionary experience and from the whole of the revolutionary experience in history. This thesis is in full accord with Lenin's description of imperialism as a "colossus with feet of clay," as a "bug-bear," as an "enemy who appears so strong" and as "capitalist beasts... absolutely incapable of doing us any harm." These people constantly boast of acting in accord with Lenin's principles. But in fact they invariably deviate from them and from the essence of Leninism, that is, from Lenin's teachings on imperialism, on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. On the question of how to appraise the nature

¹³⁸ V. I. Lenin, "Tactics of the RSDLP in the Election Campaign" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XII.

of imperialism Do they not clearly reveal themselves as far removed from Leninism? In the final analysis, those who wildly attack the thesis that “imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers” are merely chiming in with imperialism, assiduously spreading the idea among peoples who want revolution that the imperialist forces of aggression must not be resisted, that the imperialist system cannot be overthrown, and that revolution of any kind is undesirable and hopeless.

For many years US imperialism and its partners have been using nuclear blackmail against the people of the world: “whoever defies our domination will be destroyed.” All the demagogic propaganda which the modern revisionists represented by the Tito group have been conducting among the masses on the subject of nuclear weapons is entirely in tune with US imperialism’s nuclear blackmail. All genuine Marxist-Leninists, including the Chinese Communists, consistently and resolutely oppose the imperialist policy of nuclear war and stand firmly for the banning and scrapping of nuclear weapons. The Government of the People’s Republic of China has repeatedly proposed that a zone free of atomic weapons be established in the Asian and Pacific region embracing all the countries there, including the United States. All genuine Marxist-Leninists, including the Chinese Communists, always maintain that the people of all countries must grasp their destiny in their own hands and not be cowed by the US imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail. At the same time, they maintain that the socialist countries should rely on the just strength of the people and their own just policies and should not engage in nuclear gambles at all in the international arena. The modern revisionists are obviously well aware of these correct views of the Marxist-Leninists. However, they deliberately lie to deceive the masses, alleging that the “dogmatists” hope to “push mankind to the brink of nuclear war.” The modern revisionists often talk about “morality.” But where is their “morality” when they tell such lies? Have they not completely lost hold of even the ordinary morality of human conduct?

To distort and attack the theses and the standpoint of the genuine Marxist-Leninists, the modern revisionists have spread a series of deliberate lies for the purpose of preventing the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations from rising in revolution and fighting for their emancipation. In the eyes of the modern revisionists, any revolution and any action supporting revolution runs counter to the “logic of survival,” now that nuclear weapons

and similar military techniques exist. In fact, what they call the “logic of survival” is the logic of slaves, a logic that would paralyze the revolutionary will of the people of all countries, bind them up hand and foot and make them the submissive slaves of imperialism and of the reactionaries of various countries. The Marxist-Leninists are firmly against this slave logic and maintain that the people should emancipate themselves and build a happy, new life as their own masters. This is a law of social development which no one can go against.

The modern revisionists believe that, under the present historical conditions, it will be good enough just to muddle along. So what point is there in differentiating classes, differentiating the proletariat from the bourgeoisie, imperialism from the oppressed nations, capitalism from socialism, just wars from unjust wars, and revolution from counter-revolution? To them, all these differentiations have lost their significance for the present “epoch” and are “dogmatic.” In short, they have actually thrown to the winds all the teachings of Marxism, all the teachings of Leninism. At the same time, they insist that whoever does not agree with their viewpoint and practice and does not speak and act in response to their baton is “violating” Marxism-Leninism, “denying” the creativeness of Marxism-Leninism, “attacking” the policy of peaceful coexistence, and is a “pseudo-revolutionary,” a “Left adventurer,” a “dogmatist,” a “sectarian,” a “nationalist” and so on and so forth.

Lenin denounced the revisionist-opportunists of the Second International, saying that “this non-class or supra-class presentation, which supposedly embraces the entire people, is an outright travesty of the very foundation of socialism, namely, its theory of class struggle.”¹³⁹ This is still more flagrantly expressed in the preachings and policies of the modern revisionists. They deny that the masses of the people are the motive force and the creators of history. They hold that changes in the international situation and the destiny of mankind are dictated by the “leading personalities” of a few great powers, dictated by their good sense or lack of it, and not determined by the combined strength and united struggle of the people throughout the world. Some persons have even set their hearts on being in the same boat with the leading personalities of the imperialist countries and regard as “the greatest honor,” but do not want to be in the same boat with the masses of

¹³⁹ V. I. Lenin, “First Congress of the Communist International,” *op. cit.*

the world. Is it not strange that such persons should have appeared in the ranks of Marxist-Leninists?

Lenin said:

Lack of faith in the masses, fear of their initiative, fear of their independence, trepidation before their revolutionary energy instead of thorough and unstinted support of it—this is where the S.-R.'s and Menshevik leaders have sinned most.¹⁴⁰

And this is precisely the sin of the modern revisionists.

Lenin said:

To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chops and changes of petty politics, to forget the basic interests of the proletariat, the main features of the capitalist system as a whole and of capitalist evolution as a whole; to sacrifice these basic interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment—such is the policy of revisionism.¹⁴¹

Behaving thus, the revisionists always boast of their “wisdom” and “creativity” and trumpet forth their views as the “latest theories.” In fact, the “latest theories” of the modern revisionists are simply variations in modern conditions of the fallacies of Bernstein, Kautsky and other old-line revisionists and simply re-furbished versions of the stock arguments which bourgeois reaction uses to fool the people.

Revisionism is opium to anaesthetize the people; it is beguiling music for the consolation of slaves. As a political grouping, revisionism constitutes a detachment of the bourgeoisie within the working-class movement, an important social prop for the bourgeoisie and for imperialism. As a trend of thought, revisionism will never fail to appear in varying guises at different times so long as capitalism and imperialism exist in the world. In January 1917, when the Second International had become bankrupt in practice as well as in theory, Lenin made the prediction:

¹⁴⁰ V. I. Lenin, “One of the Fundamental Questions of the Revolution” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXV.

¹⁴¹ V. I. Lenin, “Marxism and Revisionism,” *op. cit.*, p. 259.

During these decades... new Plekhanovs, new Scheidemanns, new sentimental conciliators like Kautsky will grow up from the depths of the 'united' international Social-Democracy.¹⁴²

History has confirmed Lenin's foresight. In fact, shortly after Lenin's death a serious struggle between Marxist-Leninists and anti-Marxist-Leninists arose in the international communist movement. That was the struggle between, on the one hand, the Leninists headed by Stalin and, on the other hand, Trotsky, Bukharin and other "Left" adventurists and Right opportunists. In conjunction with that struggle was the protracted struggle in the Chinese Communist Party which the Marxist-Leninists led by Comrade Mao Zedong waged against the "Left" adventurists and the Right opportunists. Now another serious struggle lies before us, the struggle of the Marxist-Leninists against the anti-Marxist-Leninists, i.e., the modern revisionists.

The Moscow Declaration of 1957 points out that "the main danger at present is revisionism," and that "the existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source." In the capitalist and imperialist countries, the general cause of the emergence of revisionism, which was analyzed by Lenin, continues to exist today. Lenin said that "the comparatively peaceful and cultured existence of a stratum of privileged workers made them 'bourgeois', gave them crumbs from the profits of their own national capital, and isolated them from the sufferings, miseries and revolutionary sentiments of the ruined and impoverished masses."¹⁴³ This state of affairs is still in evidence today and is indeed more striking than ever.

The tactics used by the imperialists and the reactionaries in dealing with the masses of the people are dictated by their needs: at times they resort to outright violence, at other times they adopt certain measures of reform; sometimes they make use of crude threats, at other times they make seeming, petty concessions. These two kinds of methods are used either alternately or together in some intricate combination. Generally speaking, the more powerful the proletariat, the more cunning the policy usually adopted by the bourgeoisie in order to instill illusions in the working-class movement and evoke an opportunist response. Lenin said:

¹⁴² V. I. Lenin, "A Turn in World Politics" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII.

¹⁴³ V. I. Lenin, "The Collapse of the Second International" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

The zigzags of bourgeois tactics intensify revisionism within the labor movement and not infrequently exacerbate the differences within the labor movement to the pitch of a direct split.¹⁴⁴

His words should always serve as a warning to the international working-class movement.

Today the dark clouds of revisionism hang over the international working-class movement. The modern revisionists are openly engaged in splitting activities. The emergence of modern revisionism is, of course, a bad thing. But as its emergence was inevitable as its existence is an objective reality, its public appearance enables people to see, discern and understand the harm it does. Thus the bad thing will be turned to good account. The modern revisionists appear to be jubilant because of the support they are receiving from imperialism. But truth will eventually prevail over falsehood and Marxism-Leninism over modern revisionism. The modern revisionists may bluster for a time with their absurd announcements that Marxism-Leninism is “out of date.” However, it is not modern revisionism, but Marxism-Leninism—which is in accord with the historical development of human society—that is certain ultimately to triumph and to grow. This has been proved by history.

The situation in which the international working-class movement finds itself today is much better than in the past. Now, there stands the mighty socialist camp with a total population of one thousand million. There exists the powerful world-wide army of Marxist-Leninists, and the people throughout the world are awakened as never before. There is the surging movement of national and democratic revolution. For imperialism, things are going from bad to worse. As for socialist revolution, to the rich experience gained in Europe and Asia has been added the highly important and brilliant experience of Latin America. These experiences have enriched the treasury of Marxism-Leninism, and are ideologically arming the revolutionary people of all countries. These experiences are diametrically opposed to modern revisionism. They are objective and historical reality, and vain are all the attempts on the part of the modern revisionists to tamper with and twist these experiences.

The international ideological struggle between revolutionary Marxism and revisionism towards the end of the nineteenth century was the prelude

¹⁴⁴ V. I. Lenin, “Differences in the European Labor Movement” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XVI.

to great revolutionary battles waged by the proletariat. Today's international ideological struggle against modern revisionism, waged under the great banner of Leninism, will all the more prove a symbol and a signal for the growth of the great proletarian revolutionary movement and all peoples' revolutionary movements, on a broader scale. Guided by Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary movements of the people of various countries form an irresistible torrent. In 1913, Lenin concluded his article *The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx* with the sentence, "a still greater triumph awaits Marxism, as the doctrine of the proletariat, in the period of history that is now ensuing."¹⁴⁵ Similarly, today in our the great new epoch of revolution of ours—a great new epoch when the socialist countries have won one triumph after another in construction, when the liberation movements are rising in tempestuous waves in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and when there has emerged a new spirit of awakening within the working class and among the oppressed peoples in Europe and America—it can be predicted that a still greater triumph awaits Leninism.

Guided by the great Leninist ideology, let us raise aloft the banner of the unity of the international communist movement, the banner of the unity of all the countries in the socialist camp, the banner of the great friendship and unity between China and the Soviet Union, the banner of the unity of the communist and workers' parties of all countries, the banner of the unity of the people of all countries, and the revolutionary banner of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, in the common fight against imperialism and the reactionaries, in defense of world peace and for the progressive and righteous cause of the liberation of mankind!

¹⁴⁵ V. I. Lenin, "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx" in *Marx, Engels, Marxism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1978, p. 79.

Let Us Unite on the Basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement

RENMIN RIBAO EDITORIAL

January 27, 1963

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, January 27, 1963, p. 1.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, February 1, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 5, pp. 5-10.

The Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany was held from January 15 to January 21.

In their attempts to stop the successful development of the people's struggles for world peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism, the imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries and the Yugoslav revisionists are at the present time using every means to disrupt the unity of the peoples of the world, and especially the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement. The Communists of all countries and all progressive mankind are deeply worried and disturbed over the ever-increasing harm that is being done to the unity of the international communist ranks, and they are eagerly demanding the ironing out of differences and the strengthening of unity in the common struggle against the enemy on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

It was our hope that, meeting in these circumstances, the Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany would contribute to the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement by adhering to the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. The German Democratic Republic stands on the western front of the socialist camp, and is facing the menace of the West German militarism backed by US imperialism. The spearhead of the struggle should naturally have been directed against our common enemies; there was not the slightest reason for this Congress to repeat practices which grieve those near and dear to us all and gladden the enemy.

Unfortunately, events at the Congress ran counter to our hope.

The outstanding features of the Congress were that while much was said about stopping attacks and strengthening unity among the fraternal parties, extremely crude attacks were continued against the Chinese Communist

Party and other fraternal parties, attacks which further widen differences and damage unity, and that while much was said about supporting the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, brazen attempts, which were in open violation of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, were made to reverse the verdict passed on the Tito clique of renegades to Marxism-Leninism.

When in the course of his speech the head of the Chinese Communist Party Delegation, which attended the Congress by invitation, quoted and discussed the criticisms of Yugoslav revisionism made in the Moscow Statement, the executive chairman of the Congress repeatedly stopped him. Prompted by this cue, there was an uproar of booing, whistling and foot-stamping in the congress hall. It is indeed strange and almost incredible for such a phenomenon to occur in the international communist movement. When the delegate of the Chinese Communist Party ended his speech, the executive chairman of the Congress went so far as to protest. He stated that he “most decidedly rejected” the criticism of Yugoslav revisionism made by the delegate of the Communist Party of China and described it as “contradicting all the norms prevailing among communist and revolutionary workers’ parties.” Following this, the Soviet newspaper *Izvestia* attacked the delegate of the Communist Party of China for his criticism of Yugoslav revisionism, stating that it was “utterly impermissible.”

This Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany has posed the following vitally important questions to the Communists of the whole world: Are the ranks of the international communist movement to be united or not? Is there to be genuine unity or sham unity? On what basis is there to be unity—is there to be unity on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, or “unity” on the basis of the Yugoslav revisionist program or on some other basis? In other words, are differences to be ironed out and unity strengthened, or are differences to be widened and a split created?

The Chinese Communists, all Marxist-Leninists and all progressive mankind unanimously desire to uphold unity and oppose a split, to secure genuine unity and oppose a sham unity, to defend the common foundation of the unity of the international communist movement and oppose the undermining of this foundation, and to uphold and strengthen the unity of the

socialist camp and of the international communist movement on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

The Chinese Communist Party has always held that the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement is the reliable guarantee of victory for the revolution of the people in all countries, for the struggle against imperialism and its running dogs, for the cause of world peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism, and for the communist cause throughout the world. The basis for such unity is Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and the Moscow Statement of 1960. These two documents of vital and historic importance were unanimously agreed upon by the communist and workers' parties of all countries and constitute the common program of the international communist movement. Only by strict adherence to them is it possible to strengthen unity and is it possible to have genuine unity. Violation of these two documents can only result in the undermining of unity or in a sham unity. It is the sacred duty of Communists in all countries resolutely to uphold both the revolutionary principles and the common principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries laid down in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement and to wage an uncompromising struggle against all words and deeds violating the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

The Communist Party of China has consistently worked to uphold and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement. In 1956, the imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries and the Yugoslav revisionists organized a world-wide anti-Soviet and anti-Communist onslaught and engineered a counter-revolutionary revolt in Hungary. Together with other fraternal parties the Communist Party of China waged a resolute struggle, thus safeguarding Marxism-Leninism and defending the socialist camp. Through their joint efforts and full consultations at the 1957 and 1960 Moscow meetings, the other fraternal parties and the Chinese Communist Party formulated a common line for the international communist movement and established common principles guiding the mutual relations of fraternal parties and countries. At these two meetings, we conducted a necessary struggle against certain wrong tendencies detrimental to unity and also made necessary compromises on

certain matters, thus contributing to the unanimous agreement reached at the meetings.

At the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1961, when there occurred the first serious incident in which one Party at its own congress made an open attack by name on another fraternal party, that is, on the Albanian Party of Labor, the delegation of the Chinese Communist Party voiced firm opposition and proffered sincere advice. There and then we pointed out that a practice of this kind “does not help unity and is not helpful to resolving problems. To bring a dispute between fraternal parties and fraternal countries into the open in the face of the enemy cannot be regarded as a serious Marxist-Leninist attitude. Such an attitude will only grieve those near and dear to us and gladden the enemy. The Communist Party of China sincerely hopes that fraternal parties which have disputes or differences between them will unite afresh on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and on the basis of mutual respect for independence and equality.” It is regrettable that our efforts failed to prevent a further deterioration in Soviet-Albanian relations. Our good intentions were even subjected to repeated censure by certain people.

In its desire to uphold the principles guiding the mutual relations of fraternal parties and countries and to strengthen unity, the Chinese Communist Party in April 1962 gave its active support to the proposals made by some fraternal parties for easing relations and improving the atmosphere, and, in a letter to the fraternal party concerned, formally expressed its opinion that a meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of all countries should be convened to iron out differences and strengthen unity through comradely discussion and consultation. We also pointed out that, prior to such a meeting, all fraternal parties should make extensive preparations, including the cessation of radio and press attacks on another fraternal party, in order to create favorable conditions for the meeting and ensure its success.

To our great distress, these positive proposals of the Communist Party of China and some other fraternal parties have not evoked a corresponding response from the fraternal party concerned. On the contrary, the practice of violating the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries, and especially the vicious practice of openly attacking other fraternal parties by name at a party congress, has gone from bad to worse. At every

one of the recent congresses of fraternal parties the attacks on the Albanian Party of Labor were continued and attacks were made against the Communist Party of China, while at one congress the Korean Workers' Party, too, was attacked.

This adverse current, which runs counter to the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement and which is disrupting the unity of the international communist movement, reached a new climax at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. There, the Yugoslav revisionist clique was shielded in many ways, while the fraternal party delegate who criticized Yugoslav revisionism in accordance with the Moscow Statement was treated in an utterly uncomradely and rude manner. Such behavior is extremely vulgar as well as completely futile. In the view of certain comrades, adherence to the principles of the Moscow Statement, which had been unanimously agreed upon by the fraternal parties, was utterly impermissible and illegitimate while the Yugoslav revisionism condemned by the Moscow Statement was to be welcomed and was legitimate. On the one hand, they wantonly attacked comrades who adhere to Marxism-Leninism, and on the other, they talked volubly of uniting with out-and-out revisionists. On the one hand, they used every conceivable method to deprive delegates of fraternal parties opposing Yugoslav revisionism of the opportunity to speak, and on the other, they applauded the betrayers of Marxism-Leninism. This outrageous practice was all the more serious because it was carefully planned.

Here we must state in all seriousness that the international communist movement is at a critical juncture. The Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement—the common basis of the unity of the communist and workers' parties of all countries—are in great danger of being publicly torn up. The unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement is under a grave threat.

In the international communist movement of today, one's attitude towards Yugoslav revisionism is not a minor but a major question; it is a question that concerns not just one detail or another but the whole. It is a question of whether to adhere to Marxism-Leninism or to wallow in the mire with the Yugoslav revisionists, whether to take the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement as the foundation of unity or to take the Yugoslav revisionist program or something else as the foundation of "unity," and whether genuinely to strengthen unity or merely to pay lip service

to unity while in fact creating a split. In the final analysis, it is a question of whether to adhere strictly to the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement or to tear them up.

The Moscow Statement of 1960 unequivocally declares:

The communist parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist “theories” in concentrated form. After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist program to the Declaration of 1957; they set the LCY against the international communist movement as a whole, severed their country from the socialist camp, made it dependent on so-called “aid” from US and other imperialists, and thereby exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through a heroic struggle. The Yugoslav revisionists carry on subversive work against the socialist camp and the world communist movement. Under the pretext of an extra-bloc policy, they engage in activities which prejudice the unity of all the peace-loving forces and countries. Further exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists and active struggle to safeguard the communist movement and the working-class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists remains an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The stand taken by the Chinese Communist Party *vis-à-vis* Yugoslav revisionism is exactly that prescribed in the Moscow Statement, a stand which should be taken and must be taken by all Marxist-Leninist parties. It is the exact antithesis of the stand of the Yugoslav revisionists, who are fundamentally opposed both to the Moscow Declaration and to the Moscow Statement and who set their revisionist program against the common program of the communist and workers’ parties of all countries. In the Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the Tito clique deny the basic antagonism between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp and advocate for what they call the “extra-bloc” stand; they deny the theory of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship and maintain that the capitalist countries can “peacefully grow into” socialism; they describe ownership by

the whole people in the socialist countries as “state capitalism” and regard Marxism-Leninism as obsolete. All this is as incompatible with the Marxist-Leninist theses of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement as fire with water.

The League of Communists of Yugoslavia declared in the communique of the Ninth Plenum of its Central Committee, issued in December 1957 after the Moscow meeting of the same year:

The plenum considers that the delegation, pursuing the political line of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, acted correctly by not taking part in the meeting of the communist and workers’ parties of the twelve socialist countries and by not signing the declaration of that meeting, which contains some attitudes and appraisals contrary to the attitude of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia which considers them incorrect.

As for the Moscow Statement, the Tito clique has made wilder attacks on it. The same Vlahovic, who was given a delirious ovation by some people at the recent Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany as the representative of the Tito clique, declared in February 1961 at the enlarged meeting of the Central Executive Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia:

The Moscow Conference followed the line of seeking a compromise between different standpoints and tendencies, the line based on “stereotyped, mechanical levelling, and of establishing uniform tactical rules for the struggle.” Thus within the framework of a single statement there are to be found standpoints and tendencies reflecting contemporary objective social developments in the world mixed together with bureaucratic-dogmatic conceptions, the most obvious example of which is the position taken towards socialist Yugoslavia.

The resolution on the Moscow Statement adopted at the same meeting said that “the Moscow Statement... can have only harmful consequences not merely for the cause of socialism but also for the efforts to consolidate peace throughout the world.”

Is it or is it not right to criticize Yugoslav revisionism? There should have been no doubt about this in the international communist ranks. The principled stand taken by the Chinese Communist Party in firmly opposing Yugoslav revisionism was approved by the other fraternal parties. We may all recall that, at the Seventh Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party in June 1958, Comrade Khrushchev said that “the Chinese comrades and also the other fraternal parties are rightly and profoundly criticizing the revisionist propositions of the draft program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.”

We also remember that at the previous Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, that is, at its Fifth Congress held in July 1958, there was no difference of opinion among communist and workers’ parties on whether Yugoslav revisionism should be criticized. Comrade Khrushchev then said:

The anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist views of the Yugoslav leaders were subjected to thoroughgoing principled criticism by the Communist Party of China, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and all the other fraternal parties. In decisions taken by their leading bodies and in articles in the Party press, all the Parties took a clear-cut position and condemned those views, paying considerable attention to a critical analysis of them. And this was correct.

He also said:

When the Yugoslav leaders declare they are Marxist-Leninists and use Marxism-Leninism only as a cover to mislead gullible people and divert them from the path of revolutionary class struggle charted by Marx and Lenin, they want to wrest from the hands of the working class its sharpest class weapon. Whether they wish to or not, they are helping the class enemy of the working people, and in return for this they are given loans; in return for this the imperialists praise their “independent” policy of “no blocs,” which the reactionary forces make use of in an attempt to undermine our socialist camp.

He added:

In their speeches and official documents the Yugoslav leaders have outlined openly revisionist views that are contrary to the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism. They have taken a clearly schismatic, revisionist line and by so doing are helping the enemies of the working class in the fight against communism, in the imperialists' fight against the communist parties and against the unity of the international revolutionary working-class movement.

He went on to say:

In essence, the program of the Yugoslav leadership is a worse version of a whole series of revisionist platforms held by Right-wing Social-Democrats. Consequently the Yugoslav leaders have not been drawn to the path of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist teachings; they have followed the path laid down by revisionists and opportunists of the Second International—Bernstein, Kautsky and other renegades. In actual fact they have now joined forces with Karl Kautsky's off-spring—his son Benedict.

We cannot understand why some comrades, who formerly took the correct stand of criticizing Yugoslav revisionism, should have now made an about-turn of 180 degrees.

It has been claimed that this was because "the Yugoslav leaders have removed very much of what was considered erroneous." Unfortunately, the Tito clique themselves have never admitted to having made any mistakes, let alone removed them. It is indeed subjectivism pure and simple to assert that the Tito clique have "removed" their mistakes. We would ask the apologists for the Tito clique to listen to the Titoists' own statements.

As early as April 1958, Tito declared at the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia:

It would just be a waste of time for any quarters to expect us to retreat from our principled position on international and internal questions.

In 1959, Kardelj, another leader of the Tito clique, stated even more bluntly in a pamphlet:

and now the critics insistently urge on us what they themselves have begun to renounce, and criticize us for what they themselves have begun to accept.

Only recently, in December 1962, the moment he alighted from the train on his return from the Soviet Union, Tito said in Belgrade, "Discussions... about how Yugoslavia will now change her policy are simply superfluous and ridiculous. We have no need to change our policy." He added a few days later, "I said there [in the Soviet Union] that there is no possibility of Yugoslavia's changing her foreign policy."

These statements by Tito and Kardelj demonstrate the Tito clique's firm denial of any change in their revisionist line and policies. In fact, they have not changed at all. What were the apologists for the Tito clique doing if not lying when they said that the Tito clique "have removed very much of what was considered erroneous?"

Certain people have lately been talking a lot about how their views on many problems are coming closer to or agreeing with those of the Tito clique. We would ask, since there has not been any change in the revisionist line and policies of the Tito clique, does it not follow that the makers of these statements are themselves moving closer to the revisionist line and policies of the Tito clique?

What is particularly astonishing is that certain people have publicly declared the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement to be a "stereotyped formula." They do not allow any fraternal party to expose and condemn Yugoslav revisionism. Whoever insists on condemning Yugoslav revisionism, they say, "follows the jungle laws of capitalism" and "adopts this same jungle morality." One might ask, what is the object of describing the Moscow Statement, which was unanimously agreed upon by eighty-one fraternal parties, as "a stereotyped formula" or "the jungle laws of capitalism?" Is it not the object to tear up the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement? If it is "jungle morality" to condemn Yugoslav revisionism in accordance with the Moscow Statement, what kind of morality is the violation of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement and the eagerness to "strangle" a fraternal party and fraternal country?

We also note that Comrade Togliatti has gone so far as to say:

This amply justifies the stand which we and others have taken towards the Yugoslav comrades, hence correcting the resolution

of 1960 [the Moscow Statement unanimously agreed upon by the eighty-one fraternal parties—*Ed.*] which is wrong on this point.

We want to ask, what right has Comrade Togliatti to declare one part or another of the Moscow Statement, which was unanimously agreed upon by the fraternal parties, to be wrong? What right has he to “correct” or tear up a solemn international agreement at will? If one or several parties may do as they please in “correcting” agreements unanimously reached by all the communist and workers’ parties, will it be possible to speak of any principle that all must abide by?

Certain people are contemptuous of solemn documents adopted unanimously by the international communist movement; they not only refuse to abide by documents which bear their own signatures, but abuse others for abiding by them. Clearly, this is perfidy.

Here we should like to emphasize that those who are zealously engaged in reversing the verdict on the Tito clique are trying to make a breach in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement on the Yugoslav issue and then to tear them up completely. Were their scheme to succeed, it would be tantamount to declaring that the criticisms of Yugoslav revisionism made by all communist and workers’ parties over these years are wrong and the traitorous Tito clique is right, that the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement are wrong and the Yugoslav revisionist program is right, that the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism have become obsolete and modern revisionism can no longer be opposed, still less be treated as the main danger in the international communist movement, and that we should all follow at the heels of the Tito clique and “join forces with Karl Kautsky’s offspring—his son Benedict.” Were this to happen, the strategy and tactics of the international communist movement would have to be completely changed and the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism would have to be replaced by the capitulationist line of revisionism.

Were this to happen, what possible common basis would there be for unity among the communist and workers’ parties of all countries? Is this not a deliberate attempt to create a split in the international communist movement?

The urgent task now facing the communist and workers’ parties is to defend the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement and to uphold

and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. We resolutely uphold unity on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, and we resolutely oppose “unity” on the basis of the Yugoslav revisionist program or on some other basis. Together with all fraternal parties, the Chinese Communist Party will work indefatigably to this end.

The proletarian cause has always been international. To be victorious in this common cause, Communists of all countries must unite and wage a common struggle. Without the unity and solidarity of proletarian internationalism, the revolutionary cause cannot be victorious and consolidate its victory in any country.

The only correct way to uphold and strengthen this kind of unity is to abide by the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and fraternal countries laid down in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

The principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries, as set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, are as follows: the principle of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism; the principle of mutual support and mutual assistance, the principle of independence and equality; and the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation.

The primary test of a Communist’s sincerity in upholding the unity of the international communist movement is whether he conscientiously abides by the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries.

The Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, the two international documents unanimously agreed upon by the communist and workers’ parties, are binding on all the fraternal parties. These parties have the obligation to abide by them and have absolutely no right to wreck them. No single party or group of parties have the right to change them or to declare them null and void. In the international communist movement, the resolutions of any one fraternal party, whether right or wrong and however important the place and the role of that party, can be binding on that party alone. According to the principles laid down in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, it is impermissible to impose the program, resolutions, line or policies of any one party on other fraternal parties, or to require other fra-

ternal parties to obey the irresponsible self-contradictory statements made by the leader of a party who talks one way today and another tomorrow, as if those statements were imperial decrees; and it is more impermissible for one or more parties wantonly to kick out one or another fraternal party from the international communist movement or pull in renegades to Marxism-Leninism.

Since the international situation is complicated and is changing rapidly and since each fraternal party finds itself in different circumstances, the emergence of different views among fraternal parties on one question or another can hardly be avoided. The important thing is that, once differences have emerged among fraternal parties, they should iron out their differences and achieve unanimity through inter-party consultation on the basis of equality, basing themselves on the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. In no circumstances should they make the differences among the fraternal parties public in the face of the enemy, nor should they make use of the press and other propaganda media for open attacks on other fraternal parties, and still less should they make use of congresses of one party for this purpose. Clearly, if open attacks are directed against one fraternal party today and another tomorrow, will there be any unity of the international communist movement to speak of? We hold that continuing to make attacks while talking about one's desire to halt them is not the attitude an honest Communist should take. As the leader of the Korean Workers' Party delegation at the recent Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany pointed out:

At this Congress, which is not an international meeting of fraternal parties, there has been some talk of ending open disputes over differences of view and strengthening unity, and yet differences of view among the fraternal parties have again been brought up, and in particular there has been unilateral criticism of the Chinese Communist Party. We maintain that this cannot be regarded as a friendly and comradely attitude and that such an attitude is not conducive to the unity and unanimity which we are all calling for.

Better a single good deed contributing to unity than a thousand empty words about unity. It is time to rein in on the brink of the precipice! To do

so late in the day is better than not to do it at all. We sincerely hope that the fraternal party which launched the first attack will suit its action to its words, take the initiative, and return to the path of inter-party consultation on the basis of equality, to the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries as set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

The Communist Party of China is profoundly conscious of the duty incumbent on it to uphold and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement. As always, we shall spare no effort in making our contribution in this connection. The Communist Party of China has advocated on more than one occasion, and still advocates, the convening of a meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of all countries at which all can sit down calmly, and, through adequate and comradely discussion, harmonize their viewpoints, iron out their differences and strengthen their unity on a new basis. Together with all other fraternal parties, we desire to take every possible step towards easing relations and strengthening unity, in order to improve the atmosphere and create the conditions necessary for convening the meeting of fraternal parties.

Today, the imperialists headed by the United States and all the reactionaries are frantically and vainly struggling to halt and turn back the tide of our epoch, to prevent the emancipation of the oppressed nations and oppressed peoples and to disrupt the socialist camp. In the face of our archenemy, we Communists should, more than ever, unite closely and wage the common battle unswervingly. No words or deeds detrimental to the struggles against imperialism and the reactionaries of various countries, to the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the world, or to the unity of all Communists and the revolutionary people of the world, will be countenanced by Communists anywhere, by the proletariat and working people of all countries, by all the oppressed nations and oppressed peoples and by all those engaged in the struggle to safeguard world peace.

The unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement is the source of our strength and the hope of the oppressed nations and the oppressed peoples of the world. The more closely we are united, the more the people of the world are heartened and inspired. The more closely we are united, the greater is our ability to strengthen the revolutionary peo-

ple's confidence in victory and to deal telling blows at the imperialists and the reactionaries of all countries.

We should not disappoint the expectations of the people of the world. We must firmly uphold unity and oppose a split. We must have genuine unity and oppose sham unity. Let us unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement!

Whence the Differences?—A Reply to Thorez and Other Comrades

RENMIN RIBAO EDITORIAL

February 27, 1963

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, February 27, 1963, pp. 1-2.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, March 1, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 9, pp. 7-16.

Comrade Thorez, General Secretary of the French Communist Party [PCF], and certain other members of the PCF have a prominent place in the present adverse current of attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties, a current which is undermining the unity of the international communist movement.

Since the latter part of November 1962, they have made numerous statements in quick succession attacking the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties and published many related inner-Party documents. The following are among the main ones:

- Thorez' speech at the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party on December 14, 1962;
- The report on problems relating to the international situation and to the unity of the international communist and working-class movement, made by R. Guyot, member of the Political Bureau of the PCF, at the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the PCF on December 14, 1962;
- The resolution on problems relating to the international situation and to the unity of the international communist and working-class movement adopted by the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the PCF on December 14, 1962;
- The editorial written by R. Guyot in *l'Humanité*, organ of the Central Committee of the PCF, on January 9, 1963;
- The article entitled "War, Peace and Dogmatism," which appeared on the same day in *France Nouvelle*, a weekly published by the Central Committee of the PCF;

- Ten successive articles attacking the Chinese Communist Party by name in *l'Humanité* from January 5 to January 16, 1963;
- The article entitled “In What Epoch Do We Live?” in *France Nouvelle* on January 16, 1963;
- The pamphlet entitled *Problems of the International Communist Movement*, published by the Central Committee of the PCF in January 1963, containing fifteen documents attacking the Chinese Communist Party written by PCF leaders over the last three years, including Thorez’ speech at the Moscow Meeting of the fraternal parties in November 1960 and his subsequent report on the Moscow Meeting to a Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the PCF;
- The article by R. Guyot in *l'Humanité* on February 15, 1963.

The main content of these statements has already been published in the *Renmin Ribao* of February 24. It is evident from these statements that in the recent anti-Chinese chorus and in the emulation campaign against the Chinese Communist Party, Thorez and other comrades have been particularly energetic and have out-done many other comrades in assailing the Chinese Communist Party.

Besides their assaults on us, Thorez and other comrades have leveled malevolent attacks at the Albanian Party of Labor, censured the fraternal parties of Korea, Burma, Malaya, Thailand, Indonesia, Vietnam and Japan and even gone so far as to assail the national-liberation movement, which is heroically fighting imperialism and colonialism. They have slanderously alleged that the “sectarian and adventurist” positions taken by the Chinese Communist Party “have found some echoes in certain communist parties, particularly in Asia, and within nationalist movements,” and that they “feed the ‘Leftism’ which exists at times in these parties and movements.” The attitude of certain French comrades towards the revolutionary cause of the oppressed nations is indeed shocking. They have truly gone too far in disrupting the unity of the international communist movement.

The Chinese Communist Party has long held, and still holds, that differences between fraternal parties should and must be settled within our own ranks, and through full and comradely discussion and consultation on an equal footing in accordance with the principles set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. In no instance have we been the

first to launch public criticism of any fraternal party or to provoke public debate. Nevertheless, it would be a miscalculation for anyone to suppose that he can take advantage of our correct stand of giving first place to the interests of unity against the enemy and that he can launch public attacks on the Chinese Communist Party at will without evoking a deserved rebuff.

We should like to tell those comrades who have wantonly attacked the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties: The fraternal parties are equal. Since you have publicly lashed out at the Chinese Communist Party, you have no right to demand that we should refrain from publicly answering you. Similarly, since you have made public and vicious attacks on the Albanian Party of Labor, the Albanian comrades have the full and equal right to answer you publicly. At present, certain comrades of fraternal parties, while talking about a halt to the public polemics, are themselves continuing to attack the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties. This double-faced attitude actually implies that only you are permitted to attack others and that it is impermissible for others to reply. This will never work. In the words of an old Chinese saying, "Courtesy demands reciprocity. It is discourteous not to give after receiving." In all seriousness we feel it necessary to bring this point to the attention of those who have been assailing the Chinese Communist Party.

In attacking the Chinese Communist Party, Thorez and other comrades have touched on the nature of our epoch, the appraisal of imperialism, war and peace, peaceful coexistence, peaceful transition, and other questions. But a close look reveals that they have merely repeated other people's stale arguments. Since we have already answered their erroneous arguments on these questions in our editorials entitled "Workers of All Countries, Unite, Oppose Our Common Enemy!", "The Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us" and "Let Us Unite on the Basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement," and also in the editorial entitled "Leninism and Modern Revisionism" in the periodical *Hongqi*, there is no need here to go over the same ground again.

It is worth pointing out that in their speeches, reports and articles, Thorez and the other comrades use a great many words to distort the facts, confound right and wrong and mislead the people, thus seeking to make the Chinese Communist Party shoulder the responsibility for under-mining the unity of the international communist movement and creating a split. They endlessly

repeat that the differences in the international communist movement “were in particular the act of the Chinese comrades,” and that the differences arose because the Chinese comrades “have not yet fundamentally accepted the theses of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.” They also allege that the greater the lapse of time since the first and second Moscow Meetings of the fraternal parties, the more does the position of the Chinese comrades “diverge from the theses which they had nevertheless approved and voted for.”

Since Thorez and other comrades have brought up the question of who is responsible for the emergence of differences in the international communist movement, let us discuss it.

Whence the differences in the international communist movement?

Thorez and other comrades state that these differences arose because the Chinese Communist Party did not accept the theses of the 20th Congress of the CPSU. This very statement is a violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as set forth in the Moscow Declaration and Statement. According to these two documents which were jointly agreed upon, the fraternal parties are equal and independent in their relations. No one has the right to demand that all fraternal parties should accept the theses of any one party. No resolution of any congress of any one party can be taken as the common line of the international communist movement or be binding on other fraternal parties. If Thorez and other comrades are willing to accept the viewpoints and resolutions of another party, that is their business. As for the Chinese Communist Party, we have always held that the only common principles of action which can have binding force on us and on all other fraternal parties are Marxism-Leninism and the common documents unanimously agreed upon by the fraternal parties, and not the resolutions of the congress of any one fraternal party, or anything else.

As for the 20th Congress of the CPSU, it had both its positive and negative aspects. We have expressed our support for its positive aspects. As for its negative aspects, namely, the wrong viewpoints it put forward on certain important questions of principle relating to the international communist movement, we have held different views all along. In talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and at meetings of fraternal parties, we have made no secret of our views and have clearly set forth our opinions on many occasions. But in the interests of the international communist movement,

we have never publicly discussed this matter, nor do we intend to do so in the present article.

The facts are clear. The differences in the international communist movement in recent years arose entirely because certain comrades of a fraternal party had violated the Moscow Declaration which was unanimously agreed upon by all the communist and workers' parties .

As is well known, the 1957 Moscow Meeting of communist and workers' parties, basing itself on Marxism-Leninism, eliminated certain differences among the fraternal parties, reached agreement on the current major issues in the international communist movement, and produced the Moscow Declaration as a result of comradely consultation and collective effort. The Declaration is the common program of the international communist movement. Every fraternal party has proclaimed its acceptance of this program.

If the Declaration had been strictly adhered to by all the fraternal parties in their practice and had not been violated, the unity of the international communist movement would have been strengthened and our common struggle advanced.

For some time after the Moscow Meeting of 1957, the communist and workers' parties were fairly successful and effective in their united struggle against the common enemy, and above all against US imperialism, and in their struggle against the Yugoslav revisionists, who had betrayed Marxism-Leninism.

But, because certain comrades of a fraternal party repeatedly attempted to place the resolutions of the congress of one party above the Moscow Declaration, above the common program of all the fraternal parties, differences within the international communist movement inevitably ensued. Particularly around the time of the Camp David talks in September 1959, certain comrades of a fraternal party put forward a series of erroneous views on many important issues relating to the international situation and the international communist movement, views which departed from Marxism-Leninism and violated the Moscow Declaration.

They contravened the Moscow Declaration's scientific thesis that imperialism is the source of modern wars, and that "so long as imperialism exists there will always be soil for aggressive wars." They incessantly proclaimed that even while the imperialist system and the system of exploitation and oppression of man by man continue to exist in the greater part of the world,

“already in our times, the practical possibility is being created of banishing war from the life of society finally and forever,” and “a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars” can be brought into being. They also predicted that 1960 would “go down in history as a year in which the long-cherished hope of mankind for a world without weapons and armies and a world without wars begins to come true.”

They contravened the thesis of the Moscow Declaration that in order to prevent another world war we should rely on the joint struggle of the socialist camp, the national-liberation movement, the international working class and the mass movement of the peoples for peace. They pinned their hopes for defending world peace on the “wisdom” of the heads of the major powers, holding that the historical fate of the present epoch is actually decided by individual “great men” and their “wisdom,” and that summit meetings of the major powers can determine and change the course of history. They made such statements as: “We have already said more than once that it is only the heads of governments who are invested with great powers, who are able to settle the most complicated international questions.” They portrayed the Camp David talks as a “new stage,” a “new era” in international relations, and even “a turning point in the history of mankind.”

They contravened the thesis of the Moscow Declaration that the US imperialists “are becoming the center of world reaction, the sworn enemies of the people.” They were especially ardent in lauding Dwight Eisenhower, the chieftain of US imperialism, as one who had “a sincere desire for peace,” who “sincerely hopes to eliminate the state of ‘cold war,’” and who “also worries about ensuring peace just as we do.”

They violated the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence between the two different social systems as set forth in the Moscow Declaration, and interpreted peaceful coexistence as nothing but ideological struggle and economic competition, saying: “The inevitable struggle between the two systems must be made to take the form exclusively of a struggle of ideas and peaceful emulation, as we say, or competition, to use a word more common in the capitalist lexicon.” They even extended peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems to the relations between oppressor and oppressed classes and between oppressor and oppressed nations, maintaining that for all countries peaceful coexistence is the road leading to socialism. All this rep-resents a complete departure from the Marxist-Lenin-

ist viewpoint of class struggle. They thus actually used the pretext of peaceful coexistence to negate the political struggle against imperialism and for the liberation cause of the people of all countries, and to negate the international class struggle.

They contravened the thesis of the Moscow Declaration that US imperialism vigorously seeks “to enmesh the liberated peoples in new forms of colonialism,” and proclaimed far and wide that imperialism could help the underdeveloped countries to develop their economies on an unprecedented scale, thus virtually denying that it is the nature of imperialism to plunder the underdeveloped countries. They made such statements as: “General and complete disarmament would also create entirely new opportunities for aid to the countries whose economies are still underdeveloped and need assistance on the part of more developed countries. Even if only a small part of the money released by the termination of the military expenditure, of the great powers were devoted to such aid, it could open up literally a new epoch in the economic development of Asia, Africa and Latin America.”

They contravened the thesis of the Moscow Declaration that in our day the liberation movement of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples and the revolutionary struggle of the working class of various countries are powerful forces for the defense of world peace, and counterposed the national-liberation movement and the people’s revolutionary struggle in various countries to the struggle for the defense of world peace. Although they occasionally spoke of the necessity of supporting national liberation wars and people’s revolutionary wars, they repeatedly stressed that “a war under contemporary conditions would inevitably become a world war,” that “even a tiny spark can cause a world conflagration” and that it was necessary to “oppose all kinds of wars.” This amounts to making no distinction between just and unjust wars and to opposing wars of national liberation, people’s revolutionary wars and just wars of all kinds on the pretext of preventing a world war.

They contravened the thesis of the Moscow Declaration that there are two possibilities, peaceful and non-peaceful, with regard to the transition from capitalism to socialism, and that “the ruling classes will never relinquish power voluntarily,” and laid a one-sided stress on the “growing immediate possibility” of peaceful transition, alleging that peaceful transition “is already a realistic perspective in a number of countries.”

From this series of erroneous views, one can only draw the conclusions that the nature of imperialism has changed, that all its insuperable inherent contradictions no longer exist, that Marxism-Leninism is outmoded and that the Moscow Declaration should be cast aside.

But no matter what pretexts they may resort to, whether “diplomatic language” or “flexibility,” the comrades of a fraternal party who spread these erroneous views cannot cover up their deviations from Marxism-Leninism and from the principles of the 1957 Moscow Declaration or absolve themselves from their responsibility for the creation of differences in the international communist movement.

Such is the origin of the differences in the international communist movement which have arisen in recent years. How did these differences come to be exposed before the enemy?

Thorez and other comrades allege that the differences were brought into the open with “the Chinese Communist Party’s publication of the pamphlet *Long Live Leninism!* in all languages in the summer of 1960.” But what are the actual facts?

The truth is that the internal differences among the fraternal parties were first brought into the open, not in the summer of 1960, but on the eve of the Camp David talks in September 1959—on September 9, 1959, to be exact. On that day a socialist country, turning a deaf ear to China’s repeated explanations of the true situation and to China’s advice, hastily issued a statement on a Sino-Indian border incident through its official news agency. Making no distinction between right and wrong, the statement expressed “regret” over the border clash and in reality condemned China’s correct stand. They even said that it was “sad” and “stupid.” Here is the first instance in history in which a socialist country, instead of condemning the armed provocations of the reactionaries of a capitalist country, condemned another fraternal socialist country when it was confronted with such armed provocation. The imperialists and reactionaries immediately sensed that there were differences among the socialist countries, and they made venomous use of this erroneous statement to sow dissension. The bourgeois propaganda machines at the time made a great deal of it, saying that the statement was like a “diplomatic rocket launched at China” and that “the language of the statement was to some extent like that of a stern father coldly rebuking a child and telling him to behave himself.”

After the Camp David talks, the heads of certain comrades were turned and they became more and more intemperate in their public attacks on the foreign and domestic policies of the Chinese Communist Party. They publicly abused the Chinese Communist Party as attempting “to test by force the stability of the capitalist system,” and as “craving for war like a cock for a fight.” They also attacked the Chinese Communist Party for its general line of socialist construction, its big leap forward and its people’s commune, and they spread the slander that the Chinese Party was carrying out an “adventurist” policy in its direction of the state.

For a long time these comrades have eagerly propagated their erroneous views and attacked the Chinese Communist Party, banishing the Moscow Declaration from their minds. They have thus created confusion within the international communist movement and placed the peoples of the world in danger of losing their bearings in the struggle against imperialism. Comrade Thorez can no doubt recall what was vigorously propagated at the time in the organ of the French Communist Party, *l’Humanité*, “Between Washington and Moscow a common language has been found, that of peaceful coexistence. America has taken the turning.”

It was in those circumstances and for the sake of up-holding the Moscow Declaration, defending Marxism-Leninism and enabling the people of the world to understand our point of view on the current international situation that the Chinese Communist Party published, on the ninetieth anniversary of Lenin’s birth, the three articles, “Long Live Leninism!,” “Forward Along the Path of the Great Lenin!,” and “Unite Under Lenin’s Revolutionary Banner!.” Although we had already been under attack for more than half a year, we set store by unity and made imperialism and Yugoslav revisionism the targets of the struggle in our discussion of the erroneous views which contravened the Moscow Declaration.

Thorez and other comrades turned the truth upside down when they alleged that the publication of the three articles was the point at which the differences in the international communist movement were brought into the open.

In May 1960, the American U-2 spy plane intruded into the Soviet Union, and the four-power summit meeting in Paris was aborted. We then hoped that the comrades who had so loudly sung the praises of the so-called spirit of Camp David would draw a lesson from these events, and would

strengthen the unity of the fraternal parties and countries in the common struggle against the imperialist policies of aggression and war. But, contrary to our hopes, at the Beijing Session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions held early in June of the same year, certain comrades of fraternal parties still refused to denounce Eisenhower, spread many erroneous views and opposed the correct views put forward by the Chinese comrades. It was a fact of particular gravity that late in June 1960 someone went so far as to wave his baton and launch an all-out and converging surprise attack on the Chinese Communist Party at the meeting of the fraternal parties in Bucharest. This action was a crude violation of the principle that questions of common interest should be solved through consultation among fraternal parties. It set an extremely bad precedent for the international communist movement.

Thorez and other comrades have alleged that the delegate of the Albanian Party of Labor “attacked the Communist Party of the Soviet Union” at the meeting in Bucharest. But all the comrades who attended the meeting are very well aware that the Albanian comrade did not attack anyone during the meeting. All he did was to adhere to his own views, disobey the baton and take exception to the attack on China. In the eyes of those who regard the relations between fraternal parties as those between patriarchal father and son, it was indeed an appalling act of impudent insubordination for tiny Albania to dare to disobey the baton. From that time on they harbored a grudge against the Albanian comrades, employed all kinds of base devices against them and would not be satisfied until they had destroyed them.

After the Bucharest meeting, some comrades who had attacked the Chinese Communist Party lost no time in taking a series of grave steps to apply economic and political pressure, even to the extent of perfidiously and unilaterally tearing up agreements and contracts they had concluded with a fraternal country, in disregard of international practice. These agreements and contracts are to be counted, not in twos or threes or in scores, but in hundreds. These malicious acts, which extended ideological differences to state relations, were out-and-out violations of proletarian internationalism and of the principles guiding relations among fraternal socialist countries as set forth in the Moscow Declaration. Instead of criticizing their own errors of great-power chauvinism, these comrades charged the Chinese Communist Party with the errors of “going it alone,” sectarianism, splitting, nation-

al communism, etc. Does this accord with communist ethics? Thorez and other comrades were aware of the facts, yet they dared not criticize those who actually committed the error of extending political and ideological disputes to the damage of state relations, but on the contrary charged the Chinese comrades with “mixing problems of state with ideological and political questions.” This attitude, which confuses right and wrong and makes black white and white black, is indeed deplorable.

It is clear from the foregoing facts that the aggravation of differences in the international communist movement after the Moscow Meeting of 1957 was due entirely to the fact that with respect to a series of important issues certain fraternal party comrades committed increasingly serious violations of the common line unanimously agreed upon by the fraternal parties and of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries.

The fact that Comrade Thorez disregards the facts and perverts the truth is also strikingly manifested in his distortion of what actually happened at the 1960 Moscow Meeting. He has charged that the Chinese Communist Party “did not approve the line of the international working-class movement... and thus created a difficult situation” for the meeting.

For the good of the international communist movement we prefer not to go into detail here about what went on at this internal meeting of the fraternal parties; we intend to give the true picture and clarify right and wrong at the proper time and place. It must be pointed out here, however, that the Chinese Communist Party was an initiator of the 1960 Meeting of all the communist and workers’ parties of the world. We made great efforts to bring about its convocation. During the meeting, we upheld Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and opposed the erroneous views put forward by certain comrades of fraternal parties; at the same time, we made necessary compromises on certain questions. Together with other fraternal parties, we made concerted efforts to overcome a variety of difficulties and enabled the meeting to achieve positive results, reach unanimous agreement and issue the Moscow Statement. These facts alone give the lie to Thorez and certain other comrades.

After the Moscow Meeting of 1960, the fraternal parties should have strengthened the unity of the international communist movement and concentrated their forces for the common struggle against the enemy in accordance with the Statement to which they had unanimously agreed. In the

Resolution on the Moscow Meeting of Representatives of the communist and workers' parties adopted at the Ninth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party held in January 1961, we pointed out:

The Communist Party of China, always unswervingly upholding Marxism-Leninism and the principle of proletarian internationalism, will uphold the Statement of this Meeting, just as it has upheld the Moscow Declaration of 1957, and will resolutely strive for the realization of the common tasks set forth by this document.

In the two years and more that have passed, the Chinese Communist Party has faithfully carried out the common agreements of the international communist movement and devoted sustained efforts to upholding the revolutionary principles of the Moscow Declaration and Statement.

Yet Thorez and other comrades have charged that after the Moscow Meeting of 1960 the Chinese Communist Party "continued to express divergences on essential aspects of the policy worked out in common by all the parties," and that "the positions taken by the Chinese comrades are prejudicial to the interests of the whole movement."

Since the Moscow Meeting of 1960, who is it that has committed increasingly serious violations of the Moscow Declaration and Statement with respect to a number of issues?

Shortly after the Moscow Meeting there was a further deterioration in the relations between the Soviet Union and Albania. Comrade Thorez has tried to shift the responsibility for this deterioration onto the Chinese Communist Party. He has accused China of failing "to use its influence to bring the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labor to a more correct understanding of their duty."

In fact, the Chinese Communist Party has always maintained that the relations between fraternal parties and fraternal countries should be guided by the principles of independence, equality and the attainment of unanimity through consultation as laid down in the Moscow Declaration and Statement. We have consistently upheld this view in regard to Soviet-Albanian relations. It has been our earnest hope that the relations between the two countries would improve and we have done our internationalist duty to this end. We have offered our advice to the Soviet comrades many times,

stating that the larger Party and the larger country should take the initiative in improving Soviet-Albanian relations and settle the differences through inter-party consultation on an equal footing, and that even if it were not possible to settle some differences for the time being, they should exercise patience instead of taking any steps that might worsen relations. Accordingly, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party wrote to the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, expressing the hope that the question of Soviet-Albanian relations would be resolved through consultation.

But no consideration was given to our sincere efforts. A number of incidents occurred—the withdrawal of the fleet from the naval base of Vlore, the recall of experts from Albania, the cessation of aid to Albania, interference in her internal affairs, etc.

The Chinese Communist Party was pained by these crude violations of the principles guiding relations among fraternal countries. On the eve of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party once again gave the Soviet comrades comradely advice concerning the improvement of Soviet-Albanian relations. But to our surprise, at the 22nd Congress there occurred the grave incident in which the Albanian Party of Labor was publicly named and attacked, and the odious precedent was thus created of one party using its own congress to make a public attack on another fraternal party. In defense of the principles of the Moscow Declaration and Statement guiding relations among fraternal parties and in the interest of unity against the enemy, the delegation of the Chinese Communist Party attending the Congress explicitly stated our objection to a course of behavior which can only grieve those near and dear to us all and gladden the enemy.

It is a matter for regret that this serious and just attitude of ours should have been censured. One comrade even said:

If the Chinese comrades wish to contribute to normalizing relations between the Albanian Party of Labor and fraternal parties, there is hardly anyone who could do more than the Communist Party of China to help solve this problem.

What did this remark mean? If it meant to hold the Chinese comrades responsible for the deterioration of Soviet-Albanian relations, that was shirking one's own responsibility and trying to impute it to others. If it meant

that the Chinese comrades should help to bring about an improvement in Soviet-Albanian relations, we would point out that some comrades actually deprived other fraternal parties of the possibility of effectively contributing to the improvement of those relations by completely ignoring our repeated advice and by obdurately exacerbating Soviet-Albanian relations even to the length of openly calling for a change in the leadership of the Albanian Party and state. After the CPSU Congress these comrades broke off the Soviet Union's diplomatic relations with the fraternal socialist country of Albania without any scruples. Did this not convincingly demonstrate that they had not the slightest desire to improve relations between the Soviet Union and Albania?

Thorez and other comrades have blamed the Chinese press for "spreading the erroneous propositions of the Albanian leaders." We must point out that the Chinese Communist Party has always opposed bringing inter-party differences into the open and that it was certain comrades of a fraternal party who insisted on doing this and maintained, moreover, that not to do so was in-consistent with the Marxist-Leninist stand. In these circumstances, when the differences between the Soviet Union and Albania came into the open, we simultaneously published some of the material on both sides of the controversy in order to let the Chinese people understand how matters actually stood. Can it possibly be considered right that certain comrades of a fraternal party may repeatedly and freely condemn another fraternal party, may say that its leaders are anti-Leninist, that those leaders want to earn the privilege of receiving an imperialist handout of thirty pieces of silver, that they are executioners with blood on their hands, and so on and so forth, while this fraternal party is not allowed to defend itself, and other fraternal parties are not allowed to publish material on both sides of the controversy simultaneously? Those who claim to be "completely correct" have published one article after another attacking Albania, but they are mortally afraid of the Albanian comrades' replies; they dare not publish them and are afraid of others doing so. It simply shows that justice is not on their side and that they have a guilty conscience.

Furthermore, Comrade Thorez and other comrades accuse the Chinese Communist Party of having "transferred into the mass movements the differences which may exist or arise among communists," referring especially to the Stockholm Conference of the World Peace Council in December 1961,

where, they say, the Chinese Communist Party “counterposed the struggle for national liberation to the struggle for disarmament and peace.”

But this is the diametrical opposite of the facts. It is not the Chinese comrades but certain comrades of a fraternal party who have injected the differences between fraternal parties into the international democratic organizations. They have repeatedly tried to impose on these international democratic organizations their own wrong line, which runs counter to the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. They have counterposed the struggle for national liberation to the struggle for world peace. In disregard of the widespread desire of the masses represented by these organizations to oppose imperialism and colonialism, to win or safeguard national independence, these comrades insist on making “every effort for disarmament” the overriding task and they energetically peddle the wrong idea that “a world without weapons, without armies, without wars” can be realized while imperialism and the system of exploitation still exist. It is this that has given rise to continual sharp controversies in these organizations. Similar controversies broke out at the Stockholm Conference of the World Peace Council in December 1961. The demand made by certain persons at this conference was that colonial and semi-colonial peoples living under the bayonets of imperialism and colonialism should wait until the imperialists and colonialists accept general and complete disarmament, renounce their armed suppression of the national independence movement and help the underdeveloped countries with the money saved from disarmament. In fact, what these persons want is that, while waiting for all this, the oppressed nations should not fight imperialism and colonialism or resist the armed suppression by their colonial rulers, for otherwise, they say, a world war would be touched off, causing the death of millions upon millions of people. Proceeding from precisely this absurd “theory,” these persons have vilified the national independence movement as a “movement for piling up corpses.” It is these persons, and not the Chinese comrades, who violated the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

The two most recent major issues in the international situation were the Caribbean crisis and the Sino-Indian border conflict. The stand taken by the Chinese Communist Party on these issues conforms entirely with Marxism-Leninism and with the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow State-

ment. Yet in this connection Thorez and other comrades have made vicious attacks on the Chinese Communist Party.

With regard to the Caribbean crisis, Thorez and the other comrades have accused China of wanting to “bring on a war between the Soviet Union and the United States and so plunge the world into a thermonuclear catastrophe.” Do the facts bear out this charge? What did the Chinese people do during the Caribbean crisis? They firmly condemned the acts of aggression perpetrated by US imperialism, they firmly supported the five demands of the Cuban people in defense of their independence and sovereignty, and they firmly opposed the attempt to impose “international inspection” on Cuba which was made for the sake of an unprincipled compromise. In all this, what exactly did we do that was wrong? Did not the French Communist Party’s statement of October 23, 1962 also call for “vigorously protesting US imperialism’s warlike and provocative actions?” Did not *l’Humanité* of the same date condemn the US aggression as “pure and simple aggression prepared a long time ago against Cuba” and did it not appeal to the people of all countries as “a matter of urgency that the peoples reinforce their solidarity with Cuba and intensify their struggle?” May we ask Comrade Thorez: In thus supporting the Cuban people and opposing US aggression, did you, too, want to plunge the world into a thermonuclear catastrophe? Why was it all right for you to do this at one time, and why has it become a crime for China consistently to do the same thing? Plainly the reason is that, following the baton, you suddenly changed your stand and began to hold forth about the need for “reasonable concessions” and “sensible compromise” in the face of the US acts of aggression. That is why you turned your artillery from the Yankee pirates to those fraternal parties which have consistently maintained a correct stand.

Worse still, certain comrades in the PCF have vilified all who stand firm against the US aggressors, calling them such insulting names as “heroes of the revolutionary phrase” and accusing them of “using fine words” and “speculating on the admiration which the Cuban people’s courage has legitimately inspired.” These comrades said that “against hydrogen bombs courage alone is not sufficient” and “let us beware of sacrificing Cuban breasts on the altar of revolutionary phrases.” What kind of talk is this? Whom are you accusing? If you are accusing the heroic Cuban people, that is disgraceful. If you are accusing the Chinese people and the people of other countries who

oppose the US pirates and support the Cuban people, does this not expose your support of the Cuban people as an utter fraud? As Thorez and certain other French comrades see it, if those who do not possess hydrogen bombs support the Cuban people, they are simply using “fine words” and indulging in “speculation,” while the Cuban people who do not possess hydrogen bombs must submit to the countries which have them, sell out their state sovereignty, accept “international inspection” and allow themselves to be sacrificed on the altar of US imperialist aggression. This is naked power politics. It makes an unqualified fetish of nuclear weapons. It is no way for Communists to talk.

We should like to say to Thorez and the other comrades that the eyes of the people of the world are clear; it is not we but you who have committed mistakes in connection with the Caribbean crisis. For you have tried to help out the Kennedy Administration, which provoked the crisis in the Caribbean, by insisting that people should believe the US promise not to attack Cuba, although the Kennedy Administration has itself denied having made any such promise. You have defended those comrades who committed both the error of adventurism and the error of capitulationism. You have defended infringements upon the sovereignty of a fraternal country. And you are making the fight against the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties, rather than the fight against US imperialism, your prime concern.

On the Sino-Indian boundary question, Thorez and other comrades have accused China of lacking the “minimum of goodwill” for a settlement of the dispute. This charge is ludicrous.

We have already had occasion to deal at length with the Chinese Government’s consistent stand for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian border issue and with the efforts it has exerted in this connection over a number of years. At the moment, the situation on the border has begun to relax, as a result of the serious defeat which the Indian forces sustained in their massive attacks and of the ceasefire and withdrawal which the Chinese forces effected on China’s initiative after having fought back successfully in self-defense. The three years and more of the Sino-Indian boundary dispute have furnished conclusive proof that the Chinese Government has been absolutely right in waging a necessary struggle against the reactionary policy of the Nehru government of India.

The surprising thing is that when a fraternal socialist country was facing the Nehru government's provocations and attacks, certain self-styled Marxist-Leninists should abandon the principle of proletarian internationalism and assume a "neutral" stand. In practice, they have not only been giving political support to the anti-China policy of the Nehru government, but have been supplying that government with war *matériel*. Instead of condemning these wrong actions, Thorez and other comrades have described them as a "sensible policy." What has happened to your Marxism-Leninism and your proletarian internationalism?

Time and again, Comrade Thorez has denounced China's policy towards India as benefiting imperialism. As early as 1960, he said that the Chinese Communist Party "gives Eisenhower the opportunity to obtain a welcome in India which he would not have received in other circumstances." To this day, some French comrades are repeating this charge.

To anybody with political judgment, it is hardly necessary to dwell on the fact that one of the objects of the Nehru government in stirring up conflict on the Sino-Indian border was to serve the needs of US imperialism and secure more US aid. We would only like to ask Comrade Thorez and certain other members of the PCF: Is it possible you have forgotten that Eisenhower was accorded not only a welcome in India but a rousing welcome in France too. Comrade Thorez sharply criticized a number of elected Communist municipal and general councilors of the Paris region at the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party for not attending the reception to welcome Eisenhower when the latter was visiting Paris in September 1959. To quote Comrade Thorez:

It is necessary to say that we considered it a mistake that in spite of the decision of the Political Bureau, which had wanted the elected municipal ancillors of the Paris region to be present, they were not all present at the reception for Eisenhower at the Town Hall. That was an erroneous position. I have also criticized it since my return. [Comrade Thorez had just re-turned from a trip abroad—*Ed.*] I wish to repeat that the Political Bureau had taken a correct decision but that it did not know how to secure its application.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁶ *L'Humanité*, November 11, 1959.

If the Chinese Communist Party is to blame for the welcome Nehru gave to Eisenhower, who is to blame, we would like to ask Comrade Thorez, for his endeavors to get all the elected Communist municipal and general councilors of the Paris region to attend the reception welcoming Eisenhower? From the class viewpoint of Marxism, no one need be surprised at Nehru's welcome to Eisenhower, but when a communist party leader shows such eagerness to welcome the chieftain of US imperialism and uses such stern language in criticism of comrades for failing to attend the reception, one cannot help being amazed.

These two issues, the Caribbean crisis and the Sino-Indian border question, have once again thoroughly exposed the line and policy followed by those who claim to be "completely correct" and shown them to be contrary to Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. Nevertheless, they did not draw the proper lessons or show any desire to correct their errors and return to the path of Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration and Statement. Instead, angrier and more red-faced than ever, they have slid further and further down the wrong path; and in an effort to divert people's attention and cover up their mistakes, they have started a still bigger adverse current directed against the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties, a current that is destructive of the unity of the international communist movement.

Several fraternal European parties held their congresses between November 1962 and January 1963. At these congresses, by careful arrangements, a disgusting situation was created in which large-scale and systematic public attacks were made on the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties by name. In particular, at the recent congress of the German Socialist Unity Party, this adverse current reached a new high in the attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties and the disruption of the unity of the international communist movement. At this congress, certain comrades, while talking about ending the attacks, continued violently to assail the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties and, moreover, they openly tried to reverse the verdict on the traitorous Tito clique. Can these comrades deceive anybody by their double-dealing? Obviously not. Such double-dealing just shows that they are not sincere about stopping the polemics and restoring unity.

In particular, it must be pointed out that the question of how to treat the Tito clique is a major question of principle. It is not a question of how to interpret the Moscow Statement but of whether to defend it or tear it up. It is not a question of what attitude to take towards a fraternal party, but of what attitude to take towards traitors to the communist cause. It is not a question of helping comrades rectify the mistakes they have made, but of unmasking and denouncing enemies of Marxism-Leninism. Adhering faithfully to Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Statement, the Chinese Communist Party will never allow the common agreement of the fraternal parties to be either doctored or scrapped, will never allow traitors to be pulled into our ranks, and will never agree to any trading in Marxist-Leninist principles or bartering away of the interests of the international communist movement.

From the facts cited above one can clearly see that on a whole series of questions it is not we but certain comrades of fraternal parties who have been committing increasingly serious violations of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. It is not we but certain comrades of fraternal parties who have failed to try to remove the differences among fraternal parties in accordance with these two common documents, but have on the contrary exacerbated these differences. It is not we but certain comrades of fraternal parties who have further exposed to the enemy the differences among fraternal parties and publicly attacked fraternal parties by name and with increasing violence. It is not we but certain comrades of fraternal parties who have counter-posed to the common line of the international communist movement their own erroneous line and who have thus exposed the socialist camp and the international communist movement to the more and more serious danger of a split.

From the facts cited above, one can also clearly see that Thorez and certain other comrades of the French Communist Party have been taking a surprisingly irresponsible attitude towards the present serious debate in the international communist movement. They have been resorting to deception, blocking information, concealing facts and distorting the views of the Chinese Communist Party in order to be able to make unbridled attacks on it. This is certainly not the proper way to carry on a debate, nor does it show a responsible attitude towards the members of the French Communist Party and the French working class. If Thorez and the other comrades dare to face

the facts and believe themselves to be right, they ought to publish the material of the Chinese Communist Party which explains its views, including the relevant articles we have published recently, and let all the members of the French Communist Party and the French working class learn the truth and decide for themselves what is right and what is wrong. Comrade Thorez and the other comrades! We have already published your statements accusing us. Will you do the same? Do you have that kind of statesmanship? Do you have that kind of courage?

Comrade Thorez and certain other comrades of the French Communist Party have distorted facts and reversed right and wrong to an extent that is really astonishing and yet they keep on calling themselves “creative Marxist-Leninists.” Very well, let’s look at this kind of “creativity.”

We note that prior to 1959 Thorez and the other comrades rightly pointed out that US imperialism was the leader of the forces of aggression and that they denounced the US government’s policies of aggression and war. But on the eve of the Camp David talks someone said that Eisenhower hoped for “the elimination of tension in the relations between states,” and so Thorez and the others vied with each other in lauding Eisenhower and decided that the parliamentary deputies of the French Communist Party should welcome this “peace emissary.” This was a complete turn of 180 degrees in response to the baton.

We also note that in September 1959 after de Gaulle had issued a statement about “self-determination” for Algeria in which he totally refused to recognize her independence and sovereignty, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party issued a statement which rightly exposed this as a “purely demagogic maneuver.” At that time Comrade Thorez himself said that it was “nothing but a political maneuver.” But in little more than a month, as soon as a foreign comrade said that de Gaulle’s statement had “great significance,” Comrade Thorez severely criticized the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party for having made a “false appreciation,” declaring that the Political Bureau’s original statement had been “hasty, precipitate.” This was another complete turn of 180 degrees in response to the baton.

We note further that in the past Thorez and the other comrades correctly denounced the revisionist program of the Yugoslav Tito clique, saying that the Tito clique was accepting “the subsidies of the American capitalists,”

and that these “capitalists clearly do not bestow them in order to facilitate the construction of socialism.” But recently someone spoke of “helping” the Tito clique “to resume its place in the great family of all fraternal parties,” and so Thorez and other comrades began to talk a great deal about “helping the League of Yugoslav Communists to return once again to the fold of the great communist family.” This was another complete turn of 180 degrees in response to the baton.

We also note that a year or so ago when the Chinese Communist Party opposed the practice of one party publicly attacking another fraternal party at its own congress, someone condemned this as being “contrary to the Marxist-Leninist stand.” And then, Comrade Thorez followed him by saying that the Chinese comrades were “wrong” to take such an attitude, which was “not right.” Recently, someone continued the attacks while saying that open polemics should halt, and so certain comrades of the French Communist Party again followed suit and said this was “sensible, Leninist.” This was still another turn in response to the baton.

Instances of this sort are too numerous to mention. Turning about in this way and following the baton so unconditionally cannot possibly be regarded as indicative of the normal relationship of independence and equality that should exist among fraternal parties, but rather of abnormal feudal, patriarchal relationships. Some comrades apparently believe that the interests of the proletariat and of the people in their own country may be disregarded completely, that the interests of the inter-national proletariat and of the people of the world may also be completely disregarded, and that it is good enough just to follow others. Is it right to go east or is it right to go west? Is it right to advance or is it right to retreat?—about all such questions they do not care at all. What someone else says, they repeat word for word. If some-one else takes one step, they follow with the same step. Here there is all too much ability to parrot and all too little of Marxist-Leninist principle. Are “creative Marxist-Leninists” of this kind something to be proud of?

However much Comrade Thorez and certain other comrades of the French Party publish in order to slander and viciously attack the Chinese Communist Party, they cannot in the least sully the glory of the great Chinese Communist Party. These practices of theirs run counter to the desire of all Communists to remove differences and strengthen unity and they are

not in keeping with the glorious tradition of the French working class and the French Communist Party.

The working class and the laboring people of France have a long and glorious revolutionary tradition. In their heroic endeavor to found the Paris Commune the French working class set a brilliant example for the proletarian revolution in all countries of the world. The *Internationale*, the immortal battle-march created by two outstanding fighters and gifted songsters of the French working class, is a clarion call to the people of the world to fight for their own emancipation and carry the revolution to the end. Founded under the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the French Communist Party gathered together a vast number of the finest sons and daughters of the French people and waged determined struggles jointly with the French working class and the laboring people. In the resistance movement against fascism the French people under the leadership of the French Party enriched the revolutionary tradition of the French working class and showed dauntless heroism. In the post-war period the French Communists played an important role in the struggle to defend world peace, to preserve democratic rights, to better the living conditions of the working people and to oppose monopoly capital. The Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people have always had the greatest respect for the French Communist Party and the French working class.

Comrade Thorez and the other comrades have repeatedly stressed that the Chinese comrades should correct their mistakes. But it is Comrade Thorez and the others, and not we, who really need to correct mistakes. In spite of the fact that we have no alternative but to debate with Comrade Thorez and certain other French comrades in this article, we sincerely hope that they will honor the history of the French Communist Party and treasure their own record of militant struggle for the cause of communism. We hope that they will take the basic interests of the international communist movement to heart, correct their errors which are out of keeping with the revolutionary tradition of the French proletariat, out of keeping with the glorious tradition of the French Communist Party and out of keeping with their oath of dedication to communism, and will return to the banner of Marxism-Leninism and to the revolutionary principles of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

As always, the Chinese Communist Party firmly up-holds the unity of the socialist camp, the unity of the international communist movement and the unity of the revolutionary people throughout the world, and opposes any disruption of this unity by word or deed. As always, we firmly uphold Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, and we are against all words and deeds that run counter to these revolutionary principles.

Naturally, the occurrence of one kind of difference or another in the international communist movement can hardly be avoided. When differences do occur, and especially when they concern the line of the movement, the only way to strengthen the unity of the international communist movement is to start from the desire for unity and, through serious debate, to eliminate these differences on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The question is not whether to debate, but through what channels and by what methods to conduct the debate. We have always maintained that debates should be conducted only among the fraternal parties and not in public. Although this stand of ours is irrefutable, it has been under attack by certain comrades of fraternal parties. After having publicly attacked us and other fraternal parties for more than a year, they have now changed their tune and say they want to stop open polemics. We should like to ask: Do you or do you not consider now that the public attacks you have been making on fraternal parties were a mistake? Are you or are you not ready to admit this mistake and to apologize to the fraternal parties you have attacked? Are you truly and sincerely ready to return to the proper course of inter-party consultation on the basis of equality?

In order to eliminate differences and strengthen unity, the Chinese Communist Party has many times proposed, and still holds today, that a meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties of all countries should be convened; moreover, the Chinese Communist Party is ready to take the necessary steps together with all the fraternal parties to prepare the conditions for the convening of such a meeting.

One of the preparatory steps for such a meeting is the cessation of the public polemics which are still going on. The Chinese Communist Party made this proposal long ago. We are of the opinion that in ceasing public polemics the actions must suit the words, and that the cessation must be mutual and general. While professing to terminate these polemics, some

persons have continued to make attacks. Actually they want to forbid you to strike back after they have beaten you up. This will not do. Not only must attacks on the Chinese Communist Party cease, the attacks leveled at the Albanian Party of Labor and other fraternal parties must also stop. Moreover, it is absolutely impermissible to use the pretext of stopping polemics in order to forbid the exposure and condemnation of Yugoslav revisionism, because this violates the provision of the Moscow Statement on the obligation to expose further the revisionist leaders of Yugoslavia. Some persons now want to oust the fraternal Albanian Party of Labor from the international communist movement on the one hand, and to pull in the renegade Tito clique on the other. We want to tell these people frankly that this is absolutely impossible.

A necessary step for preparing such a meeting is to hold bilateral and multilateral talks among the fraternal parties. This was proposed by the Chinese Communist Party as far back as ten months ago. We have always been willing to have talks with all the fraternal parties which share our desire to eliminate differences and strengthen unity. As a matter of fact, we have had such talks with a number of fraternal parties. We have never refused to hold bilateral talks with any fraternal party. In their statement of January 12, the Executive Committee of the British Communist Party alleged that the Chinese Communist Party had not accepted the CPSU's request "for joint discussion." It has been said they were told this by another Party. However, we must point out in all seriousness that this is a sheer fabrication. We wish to reiterate that we are ready to hold talks and to exchange views with any fraternal party or parties in order to facilitate the convening of a meeting of representatives of the communist parties of all countries.

At present the imperialists, and particularly the US imperialists, are stepping up their policies of aggression and war, are frantically opposing the communist parties and the socialist camp, and are savagely suppressing national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the people's revolutionary struggles in various countries. At this juncture all communist parties, the proletariat of the world and the people of all countries are urgently calling for the strengthening of the unity of the socialist camp, the unity of the international communist ranks and the unity of the people of the whole world against our common enemy. Let us eliminate differences and strengthen unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and on the

basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement! Let us work together to strengthen our struggle against imperialism, to win victory for the cause of world peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism, and to attain our great goal of communism!

More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us—Some Important Problems of Leninism in the Contemporary World

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT OF “*HONGQI*”

March 4, 1963

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, Nos. 3-4, 1963.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, March 15, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 10-11, pp. 8-58.

I. INTRODUCTION

At the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Italy Comrade Togliatti launched an open attack on the Chinese Communist Party and provoked a public debate. For many years, he and certain other comrades of the CPI have made many fallacious statements violating fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism on a whole series of vital issues of principle concerning the international communist movement. From the very outset we have disagreed with these statements. However, we did not enter into public debate with Togliatti and the other comrades, nor did we intend to do so. We have always stood for strengthening the unity of the international communist movement. We have always stood for handling relations between fraternal parties in accordance with the principles of independence, equality and the attainment of unanimity through consultation as laid down in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. We have always held that differences between fraternal parties should be resolved through inter-party consultation by means of bilateral or multilateral talks or conferences of fraternal parties. We have always maintained that no party should make unilateral public charges against a fraternal party, let alone level slanders or attacks against it. We have been firm and unshakable in thus standing for unity. It was contrary to our expectations that Togliatti and the other comrades should have utilized their Party Congress to launch public attacks against the Chinese Communist Party. But since they directly challenged us to a public debate in this way, what were we to do? Were we to keep silent as we had done before? Were the “magistrates to be allowed to burn down houses,

while the common people were forbidden even to light lamps?” No, and again no! We absolutely had to reply. They left us no alternative but to make a public reply. Consequently, our paper *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*) carried an editorial on December 31, 1962, entitled “The Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us.”

Togliatti and certain other comrades of the CPI were not at all happy about this editorial and they published another series of articles attacking us. They declared that our article “often lacked explicit clarity,” was “highly abstract and formal” and “lacked a sense of reality.”¹⁴⁷ They also said that we were “not accurately informed”¹⁴⁸ on the situation in Italy and on the work of the CPI and had committed an “obvious falsification”¹⁴⁹ of the views of the CPI. They accused us of being “dogmatists and sectarians who hide their opportunism behind an ultra-revolutionary phraseology”¹⁵⁰ and so on and so forth. Togliatti and the other comrades are bent on continuing the public debate. Well then, let it continue!

In the present article we shall make a more detailed analysis and criticism of the fallacious statements made by Togliatti and the other comrades over a number of years, as a reply to their continued attacks against us. When Togliatti and the other comrades have read our reply, we shall see what attitude they will take—whether they will still say that we “often lack explicit clarity,” that we are “highly abstract and formal” and “lack a sense of reality,” that we are “not accurately informed” on the situation in Italy and on the work of the CPI, that we are committing an “obvious falsification” of the views of the CPI, and that we are “dogmatists and sectarians who hide their opportunism behind an ultra-revolutionary phraseology.” We shall wait and see.

In a word, it will not do for certain persons to behave like the magistrate who ordered the burning down of people's houses while forbidding the people so much as to light a lamp. From time immemorial the public has never sanctioned any such unfairness. Furthermore, differences between us Communists can only be settled by setting forth the facts and discussing

¹⁴⁷ Togliatti, “Let Us Lead the Discussion Back to Its Real Limit,” *L'Unita*, January 10, 1963.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁹ Luigi Longo, “The Question of Power,” *L'Unita*, January 16, 1963.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

them rationally, and absolutely not by adopting the attitude of masters to their servants. The workers and Communists of all countries must unite, but they can be united only on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, on the basis of setting forth the facts and discussing them rationally, on the basis of consultations on an equal footing and reciprocity, and on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. If it is a case of masters wielding batons over the heads of servants, incanting “Unity! Unity!,” then what is actually meant is “Split! Split!” The workers of all countries will not accept such splittism. We desire unity, and we will never allow a handful of people to keep on with their splitting activities.

II. THE NATURE OF THE PRESENT GREAT DEBATE AMONG COMMUNISTS

As a result of the challenge the modern revisionists have thrown out to Marxist-Leninists, a widespread debate on issues of theory, fundamental line and policy is now unfolding in the international communist movement. This debate has a vital bearing on the success or failure of the whole cause of the proletariat and the working people throughout the world and on the fate of mankind.

In the last analysis, one ideological trend in this debate is genuine proletarian ideology, that is, revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, and the other is bourgeois ideology which has infiltrated into the ranks of the workers, that is, an anti-Marxist-Leninist ideology. Ever since the birth of the working-class movement, the bourgeoisie has tried its utmost to corrupt the working class ideologically in order to subordinate the movement to its own fundamental interests, weaken the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries and lead the people astray. For this purpose, bourgeois ideological trends assume different forms at different times, now taking a Rightist form and now a “Leftist” form. The history of the growth of Marxism-Leninism is one of struggle against bourgeois ideological trends, whether from the Right or the “Left.” The duty of Marxist-Leninists is to act as Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin did, not to run away from the challenge presented by any bourgeois ideological trend, but to smash attacks in the fields of theory, fundamental line and policy whenever they are made and to chart the correct road to victory for the proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations in their struggles.

Since Marxism became predominant in the working-class movement, a number of struggles have taken place between Marxists on the one hand and revisionists and opportunists on the other. Among them there were two debates of the greatest historic significance, and now a third great debate is in progress. Of these the first was the great debate which Lenin had with Kautsky and Bernstein and the other revisionists and opportunists of the Second International; it advanced Marxism to a new stage of development, the stage of Leninism, which is Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. The second was the great debate which the Communists of the Soviet Union and of other countries, headed by Stalin, conducted against Trotsky, Bukharin and other “Left” adventurists and Right opportunists. It successfully defended Leninism and elucidated Lenin’s theory and tactics concerning the proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the revolution of the oppressed nations and the building of socialism. Side by side with this debate there was the fierce and fairly protracted debate inside the Chinese Communist Party, which Comrade Mao Zedong carried on against the “Left” adventurists and Right opportunists for the purpose of closely integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution.

The current great debate was first provoked by the Tito clique of Yugoslavia through its open betrayal of Marxism-Leninism.

The Tito clique had taken the road of revisionism long ago. In the winter of 1956, it took advantage of the anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaign launched by the imperialists to conduct propaganda against Marxism-Leninism on the one hand and, on the other, to carry out subversive activities within the socialist countries in coordination with imperialist schemes. Such propaganda and sabotage reached a climax in the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary. It was then that Tito made his notorious Pula speech. The Tito clique did its utmost to vilify the socialist system, insisted that “a thorough change is necessary in the political system” of Hungary, and asserted that the Hungarian comrades “need not waste their efforts on trying to restore the Communist Party.”¹⁵¹ The Communists of all countries waged a stern struggle against this treacherous attack by the Tito clique. We had published the article “On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship

¹⁵¹ Cf. Kardelj’s speech at the National Assembly of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia, *Borba*, December 8, 1956.

of the Proletariat” in April 1956. Towards the end of December 1956, aiming directly at the Titoite attack, we published another article “More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.” In 1957, the Meeting of Representatives of the communist and workers’ parties of the socialist countries adopted the famous Moscow Declaration. This Declaration explicitly singled out revisionism as the main danger in the present international communist movement. It denounced the modern revisionists because they “seek to smear the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, declare that it is ‘outmoded’ and allege that it has lost its significance for social progress.” The Tito clique refused to sign the Declaration, and in 1958 put forward their out-and-out revisionist program, which they counterposed to the Moscow Declaration. Their program was unanimously repudiated by the Communists of all countries. But in the ensuing period, especially from 1959 onwards, the leaders of certain communist parties went back on the joint agreement they had signed and endorsed, and made Tito-like statements. Subsequently, these persons found it increasingly hard to contain themselves; their language became more and more akin to Tito’s, and they did their best to prettify the US imperialists. They turned the spearhead of their struggle against the fraternal parties which firmly uphold Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles laid down in the Moscow Declaration, and made unbridled attacks on them. After consultation on an equal footing at the 1960 Meeting of Representatives of communist and workers’ parties, agreement was reached on many differences that had arisen between the fraternal parties. The Moscow Statement issued by this meeting severely condemned the leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists for their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism. We heartily welcomed the agreement reached by the fraternal parties at this meeting, and in our own actions have strictly adhered to and defended the agreement. But not long afterwards, the leaders of certain fraternal parties again went back on the joint agreement they had signed and endorsed, and they made public attacks on other fraternal parties at their own party congresses, laying bare before the enemy the differences in the international communist movement. While assailing fraternal parties, they extravagantly praised the Tito clique and willfully wallowed in the mire with it.

Events have shown that the modern revisionist trend is a product, under new conditions, of the policies of imperialism. Inevitably, therefore, this

trend is international in character, and, like the previous debates, the present debate between Marxist-Leninists and the modern revisionists is inevitably developing into an international one.

The first great debate between the Marxist-Leninists and the revisionists and opportunists led to the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the founding of revolutionary proletarian parties of a new type throughout the world. The second great debate led to victory in the building of socialism in the Soviet Union, the victory of the anti-fascist world war, in which the great Soviet Union was the main force, the victory of the socialist revolution in a number of European and Asian countries and the victory of the great revolution of the Chinese people. The present great debate is taking place in the epoch in which the imperialist camp is disintegrating, the forces of socialism are developing and growing stronger, the great revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America is surging forward, and the mighty working class of Europe and America is experiencing a new awakening. In starting the present debate, the modern revisionists vainly hoped to abolish Marxism-Leninism at one stroke, liquidate the liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations and save the imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries from their doom. But Marxism-Leninism cannot be abolished, the peoples' liberation struggles cannot be liquidated, and the imperialists and reactionaries cannot be saved from their doom. Contrary to their aspirations, the modern revisionists are doomed to fail in their shameful attempt.

The working-class movement of the world sets before all Marxist-Leninists the task of replying to the general revision of Marxism-Leninism by the modern revisionists. Their revisions serve the current needs of world imperialism, of the reactionaries of various countries or of the bourgeoisie of their own countries, and are aimed at robbing Marxism-Leninism of its revolutionary soul; they throw overboard the most elementary principle of Marxism-Leninism, the principle of class struggle, and all they want to retain is the Marxist-Leninist label.

In discussing international and social problems, the modern revisionists use the utterly hypocritical bourgeois "supra-class" viewpoint in place of the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint of class analysis. They concoct a host of surmises and hypotheses, which are purely subjective and devoid of any factual basis and which they substitute for the scientific Marxist-Leninist investigation of

society as it actually exists. They substitute bourgeois pragmatism for dialectical materialism and historical materialism. In a word, they indulge in a lot of nonsensical talk, which they themselves must find it hard to understand or believe, in order to fool the working class and the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations.

In the past few years, a great number of international events have testified to the bankruptcy of the theories and policies of the modern revisionists. Nevertheless, every time their theories and policies are disgraced before the people of the world, they invariably “glory in their shame,”¹⁵² as Lenin once remarked, and, stopping at nothing and disregarding all consequences, they direct their fire at the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists—their brothers in other countries—who have previously advised them not to entertain illusions nor to act so blindly. By venting their venom and fury on others in the same ranks, they try to prove that they have gained a “victory,” in a vain attempt to isolate the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists, to isolate all their brothers in other countries who are defending revolutionary principles.

In the circumstances, what can all true revolutionary Marxist-Leninists do but take up the challenge of the modern revisionists? With regard to differences and disputes on matters of principle, Marxist-Leninists have the duty to differentiate between truth and error and to straighten things out. For the common interests of unity against the enemy, we have always stood for a solution through inter-party consultation and against making the differences public in the face of the enemy. But since some people have insisted on making the dispute public, what alternative is there for us but to reply publicly to their challenge?

Latterly, the Chinese Communist Party has come under preposterous attacks. The attackers have vociferously leveled many trumped-up charges against us in total disregard for the facts. The hows and whys of these attacks are not hard to understand. It is also as clear as daylight where those who have planned and carried out these attacks put themselves, and with whom they align themselves.

Whoever is acquainted with statements made by Comrade Togliatti and certain other comrades of the Italian Communist Party in recent years will see that it is no accident that at the last CPI Congress they added their voice

¹⁵² V. I. Lenin, “What Should Not Be Copied From the German Labor Movement” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XX.

to the attacks on the Marxist-Leninist views of the Chinese Communist Party. An ideological thread alien to Marxism-Leninism runs right through the Theses for the CPI Congress and Comrade Togliatti's report and concluding speech at the Congress. Along this line, they employed the same language as that used by the social-democrats and the modern revisionists in dealing both with international problems and with domestic Italian issues. A careful reading of the Theses and other documents of the CPI reveals that the numerous formulations and viewpoints contained therein are none too fresh, but by and large are the same as those put forward by the old-line revisionists and those propagated from the outset by the Titoite revisionists of Yugoslavia.

Let us now analyze the theses and other relevant documents of the CPI so as to show clearly how far Togliatti and the other comrades have moved away from Marxism-Leninism.

III. CONTRADICTIONS IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

COMRADE TOGLIATTI'S NEW IDEAS

Comrade Togliatti and some other comrades of the Communist Party of Italy make their appraisal of the international situation their fundamental point of departure in posing questions.

Proceeding from their appraisal, they have formed their new ideas, of which they are very proud, concerning international as well as domestic issues.

- (1) "It is necessary, in the world struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence, to fight for a policy of international economic cooperation, which will make it possible to overcome those contradictions at present preventing a more rapid economic development which will be translated into social progress."¹⁵³
- (2) "In Europe, in particular, it is necessary to develop an integral initiative in order to lay the foundation for European economic cooperation even among states with diverse social structures, which will make it possible, within the framework of the economic and political organs of the United Nations, to step up trade, eliminate or lower customs

¹⁵³ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI

barriers, and make joint interventions to promote the progress of the underdeveloped areas.”¹⁵⁴

- (3) “One should demand... the unfolding of systematic action to overcome the division of Europe and the world into blocs while breaking down the political and military obstacles which preserve this division,”¹⁵⁵ and “the rebuilding of a single world market.”¹⁵⁶
- (4) In the conditions of modern military technique, “war becomes something qualitatively different from what it was in the past. In the face of this change in the nature of war, our very doctrine requires fresh deliberations.”¹⁵⁷
- (5) “Fighting for peace and peaceful coexistence, we wish to create a new world, whose primary characteristic will be that it is a world without war.”¹⁵⁸
- (6) “The colonial regime has almost completely crumbled.”¹⁵⁹ “There are no longer any spheres of influence preserved for imperialism in the world.”¹⁶⁰
- (7) “In fact, there exists in the capitalist world today an urge towards structural reforms and to reforms of a socialist nature, which is related to economic progress and the new expansion of productive forces.”¹⁶¹
- (8) “The very term ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ can assume a content different from what it had in the hard years of the Civil War and of socialist construction for the first time, in a country encircled by capitalism.”¹⁶²

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Togliatti, “Unity of the Working Class in Order to Advance Towards Socialism in Democracy and Peace,” report to the Xth Congress of the CPI, December 2, 1962.

¹⁵⁸ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁵⁹ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁶⁰ Togliatti, “Today It Is Possible to Avoid War,” speech at the session of the Central Committee of the CPI, July 21, 1960.

¹⁶¹ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁶² Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI. See *L’Unita* supplement, September 13, 1962.

- (9) In order “to realize profound changes in the present economic and political structure” in the capitalist countries, “a function of prime importance can fall... on parliamentary institutions.”¹⁶³
- (10) In capitalist Italy “the accession of all the people to the direction of the state” is possible.¹⁶⁴ In Italy, the democratic forces “can oppose the class nature and class objectives of the state, while fully accepting and defending the constitutional compact.”¹⁶⁵
- (11) “Nationalization,” “planning” and “state intervention” in economic life can be turned into “instruments of struggle against the power of big capital in order to hit, restrict and break up the rule of the big monopoly groups.”¹⁶⁶
- (12) The bourgeois ruling groups can now accept “the concepts of planning and programming the economy, considered at one time a socialist prerogative,” and “this can be a sign of the ripening of the objective conditions for a transition from capitalism to socialism.”¹⁶⁷

To sum up, the new ideas advanced by Comrade Togliatti and others present us with a picture of the contemporary world as they envisage it in their minds. Despite the fact that in their Theses and articles they employ some Marxist-Leninist phraseology as a camouflage and use many specious and ambiguous formulations as a smokescreen, they cannot cover up the essence of these ideas. That is, they attempt to substitute class collaboration for class struggle, “structural reform” for proletarian revolution, and “joint intervention” for the national-liberation movement.

These new ideas put forward by Togliatti and the other comrades imply that antagonistic social contradictions are vanishing and conflicting social forces are merging into a single whole throughout the world. For instance, such conflicting forces as the socialist system and the capitalist system, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, rival imperialist countries, imperialist countries and the oppressed nations, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and working people in each capitalist country, and the various monopoly

¹⁶³ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁶⁴ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁶⁵ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI. See *L’Unita* supplement, September 13, 1962.

¹⁶⁶ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

capitalist groups in each imperialist country, are all merging or will merge into a single whole.

It is difficult for us to see any difference between these new ideas put forward by Togliatti and other comrades and the series of absurd anti-Marxist-Leninist views in the Tito clique's Program which earned it notoriety.

Undoubtedly, these new ideas advanced by Togliatti and other comrades constitute a most serious challenge to the theory of Marxism-Leninism and an attempt to overthrow it completely. It reminds us of the title Engels gave to the book he wrote in his polemic against Dühring, *Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science*.¹⁶⁸ Can it be that Comrade Togliatti now intends to follow in Dühring's footsteps and start another "revolution"—in the theory of Marxism-Leninism?

A PRESCRIPTION FOR CHANGING THE WORLD IN WHICH THE PRESCRIBER HIMSELF SCARCELY BELIEVES

How can "those contradictions at present preventing a more rapid economic development which will be translated into social progress"¹⁶⁹ be overcome? In other words, how can the antagonistic social forces, international and domestic, be merged into a single whole? The answer of Togliatti and other comrades is:

For the socialist countries, and for the Soviet Union in the first place, to challenge the bourgeois ruling classes to a peaceful competition for the establishment of an economic and social order capable of satisfying all the aspirations of men and peoples towards freedom, well-being, independence and the full development of and respect for the human personality, and towards peaceful cooperation of all states.¹⁷⁰

Does this mean that it is possible, merely through peaceful competition between the socialist and the capitalist countries, and without a people's revolution, to establish the same "economic and social order" in capitalist countries as in the socialist countries? If so, does it not mean that capitalism need no longer be capitalism, that imperialism need no longer be imperialism, and that the capitalists may cease their life-and-death scramble for

¹⁶⁸ F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021.

¹⁶⁹ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

profits or super-profits at home and abroad, but instead may enter into “peaceful cooperation” with all people and all nations in order to satisfy all the aspirations of men?

This is the prescription Comrade Togliatti has invented for changing the world. But this panacea has not proved effective even in the actual movement in Italy. How can Marxist-Leninists lightly believe in it?

It is common knowledge—and Marxist-Leninists particularly should remember—that soon after the October Revolution Lenin advanced the policy of peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist countries and favored economic competition between the two. During the greater part of the forty years and more since its founding, the socialist Soviet Union has in the main been in a state of peaceful coexistence with the capitalist countries. We consider the policy of peaceful coexistence, as pursued by Lenin and Stalin, to be entirely correct and necessary. It indicates that the socialist countries neither desire nor need to use force to settle international disputes. The superiority of the socialist system as demonstrated in the socialist countries is a source of great inspiration to the oppressed peoples and nations. After the October Revolution Lenin reiterated that the socialist construction of the Soviet Union would set an example for the rest of the world. He said that the communist system can be created by the victorious proletariat and that “this task is of world significance.”¹⁷¹ In 1921 when the Civil War had more or less come to an end and the Soviet state was making the transition to peaceful construction, Lenin set socialist economic construction as the main task for the Soviet state. He said: “At present it is by our economic policy that we are exerting our main influence on the international revolution.”¹⁷² Lenin’s view was correct. Precisely as he foresaw, the forces of socialism have exerted increasing influence on the international situation. But Lenin never said that the building of a Soviet state could take the place of the struggles of the people of all countries to liberate themselves. Historical events during the forty years and more of the Soviet Union’s existence also show that a revolution or a transformation of the social system in any country is a matter for the people of that country, and that the policy of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition followed by socialist countries cannot

¹⁷¹ V. I. Lenin, “Our Foreign and Domestic Position and Party Tasks” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

¹⁷² V. I. Lenin, “Tenth Congress of the RCP(B)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXII.

possibly result in a change of the social system in any other country. What grounds have Togliatti and other comrades for believing that the pursuit of the policy of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition by the socialist countries can change the face of the social system in every other country and establish an “economic and social order” capable of satisfying all the aspirations of men?

True, Comrade Togliatti and the others are by no means so wholehearted in believing their own prescription. That is why they go on to say in the Theses, “However, the ruling groups of the imperialist countries do not want to renounce their domination over the whole world.”

But Comrade Togliatti and the others do not base themselves on the laws of social development to find out why the ruling groups of the imperialist countries “do not want to renounce their domination over the whole world.” They simply maintain that this is so because the ruling groups of the imperialist countries have a wrong conception or “understanding” of the world situation, and also that “the uncertainty of the international situation”¹⁷³ arises precisely from this wrong conception and “understanding.”

From a Marxist-Leninist point of view, how can one reduce the attempt of imperialism to preserve its domination, the uncertainty of the international situation, etc. to a mere question of understanding on the part of the ruling groups of the imperialist countries, and not regard them as conforming to the operation of the laws of development of capitalist imperialism? How can one assume that once the ruling groups of the imperialist countries acquire a “correct understanding” and once their rulers become “sensible,” the social systems of different countries will be radically changed without class struggle and revolutions by the peoples of these countries?

TWO FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT VIEWS ON CONTRADICTIONS IN THE WORLD

In analyzing the present-day international situation, Marxist-Leninists must grasp the sum and substance of the political and economic data on various countries and comprehend the following major contradictions: the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, the contradiction among imperialist countries, the contradiction between the imperialist countries and the oppressed nations, the contradiction between

¹⁷³ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and other working people in each capitalist country, the contradiction among different monopolist groups in each capitalist country, the contradiction between the monopoly capitalists and the small and medium capitalists in each capitalist country, etc. Obviously, only by comprehending these contradictions, by analyzing them and their changes at different times and by locating the focus of the specific contradictions at a given time, can the political parties of the working class correctly appraise the international and domestic situation and provide a reliable theoretical basis for their policies. Unfortunately, these are the very contradictions that Togliatti and other comrades have failed to face seriously in their Theses, and consequently their whole program has inevitably departed from the orbit of Marxism-Leninism.

Of course, Togliatti and the other comrades do mention many contradictions in their Theses, but strangely enough Comrade Togliatti, who styles himself a Marxist-Leninist, has evaded precisely the above major contradictions.

The following contradictions in the international situation are listed in the Theses in the part concerning the European Common Market:

The increased economic rivalry among the big capitalist countries is accompanied by an accentuated trend not only towards international agreements among the big monopolies, but also towards the creation of organic commercial and economic alliances among groups of states. The extension of markets, which has been the outcome of one of these alliances (European Common Market) in Western Europe, has stimulated the economic development of certain countries (Italy, the German Federal Republic). Economic integration accomplished under the leadership of the big monopoly groups and linked to the Atlantic policy of rearmament and war has created new contradictions both on an international scale and in individual countries between the progress of some highly industrialized regions and the permanent and even relatively increasing backwardness and decline of others; between the rate of growth of production in industry and that in agriculture, which is everywhere experiencing a period of grave difficulties and crises; between fairly broad zones of well-being with a high level of consumption and

the broadest zones of low wages, underconsumption and poverty; between the enormous mass of wealth which is destroyed not only in rearmament but in unproductive expenditures and unbridled luxury, and the impossibility of solving problems vital to the masses and to progress (housing, education, social security, etc.).

Here a long list of so-called contradictions, or “new contradictions,” is given. Yet no mention is made of contradictions between classes, of the contradiction between the imperialists and their lackeys on the one hand and the peoples of the world on the other, etc. Togliatti and other comrades describe the contradictions “on an international scale and in individual countries” as contradictions between the industrially developed and industrially underdeveloped areas and between areas of well-being and areas of poverty.

They admit the existence of economic rivalry between the capitalist countries, of big monopoly capitalist groups and of groups of states, but the conclusion they draw is that the contradictions are non-class or supra-class contradictions. They hold that the contradictions among the imperialist countries can be harmonized or even eliminated by “international agreements among the big monopolies” and “the creation of organic commercial and economic alliances among groups of states.” In fact this view plagiarizes the “theory of ultra-imperialism” held by the old-line revisionists and is, as Lenin put it, “ultra-nonsense.”

It is well known that in the imperialist epoch Lenin put forward the important thesis that “uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism.”¹⁷⁴ The uneven development of the capitalist countries in the imperialist epoch takes the form of leaps, with those previously trailing behind leaping ahead, and those previously ahead falling behind. This inexorable law of the uneven development of capitalism still holds after World War II. The US imperialists and the revisionists and opportunists have all along proclaimed that the development of US capitalism transcends this inexorable law, but the rate of economic growth in Japan, West Germany, Italy, France and certain other capitalist countries has for many years since the War surpassed that in the United States. The weight of the United States in the world capitalist economy has declined. US industrial production accounted for 53.4 percent of that of the whole

¹⁷⁴ V. I. Lenin, “On the Slogan for a United States of Europe” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

capitalist world in 1948 and fell to 44.1 percent in 1960 and to 43 percent in 1961.

Although the rate of economic growth of US capitalism lags behind that of a number of other capitalist countries, the United States has not altogether lost its monopolistic position in the capitalist world. Hence, on the one hand, the United States is trying hard to maintain and expand its monopolistic and dominant position in that world, and on the other, the other imperialist and capitalist countries are striving to shake off this US imperialist control. This is an outstanding and increasingly acute real contradiction in the politico-economic system of the capitalist world. Besides this contradiction between US imperialism and the other imperialist countries, there are contradictions among other imperialist countries and among other capitalist countries. The contradictions among the imperialist powers are bound to give rise to, and in fact have given rise to, an intensified struggle for markets, outlets for investments, and sources of raw materials. Here lies an interwoven pattern of struggles between the old colonialism and the new and between the victorious and the vanquished imperialist nations. The case of the Congo, the recent quarrel over the European Common Market and the quarrel arising from the recent US restrictions on imports from Japan are striking instances of such struggles.

Although according to the Theses for the Tenth Congress of the CPI “the absolute economic supremacy of US capitalism is beginning to disappear by one of those processes of uneven development and leaps peculiar to capitalism and imperialism,” Togliatti and the other comrades have failed to perceive from this new phenomenon the fact that the contradictions in the capitalist world are growing in breadth and in depth, and they have also failed to perceive that this new phenomenon will bring about a new situation with sharp life-and-death struggles among the imperialist powers, and sharp struggles among the various monopoly groups in each imperialist country and between the proletariat and working people and the monopoly capitalists in each capitalist country. In particular, the imperialist-controlled world market has substantially contracted in area as a result of the victory of the socialist revolution in a series of countries; moreover, the emergence of many countries possessing national independence in Asia, Africa and Latin America has shaken the imperialist economic monopoly in those areas. In

these circumstances, the sharp struggles raging in the capitalist world have become not weaker, but fiercer, than in the past.

There now exist two essentially different world economic systems, the socialist system and the capitalist system, and two mutually antagonistic world camps, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp. In the course of events the strength of socialism has surpassed that of imperialism. Undoubtedly, the strength of the socialist countries, combined with that of the revolutionary people of all countries, of the national-liberation movement and of the peace movement, greatly surpasses the strength of the imperialists and their lackeys. In other words, in the world balance of forces as a whole, the superiority belongs to socialism and the revolutionary people, and not to imperialism; it belongs to the forces defending world peace, and not to the imperialist forces of war. As we Chinese Communists put it, “The East wind prevails over the West wind.”¹⁷⁵ It is utterly wrong not to take into account this tremendous change in the world balance of forces after World War II. However, this change has not done away with the various inherent contradictions in the capitalist world, has not altered the jungle law of survival in capitalist society, and does not preclude the possibility of the imperialist countries splitting into blocs and engaging in all kinds of conflicts in the pursuit of their own interests.

How can it be said that the distinction between the two social systems of capitalism and socialism will automatically vanish as a result of the change in the world balance of forces?

How can it be said that the various inherent contradictions of the capitalist world will automatically disappear as a result of this change in the world balance of forces?

How can it be said that the ruling forces in the capitalist countries will voluntarily quit the stage of history as a result of this change in the world balance of forces?

Yet, those very views are to be found in the program of Togliatti and other comrades.

¹⁷⁵ Mao Zedong, “The East Wind Prevails Over the West Wind” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. VII, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, pp. 416-417.

THE FOCUS OF CONTRADICTIONS IN THE WORLD AFTER WORLD WAR II

Togliatti and other comrades live physically in the capitalist world, but their minds are in cloud-cuckoo-land.

As Communists in the capitalist world, they should base themselves on the Marxist-Leninist class analysis and, proceeding from the world situation as a whole, analyze the contradiction between the socialist and imperialist camps and lay stress on analyzing the contradictions among the imperialist powers, between the imperialist powers and the oppressed nations, and between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and other working people in each imperialist country, in order to chart the right course for the proletariat of their own country and all the oppressed peoples and nations. But, to our regret, Togliatti and the others have failed to do so. They merely indulge in irrelevant inanities about contradictions while actually covering them up and trying to lead the Italian proletariat and all the oppressed peoples and nations astray.

Like Tito, Comrade Togliatti describes the contradiction between the imperialist and socialist camps as the “existence and contraposition of two great military blocs,”¹⁷⁶ and holds that by “changing this situation” a new world “without war,” a world of “peaceful cooperation,”¹⁷⁷ can be realized and that the contradiction between the two major social systems of the world will disappear.

These ideas of Comrade Togliatti are a bit too naïve. Day after day he may go on hoping that the rulers of the imperialist countries will become “sensible,” but the imperialists will never comply with his wishes by voluntarily disarming themselves or changing their social system. In essence, his ideas can only mean that the socialist countries should abandon or abolish their defenses and that there should be a so-called liberalization, i.e., “peaceful evolution” or “spontaneous evolution,” of the socialist system towards capitalism, which the imperialists have always hoped for.

The contradiction between the imperialist and socialist camps is a contradiction between the two social systems, a basic world contradiction, which is undoubtedly acute. How can a Marxist-Leninist regard it as a contradiction between two military blocs rather than between two social systems?

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Togliatti's report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

Nor should a Marxist-Leninist view the contradictions in the world simply and exclusively as contradictions between the imperialist and socialist camps.

It must be pointed out that by the nature of their society the socialist countries need not, cannot, should not and must not engage in expansion abroad. They have their own internal markets, and China and the Soviet Union, in particular, have most extensive internal markets. At the same time, the socialist countries engage in international trade in accordance with the principle of equality and mutual benefit, but there is no need for them to scramble for markets and spheres of influence with the imperialist countries, and they have absolutely no need for conflicts, and especially armed conflicts, with the imperialist countries on this ground.

However, things are quite different with the imperialist countries.

So long as the capitalist-imperialist system exists, the laws of capitalist imperialism continue to operate. Imperialists always oppress and exploit their own people at home, and always perpetrate aggression against other nations and countries and oppress and exploit them. They always regard colonies, semi-colonies and spheres of influence as sources of wealth for themselves. The “civilized” wolves of imperialism have always regarded Asia, Africa and Latin America as rich meat to contend for and devour. Using various means they have never ceased to suppress the struggles and uprisings of the people in the colonies and in their spheres of influence. Whatever policies the capitalist-imperialists pursue, whether old colonialist policies or new colonialist policies, contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations is inevitable. This contradiction is irreconcilable and extremely acute, and it cannot be covered up.

Furthermore, the imperialist powers are constantly struggling with each other in the scramble for markets, sources of raw materials, spheres of influence and profits from war contracts. At times this struggle may grow somewhat less acute, and may result in certain compromises or even in the formation of “alliances of groups of states,” but such relaxations of tension, compromises or alliances always breed more acute, more intense and more widespread contradictions and struggles among the imperialists.

Stepping into the shoes of the German, Italian and Japanese fascists, the US imperialists have been carrying out a policy of expansion in all parts of the world ever since World War II. Under the cover of their opposition to

the Soviet Union, they have embarked on a course of aggression, annexation and domination *vis-à-vis* the former colonies and spheres of influence of Britain, France, Germany, Japan and Italy. Again under the cover of their opposition to the Soviet Union, they have taken advantage of post-war conditions to place a string of capitalist countries—Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, Italy, Belgium, Canada, Australia and others—under the direct control of US monopoly capital. This control is political and economic as well as military.

In other words, US imperialism is trying to build a huge empire in the capitalist world, such as has never been known before. This huge empire which US imperialism is seeking to build would involve the direct enslavement not only of such vanquished nations as West Germany, Italy and Japan, and of their former colonies and spheres of influence, but also of its own wartime allies, Britain, France, Belgium, etc., and their existing and former colonies and spheres of influence.

That is to say, in its quest for this unprecedentedly large empire, US imperialism concentrates its efforts primarily on the seizure of the immense intermediate zone between the United States and the socialist countries. At the same time, it is using every means to conduct subversion, sabotage, and aggression against the socialist countries.

Here we may recall the well-known interview by Comrade Mao Zedong in August 1946 in which he exposed the anti-Soviet smokescreen the US imperialists were then putting up and in which he gave the following concise analysis of the world situation:

The United States and the Soviet Union are separated by a vast zone which includes many capitalist, colonial and semi-colonial countries in Europe, Asia and Africa. Before the US reactionaries have subjugated these countries, an attack on the Soviet Union is out of the question. In the Pacific the United States now controls areas larger than all the former British spheres of influence there put together; it controls Japan, that part of China under Kuomintang rule, half of Korea, and the South Pacific. It has long controlled Central and South America. It seeks also to control the whole of the British Empire and Western Europe. Using various pretexts, the United States is making large-scale military arrangements and setting up military bases in many

countries. The US reactionaries say that the military bases they have set up and are preparing to set up all over the world are aimed against the Soviet Union. True, these military bases are directed against the Soviet Union. At present, however, it is not the Soviet Union but the countries in which these military bases are located that are the first to suffer US aggression. I believe it won't be long before these countries come to realize who is really oppressing them, the Soviet Union or the United States. The day will come when the US reactionaries find themselves opposed by the people of the whole world.

Of course, I do not mean to say that the US reactionaries have no intention of attacking the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is a defender of world peace and a powerful factor preventing the domination of the world by the US reactionaries. Because of the existence of the Soviet Union, it is absolutely impossible for the reactionaries in the United States and the world to realize their ambitions. That is why the US reactionaries rabidly hate the Soviet Union and actually dream of destroying this socialist state. But the fact that the US reactionaries are now trumpeting so loudly about a US-Soviet war and creating a foul atmosphere, so soon after the end of World War II, compels us to take a look at their real aims. It turns out that under the cover of anti-Soviet slogans they are frantically attacking the workers and democratic circles in the United States and turning all the countries which are the targets of US external expansion into US dependencies. I think the American people and the peoples of all countries menaced by US aggression should unite and struggle against the attacks of the US reactionaries and their running dogs in these countries. Only by victory in this struggle can a third world war be avoided; otherwise it is unavoidable.¹⁷⁸

Thus, sixteen years ago, Comrade Mao Zedong most lucidly exposed the attempts of the US imperialists to set up a huge world empire and showed

¹⁷⁸ Mao Zedong, "Talk With the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 90.

how to defeat the insane plan of the US imperialists to enslave the world and how to strive to avert a third world war.

In this passage Comrade Mao Zedong explains that there is a vast intermediate zone between the US imperialists and the socialist countries. This intermediate zone includes the entire capitalist world, the United States excepted. The US imperialists' clamor about a war against the socialist camp shows that while they are in fact preparing an aggressive war against the socialist countries and dreaming of destroying them, this clamor also serves as a smokescreen to conceal their immediate aim of aggression against and enslavement of the intermediate zone.

This policy of aggression and enslavement on the part of the US imperialists with their lust for world hegemony runs up first against the resistance of the oppressed nations and peoples in the intermediate zone, and particularly those of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This reactionary policy has in fact ignited revolutions by the oppressed nations and peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America and has fanned the flames of revolution, which have now been burning in these areas for more than a decade. The flames of revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America are further damaging the foundations of imperialist rule; they are spreading, and will certainly go on spreading to even wider areas.

Meanwhile, the US imperialist policy of world hegemony inevitably intensifies the fight between the imperialist powers and between the old and new colonialists over colonies and spheres of influence; it also intensifies the struggles between US imperialism with its policy of control and the other imperialist powers which are resisting this control. These struggles affect the vital interests of imperialism, and the imperialist contestants give each other no quarter, for each side is striving to strangle the other.

The policy of the US imperialists and their partners towards the oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who are struggling for their own liberation, is an extremely reactionary policy of suppression and deception. The socialist countries, acting from a strong sense of duty, naturally pursue a policy of sympathy and support for the national and democratic revolutionary struggles in these areas. These two policies are fundamentally different. The contradiction between them inevitably manifests itself in these areas. The policy of the modern revisionists towards these areas in fact serves the ends of the imperialist policy. Consequently, the contra-

diction between the policy of the Marxist-Leninists and that of the modern revisionists inevitably manifests itself in these areas, too.

The population of these areas in Asia, Africa and Latin America constitutes more than two-thirds of the total population of the capitalist world. The ever-mounting tide of revolution in these areas and the fight over them between the imperialist powers and between the old and new colonialists clearly show that these areas are the focus of all the contradictions of the capitalist world; it may also be said that they are the focus of world contradictions. These areas are the weakest link in the imperialist chain and the storm-center of world revolution.

The experience of the last sixteen years has completely confirmed the correctness of Comrade Mao Zedong's thesis on the location of the focus of world contradictions after World War II.

HAS THE FOCUS OF WORLD CONTRADICTIONS CHANGED?

Tremendous changes have taken place in the world over the past sixteen years. The main ones are:

- (1) With the founding of a series of socialist states in Europe and Asia and with the victory of the people's revolution in China, these countries together with the Soviet Union formed the socialist camp, which comprises twelve countries, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Viet Nam, the German Democratic Republic, China, Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, USSR and Czechoslovakia, and has an aggregate population of one thousand million. This has fundamentally changed the world balance of forces.
- (2) The strength of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist world has greatly increased and its influence has greatly expanded.
- (3) In Asia, Africa and Latin America, the national-liberation movement and the people's revolutionary movement have destroyed and are destroying the positions of US imperialism and its partners over wide areas with the force of a thunderbolt. The heroic Cuban people have won great victories in their revolution after overthrowing the reactionary rule of the running dogs of US imperialism and have taken the road of socialism.

- (4) There have been new activity and new developments in the struggle for democratic rights and socialism on the part of the working class and the working people in the European and American capitalist countries.
- (5) The uneven development of the capitalist countries has become more pronounced. There have been certain new developments in the capitalist forces of France, which are beginning to be bold enough to stand up to the United States. The contradiction between Britain and the United States has been further aggravated. Nurtured by the United States, the nations defeated in World War II, namely, West Germany, Italy and Japan, have risen to their feet again and are striving, in varying degrees, to shake off US domination. Militarism is resurgent in West Germany and Japan, which are again becoming hotbeds of war. Before World War II, Germany and Japan were the chief rivals of US imperialism. Today West Germany is again colliding with US imperialism as its chief rival in the world capitalist market. The competition between Japan and the United States is also becoming increasingly acute.
- (6) While the capitalist countries develop more and more unevenly in relation to each other in the economic and political spheres, the competition among the monopoly capitalist groups in each capitalist country sharpens, too.

All these changes show that the people in various countries can defeat the US imperialists and their lackeys and win freedom and emancipation for themselves if they awaken and unite.

These changes also show that the greater the strength of the socialist countries, the firmer the unity of the socialist camp, the broader the liberation movement of the oppressed nations, and the more vigorous the struggle of the proletariat and the oppressed people in the capitalist countries, then the greater the possibility of manacled the imperialists in such a way that they will not dare to defy the universal will of the people, and the greater the possibility of preventing a new world war and preserving world peace.

Moreover, these changes show that the contradictions between US imperialism and other imperialist countries are growing deeper and sharper and that new conflicts are developing between them.

The victory of the Chinese people's revolution, the victories in construction in all the socialist countries, the victory of the national democratic revolution in many countries and the victory of the Cuban people's revolution have dealt most telling blows to the US imperialists' wild plans for enslaving the world. In order to carry through their policy of aggression the US imperialists, in addition to conducting anti-Soviet propaganda, have been particularly active in recent years in their propaganda against China. Their purpose in this propaganda is of course to perpetuate their forcible occupation of our territory of Taiwan and to carry on all sorts of criminal subversive activities menacing our country. At the same time, it is obvious that the US imperialists are using this propaganda for another important practical purpose, namely, the control and enslavement of Japan, southern Korea and the whole of Southeast Asia. The "Japan-US Mutual Cooperation and Security Treaty," SEATO, etc., are US instruments for controlling and enslaving a host of countries in this area.

For years, the US imperialists have given both overt and covert support to the Indian reactionaries and the Nehru government. What is their real objective? They are trying by underhand means to turn India, which was formerly a colonial possession of the British Empire and is still a member of the British Commonwealth, into a US sphere of influence, and to turn the "brightest jewel" in the British Imperial Crown into a jewel in the Yankee Dollar Imperial Crown. To attain this object, the US imperialists must first create a pretext, or put up a smokescreen, to fool the people of India and of the whole world; hence their campaign against China and against the so-called Chinese aggression, though they themselves do not believe there is any such thing as "Chinese aggression." The US imperialists see a golden opportunity for controlling India in the Nehru government's current military operations against China. After Nehru provoked the Sino-Indian boundary conflict, the US imperialists swaggeringly entered India on the pretext of opposing China and are extending their influence there in the military, political and economic fields.

These massive US imperialist inroads represent an important step taken by the US reactionaries in their neo-colonialist plans for India; they are an important development in the present overt and covert struggle among the imperialist countries to seize markets and spheres of influence and redivide the world. This US imperialist action is bound to hasten a new awakening

of the Indian people, and at the same time to intensify the contradiction between British and US imperialism in India.

With the loss of the old colonies, the extension of the national revolutionary movement and the shrinking of the world capitalist market, the scramble among the imperialist countries is not only continuing in many parts of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Australasia, but is also manifesting itself in Western Europe, the classical home of capitalism. Never in history has the tussle among the imperialist countries been so extensive in peacetime, reaching every corner of Western Europe, and never before has it taken the form of a fierce scramble for industrially developed areas like Western Europe. The European Common Market consisting of the six countries of West Germany, France, Italy and Benelux, the European Free Trade Association of seven countries headed by Britain, and the Atlantic Community energetically planned by the United States represent the increasingly fierce scramble of the imperialist powers for Western European markets. What Togliatti and other comrades call “the development of Italian commerce in all directions”¹⁷⁹ in fact demonstrates the reaching out of the Italian monopoly capitalists for markets.

Outside Western Europe, the recent open quarrel over the US restriction on cotton imports from Japan shows that the struggle for markets between the United States and Japan is becoming more overt.

Comrade Togliatti and other comrades say: “The colonial regime has almost completely crumbled,”¹⁸⁰ and “there are no longer any spheres of influence preserved for imperialism in the world.”¹⁸¹ Others say, “There are only fifty million people on earth still groaning under colonial rule,” and only vestiges of the colonial system remain. In their view, the struggle against imperialism is no longer the arduous task of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Such a view has no factual basis at all. Most countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are still victims of imperialist aggression and oppression, of old and new colonialist enslavement. Although a number of countries have won their independence in recent years, their economies are still under the control of foreign monopoly capital. In some countries, the old colonialists have been driven out, but even more powerful and danger-

¹⁷⁹ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁸⁰ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁸¹ Togliatti’s speech at the session of the Central Committee of the CPI, July 21, 1960.

ous colonialists of a new type have forced their way in, gravely threatening the existence of many nations in these areas. The peoples in these areas are still a long way from completing their struggle against imperialism. Even for a country like ours, which has accomplished its national democratic revolution and, moreover, has won victory in its socialist revolution, the task of combating the aggression of the US imperialists still remains. Our sacred territory of Taiwan is still forcibly occupied by the US imperialists; even now many imperialist countries refuse to recognize the existence of the great People's Republic of China, and China is still unjustifiably deprived of its rightful position in the United Nations. To struggle against imperialism, against old and new colonialism, remains the cardinal and most urgent task of the oppressed nations and peoples in the vast regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The changes occurring in the world in the past sixteen years have proved again and again that the focus of post-war world contradictions is the contradiction between the US imperialist policy of enslavement and the people of all countries and between the US imperialist policy of world-wide expansion and the other imperialist powers. This contradiction manifests itself particularly in the contradiction between the US imperialists and their lackeys on the one hand and the oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America on the other, and in the contradiction between the old and new colonialists in their struggles for these areas.

WORKERS AND OPPRESSED NATIONS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

Asia, Africa and Latin America have long been plundered and oppressed by the colonialists of Europe and the United States. They have fed and grown fat on the enormous wealth seized from these vast areas. They have turned the blood and sweat of the people there into "manure" for "capitalist culture and civilization,"¹⁸² while condemning them to extreme poverty and economic and cultural backwardness. However, once a certain limit is reached, a change in the opposite direction is inevitable. Long enslavement by these alien colonialist and imperialist oppressors has necessarily bred hatred in the people of these areas, aroused them from their slumbers and compelled them to wage unremitting struggles, and even to launch armed resistance

¹⁸² V. I. Lenin, "Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

and armed uprisings, for their personal and national survival. There are vast numbers of people who refuse to be slaves in these areas and they include not only the workers, peasants, handicraftsmen, the petit bourgeoisie and the intellectuals, but also the patriotic national bourgeoisie and even some patriotic princes and aristocrats.

The people's resistance to colonialism and imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America has been continually and ruthlessly suppressed and has suffered many defeats. But after each defeat the people have risen to fight again. Comrade Mao Zedong has given a concise explanation of imperialist aggression against China and how it engendered opposition to itself. In 1949, when the great revolution of the Chinese people achieved basic victory, he wrote in "Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle":

All these wars of aggression, together with political, economic and cultural aggression and oppression, have caused the Chinese to hate imperialism, made them stop and think, "What is all this about?" and compelled them to bring their revolutionary spirit into full play and become united through struggle. They fought, failed, fought again, failed again and fought again and accumulated 109 years of experience, accumulated the experience of hundreds of struggles, great and small, military and political, economic and cultural, with bloodshed and without bloodshed—and only then won today's basic victory.¹⁸³

The experience of the Chinese people's struggle has a practical significance for the people's liberation struggles of many countries and regions in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Great October Revolution linked the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat with the liberation movement of the oppressed nations and opened up a new path for the latter. The success of the Chinese people's revolution has furnished the oppressed nations with a great example of victory.

Following on the October Revolution in Russia and the revolution in China, the people's revolutionary struggles in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America have reached unparalleled proportions. Experience has shown over and over again that although these struggles may suffer setbacks, the imperialists and their lackeys will never be able to withstand this tide.

¹⁸³ Mao Zedong, "Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 430.

Today, the imperialist countries of Europe and America are besieged by the people's liberation struggle of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This struggle renders most vital support to the struggle of the working class in Western Europe and North America.

Marx, Engels and Lenin always regarded the peasant struggle in the capitalist countries and the struggle of the people in the colonies and dependent countries as the two great and immediate allies of the proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries.

As is well known, Marx expressed the following hope in 1856: "The whole thing in Germany will depend on the possibility of backing the proletarian revolution by some second edition of the Peasants' War."¹⁸⁴ The heroes of the Second International evaded this direct instruction bequeathed by Marx, and Lenin bitterly denounced them, saying that "the statement Marx made in one of his letters—I think it was in 1856—expressing the hope of a union in Germany of a peasant war, which might create a revolutionary situation, with the working-class movement—even this plain statement they avoid and prowl around it like a cat around a bowl of hot porridge."¹⁸⁵ When discussing the importance of the peasants as an ally in the emancipation of the proletariat, Lenin said:

Only in the consolidation of the alliance of workers and peasants lies the general liberation of all humanity from such things as the recent imperialist carnage, from those savage contradictions we now see in the capitalist world...¹⁸⁶

And Stalin said:

Indifference towards so important a question as the peasant question on the eve of the proletarian revolution is the reverse side of the repudiation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is an unmistakable sign of downright betrayal of Marxism.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁴ K. Marx, F. Engels, "Marx to Engels" in *Selected Letters*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1977, p. 20.

¹⁸⁵ V. I. Lenin, "On Our Revolution" in *Marx, Engels, Marxism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1978, pp. 562-563.

¹⁸⁶ V. I. Lenin, "Ninth All-Russia Congress of Soviets" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

¹⁸⁷ Joseph Stalin, *The Foundations of Leninism*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 50.

We also know the celebrated saying of Marx and Engels: “No nation can be free if it oppresses other nations.” In 1870 Marx made the following surmise in the light of the then existing situation:

After occupying myself with the Irish question for many years I have come to the conclusion that the decisive blow against the English ruling classes... cannot be delivered in England but only in Ireland.¹⁸⁸

In 1853 during the Taiping Revolution in China, Marx wrote in his famous essay *Revolution in China and in Europe*:

It may safely be augured that the Chinese revolution will throw the spark into the overloaded mine of the present industrial system and cause the explosion of the long-prepared general crisis, which, spreading abroad, will be closely followed by political revolutions on the Continent.¹⁸⁹

Lenin developed Marx’s and Engels’ view, stressing the great significance of the unity between the proletariat in the capitalist countries and the oppressed nations for the victory of the proletarian revolution. He affirmed the correctness of the slogan “Workers and oppressed nations of the world, unite!” for our epoch.¹⁹⁰ He pointed out:

The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would actually be a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and America were not closely and completely united with the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of “colonial” slaves who are oppressed by capital.¹⁹¹

Stalin developed the theory of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the national question and Lenin’s thesis that the national question is part of the general problem of the world socialist revolution. In his *The Foundations of Leninism* Stalin pointed out that Leninism

¹⁸⁸ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Marx to S. Meyer and A. Vogt” in *Selected Correspondence*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, p. 285.

¹⁸⁹ K. Marx, “Revolution in China and In Europe” in *Marx on China, 1853-1860*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1951, p. 7.

¹⁹⁰ V. I. Lenin, “Speech Delivered at a Meeting of Activists of the Moscow Organization of the RCP(B)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

¹⁹¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Second Congress of the Communist International” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

broke down the wall between whites and blacks, between Europeans and Asiatics, between the “civilized” and “uncivilized” slaves of imperialism, and thus linked the national question with the question of the colonies. The national question was thereby transformed from a particular and internal state problem into a general and international problem, into a world problem of emancipating the oppressed peoples in the dependent countries and colonies from the yoke of imperialism.¹⁹²

In discussing the world significance of the October Revolution in his article *The October Revolution and the National Question*, Stalin said that the October Revolution “erected a bridge between the socialist West and the enslaved East, having created a new front of revolutions against world imperialism, extending from the proletarians of the West, through the Russian Revolution, to the oppressed peoples of the East.”¹⁹³

Thus, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin very clearly pointed out the two basic conditions for the emancipation and victory of the proletariat of Europe and America. As far as the external condition is concerned, they maintained that the development of the struggle for national liberation would deal the ruling classes of the metropolitan capitalist countries a decisive blow.

As is well known, Comrade Mao Zedong has devoted considerable time and energy to the exposition of the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the two great allies of the proletariat in its struggle for emancipation. He concretely and successfully solved the peasant question and the question of national liberation in the practice of the Chinese revolution under his leadership and thus ensured victory for the great Chinese revolution.

Every struggle of the oppressed nations for survival won the warm sympathy and praise of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Although Marx, Engels and Lenin did not live to see the fiery national liberation struggles and people’s revolutionary struggles now raging in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America or their successive victories, yet the validity of the laws they discovered from the experience of the national liberation struggles of their own times has been increasingly confirmed by life itself. The tremendous changes in Asia, Africa and Latin America following World War II have in

¹⁹² Joseph Stalin, *The Foundations of Leninism*, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

¹⁹³ Joseph Stalin, “The October Revolution and the National Question” in *The National and Colonial Question*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 87.

no way outmoded this Marxist-Leninist theory of the relationship between the national-liberation movement and the proletarian revolutionary movement, as some people suggest; on the contrary, they more than ever testify to its great vitality. Indeed, the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have further enriched this theory.

A fundamental task is thus set before the international communist movement in the contemporary world, namely, to support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, because these struggles are decisive for the cause of the international proletariat as a whole. In a sense, the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat as a whole hinges on the outcome of the people's struggles in these regions, which are inhabited by the overwhelming majority of the world's population, as well as on the acquisition of support from these revolutionary struggles.

The revolutionary struggles in Asia, Africa, and Latin America cannot be suppressed. They are bound to burst forth. Unless the proletarian parties in these regions lead these struggles, they will become divorced from the people and fail to win their confidence. The proletariat has very many allies in the anti-imperialist struggle in these regions. Therefore, in order to lead the struggle step by step to victory and to guarantee victory in each struggle, the proletariat and its vanguard in the countries of these regions must march in the van, hold high the banner of anti-imperialism and national independence, and be skillful in organizing their allies in a broad anti-imperialist and anti-feudal united front, exposing every deception practiced by the imperialists, the reactionaries and the modern revisionists, and leading the struggle in the correct direction. Unless all these things are done, victory in the revolutionary struggle will be impossible, and even if victory is won, its consolidation will be impossible and the fruits of victory may fall into the hands of the reactionaries, with the country and the nation once again coming under imperialist enslavement. Experience, past and present, abounds in instances of how the people have been betrayed in the revolutionary struggle, the defeat of the Chinese revolution of 1927 being a significant example.

The proletariat of the capitalist countries in Europe and America, too, must stand in the forefront of those nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In fact, such support simultaneously helps the cause of the emancipation of the proletariat in Europe and America. Without

support from the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, it will be impossible for the proletariat and the people in capitalist Europe and America to free themselves from the calamities of capitalist oppression and of the menace of imperialist war. Therefore, the proletarian parties of the metropolitan imperialist countries are duty bound to heed the voice of the revolutionary people in these regions, study their experience, respect their revolutionary feelings, and support their revolutionary struggles. They have no right whatsoever to flaunt their seniority before these people, to put on lordly airs, to carp and cavil, like Comrade Thorez of France who so arrogantly and disdainfully speaks of them as being “young and inexperienced.”¹⁹⁴ Much less have they the right to take a social-chauvinist attitude, slandering, cursing, intimidating and obstructing the fighting revolutionary people in these regions. It should be understood that according to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, without a correct stand, line and policy on the national-liberation movement and the people’s revolutionary movement in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, it will be impossible for the workers’ parties in the metropolitan imperialist countries to have a correct stand, line and policy on the struggle waged by the working class and the broad masses of the people in their own countries.

The national-liberation movement and the people’s revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America give great support to the socialist countries; they constitute an extremely important force safeguarding the socialist countries from imperialist invasion. Beyond any doubt, the socialist countries should give warm sympathy and active support to these movements and they absolutely must not adopt a perfunctory attitude, or one of national selfishness or of great-power chauvinism, much less hamper, obstruct, mislead or sabotage these movements. Those countries in which socialism has been victorious must make it their sacred internationalist duty to support the national liberation struggles and the people’s revolutionary struggles in other countries. Some people take the view that such support is but a one-sided “burden” on the socialist countries. This view is very wrong and runs counter to Marxism-Leninism. It must be understood that such support is a two-way, mutual affair; the socialist countries support the people’s revolutionary struggles in other countries, and these struggles in turn

¹⁹⁴ Thorez’ report to the session of the Central Committee of the PCF, December 15, 1960

serve to support and defend the socialist countries. In this connection, Stalin put it very aptly:

The characteristic feature of the assistance given by the victorious country is not only that it hastens the victory of the proletarians of other countries, but also that, by facilitating this victory, it ensures the final victory of socialism in the first victorious country.¹⁹⁵

Some persons hold that peaceful economic competition between the socialist and capitalist countries is now the chief and most practical way to oppose imperialism. They assert that the national liberation struggles, the people's revolutionary struggles, the exposure of imperialism, etc. are nothing but "the cheapest methods of struggle" and "practices of medicine men and quacks." Like opulent and lordly philanthropists, they tell the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America not to display "sham courage," not to kindle "sparks," or hanker after "dying beautifully," or "lack faith in the possibility of triumphing over the capitalist system in peaceful economic competition," but to await the day when the socialist countries have completely beaten capitalism in the level of their productive forces, for then the people in these areas will have everything, and imperialism will automatically tumble. Strangely enough, these people fear the people's revolutionary struggle in these areas like the plague. Their attitude has absolutely nothing in common with that of Marxist-Leninists; it runs completely counter to the interests of all the oppressed peoples and nations, to the interests of the proletariat and other working people of their own countries, and to the interests of the socialist countries.

In short, the present situation is an excellent one for the people of the world. It is most favorable for the oppressed nations and peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America, for the proletariat and working people of the capitalist countries, for the socialist countries and for the cause of world peace; it is unfavorable only for the imperialists and the reactionaries in all countries and for the forces of aggression and war. In such a situation, the attitude towards the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America becomes an important criterion for distinguishing between revolution and non-revolution, between interna-

¹⁹⁵ Joseph Stalin, "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists" in *Problems of Leninism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, p. 158.

tionalism and social chauvinism, and between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. It is also an important criterion for distinguishing between those who genuinely work for world peace and those who encourage the forces of aggression and war.

SOME BRIEF CONCLUSIONS

Here we shall recapitulate our theses on the international situation.

First, US imperialism is the common enemy of the people of the world, the international gendarme suppressing the just struggle of the people of various countries and the chief bulwark of modern colonialism. Since World War II, the US imperialists have been making frenzied efforts to seize the vast intermediate zone between the United States and the socialist countries; they are not only enslaving the vanquished powers and their former colonies and spheres of influence but are also getting their wartime allies under their control, and grabbing their existing and former colonies and spheres of influence by every means. But the US imperialists are besieged by the people of the world, and their unbridled ambition has led to their increasing isolation among the imperialist countries; actually their power is being constantly curtailed and the united front of the peoples of the world against the imperialists headed by the United States is steadily broadening. The American people and the oppressed peoples and nations of the world will be able to defeat the US imperialists by struggle. The prospects are not so bright for the imperialists headed by the United States and for the reactionaries in all countries, whereas the strength of the people of the world is in the ascendant.

Second, the struggles among the imperialist powers for markets and spheres of influence in Asia, Africa and Latin America and in Western Europe are bringing about new divisions and alignments. Contradictions and clashes among the imperialist powers are objective facts, which are determined by the nature of the imperialist system. In terms of the actual interests of the imperialist powers, these contradictions and clashes are more pressing, more direct, more immediate than their contradictions with the socialist countries. Failure to see this point is tantamount to denying the sharpening of the contradictions which arises from the uneven development of capitalism in the era of imperialism, makes it impossible to understand the specific

policies of imperialism and thus makes it impossible for Communists to work out a correct line and policy for fighting imperialism.

Third, the socialist camp is the most powerful bulwark of world peace and of the cause of justice. Further consolidation and strengthening of this bulwark will make the imperialists more wary of attacking it. For the imperialists know that any attack on this bulwark will constitute a grave risk for themselves, a risk which will involve not only their draining the cup of bitterness but their very existence.

Fourth, some persons regard the contradictions in the contemporary world simply as contradictions between the socialist and imperialist camps, and fail to see or actually cover up the contradictions between the old and new colonialist imperialists and their lackeys on the one hand and the oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America on the other; they fail to see or actually cover up the contradictions among the imperialist countries; they fail to see or actually cover up the focus of the contradictions in the contemporary world. We cannot agree with this view.

Fifth, while admitting the existence of contradiction between the socialist and imperialist camps, some people hold that this contradiction can actually disappear and that the socialist and capitalist systems can merge and become one, if what they call “the existence and contraposition of two great military blocs”¹⁹⁶ can be eliminated, or if the socialist countries “propose a challenge of peaceful competition with the capitalist ruling classes.”¹⁹⁷ We cannot agree with this view.

Sixth, the development of state-monopoly capitalism in the imperialist countries shows that, so far from weakening its ruling position at home and its competitive position abroad, the monopoly capitalist class is striving to strengthen them. At the same time, the imperialists are frantically reinforcing their war machines, not only for the purpose of plundering other nations and ousting foreign competitors but also for the purpose of intensifying their oppression of the people at home. So-called bourgeois democracy in the imperialist countries has more nakedly revealed itself as the tyranny of a handful of oligarchs over their wage slaves and the broad masses of the people. What is it if not pure subjectivist delirium to say that state-monopoly capitalism in these countries is gradually passing into socialism and

¹⁹⁶ Togliatti's report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁹⁷ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

that their working people can come into and are actually coming into the direction of the state, and hence to maintain that “in fact, there exists in the capitalist world today an urge towards structural reforms and towards reforms of a socialist nature?”¹⁹⁸

History is on the side of the peoples of the world and not on the side of the imperialists headed by the United States and the reactionaries in all countries. In their desperation the imperialists are trying to find a way out. They most absurdly pin their hopes on what they call a “clash between China and the Soviet Union.” The imperialists and their apologists have long voiced this idea. The ludicrous attacks and slanders recently hurled at the Chinese Communist Party by the modern revisionists and their followers have encouraged them in this idea. They are overjoyed and are assiduously playing the dirty game of sowing dissension. However, these reactionary daydreamers are making far too low an estimate of the great strength of the friendship between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union and of the great strength of a unity based on proletarian internationalism, and far too high an estimate of the role the modern revisionists and their followers can play. Sooner or later, the hard facts of history will completely demolish their illusions and the reactionary daydreamers will inevitably come to grief.

The mistake of Comrade Togliatti and other comrades in their Theses, reports and concluding speech lies in their fundamental departure from the Marxist-Leninist scientific analysis, from the class analysis, of the international situation.

As Lenin said, ridiculing the Narodniks, “The whole of their philosophy amounts to whining that struggle and exploitation exist but that they ‘might’ not exist if... if there were no exploiters.” He went on to say, “And they are content to spend their whole lives just repeating these ‘ifs’ and ‘ans.’”¹⁹⁹

Surely a Marxist-Leninist cannot behave like a Narodnik!

And yet, the point of departure and positions of Togliatti and other comrades in their Theses and reports rest on exactly these “ifs” and “ans.” Hence, their original ideas are inevitably a bundle of extremely confused notions.

¹⁹⁸ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

¹⁹⁹ V. I. Lenin, *What the “Friends of the People” Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1978, p. 140.

IV. WAR AND PEACE

THE QUESTION IS NOT ONE OF SUBJECTIVE IMAGINATION BUT OF THE LAWS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

In recent years, some so-called Marxist-Leninists have made endless speeches, written many prolix articles and flooded the market with books and pamphlets on the subject of war and peace. But they have refused to make a serious investigation of the root cause of war, of the difference between just and unjust wars and of the road to the elimination of war.

The anarchists demanded that the state should be done away with overnight. Certain self-styled Marxist-Leninists now call for the emergence some fine morning of a “world without weapons, without armies, without wars” while the system of capitalism and exploitation still exists. They proudly assert that this is a “great epoch-making discovery,” “a revolutionary change in human consciousness,” and a “creative contribution” to Marxism-Leninism, and that one of the crimes of the “dogmatists” is an obtuse failure to accept this scientific offering of theirs.

Apparently, Comrade Togliatti and some other Italian comrades are zealously peddling this offering. They claim that the only strategy for the creation of a new world “without war” is the “strategy of peaceful coexistence” as they interpret it. But the content of this “strategy of peaceful coexistence” differs radically from the policy of peaceful coexistence propounded by Lenin after the October Revolution and supported by all Marxist-Leninists.

In present-day, peace-time Italy, which is ruled by monopoly capital, there are over four hundred thousand troops in the standing army for the oppression of the people, about one hundred thousand police, nearly eighty thousand gendarmes, and US military bases equipped with missiles. When Togliatti and other comrades demand “peace and peaceful coexistence” in such a country, what do they really mean? If the demand means that the Italian government should follow a policy of peace and neutrality and of peaceful coexistence with the socialist countries, that is of course correct. But, apart from this, do you also demand of the Italian working class and other oppressed masses that they should practice “peace and peaceful coexistence” with the monopoly capitalist class? Does this sort of peace and peaceful coexistence imply that the US imperialists will voluntarily remove their military bases from Italy and that the Italian monopoly capitalists will voluntarily lay

down their arms and disband their troops? And if this is impossible, how is “peace and peaceful coexistence” to be realized between the oppressors and the oppressed in Italy? By a logical extension of this point, how can a “world without war” be created in this way?

Would it not indeed be a fine thing if there were to emerge a “world without weapons, without armies, without wars?” Why should it not have our approval and applause?

However, as Marxist-Leninists see it, the question is clearly not one of subjective imagination but of the laws of social development.

In *Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War*, written in 1936, Comrade Mao Zedong said, “War, this monster of mutual slaughter among men, will be finally eliminated by the progress of human society.”²⁰⁰ During the War of Resistance Against Japan in 1938, Comrade Mao Zedong again expressed this ideal when he said in *On Protracted War*, “Fascism and imperialism wish to perpetuate war, but we wish to put an end to it in the not too distant future.”²⁰¹

In the same work, he stated that the war then being fought by the Chinese nation for its own liberation was a war for perpetual peace. He said that “our War of Resistance Against Japan takes on the character of a struggle for perpetual peace.”²⁰²

He wrote there that war is a product of the “emergence of classes.”²⁰³ He continued:

Once man has eliminated capitalism, he will attain the era of perpetual peace, and there will be no more need for war. Neither armies, nor warships, nor military aircraft, nor poison gas will then be needed. Thereafter and for all time, mankind will never again know war.²⁰⁴

These theses of Comrade Mao Zedong's fully accord with those reiterated by Lenin on the question of war and peace.

²⁰⁰ Mao Zedong, “Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. I, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 162.

²⁰¹ Mao Zedong, “On Protracted War” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. II, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 137.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 136.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

In 1905, the year in which the first Russian Revolution broke out, Lenin wrote:

Social-Democracy has never taken a sentimental view of war. It unreservedly condemns war as a bestial means of settling conflicts in human society. But Social-Democracy knows that so long as society is divided into classes, so long as there is exploitation of man by man, wars are inevitable. This exploitation cannot be destroyed without war, and war is always and everywhere begun by the exploiters themselves, by the ruling and oppressing classes.²⁰⁵

In 1915, during the first imperialist world war, Lenin wrote that Marxists

Have always condemned war between nations as barbarous and brutal. But our attitude towards war is fundamentally different from that of the bourgeois pacifists (supporters and advocates of peace) and of the Anarchists. We differ from the former in that we understand the inevitable connection between wars and the class struggle within the country; we understand that war cannot be abolished unless classes are abolished and Socialism is created; and we also differ in that we fully regard civil wars, i.e., wars waged by the oppressed class against the oppressing class, slaves against slave-owners, serfs against landowners, and wage-workers against the bourgeoisie, as legitimate, progressive and necessary. We Marxists differ from both the pacifists and the Anarchists in that we deem it necessary historically (from the standpoint of Marx's dialectical materialism) to study each war separately.²⁰⁶

During World War I, Lenin, as a most conscientious Marxist, devoted himself to studying the problem of war, of which he made an extensive and rigorous scientific analysis. He sharply denounced the many absurdities regarding war and peace put about by the opportunists and revisionists of

²⁰⁵ V. I. Lenin, "The Revolutionary Army and the Revolutionary Government" in *Collected Works*, Vol. VIII.

²⁰⁶ V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and War" in *On War and Peace*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1970, p. 4.

Kautsky's ilk and he showed mankind the correct road to the elimination of war.

Today, however, some self-styled Leninists talk drivel on the question of war and peace without the least inclination to pause and consider how Lenin studied the question of war or to consider any of his scientific conclusions on the question of war and peace. Nevertheless, they vociferously accuse others of betraying Lenin and claim that they alone are the "reincarnations of Lenin."

IS THE AXIOM "WAR IS THE CONTINUATION OF POLITICS BY OTHER MEANS" OUT OF DATE?

Some people may perhaps say, "There's no need for you to be so garrulous. We are just as familiar with Lenin's views on the question of war and peace, but now conditions are different and Lenin's theses have become out of date."

It was the Tito clique which first openly treated Lenin's fundamental theory on war and peace as outmoded. They claim that, with the emergence of atomic weapons, the axiom that "war is the continuation of politics by other means," which Lenin stressed as the theoretical basis for studying all wars and for determining the nature of different kinds of wars, is no longer applicable. In their view, war has ceased to be the continuation of the politics of one class or another and has lost its class content, and there is no longer any distinction between just and unjust wars. The assertion of Togliatti and other comrades that with modern military technique the nature of war has changed in fact repeats what the Tito clique has been saying for a long time.

Clearly, the imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries will not divest themselves of their armaments and stop suppressing the oppressed peoples and nations, or abandon their aggressive and subversive activities against the socialist countries simply because the modern revisionists deny the axiom that "war is the continuation of politics by other means," nor will they on that account stop clashing with one another in their scramble for superprofits. The modern revisionists are actually striving to influence the oppressed peoples and nations by such assertions, and want to put false notions into their heads, as though the imperialists' war moves to hold down the oppressed peoples and nations, their arms expansion and war prepara-

tions, their direct and indirect armed conflicts for the seizure of markets and spheres of influence were not all the continuation of imperialist politics. For example, in their view, the US imperialist war to suppress the people of southern Vietnam and the war engineered by the old and new colonialists in the Congo are not to be considered the continuation of imperialist politics.

Are the war the US imperialists are carrying on in southern Vietnam and the armed conflict in the Congo between the old and new colonialists to be regarded as wars or not? If they are not to be regarded as wars, what are they? If they are wars, is there not a connection between them and the system of US imperialism and its politics? And what kind of connection?

Togliatti and certain other comrades of the CPI hold that it is "possible to avoid small local wars."²⁰⁷ They also hold that "war would become impossible in human society even if socialism has not yet been realized everywhere."²⁰⁸ In all likelihood, these conclusions were reached by Togliatti and other comrades after their "fresh deliberations" on "our very doctrine." Now, these remarks by Togliatti and other comrades were made in November 1960. Let us leave aside the events prior to that year. In the year 1960 alone, there occurred in different parts of the world various kinds of military conflicts and armed interventions which are mostly of the category Togliatti and other comrades call "small local wars":

The war waged by the French colonial forces to suppress the Algerian national-liberation movement went on for its sixth year.

During this year the US imperialists and their running dog Ngo Dinh Diem continued their brutal suppression of the people of southern Vietnam, arousing still greater armed resistance by the latter.

In January and February, armed clashes broke out between Syria and Israel, which was supported by the United States.

²⁰⁷ Speeches of the CPI Delegation to the Conference of the 81 communist and workers' parties, pamphlet published in January 1962, by the Central Department of Press and Propaganda of the CPI

²⁰⁸ Ibid.

On February 5, four thousand US marines landed in the Dominican Republic in Latin America, intervening in its internal affairs by force of arms.

On May 1, an American U-2 plane intruded over the Soviet Union and was shot down by Soviet rocket units.

On July 10, Belgium launched armed intervention in the Congo. Three days later, the United Nations Security Council adopted a resolution under which a “United Nations force” arrived in the Congo to put down the national-liberation movement there.

In August, the United States aided and abetted the Savannakhet clique in provoking civil war in Laos.

Perhaps the events of 1960 do not fall within the scope of discussion of Togliatti and other comrades. Well then, do world events of 1961 and 1962 serve to bear out their prediction?

Let us review the facts.

The French colonial forces continued their criminal war of suppression against the Algerian national-liberation movement until they were forced to accept a ceasefire in March 1962. By then, the war had lasted more than seven years. The “special war” waged by the US imperialists against the people in southern Vietnam is still going on.

The “United Nations force” (mainly Indian troops) serving US neo-colonialism continued its suppression of the Congolese people. Early in 1961, Lumumba, national hero of the Congo, was murdered by the hirelings of the US and Belgian imperialists and on their instructions. From September 1961 to the end of the following year, the US-manipulated “United Nations force” mounted three armed attacks on Katanga, which was under the control of the British, French and Belgian old colonialists.

In March 1961, the Portuguese colonialists, supported by US imperialism, massed their forces and began their large-scale suppression and massacre of the people of Angola who are demanding national independence. This bloody atrocity is still going on.

On April 17, 1961, US mercenaries staged an armed invasion of Cuba and were wiped out at Giron Beach by the heroic army and people of Cuba within seventy-two hours.

On July 1, 1961, British troops landed in Kuwait. On the 19th, French troops attacked the port of Bizerta in Tunisia.

On November 19 and 20, 1961, the United States again intervened in the Dominican Republic by armed force, using naval and air units.

On January 15, 1962, the Dutch colonialists' naval forces attacked Indonesian naval units off the coast of West Irian.

In April 1962, the Indonesian people launched a guerrilla campaign in West Irian against the Dutch colonialists.

In May 1962, the United States plotted to expand the civil war in Laos and prepared direct intervention by armed force. On the 17th, US forces entered Thailand, and on the 24th Britain announced the dispatch of an air squadron to Thailand. These military moves by the United States and Britain posed a direct threat to peace in Southeast Asia. After resolute struggle on the part of the Laotian people and concerted efforts by the socialist countries and the neutral nations, a Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos and a protocol to the declaration were signed on July 23, 1962, at the enlarged Geneva Conference for the peaceful settlement of the Laotian question.

On August 24, 1962, US armed vessels bombarded the seaside residential areas of Havana, the Cuban capital.

On September 26, 1962, when a military coup d'état took place in the Yemen, the United States instigated Saudi Arabian armed intervention.

During 1962, the Nehru government of India made repeated armed intrusions into Chinese territory with US imperialist support. On October 20, the Nehru government launched a massive military attack along the Sino-Indian border.

On October 22, 1962, the United States, resorting to piracy, imposed a military blockade and carried out a war provocation against Cuba which shocked the world. The Cuban people

gained a great victory in their struggle to defend the sovereignty of their fatherland, supported as they were by the people of the socialist and all other countries in the world.

During these two years, ruthless exploitation, brutal repression and armed intervention by the imperialists and their lackeys continued to evoke armed resistance by the people in many countries and by many oppressed nations, such as the armed uprising of the Brunei people against Britain on December 8, 1962.

Time and again events have confirmed Lenin's statement that "war is always and everywhere begun by the exploiters themselves, by the ruling and oppressing classes," and that "war is the continuation of politics by other means." Present and future realities will continue to bear out these truths enunciated by Lenin.

WHAT HAS EXPERIENCE PAST AND PRESENT TO TEACH US?

Since the imperialists and reactionaries incessantly foment wars in various regions of the world to serve their own political ends, it is impossible for anybody to prevent the oppressed peoples and nations from waging wars of resistance against oppression.

Certain self-styled Marxist-Leninists may not regard the many wars cited above as wars at all. They acknowledge only wars which take place in "highly developed civilized regions." Actually, such ideas are nothing new.

Lenin long ago criticized the absurd view that wars outside Europe were not wars. Lenin said sarcastically in a speech in 1917 that there were "wars which we Europeans do not regard as wars, because all too often they resembled not wars, but the most brutal massacre, extermination of unarmed peoples."²⁰⁹

People exactly like those Lenin criticized are still to be found today. They think that all is quiet in the world so long as there is no war in their own locality or neighborhood. They do not consider it worth their while to bother whether the imperialists and their lackeys are ravaging and slaughtering people in other localities, or engaging in military intervention and armed conflicts or provoking wars there. They only worry lest the "sparks" of resistance by the oppressed nations and peoples in these places might lead to

²⁰⁹ V. I. Lenin, "War and Revolution" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIV.

disaster and disturb their own tranquility. They see no need whatsoever to examine how wars in these places originate, what social classes are waging these wars, and what the nature of these wars is. They simply condemn these wars in an indiscriminating and arbitrary fashion. Can this approach be regarded as Leninist?

There are certain other self-styled Marxist-Leninists who think only of war between the socialist and imperialist camps whenever war is mentioned, as if there could be no wars to speak of other than one between the two camps. This thesis, too, was first invented by the Titoites, and now there are certain people who are singing the same tune. They are simply unwilling to face reality or to give thought to the facts of history.

If these people's memories are not too short, they will remember that when World War I started, there was no socialist country in existence, let alone a socialist camp. All the same, a world war broke out.

If their memories are not too short, they may also recall World War II. From September 1939 to June 1941 when the German-Soviet war began, a war had been going on for almost two years in the capitalist world and among the imperialist countries themselves. This was not a war between socialist and imperialist countries. The Soviet Union, after Hitler attacked it, became the main force in the war against the fascist hordes, but even after June 1941 the war could not be looked upon as one simply between the socialist and imperialist countries. In addition to the land of socialism, the USSR, a number of capitalist countries—Great Britain, the United States and France—were part of the anti-fascist front and so were many colonial and semi-colonial countries suffering from oppression and aggression.

It is therefore clear that both world wars originated in the contradictions inherent in the capitalist world and in the conflict of interests between the imperialist powers, and that both were unleashed by the imperialist countries.

World wars do not originate in the socialist system. A socialist country has no such antagonistic social contradictions as are peculiar to the capitalist countries, and it is absolutely unnecessary and impermissible for a socialist country to embark on wars of expansion. No world war can ever be started by a socialist country.

Thanks to the victories of the socialist countries and to the victories of the national-democratic revolutionary movement in many countries, great

new changes continue to take place in the world situation. Togliatti and other comrades say that in view of the changes in the world balance of forces the imperialists can no longer do as they like. There is nothing wrong with this statement. As a matter of fact, the point was made by Lenin not long after the October Revolution. Basing himself on an appraisal of the changes in the balance of class forces at that time, Lenin said, “The hands of the international bourgeoisie are now no longer free.”²¹⁰ But when the world balance of forces is becoming more and more favorable to socialism and to the people of all countries, and when we say that the imperialists can no longer do as they please, does this now mean the spontaneous disappearance of the possibility of all sorts of conflicts arising from the contradictions inherent in the capitalist world, has it meant so in the past, and will it mean so in the future? Does it mean that the imperialist countries have ceased to dream about, and prepare for, attacks on the socialist countries? Does it mean that the imperialist countries have stopped their aggression against and oppression of the colonial and semi-colonial countries? Does it mean that the imperialist countries will no longer fight each other to the death over markets and spheres of influence? Does it mean that the monopoly capitalist class has given up its brutal grinding down and suppression of the people at home? Nothing of the kind.

The question of war and peace can never be understood unless it is seen in the light of social relations, of the social system, and of the laws of social development.

That old-line opportunist Kautsky held that “war is a product of the arms drive,” and that “if there is a will to reach agreement on disarmament,” it will “eliminate one of the most serious causes of war.”²¹¹ Lenin sharply criticized these anti-Marxist views of Kautsky and other old-line opportunists who examined the causes of war without reference to the social system and the system of exploitation.

In *The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution* Lenin pointed out that “Only *after* the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world-historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap heap; and the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but *only when this*

²¹⁰ V. I. Lenin, “Report on Work in the Countryside—Eighth Congress of the RCP(B)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX.

²¹¹ Karl Kautsky, *National State, Imperialist State and Confederation* (February 1915).

condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before.”²¹² Such is the law of social development, and it cannot be otherwise.

Being incapable of explaining the question of war and peace from the historical and class angle, the modern revisionists always talk about peace and about war in general terms without making any distinction between just and unjust wars. Some people are trying to persuade others that the people’s liberation would be “incomparably easier” after general and complete disarmament, when the oppressors would have no weapons in their hands. In our opinion this is nonsensical and totally unrealistic and is putting the cart before the horse. As pointed out by Lenin, such people try to “reconcile two hostile classes and two hostile political lines by means of a little word which ‘unites’ the most divergent things.”²¹³

On the lips of the modern revisionists, “peace” and “the strategy of peaceful coexistence” amount to pinning the hope of world peace on the “wisdom” of the imperialist rulers, instead of relying on the unity and struggle of the people of the world. The modern revisionists are resorting to every method to fetter the struggles of the people in all countries, are trying to paralyze their revolutionary will and induce them to abandon revolutionary action, and thus weakening the forces fighting against imperialism and for world peace. This can only result in increasing the reactionary arrogance of the imperialist forces of aggression and war and in increasing the danger of a world war.

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM, OR THE THEORY THAT “WEAPONS DECIDE EVERYTHING?”

The modern revisionists hold that with the emergence of atomic weapons the laws of social development have ceased to operate and the fundamental Marxist-Leninist theory concerning war and peace is outmoded. Comrade Togliatti holds the same view. The *Renmin Ribao* editorial of December 31, 1962 has already discussed our main differences with Comrade Togliatti on the question of nuclear weapons and nuclear war. We shall now go into this question further.

²¹² V. I. Lenin, “The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution” in *On War and Peace*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1970, p. 63.

²¹³ V. I. Lenin, “The Question of Peace” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

Marxist-Leninists give proper and adequate weight to the role of modern weapons and military techniques in the organization of armies and in war. Marx's pamphlet, *Wage Labor and Capital*, contains the well-known passage:

With the invention of a new instrument of warfare, firearms, the whole internal organization of the army necessarily changed; the relationships within which individuals can constitute an army and act as an army were transformed and the relations of different armies to one another also changed.²¹⁴

But no Marxist-Leninist has ever been an exponent of the theory that "weapons decide everything."

Lenin said after the October Revolution, "He wins in war who has the greater reserves, the greater sources of strength, the greater endurance in the mass of its people." Again, "We have more of all of this than the Whites have, and more than 'all-powerful' Anglo-French imperialism, that colossus with feet of clay."²¹⁵

To elucidate the point, we might quote another passage from Lenin. He said:

In every war, victory is conditioned in the final analysis by the spiritual state of those masses who shed their blood on the field of battle... This comprehension by the masses of the aims and reasons of the war has an immense significance and guarantees victory.²¹⁶

On the question of war, it is a fundamental Marxist-Leninist principle to give full weight to the role of man in war. But this principle has often been forgotten by some self-styled Marxist-Leninists. When atomic weapons appeared at the end of World War II, some people became confused, thinking that atom bombs could decide the outcome of war. Comrade Mao Zedong said at that time: "These comrades show even less judgment than

²¹⁴ K. Marx, *Wage Labor and Capital & Wages, Price and Profit*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 27.

²¹⁵ V. I. Lenin, "Results of Party Week in Moscow and Our Tasks" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

²¹⁶ V. I. Lenin, "Speech at Conference of Workers and Red Army Men" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

a British peer... These comrades are more backward than Mountbatten.”²¹⁷ The British peer, Mountbatten, then Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Southeast Asia, had declared that the worst possible mistake would be to believe that the atom bomb could end the war in the Far East.²¹⁸

Of course, Comrade Mao Zedong took the destructiveness of atomic weapons into full account. He said, “The atom bomb is a weapon of mass slaughter.”²¹⁹ The Chinese Communist Party has always held that nuclear weapons are unprecedentedly destructive and that humanity will suffer unprecedented havoc if a nuclear war should break out. For this reason, we have always stood for the total banning of nuclear weapons, that is, the complete prohibition of their testing, manufacture, stockpiling and use, and for the destruction of existing nuclear weapons. At the same time, we have always held that in the final analysis atomic weapons cannot change the laws governing the historical development of society, cannot decide the final outcome of war, cannot save imperialism from its doom or prevent the proletariat and people of all countries and the oppressed nations from winning victory in their revolutions.

Stalin said in September 1946:

I do not believe the atom bomb to be as serious a force as certain politicians are inclined to think.

Atomic bombs are intended for intimidating the weak-nerved, but they cannot decide the outcome of war, since atom bombs are by no means sufficient for this purpose. Certainly, monopolistic possession of the secret of the atom bomb does create a threat, but at least two remedies exist against it: (a) Monopolist possession of the atom bomb cannot last long; (b) use of the atom bomb will be prohibited.²²⁰

These words of Stalin’s showed his great foresight.

²¹⁷ Mao Zedong, “The Situation and Our Policy After the Victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 11.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

²¹⁹ Mao Zedong, “Talk With the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

²²⁰ Joseph Stalin, “Replies to Questions put by Mr. Alexander Werth, Moscow, Correspondent of the ‘Sunday Times’” in *Works*, Vol. XVI, Red Star Press, London, 1986.

After World War I, some imperialist countries noisily advertised a military theory, according to which quick victory in war could be won through air supremacy and surprise attacks. Events in World War II exposed its bankruptcy. With the appearance of nuclear weapons, some imperialists have again noisily advertised this kind of theory and resorted to nuclear blackmail, asserting that nuclear weapons could quickly decide the outcome of war. Their theory will definitely go bankrupt too. But the modern revisionists, such as the Tito clique, are serving the US and other imperialists, preaching and trumpeting this theory in order to intimidate the people of all countries.

The policy of nuclear blackmail employed by the US imperialists reveals their evil ambition to enslave the world, and at the same time it reveals their fear.

It must be pointed out that if the imperialists should start using nuclear weapons, they will bring fatal consequences upon themselves.

First, if the imperialists should start using nuclear weapons to attack other countries, they will find themselves completely isolated in the world. For such an attack will be the greatest possible crime against human justice and will proclaim the attackers to be the enemy of all mankind.

Second, when they menace other countries with nuclear weapons, the imperialists put their own people first under threat and fill them with dread of such weapons. By clinging to the policy of nuclear blackmail, the imperialists will gradually arouse the people in their own countries to rise against them. One of the US airmen who dropped the first atom bombs on Japan has attempted suicide because of post-war condemnation of atomic bombing by the people of the whole world and has been sent to a mental hospital many times. This instance, in itself, shows to what extent the nuclear war policy of US imperialism has been discredited.

Third, the imperialists unleash wars for the purpose of seizing territory, expanding markets, and plundering the wealth and enslaving the working people of other countries. The destructiveness of nuclear weapons, however, compels the imperialists to think twice, because the consequences of the employment of such weapons would conflict with the actual interests they are seeking.

Fourth, the secret of nuclear weapons has long since ceased to be a monopoly. Those who possess nuclear weapons and guided missiles cannot

prevent other countries from possessing the same. In their vain hope of destroying their opponents with nuclear weapons, the imperialists are, in fact, subjecting themselves to the danger of being destroyed.

Above, we have dealt with some of the consequences which will inevitably arise if the imperialists use nuclear weapons in war. It is also one of the important reasons why we have always maintained that it is possible to conclude an agreement for a total ban on nuclear weapons.

It must also be pointed out that the policy of frantic expansion of nuclear arms pursued by the imperialists, and particularly the US imperialists, aggravates the crises within the capitalist-imperialist system itself:

First, the unprecedentedly onerous military expenditures imposed on the people in the imperialist countries and the increasingly lopsided militarization of the national economy are arousing the growing opposition of the people to the imperialist governments and their policy of arms expansion and war preparation.

Second, the imperialists' arms drive, and especially their nuclear arms drive, exacerbates the struggle among the imperialist powers and among the monopoly groups in each imperialist country.

Engels said in *Anti-Dühring*, written in the 1870s, "Militarism dominates and is swallowing Europe. But this militarism also bears within itself the seed of its own destruction."²²¹

Today there is all the more reason to say that the policy of nuclear arms expansion pursued by the US and other imperialists is dominating and swallowing North America and Western Europe, but that this policy, this new militarism, bears within itself the seed of the destruction of the imperialist system.

It can therefore be seen that the policy of nuclear arms expansion pursued by the US imperialists and their partners is bound to be self-defeating. If they dare to use nuclear weapons in war, the result will be their own destruction.

What should one conclude from all this? Contrary to the pronouncements of Togliatti and other comrades about the "total destruction" of mankind, the only possible conclusions are:

First, mankind will destroy nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons will not destroy mankind.

²²¹ F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 184-185.

Second, mankind will destroy the cannibal system of imperialism, the imperialist system will not destroy mankind.

Togliatti and other comrades hold that with the appearance of nuclear weapons “the destiny of humanity today is uncertain.”²²² They hold that with the existence of nuclear weapons and the threat of a nuclear war, there is no longer any point in talking about the choice of a social system. If one follows their argument, then what happens to the law of social development according to which the capitalist system will inevitably be replaced by the socialist and communist system? And what happens to the truth elucidated by Lenin—that imperialism is parasitic, decaying and moribund capitalism? Does not their view represent real “fatalism,” “skepticism” and “pessimism?”

We stated in the article “Long Live Leninism!”:

As long as the people of all countries enhance their awareness and are fully prepared, with the socialist camp also possessing modern weapons, it is certain that if the US or other imperialists refuse to reach an agreement on the banning of atomic and nuclear weapons and should dare to fly in the face of the will of all the peoples by launching a war using atomic and nuclear weapons, the result will only be the very speedy destruction of these monsters themselves encircled by the peoples of the world, and certainly not the so-called annihilation of mankind. We consistently oppose the launching of criminal wars by imperialism, because imperialist war would impose enormous sacrifices upon the peoples of various countries (including the peoples of the United States and other imperialist countries). But should the imperialists impose such sacrifices on the peoples of various countries, we believe that, just as the experience of the Russian revolution and the Chinese revolution shows, those sacrifices would be rewarded. On the ruins of imperialism, the victorious people would very swiftly create a civilization thousands of times higher than the capitalist system and a truly beautiful future for themselves.

Is this not the truth?

²²² Political resolution of the Xth Congress of the CPI.

During the past few years, however, some self-styled Marxist-Leninists have wantonly distorted and condemned these Marxist-Leninist theses, stubbornly describing the ruins of imperialism as “the ruins of mankind” and equating the destiny of the imperialist system with that of mankind. In fact, this view is a defense of the imperialist system. If these people had read some of the Marxist-Leninist classics, it would have been clear to them that building a new system on the ruins of the old was a formulation used by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Engels said in *Anti-Dühring*, “The bourgeoisie broke up the feudal system and built upon its ruins the capitalist order of society...”²²³ Did the ruins of the feudal system, which Engels spoke of, mean the “ruins of mankind?”

In his article *The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, written in December 1919, Lenin spoke of the proletariat “organizing socialism on the ruins of capitalism.”²²⁴ Did the ruins of capitalism, which Lenin mentioned, mean the “ruins of mankind?”

To describe the ruins of the old systems mentioned by Marxist-Leninists as the “ruins of mankind” is to substitute frivolous quibbling for serious debate. Can this be the non-“discordant note” which Togliatti and the other comrades want? Is this the polemic carried on in an “admissible tone” which they demand? In fact, at the time of the collapse of Italian fascism, Comrade Togliatti himself said, “A great task rests upon us: we should establish a new Italy on the ruins of fascism, on the ruins of reactionary tyranny.”²²⁵

Every serious Marxist-Leninist must consider the possibility of the imperialists adopting the most criminal means to inflict the heaviest sacrifices and the keenest suffering on the people of all countries. The purpose of such consideration is to awaken the people, mobilize and organize them more effectively, and to find the correct course of struggle for liberation and a way to deliver mankind from suffering, a way to win peace in the face of the threats of imperialism, and a way effective in preventing a nuclear war.

That no socialist country will ever start an aggressive war is known by everybody, even by the US imperialists as well as by all the other imperialists and reactionaries. The national defense of each socialist country is designed

²²³ F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, *ibid.*, p. 295.

²²⁴ V. I. Lenin, “The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

²²⁵ Quoted in *The Italian Communist Party*, published by the CPI in May 1950.

for protection against external aggression, and absolutely not for attacking other countries. If the aggressors should impose a war on a socialist country, then the war waged by the socialist country would above all be a war of self-defense.

Possession of nuclear weapons by the socialist countries has a purely defensive purpose, the purpose of preventing the imperialists from unleashing nuclear war. Therefore, with nuclear superiority in their hands, the socialist countries will never attack other countries with such weapons; they will not permit themselves to launch such attacks, nor will they have any need to do so. Being firmly opposed to the policy of nuclear blackmail, the socialist countries advocate for the total banning and destruction of nuclear weapons. Such is the attitude, line and policy of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China on the question of nuclear weapons. Such is the attitude, line and policy of all Marxist-Leninists. The modern revisionists deliberately distort our attitude, line and policy on this question and fabricate mean and vulgar slanders and lies; their purpose is to cover up the nuclear blackmail of the imperialists and to conceal their own adventurism and capitulationism on the question of nuclear weapons. It must be pointed out that adventurism and capitulationism on this question are very dangerous and are an expression of the worst kind of irresponsibility.

A STRANGE FORMULATION

In accordance with the nature of their social system, socialist countries give sympathy and support to all oppressed peoples and oppressed nations in their struggles for liberation. But socialist countries will never launch external wars as a substitute for revolutionary struggles by the peoples of other countries. The emancipation of the people of each country is their own task—this is the firm standpoint held since the time of Marx by all true Communists, including the Communists who wield state power. It is identical with the standpoint consistently advocated by all Marxist-Leninists that “revolution cannot be exported or imported.”

If the people of any country do not want a revolution, no one can impose it from without; where there is no revolutionary crisis and the conditions for a revolution are not ripe, nobody can create a revolution. And of course, if the people in any country desire a revolution and themselves start a revolu-

tion, no one can prevent them from making it, just as no one could prevent the revolutions in Cuba, in Algeria or in southern Vietnam.

Togliatti and other comrades say that peaceful coexistence implies “excluding... the possibility of foreign intervention to ‘export’ either counter-revolution or revolution.”²²⁶ We should like to ask: When you talk about “export of revolution” by foreign countries, do you mean that the socialist countries want to export revolution? This is just what the imperialists and reactionaries have been alleging all along. Should a Communist talk in such terms? As for the imperialist countries, they have always exported counter-revolution. Can anyone name an imperialist country which has not done so? Can we forget that the imperialists launched direct intervention against the Great October Revolution and the Chinese revolution? Can anyone deny that the US imperialists are still forcibly occupying our territory of Taiwan today? Can anyone deny that the US imperialists have all along been intervening in the Cuban revolution? Is not US imperialism playing the international gendarme and trying its utmost to export counterrevolution to all parts of the world and interfering in the internal affairs of the other countries in the capitalist world?

Togliatti and other comrades make no distinction between countries whose social systems differ in nature; they do not understand the Marxist-Leninist view that “revolution cannot be exported or imported”; and in discussing peaceful coexistence they ignore the imperialists’ incessant export of counter-revolution and speak of “export of counter-revolution” and “export of revolution” in the same breath. This strange formulation cannot but be considered an error of principle.

THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS’ BASIC THESES ON THE QUESTION OF WAR AND PEACE

On the question of war and peace, the Chinese Communists, now as always, uphold the views of Lenin.

In the above quotations, Lenin pointed out that proletarian parties “unreservedly condemn war” and “have always condemned wars between nations.” But Lenin always maintained that unjust wars must be opposed and that just wars must be supported; he never indiscriminately opposed all wars. There are people today who unblushingly compare themselves to

²²⁶ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

Lenin and allege that Lenin, and Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, too, opposed war in the same way as they do. They have emasculated Lenin's theories and policies on the question of war and peace. It is common knowledge that during World War I, Lenin resolutely opposed the imperialist war. At the same time he maintained that once war broke out among the imperialist countries, the proletariat and other working people of these countries should turn the imperialist war into just revolutionary wars inside the imperialist countries, i.e., into just revolutionary wars of the proletariat and other working people against the imperialists of their own countries. The day after the outbreak of the October Revolution, the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, under the chairmanship of Lenin, adopted the famous Decree on Peace. This Decree was an appeal to the international proletariat, and particularly to the class-conscious workers of Britain, France and Germany, trusting that they "will understand the duty that now faces them of saving mankind from the horrors of war and its consequences, that these workers, by comprehensive, determined, and supremely vigorous action, will help us to bring to a successful conclusion the cause of peace, and at the same time the cause of the emancipation of the toiling and exploited masses of the population from all forms of slavery and all forms of exploitation."²²⁷ The Decree pointed out that the Soviet government "considers it the greatest of crimes against humanity to continue this war over the issue of how to divide among the strong and rich nations the weak nationalities they have conquered, and solemnly announces its determination immediately to sign terms of peace to stop this war on the conditions indicated, which are equally just for all nationalities without exception."²²⁸ This Decree proposed by Lenin is a great document in the history of the proletarian revolution. Yet there are people today who dare to distort and mutilate it; they have tampered with Lenin's description of a war waged by imperialist countries to divide the world and oppress weak nations as constituting the greatest of crimes against humanity, and deliberately twisted it into "war is the greatest of crimes against humanity." These people portray Lenin, the great proletarian revolutionary, the great Marxist, as a bourgeois pacifist. They brazenly distort Lenin, distort Leninism, distort

²²⁷ V. I. Lenin, "Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*

history, and yet they presumptuously assert that others “do not understand the substance of the Marxist doctrine of revolutionary struggle.” Isn’t this strange and monstrous?

We Chinese Communists are being abused by the modern revisionists because we oppose all the ridiculous arguments that are used to distort Leninism and because we insist on restoring the original features of Lenin’s theory on the question of war and peace.

Marxist-Leninists hold that, in order to defend world peace and prevent a new world war, we must rely on the unity and growing strength of the socialist countries, on the struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples, on the struggles of the international proletariat, and on the struggles of all the peace-loving countries and people in the world. This is the correct line for defending world peace for the people of all lands, a line which is in full accord with the Leninist theory of war and peace. Some people maliciously distort this line, calling it “a ‘theory’ to the effect that the road to victory for socialism runs through war between nations, through destruction, bloodshed and the death of millions of people.” They place the defense of world peace in opposition to the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries, and they hold that in order to have peace the people of all countries should kneel before the imperialists, and the oppressed nations and peoples should give up their struggles for liberation. Instead of fighting for world peace by relying on the united struggle of all the world’s peace-loving forces, all these people do is to beg the imperialists, headed by the United States, for the gift of world peace. This so-called theory, this line of theirs, is absolutely wrong; it is anti-Leninist.

The Chinese Communists’ basic views on the question of war and peace and our differences with Togliatti and other comrades on this question were made clear in the *Renmin Ribao* editorial of December 31, 1962. We said in that editorial:

On the question of how to avert world war and safeguard world peace, the Communist Party of China has consistently stood for the resolute exposure of imperialism, for strengthening the socialist camp, for firm support of the national-liberation movements and the peoples’ revolutionary struggles, for the broadest alliance of all the peace-loving countries and people of the world, and at the same time, for taking full advantage

of the contradictions among our enemies, and for utilizing the method of negotiation as well as other forms of struggle. The aim of this stand is precisely the effective prevention of world war and preservation of world peace. This stand fully conforms with Marxism-Leninism and with the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. It is the correct policy for preventing world war and defending world peace. We persist in this correct policy precisely because we are deeply convinced that it is possible to prevent world war by relying on the combined struggle of all the forces mentioned above. How then can this stand be described as lacking faith in the possibility of averting world war? How can it be called “warlike?” It would simply result in a phoney peace or bring about an actual war for the people of the whole world if you prettify imperialism, pin your hopes of peace on imperialism, take an attitude of passivity or opposition towards the national-liberation movements and the peoples’ revolutionary struggles and bow down and surrender to imperialism, as advocated by those who attack the Communist Party of China. This policy is wrong and all Marxist-Leninists, all revolutionary people, all peace-loving people must resolutely oppose it.

Here let us recapitulate our basic theses on the question of war and peace:

First, we have always held that the forces of war and aggression headed by US imperialism are preparing in earnest for a third world war and that the danger of war exists. But in the last ten years or so, the world balance of forces has changed more and more in favor of socialism and in favor of the struggles for national liberation, people’s democracy and the defense of world peace. The people are the decisive factor. Imperialism and the reactionaries are isolated. By relying on the unity and the struggles of the people, and on the correct policies of the socialist countries and of the proletarian parties of various countries, it is possible to avert a new world war and to avert a nuclear war, and it is possible to achieve an agreement for the total banning of nuclear weapons.

Second, if the people of the world wish to be successful in preserving world peace, preventing a new world war and preventing nuclear war, they

must support one another, form the broadest possible united front, and unite all the forces that can be united, including the people of the United States, to oppose the policies of war and aggression of the imperialist bloc headed by the US reactionaries.

Third, the socialist countries stand for and adhere to the policy of peaceful coexistence with countries having other social systems, and develop friendly relations and carry on trade on the basis of equality with them. In pursuing the policy of peaceful coexistence, the socialist countries oppose the use of force to settle disputes between states and do not interfere in the internal affairs of any other country. Some people say that peaceful coexistence will result in the transformation of the social system in all the capitalist countries, and that it is “the road to world socialism.”²²⁹ Others say that the policy of peaceful coexistence is “the most advanced form of struggle against imperialism and for the peoples’ liberation”²³⁰ by all the oppressed peoples and nations. These people have completely distorted Lenin’s policy of peaceful coexistence by jumbling together the question of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, the question of class struggle in capitalist countries and the question of the struggles of the oppressed nations for liberation.

Fourth, we have always believed in the necessity of constantly maintaining sharp vigilance against the danger of imperialist aggression on the socialist countries. We have always believed, too, that it is possible for the socialist countries to reach agreement through peaceful negotiations and make the necessary compromises with the imperialist countries on some issues, not excluding important ones. However, as Comrade Mao Zedong has said:

Such compromise does not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in those countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions.²³¹

Fifth, the sharp contradictions among the imperialist powers exist objectively and are irreconcilable. Among the imperialist countries and blocs,

²²⁹ Todor Zhivkov, “Peace: Key Problem of Today,” *World Marxist Review*, No. 8, 1960.

²³⁰ “Groundless Polemics of the Chinese Communists,” *L’Unita*, December 31, 1962.

²³¹ Mao Zedong, “Some Points in Appraisal of the Present International Situation” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

clashes, big and small, direct and indirect and in one form or another, are bound to occur. They arise from the actual interests of the imperialists and are determined by the inherent nature of imperialism. To claim that the possibility of clashes among the imperialist countries arising from their actual interests has disappeared under the new historical conditions is tantamount to saying that imperialism has undergone a complete change, and is, in fact, to embellish imperialism.

Sixth, since capitalist-imperialism and the system of exploitation are the source of war, no one can guarantee that imperialists and reactionaries will not launch wars of aggression against the oppressed nations, or wars against the oppressed people of their own countries. On the other hand, no one can prevent the awakened oppressed nations and peoples from rising to wage revolutionary wars.

Seventh, the axiom that “war is the continuation of politics by other means,” which was affirmed and stressed by Lenin, remains valid today. The social system of the capitalist-imperialist countries is fundamentally different from that of the socialist countries, and their domestic and foreign policies are likewise fundamentally different from those of the socialist countries. From this it follows that the capitalist-imperialist countries and the socialist countries must take fundamentally different stands on the question of war and peace. As far as the capitalist imperialist countries are concerned, whether they launch wars or profess peace, their aim is to pursue or to maintain their imperialist interests. Imperialist war is the continuation of imperialist peacetime politics, and imperialist peace is the continuation of imperialist wartime politics. The bourgeois pacifists and the opportunists have always denied this point. As Lenin said, “The pacifists of both shades have never understood that ‘war is the continuation of the politics of peace, and peace is the continuation of the politics of war.’”²³²

Eighth, the era of perpetual peace for mankind will come; the era when all wars will be eradicated will come. We are striving for its advent. But this great era will come only after, and not before, mankind has eradicated the system of capitalist-imperialism. As the Moscow Statement puts it, “*The victory of socialism all over the world will completely remove the social and national causes of all wars.*”

²³² V. I. Lenin, “Bourgeois Pacifism and Socialist Pacifism” in *On War and Peace*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1970, p. 95.

These are our basic theses on the question of war and peace.

Our theses are derived from analysis, based on the Marxist materialist conception of history, of a host of phenomena objectively existing in the world, of the extremely complex political and economic relationships among different countries, and of the specific conditions in the new world epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Revolution. These theses are correct in theory and, moreover, they have been repeatedly tested in practice. Since the modern revisionists and their followers have no way of disproving these theses, they have freely resorted to distortions and lies in their attempt to demolish the truth.

But how can the truth ever be demolished? Should it not rather be said that those trying to do this will themselves, sooner or later, be demolished by the truth?

At the present time, certain self-styled “creative Marxist-Leninists” believe that world history moves to the waving of their baton, and not according to the objective laws of society. This reminds us of the words of the famous French philosopher Diderot, as quoted by Lenin in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*:

There was a moment of insanity when the sentient piano imagined that it was the only piano in the world, and that the whole harmony of the universe took place within it.²³³

Let those historical idealists who think that they are everything and that everything is contained in their own subjectivism carefully think over this passage!

V. THE STATE AND REVOLUTION

WHAT IS THE “POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION” OF COMRADE TOGLIATTI’S
“THEORY OF STRUCTURAL REFORM?”

Togliatti and some other comrades describe their “fundamental line” of “structural reform” as “common to the whole international communist movement”;²³⁴ they describe their thesis of structural reform as “a principle

²³³ V. I. Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1972, p. 29.

²³⁴ Togliatti’s concluding speech at the Xth Congress of the CPI.

of the world strategy of the working class and communist movement in the present situation.”²³⁵

It seems that Togliatti and other comrades not only want to thrust the “Italian road” on the working class and working people of Italy but to impose it on the people of the whole capitalist world. For they consider their proposed Italian road to be “the road of advance to socialism” for the whole capitalist world today, and apparently the one and only such road. Comrade Togliatti and certain other Italian comrades have an extraordinarily high opinion of themselves.

In order to make the issue clear, it may be useful first to introduce the reader to the main contents of their proposed Italian road and structural reform.

- (1) Is the most fundamental thesis of Marxism-Leninism that the state apparatus of bourgeois dictatorship has to be smashed and a state apparatus of proletarian dictatorship established, still wholly valid? In their opinion, this is “a subject for discussion.” They say that “it is evident that we correct something of this position, taking into account the changes which have taken place and which are still in the process of being realized in the world.”²³⁶
- (2) “Today, the question of doing what was done in Russia is not posed to the Italian workers.”²³⁷ Comrade Togliatti expressed this view in April 1944 and reaffirmed it as being “programmatic” in his report to the Tenth Congress of the CPI.
- (3) The Italian working class can “organize itself into the ruling class within the limits of the constitutional system.”²³⁸
- (4) The Italian Constitution “assigns to the forces of labor a new and pre-eminent position” and “permits and envisages structural modifica-

²³⁵ Togliatti’s speech at the April 1962 session of the Central Committee of the CPI.

²³⁶ Togliatti, “The Italian Road to Socialism,” report to the June 1956 session of the Central Committee of the CPI.

²³⁷ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

²³⁸ Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the CPI, adopted by the VIIth Congress of the CPI in December 1956.

tions.” “The struggle to give a new socialist content to Italian democracy has ample room for development within our Constitution.”²³⁹

- (5) “We can talk of the possibility of the thorough utilization of legal means and also of Parliament to carry out serious social transformations...”²⁴⁰ “Full power should be given to Parliament, allowing it to carry out not only legislative tasks, but also the functions of direction of and control over the activities of the Executive...”²⁴¹ And they talk of the demand for “the effective extension of the powers of Parliament to the economic field.”²⁴²
- (6) “The building of a new democratic regime advancing towards socialism is closely connected with the formation of a new historical grouping, which, under the leadership of the working class, would fight to change the structure of society and which would be the bearer of an intellectual and moral as well as a political revolution.”²⁴³
- (7) “The destruction of the most backward and burdensome structures in Italian society and the beginning of their transformation in a democratic and socialist sense cannot and should not be postponed till the day when the working class and its allies win power...”²⁴⁴
- (8) The nationalized economy, i.e., state-monopoly capital, in Italy can stand “in opposition to the monopolies,”²⁴⁵ can be “the expression of the popular masses”²⁴⁶ and can become “a more effective instrument for opposing monopolistic development.”²⁴⁷ It is possible “to break up and abolish the monopoly ownership of the major productive forces and transform it into collective ownership... through nationalization.”²⁴⁸

²³⁹ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

²⁴⁰ Togliatti’s report to the March 1956 session of the Central Committee of the CPI.

²⁴¹ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

²⁴² Political theses approved by the IXth Congress of the CPI.

²⁴³ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

²⁴⁴ Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the CPI.

²⁴⁵ A. Pesenti, “Is It a Question of the Structure or of the Superstructure?” in *Rinascita*, May 19, 1962.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁷ A. Pesenti, “Direct or Indirect Forms of State Intervention,” in *Rinascita*, June 9, 1962.

²⁴⁸ Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the CPI.

- (9) State intervention in economic life can “fulfil the needs for a democratic development of the economy”²⁴⁹ and can be turned into an “instrument of struggle against the power of big capital in order to hit, restrict and break up the rule of the big monopoly groups.”²⁵⁰
- (10) Under capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship, “the concepts of planning and programming the economy, considered at one time a socialist prerogative”²⁵¹ can be accepted. The working class, by “taking part in formulating and executing the planning policy in full realization of its own ideals and autonomy, with the strength of its own unity,”²⁵² can turn planning policy into “a means of satisfying the needs of men and of the national collective.”²⁵³

In short, the Italian road and the structural reform of Togliatti and other comrades amount to this—politically, while preserving the bourgeois dictatorship, “progressively to change the internal balance and structure of the state” and thus “impose the rise of new classes to its leadership” through the “legal” means of bourgeois democracy, constitution and parliament (as to what is meant by “new classes,” their exposition has always been ambiguous);²⁵⁴ and economically, while preserving the capitalist system, gradually to “restrict” and “break up” monopoly capital through “nationalization,” “programming” and “state intervention.” In other words, it is possible to attain socialism in Italy through bourgeois dictatorship, without going through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Togliatti and other comrades consider their ideas to be “a positive contribution to the deepening and development of Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary doctrine of the working class.”²⁵⁵ Unfortunately there is nothing new in their ideas; they are very old and very stale; they are the bourgeois socialism which Marx and Engels so relentlessly refuted long ago.

The bourgeois socialism Marx and Engels criticized belonged to a period before monopoly capitalism had emerged. If Togliatti and the other com-

²⁴⁹ Togliatti’s speech at the April 1962 session of the Central Committee of the CPI.

²⁵⁰ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

²⁵¹ Ibid.

²⁵² Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

²⁵³ Ibid.

²⁵⁴ Ibid.

²⁵⁵ Togliatti, “Let Us Lead the Discussion Back to Its Real Limit.”

rades have made any “positive contribution,” it is to the development, not of Marxism, but of bourgeois socialism. They have developed pre-monopoly bourgeois socialism into monopoly bourgeois socialism. But this is the very development which the Tito clique proposed long ago, and Togliatti and the other comrades have taken it over after their “study and profound understanding” of what the Tito clique has done and is doing.

COMPARE THIS WITH LENINISM

Whether it is possible to pass over to and realize socialism before overthrowing the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat has always been the most fundamental question at issue between Marxist-Leninists and every kind of opportunist and revisionist. In *The State and Revolution* and *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, two great works familiar to all Marxist-Leninists, Lenin comprehensively and penetratingly elucidated this fundamental question, defended and developed revolutionary Marxism and thoroughly exposed and repudiated the distortions of Marxism by the opportunists and revisionists.

As a matter of fact, “structural reform,” the “change in the internal balance of the state” and other ideas held by Togliatti and the other comrades are all ideas of Kautsky, which Lenin criticized in *The State and Revolution*. Comrade Togliatti says, “The Chinese comrades want to scare us by reminding us of Kautsky, with whose views our policy has nothing in common.”²⁵⁶ Are we trying to scare Comrade Togliatti and the others? Has their policy nothing in common with Kautsky’s views? As they did, we ask whether they will “permit us to remind them” to re-read carefully *The State and Revolution* and Lenin’s other works.

Togliatti and the other comrades refuse to pay attention to the fundamental difference between proletarian socialist revolution and bourgeois revolution.

Lenin said:

The difference between socialist revolution and bourgeois revolution lies precisely in the fact that the latter finds ready forms of

²⁵⁶ Togliatti, “Let Us Lead the Discussion Back to Its Real Limit.”

capitalist relationships; while the Soviet power—the proletarian power—does not inherit such ready-made relationships.²⁵⁷

All state power in class society is designed to safeguard a particular social and economic system, that is, particular relations of production. As Lenin put it, “Politics are the concentrated expression of economics.”²⁵⁸ Every social and economic system invariably has a corresponding political system which serves it and clears away the obstacles to its development.

Historically speaking, the slave-owners, the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie all had to establish themselves politically as the ruling class and take state power into their own hands in order to make their relations of production prevail over all others and to consolidate and develop these relations of production.

A fundamental point differentiating revolutions of exploiting classes from proletarian revolution is that, before the seizure of state power by any of the three great exploiting classes—the slave-owners, the landlords or the bourgeoisie—the relations of production of slavery, feudalism or capitalism already existed in society, and in certain cases had become fairly mature. But before the proletariat seizes power, socialist relations of production do not exist in society. The reason is obvious. A new form of private ownership can come into being spontaneously on the basis of an old one, whereas socialist public ownership of the means of production can never come into being spontaneously on the basis of capitalist private ownership.

Let us compare the ideas and program of Togliatti and the other comrades with Leninism.

Contrary to Leninism, Togliatti and the other comrades maintain that socialist relations of production can gradually come into being without a socialist revolution and proletarian state power, and that the basic economic interests of the proletariat can be satisfied without a political revolution which replaces the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the starting-point of the “Italian road” and the “theory of structural reform” of Comrade Togliatti and the others.

²⁵⁷ V. I. Lenin, “Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the RCP(B), Report on War and Peace” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII.

²⁵⁸ V. I. Lenin, “Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXII.

Who are right? Marx, Engels and Lenin, or Togliatti and the other comrades? Which ones “lack a sense of reality?” The Marxist-Leninists, or Togliatti and the other comrades with their ideas and program?

Let us look at the reality in Italy.

Italy is a country with a population of fifty million. According to available statistics, Italy now has, in a period of peace, several hundred thousand government officials, over four hundred thousand troops in the standing army, nearly eighty thousand gendarmes, about one hundred thousand policemen, over one thousand two hundred law courts of all levels, and nearly one thousand prisons; this does not include the secret machinery of suppression with its armed personnel. In addition, there are US military bases and US armed forces stationed in Italy.

In their Theses, Togliatti and the other comrades delight in talking about Italy’s democracy, constitution, parliament and so forth, but they do not use the class point of view to analyze the army, the gendarmes, the police, the law courts, the prisons and the other instruments of violence in present-day Italy. Whom do these instruments of violence protect and whom do they suppress? Do they protect the proletariat and the other working people and suppress the monopoly capitalists, or vice versa? When talking about the state system, a Marxist-Leninist must answer this question and not evade it.

Let us see what these instruments of violence are used for in Italy. Here are a few illustrations.

In the three years from 1948 to 1950, the Italian government killed or injured more than three thousand people and arrested more than ninety thousand in the course of suppressing the mass opposition of the people.

In July 1960, the Tambroni government killed eleven people, injured one thousand and arrested another thousand, while suppressing the anti-fascist movement of the Italian working people.

In 1962 after the so-called center-left government of Fanfani was formed, there were a succession of incidents as the government suppressed strikes or mass demonstrations—in Ceccano in May, in Turin in July, in Bari in August, in Milan in October and in Rome in November. In the Rome incident alone, dozens of people were injured, and six hundred arrested.

These are just a few instances, but do they not suffice to expose Italian democracy for what it really is? In an Italy with a powerful state machine,

both open and secret, for suppressing the people, is it possible not to describe Italian democracy as the democracy, i.e., the dictatorship of the Italian monopoly capitalist class?

Is it possible for the working class and all the working people of Italy to participate in the formulation of the Italian government's domestic and foreign policy under the Italian democracy of which Togliatti and the other comrades boast? If you, Togliatti and the other comrades, think it possible, will you take responsibility for the numerous crimes of suppression of the people committed by the Italian government, for that government's agreement to let the United States build military bases in Italy, for its participation in NATO, etc.? Naturally, you will say that you cannot be held responsible for these reactionary domestic and foreign policies of the Italian government. But since you claim a share in policy-making, why are you unable to achieve the slightest change in these most fundamental policies of the Italian government?

To laud "democracy" in general terms, without making any distinction concerning the class character of democracy, is to sing the tune which the heroes of the Second International and the Right-wing social-democratic leaders played to death. Is it not strange for the self-styled Marxist-Leninists of today to claim these worn-out tunes as their own new creations?

Perhaps Comrade Togliatti does want to differentiate himself a little from the social-democrats. He maintains that as far as "abstract argument" is concerned, one may acknowledge the class character of the state and the bourgeois character of the present Italian state, but that "putting it in concrete terms" is another matter. In terms of "concrete argument," he maintains that "starting from the present state structure... by realizing the profound reforms envisaged by the Constitution, it would be possible... to obtain such results as would change the present power grouping and create the conditions for another grouping, of which the laboring classes constitute a part and in which they would assume the function which is their due..." and thus to make Italy "advance towards socialism in democracy and peace."²⁵⁹ When translated into language intelligible to ordinary people, these vague phrases of Comrade Togliatti mean that the nature of the state machine of the Italian monopoly capitalists can be gradually changed without a people's revolution in Italy.

²⁵⁹ Cf., Togliatti's report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

Comrade Togliatti's "concrete argument" is at loggerheads with his "abstract argument." In his "abstract argument" he comes a little closer to Marxism-Leninism, but when he gives the "concrete argument" he is far removed from Marxism-Leninism. Perhaps he thinks this is the only way to avoid being "dogmatic!"

When Togliatti and the other comrades are assessed in the light of their "concrete argument," the hairline between them and the social-democrats vanishes.

Today, when certain people are doing their utmost to adulterate the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state and revolution, and when the modern revisionists are usurping the name of Lenin in their frenzied attacks on Leninism, we would like to draw attention to the following two paragraphs from Lenin's speech at the First Congress of the Communist International in 1919:

The main thing that socialists fail to understand and that constitutes their short-sightedness in matters of theory, their subservience to bourgeois prejudices and their political betrayal of the proletariat is that in capitalist society, whenever there is any serious aggravation of the class struggle intrinsic to that society, there can be no alternative but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dreams of some third way are reactionary petit-bourgeois lamentations. That is borne out by more than a century of development of bourgeois democracy and the labor movement in all the advanced countries, and notably by the experience of the past five years. This is also borne out by the science of political economy, by the entire content of Marxism, which reveals the economic inevitability, wherever commodity economy prevails, of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie that can only be replaced by the class which the growth of capitalism develops, multiplies, welds together and strengthens, that is, the proletarian class.

Another theoretical and political error of the socialists is their failure to understand that ever since the rudiments of democracy first appeared in antiquity, its forms inevitably changed over the centuries as one ruling class replaced another. Democracy assumed different forms and was applied in different degrees

in the ancient republics of Greece, the medieval cities and the advanced capitalist countries. It would be sheer nonsense to think that the most profound revolution in human history, the first case in the world of power being transferred from the exploiting minority to the exploited majority, could take place within the time-worn framework of the old, bourgeois, parliamentary democracy, without drastic changes, without the creation of new forms of democracy, new institutions that embody the new conditions for applying democracy, etc.²⁶⁰

Here we see that Lenin drew these clear-cut and definite conclusions on the basis of the whole of Marxist teaching, the whole experience of class struggle in capitalist society and the whole experience of the October Revolution. He held that within the old framework of bourgeois parliamentary democracy it was impossible for state power to be transferred from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat, impossible to realize the most profound revolution in human history, the socialist revolution. Have not these specific truths which Lenin expounded in 1919 been repeatedly confirmed since by the experience of every country where the socialist revolution has taken place? Has not this experience confirmed again and again that the road of the October Revolution, which Lenin led, is the common road for the emancipation of mankind?

Have not the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and the Moscow Statement of 1960 reiterated that this is the common road to socialism for the working class in all countries? Whether the working class uses peaceful or non-peaceful means depends, of course, “on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or another stage of the struggle for socialism.”²⁶¹ But, one way or the other, it is necessary to smash the old bourgeois state machine and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Instead of taking the experience of the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat or the living reality of Italian society as their starting-point, Togliatti and other comrades start from the present Italian Constitution and maintain that Italy can achieve socialism within the framework of bourgeois par-

²⁶⁰ V. I. Lenin, “First Congress of the Communist International” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVIII.

²⁶¹ See p. 489 of this volume.

liamentary democracy without smashing the old state machine. What they call the “new democratic regime” is nothing but an “extension” of bourgeois democracy. Small wonder that their “concrete argument” diverges so widely from the specific truths of Marxism-Leninism.

A MOST MARVELOUS CONSTITUTION

The Theses for the Tenth Congress of the CPI declare that “the Italian road to socialism passes through the building of the new state as described in the Constitution (a state which is profoundly different from the present regime) and the accession of the new ruling classes to its leadership.”

According to Togliatti and the other comrades, the Constitution of Italy is indeed a most marvelous one.

- (1) The Constitution of the Republic is “a unitary compact voluntarily binding on the great majority of the Italian people...”²⁶²
- (2) The Constitution of the Republic “envisages some fundamental reforms which... carry the marks of socialism.”²⁶³
- (3) The Constitution of the Republic “affirms the principle of the sovereignty of the people.”²⁶⁴
- (4) The Constitution of the Republic “proclaims it [the state] to be ‘founded on labor’”²⁶⁵ and “assigns to the forces of labor a new and pre-eminent position.”²⁶⁶
- (5) The Constitution of the Republic recognizes “the workers’ right to enter into the direction of the state.”²⁶⁷
- (6) The Constitution of the Republic “affirms the necessity of those economic and political changes which are essential for reconstructing our society and for moving it in the direction of socialism.”²⁶⁸

²⁶² Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the CPI.

²⁶³ Togliatti’s report to the March 1956 session of the Central Committee of the CPI.

²⁶⁴ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

²⁶⁵ Togliatti, “For an Italian Road to Socialism. For a Democratic Government of the Working Class,” report to the VIIth Congress of the CPI, December 1956.

²⁶⁶ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

²⁶⁷ Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the CPI.

²⁶⁸ Togliatti’s report to the VIIIth Congress of the CPI.

- (7) The Constitution of the Republic has resolved “the problem of principle of the march towards socialism within the ambit of democratic legality.”²⁶⁹
- (8) The Italian people “are able to oppose the class nature and class aims of the state while fully accepting and defending the constitutional compact.”²⁷⁰
- (9) The Italian working class “can organize itself into the ruling class within the ambit of the constitutional system.”²⁷¹
- (10) “The respect for, the defense of, and the integral application of, the Constitution of the Republic form the pivot of the whole political program of the Party.”²⁷²

We do not, of course, deny that the present Italian Constitution contains some lofty phraseology. But how can a Marxist-Leninist take the high-sounding phrases in a bourgeois constitution for reality?

There are 139 articles in the present Italian Constitution. But, in the final analysis, its class nature is most clearly represented by Article 42, which provides that “private ownership is recognized and guaranteed by law.” In terms of Italian reality, this article protects the private property of the monopoly capitalists. By virtue of this provision, the Constitution satisfies the demands of the monopoly capitalists, for their private property is made sacred and inviolable. To try to cover up the real nature of the Italian Constitution and to talk about it in superlative terms is only to deceive oneself and others.

Togliatti and the other comrades say that the Italian Constitution “bears the marks of the presence of the working class,” “affirms the principle of the sovereignty of the people” and “recognizes certain new rights for the workers.”²⁷³ When they talk about this principle and these new rights, why do they not compare the Italian Constitution with other bourgeois constitutions before drawing conclusions?

It should be noted that the provision concerning the sovereignty of the people is found in practically every bourgeois constitution since the time of

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

²⁷⁰ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI See *L'Unita* supplement, September 13, 1962.

²⁷¹ Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the CPI.

²⁷² Ibid.

²⁷³ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

the Declaration of the Rights of Man in the French bourgeois revolution of 1789, and is not peculiar to the Italian Constitution. “Sovereignty belongs to the people” was once a revolutionary slogan which the bourgeoisie pitted against the feudal monarchs’ dictum of *L’État, c’est moi*. But since the establishment of bourgeois rule this article has become a mere phrase in bourgeois constitutions to conceal the nature of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

It should be noted, too, that the Italian Constitution is not the only one that provides for civil liberties and rights. Such provisions are found in the constitutions of nearly all the capitalist countries. But after stipulating certain civil liberties and rights, some constitutions go straight on to make other provisions to restrict or cancel them. As Marx said of the French Constitution of 1848, “Every one of its provisions contains its own antithesis—utterly nullifies itself.”²⁷⁴ There are other constitutions in which such articles are not followed by restrictive or nugatory provisions, but the bourgeois governments concerned readily achieve the same purpose by other means. The Italian Constitution falls into the former category; in other words, it is a nakedly bourgeois constitution and can in no way be described as “fundamentally socialist in inspiration.”²⁷⁵

Lenin said, “Where laws are out of keeping with reality, the constitution is false; where they conform with reality, the constitution is not false.”²⁷⁶ The present Italian Constitution has both these aspects; it is both false and not false. It is not false in such matters of substance as its open protection of the interests of the bourgeoisie, and it is false in its high-sounding phrases designed to deceive the people.

At the Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of Italy held in January 1948, Comrade Togliatti said:

Our political and even constitutional future is uncertain, because one can foresee serious collisions between a progressive sector which will rely on one part of our constitutional charter, and a conservative and reactionary sector which will look for

²⁷⁴ K. Marx, F. Engels, “The Constitution of the French Republic Adopted November 4, 1848” in *Collected Works*, Vol. X, Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, p. 577.

²⁷⁵ Togliatti, “The Communists’ Struggle for Liberation, Peace and Socialism,” report to the IVth National Conference of the CPI.

²⁷⁶ V. I. Lenin, “How the Socialist-Revolutionaries Sum Up the Revolution and How the Revolution Has Summed Them Up” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XV.

instruments of resistance in the other part. Therefore it would be committing a serious political error and deceiving the people if one confined oneself to saying: "Everything is now written in the Constitution. Let us apply what is sanctioned in it, and all the aspirations of the people will be realized." That is wrong. No constitution is ever used to save liberty if it is not defended by the consciousness of the citizens, by their power, and by their ability to crush every reactionary attempt. No constitutional norm will by itself assure us of democratic and social progress if the organized and conscious forces of the laboring masses are unable to lead the whole country along this road of progress and smash the resistance of reaction.

From these words spoken by Comrade Togliatti in 1948, it would seem that he then still retained certain Marxist-Leninist views, since he admitted that the political and constitutional future of Italy was uncertain and that the Italian Constitution was two-sided in character and could be used both by the conservative reactionary forces and the progressive forces. Comrade Togliatti then held that to place blind faith in the Italian Constitution was "a serious political error" and was "deceiving the people."

In January 1955, Comrade Togliatti said in a speech, "It is clear that we have in our Constitution the lines of a program, fundamentally socialist in inspiration, which is not only a political but also an economic and social program."²⁷⁷ So by that time Comrade Togliatti had already taken the Italian Constitution as one "fundamentally socialist in inspiration."

Thus, the Togliatti of 1955 came out in opposition to the Togliatti of 1948.

From then on Comrade Togliatti has gone into a precipitous decline and has virtually deified the Italian Constitution.

In 1960 Comrade Togliatti said in his report to the Ninth Congress of the CPI:

We move on the terrain of the Constitution, and as for all those who ask us what we would do if we were in power, we remind them of the Constitution. We have written in our Programmatic Declaration, and we repeat, that it is possible to carry out "in

²⁷⁷ Togliatti's report to the IVth National Conference of the CPI.

full constitutional legality the structural reforms necessary to undermine the power of the monopolist groups, to defend the interests of all workers against the economic and financial oligarchies, to exclude these oligarchs from power, and to enable the laboring classes to accede to power.”

That is to say, Comrade Togliatti demanded that the working class and other working people of Italy must act in full legality under the bourgeois constitution and rely on it in order to “undermine the power of the monopoly groups.”

At the Tenth Congress of the CPI in 1962, Togliatti and some other comrades of the CPI reasserted that they are “firm” on this point. They declared that “the Italian road to socialism passes through the building of the new state as described in the Constitution... and the rise of the new ruling classes to its leadership”;²⁷⁸ that this road means to “demand and impose the transformation of the state in the light of the Constitution, to conquer new positions of power within the state, to push forward the socialist transformation of society”;²⁷⁹ and that it means to form “a social and political bloc capable of carrying the socialist transformation of Italy in constitutional legality.”²⁸⁰ They also proposed to “oppose the class nature and class aims of the state while fully accepting and defending the constitutional compact, developing ample and articulated action tending to push the state along the road of a progressive democracy capable of developing towards socialism.”²⁸¹

In brief, Togliatti and the other comrades intend to bring about socialism within the framework of the Italian bourgeois constitution, completely forgetting that though there are some attractively worded articles in the Italian Constitution, the monopoly capitalists can nullify the Constitution whenever they find it necessary and opportune, so long as they have control of the state machine and all the armed forces.

Marxist-Leninists must expose the hypocrisy of bourgeois constitutions, but at the same time they should utilize certain of their provisions as weapons against the bourgeoisie. In ordinary circumstances, refusal to make use of a bourgeois constitution and carry on legal struggle wherever possible is

²⁷⁸ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

²⁷⁹ Ibid.

²⁸⁰ Ibid.

²⁸¹ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI. See *L'Unita* supplement, September 13, 1962.

a mistake, which Lenin called a “Left” infantile disorder. But to call upon Communists and the people to place blind faith in a bourgeois constitution, to say that a bourgeois constitution can bring socialism to the people, and that respect for, and defense and integral application of, such a constitution “form the pivot of the whole political program of the Party”²⁸² is not just an infantile disorder but, again in Lenin’s words, mental subservience to bourgeois prejudices.

CONTEMPORARY “PARLIAMENTARY CRETINISM”

Comrade Togliatti and certain other CPI comrades admit that to realize socialism involves struggle, that socialism must be realized through struggle. But they confine the people’s struggle to the scope permitted by the bourgeois constitution and assign the primary role to parliament.

In describing how the present Italian Constitution came into existence, Comrade Togliatti said:

This was due to the fact that in 1946 the Communists rejected the road of breaking legality by desperately attempting to seize power, and on the contrary chose the road of participation in the work of the Constituent Assembly.²⁸³

That is how Comrade Togliatti came to take the parliamentary road as the one by which the working class and other working people of Italy would “advance towards socialism.”

For years Togliatti and other comrades have stressed the same point:

Today the thesis of the possibility of a march towards socialism within the forms of democratic and even parliamentary legality has been formulated in a general way... This proposition... was ours in 1944-46.²⁸⁴

It is possible to pass to socialism by taking the parliamentary road.²⁸⁵

²⁸² Elements for a Programmatic Declaration of the CPI.

²⁸³ Togliatti’s report to the March 1956 session of the Central Committee of the CPI.

²⁸⁴ Togliatti’s report to the VIIIth Congress of the CPI.

²⁸⁵ Togliatti, “Parliament and the Struggle for Socialism,” in *Pravda*, March 7, 1956.

Here we should like to discuss with Togliatti and the other comrades the question of whether the transition to socialism can be brought about through parliamentary forms.

The question must be made clear. We have always held that taking part in parliamentary struggle is one of the methods of legal struggle which the working class should utilize in certain conditions. To refuse to utilize parliamentary struggle when it is necessary, but instead to play at or prattle about revolution, is something that all Marxist-Leninists resolutely oppose. On this question, we have always adhered to the whole of Lenin's theory as expounded in his *"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder*. But some people deliberately distort our views. They say that we deny the necessity of all parliamentary struggle and that we deny that there are twists and turns in the development of the revolution. They ascribe to us the view that some fine morning the people's revolutions will suddenly come in various countries. Or they assert, as Comrade Togliatti does in his reply of January 10 this year to our article, that we want the Italian comrades to "confine themselves to preaching and waiting for the great day of revolution." Of late such distortion of the arguments of the other side in the discussion has virtually become the favorite trick of the self-styled Marxist-Leninists in dealing with the Chinese Communists.

It may be asked: What are our differences with Comrade Togliatti and the others on the proper attitude towards bourgeois parliaments?

First, we hold that all bourgeois parliaments, including the present Italian parliament, have a class nature and serve as ornaments for bourgeois dictatorship. As Lenin put it:

Take any parliamentary country, from America to Switzerland, from France to England, Norway and so forth—in these countries the real business of 'state' is performed behind the scenes and is carried on by the departments, chancelleries and the General Staffs.²⁸⁶

The more highly [bourgeois] democracy is developed, the *more* the bourgeois parliaments are subjected by the stock exchange and the bankers.²⁸⁷

²⁸⁶ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 47.

²⁸⁷ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, p. 24.

Secondly, we are for utilizing parliamentary struggle, but against spreading illusions, against “parliamentary cretinism.” Again, as Lenin said, political parties of the working class “stand for utilizing the parliamentary struggle, for participating in parliament; but they ruthlessly expose ‘parliamentary cretinism,’ that is, the belief that the parliamentary struggle is the *sole or under all circumstances the main* form of the political struggle.”²⁸⁸

Thirdly, we are for utilizing the platform of the bourgeois parliament to expose the festering sores in bourgeois society and also to expose the fraud of the bourgeois parliament. For its own interests, the bourgeoisie under certain conditions admits representatives of the working class party to its parliament; at the same time this is a method by which it tries to deceive, corrupt and even buy over certain representatives and leaders of the workers. Therefore, in waging the parliamentary struggle the political party of the working class must be highly vigilant and must at all times maintain its political independence.

On the three points just mentioned, Togliatti and the other comrades have completely cast away the Leninist stand. Regarding parliament as being above classes, they exaggerate the role of the bourgeois parliament for no valid reason and see it as the only road for achieving socialism in Italy.

Togliatti and other comrades have become thoroughly obsessed with the Italian parliament.

They hold that given an “honest electoral law” and provided that “in parliament a majority is formed, which is conformable to the will of the people,”²⁸⁹ it is possible to carry out “profound social reforms”²⁹⁰ and “change the present relations of production, and consequently also the big property regime.”²⁹¹

Can things really happen that way?

No. Things can only happen like this: So long as the military-bureaucratic state machine of the bourgeoisie still exists, for the proletariat and its reliable allies to win a parliamentary majority under normal conditions and in accordance with bourgeois electoral law is something either impossible or in no way to be depended upon. After World War II, the communist

²⁸⁸ V. I. Lenin, “The Unity Congress of the RSDLP” in *Collected Works*, Vol. X.

²⁸⁹ Togliatti, “Parliament and the Struggle for Socialism.”

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁹¹ Political theses approved by the IXth Congress of the CPI.

and workers' parties in many capitalist countries held seats in parliament, in some cases many seats. In every case, however, the bourgeoisie used various measures to prevent the Communists from gaining a parliamentary majority—nullifying elections, dissolving parliament, revising the electoral laws or the constitution, or outlawing the Communist Party. For quite a while after World War II, the Communist Party of France had the largest popular vote and parliamentary representation of any party in the country, but the French monopoly capitalists revised the electoral law and the constitution itself and deprived the French Communist Party of many of its seats.

Can the working class become the ruling class simply by relying on votes in elections? History records no case of an oppressed class becoming the ruling class through the vote. The bourgeoisie preaches a lot about parliamentary democracy and elections, but there was no country where the bourgeoisie replaced the feudal lords and became the ruling class simply by a vote. It is even less likely for the proletariat to become the ruling class through elections. As Lenin put it in his *Greetings to Italian, French, and German Communists*:

Only scoundrels or simpletons can think that the proletariat must win the majority in elections carried out under the yoke of the bourgeoisie, under the yoke of wage-slavery, and that only after this must it win power. This is the height of folly or hypocrisy; it is substituting voting under the old system and with the old power, for class struggle and revolution.²⁹²

History does tell us that when a workers' party abandons its proletarian revolutionary program, degenerates into an appendage of the bourgeoisie, and converts itself into a political party that is a tool of the bourgeoisie, the latter may permit it to have a temporary parliamentary majority and to form a government. This was the case with the British Labour Party. It was also the case with the social-democratic parties of several countries after they had betrayed their original socialist revolutionary programs. But this sort of thing can only maintain and consolidate the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and cannot in the least alter the position of the proletariat as an oppressed and exploited class. The British Labour Party has been in power three times since 1924, but imperialist Britain is still imperialist Britain, and, as before,

²⁹² V. I. Lenin, "Greetings to Italian, French and German Communists" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

the British working class has no power. We would ask Comrade Togliatti whether he is thinking of following in the footsteps of the British Labour Party and of the social-democratic parties in other countries.

The Theses for the Tenth Congress of the CPI declare that parliament must be given full powers to legislate and to direct and control the activities of the executive. We do not know who will give parliament the powers certain leaders of the Italian Communist Party desire for it. Are they to be given by the bourgeoisie or by Togliatti and the other comrades? In fact, the powers of a bourgeois parliament are given it by the bourgeoisie. Their extent is decided by the bourgeoisie according to its interests. No matter how much power the bourgeoisie allows parliament, the latter can never become the real organ of power of the bourgeois state. The real organ of power, by means of which the bourgeoisie rules over the people, is the bureaucratic and military apparatus of the bourgeoisie, and not its parliament.

If Communists abandon the road of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, pin all their hopes on winning a majority in the bourgeois parliament by a vote and wait to be given powers to lead the state, what difference is there between their road and Kautsky's parliamentary road? Kautsky said:

The aim of our political struggle remains, as hitherto, the conquest of state power by winning a majority in parliament and by converting parliament into the master of the government.²⁹³

Lenin said in criticism of this Kautskian road, "This is nothing but the purest and the most vulgar opportunism."²⁹⁴

In March 1956, when talking about "utilization of legal means and also of parliament," Comrade Togliatti stated, "What we do today would have been neither possible nor correct thirty years ago, it would have been pure opportunism, as we described it at that time."²⁹⁵

What grounds are there for saying that what was neither possible nor correct thirty years ago has become so today? What grounds are there for saying that what was then pure opportunism has now suddenly become pure Marxism-Leninism? Comrade Togliatti's words are in fact an admission

²⁹³ Karl Kautsky, "New Tactics," in *Neue Zeit*, No. 46, 1912.

²⁹⁴ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

²⁹⁵ Togliatti's report to the March 1956 session of the Central Committee of the CPI.

that the road he and the other comrades are travelling is the same as that taken by the opportunists in the past.

However, when it was pointed out that they were travelling this parliamentary road, Comrade Togliatti changed his tune, saying in June 1956:

I would like to correct those comrades who have said—as if it were undoubtedly a peaceful matter—that the Italian road of development towards socialism means the parliamentary road and nothing more. That is not true.²⁹⁶

He also said:

To reduce this struggle to electoral competitions for parliament and to wait for the acquisition of fifty-one percent would be not only simple-minded but also illusory.²⁹⁷

Comrade Togliatti argued that what they advocated was not only “a parliament which functions”²⁹⁸ but also “a great popular movement.”²⁹⁹

To demand a great popular movement is a good thing, and Marxist-Leninists should of course feel happy about it. It should be recognized that there is a mass movement of considerable scale in Italy today and that the Communist Party of Italy has in this respect made achievements. The pity is that Comrade Togliatti looks at the mass movement only within a parliamentary framework. He holds that the mass movement “can bring about the raising in our country of those urgent demands which could then be satisfied by a parliament, in which the popular forces have won sufficiently strong representation.”³⁰⁰

The masses raise demands, then parliament satisfies them—such is Comrade Togliatti’s formula for the mass movement.

The basic tactical principle of Marxism-Leninism is as follows: In all mass movements, and likewise in parliamentary struggle, it is necessary to maintain the political independence of the proletariat, to draw a line of demarcation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, to integrate the present interests of the movement with its future interests, and to coordinate the

²⁹⁶ Togliatti’s report to the June 1956 session of the Central Committee of the CPI.

²⁹⁷ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

²⁹⁸ Togliatti’s report to the June 1956 session of the Central Committee of the CPI.

²⁹⁹ Ibid.

³⁰⁰ Ibid.

current movement with the entire process and the final goal of the working-class struggle. To forget or violate this principle is to fall into the quagmire of Bernsteinism and, in reality, to accept the notorious formula that “the movement is everything, the aim is nothing.” We should like to ask: What difference is there between Comrade Togliatti’s formula concerning the mass movement and Bernstein’s formula?

CAN STATE-MONOPOLY CAPITAL BECOME “A MORE EFFECTIVE INSTRUMENT FOR OPPOSING MONOPOLISTIC DEVELOPMENT?”

Replying to the editorial in our paper *Renmin Ribao*, Comrade Luigi Longo, one of the chief leaders of the Communist Party of Italy, wrote in an article on January 4, 1963:

Our Tenth Congress has also forcefully reaffirmed that a firm point in what we call the Italian road to socialism is the recognition that already today, in the existing international and domestic situation, even when the capitalist regime continues to exist, it is possible and necessary to arrive at the liquidation of the monopolies and of their economic and political power.³⁰¹

These comrades maintain that by adopting the measures they have worked out, it is possible to change the capitalist relations of production now existing in Italy and to change the “big property regime” of the Italian monopoly capitalists.

The economic measures of “structural reform” which have been worked out by Togliatti and other comrades are, in their own words, the realization of “the demand for a definite degree of nationalization, the demand for programming, the demand for state intervention to guarantee democratic economic development, and so on”³⁰² and “the movement which tends to increase direct state intervention in economic life, through programming, the nationalization of whole sectors of production, etc.”³⁰³

Probably Togliatti and the other comrades will go on to devise still more measures of this sort.

Of course, they have the right to think and say what they like, and no one has the right to interfere, nor do we want to. However, since they want

³⁰¹ *L'Unita*.

³⁰² Togliatti’s speech at the April 1962 session of the Central Committee of the CPI.

³⁰³ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

others to think and speak as they do, we cannot but continue the discussion of the questions they have raised.

Let us take first the question of state intervention in economic life.

Has not the state intervened in economic life ever since it came into being, no matter whether it was a state of slave-owners, of feudal lords or of the bourgeoisie? When these classes are in the ascendant, state intervention in economic life may take one form, and when they are on the decline, it may take another form. State intervention in economic life may also take different forms in different countries where the state power is the same in its class nature. Leaving aside the question of how the state of slave-owners or feudal lords intervenes in economic life, we shall discuss only the intervention of the bourgeois state in economic life.

Whether a bourgeois state pursues a policy of grabbing colonies or of contending for world supremacy, a policy of free trade or of protective tariffs, every such policy constitutes state intervention in economic life, which bourgeois states have long practiced in order to protect the interests of their bourgeoisie. Such intervention has played an important role in the development of capitalism. State intervention in economic life is, therefore, not something new that has recently made its appearance in Italy.

But perhaps what Togliatti and the other comrades refer to by “state intervention in economic life” is not these policies long practiced by the bourgeoisie, but mainly the nationalization they are talking about.

Well then, let us talk about nationalization.

In reality, from slave society onward, different kinds of states have had different kinds of “nationalized sectors of the economy.” The state of slave-owners had its nationalized sector of the economy, and so had the state of feudal lords. The bourgeois state has had its nationalized sector of the economy ever since it came into being. Therefore, the question to be clarified is the nature of the nationalization in each case, and what class carries it out.

A veteran Communist like Comrade Togliatti certainly not ignorant of what Engels said in his *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*:

In any case, with trusts or without, the official representative of capitalist society—the state—will ultimately have to undertake the direction of production. This necessity for conversion into state property is felt first in the great institutions for intercourse

and communication—the post office, the telegraphs, the railways.³⁰⁴

To this statement, Engels added the following very important rider:

I say “have to.” For only when the means of production and distribution have actually outgrown the form of management by joint-stock companies, and when, therefore, the taking them over by the state has become economically inevitable, only then—even if it is the state of today that effects this—is there an economic advance, the attainment of another step preliminary to the taking over of all productive forces by society itself. But of late, since Bismarck went in for state ownership of industrial establishments, a kind of spurious socialism has arisen, degenerating, now and again, into something of flunkeyism, that without more ado declares all state ownership, even of the Bismarckian sort, to be socialistic. Certainly, if the taking over by the state of the tobacco industry is socialistic, then Napoleon and Metternich must be numbered among the founders of socialism. If the Belgian state, for quite ordinary political and financial reasons, itself constructed its chief railway lines; if Bismarck, not under any economic compulsion, took over for the state the chief Prussian lines, simply to be the better able to have them in hand in case of war, to bring up the railway employees as voting cattle for the government, and especially to create for himself a new source of income independent of parliamentary votes—this was, in no sense, a socialistic measure, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously. Otherwise, the Royal Maritime Company, the Royal porcelain manufacture, and even the regimental tailor shops of the Army would also be socialistic institutions, or even, as was seriously proposed by a sly dog in Frederick William III’s reign, the taking over by the state of the brothels.³⁰⁵

Engels then went on to emphasize the nature of so-called state ownership in capitalist countries. He said:

³⁰⁴ F. Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 77.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, footnote.

But the transformation, either into joint-stock companies and trusts, or into state ownership, does not do away with the capitalistic nature of the productive forces. In the joint-stock companies and trusts this is obvious. And the modern state, again, is only the organization that bourgeois society takes on in order to support the external conditions of the capitalist mode of production against the encroachments as well of the workers as of individual capitalists. The modern state, no matter what its form, is essentially a capitalist machine, the state of the capitalists, the ideal personification of the total national capital. The more it proceeds to the taking over of productive forces, the more does it actually become the national capitalist, the more citizens does it exploit. The workers remain wage-workers—proletarians. The capitalist relation is not done away with. It is rather brought to a head. But, brought to a head, it topples over. State ownership of the productive forces is not the solution of the conflict, but concealed within it are the technical conditions that form the elements of that solution.³⁰⁶

Engels wrote all this in the period when monopoly capital was first emerging and capitalism had begun to move from free competition to monopoly. Have his arguments lost their validity now that monopoly capital has assumed a completely dominating position? Can it be said that nationalization in the capitalist countries has now changed and even done away with “the capitalist nature of the productive forces?” Can it be said that state-monopoly capitalism, formed through capitalist nationalization or in other ways, is no longer capitalism? Or perhaps this can be said of Italy, though not of other countries?

Here, then, we have to go into the question of state-monopoly capitalism, and in Italy in particular.

Concentration of capital results in monopoly. From World War I onward, world capitalism has not only taken a step further towards monopoly in general but also taken a step further away from monopoly in general to state monopoly. After World War I, and particularly after the economic crisis broke out in the capitalist world in 1929, state-monopoly capitalism further developed in all the imperialist countries. During World War II,

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

the monopoly capitalists in the imperialist countries on both sides utilized state-monopoly capital to the fullest possible extent in order to make high profits out of the war. And since the War, state-monopoly capital has actually become the more or less dominant force in economic life in some imperialist countries.

Compared with the other principal imperialist countries, the foundations of capitalism in Italy are relatively weak. From an early date, therefore, Italy embarked upon state capitalism for the purpose of concentrating the forces of capital so as to grab the highest profits, compete with international monopoly capital, expand her markets and redivide the colonies. In 1914, the *Consorzio per Sovvenzione su Valore Industria* was established by the Italian government to provide the big banks and industrial firms with loans and subsidies. There was a further integration of the state organs with monopoly capitalist organizations during Mussolini's fascist regime. In particular, during the great crisis of 1929-33, the Italian government bought up at pre-crisis prices large blocks of shares of many failing banks and other enterprises, brought many banks and enterprises under state control, and organized the *Istituto per la Ricostruzione Industriale*, thus forming a gigantic state-monopoly capitalist organization. After World War II, Italian monopoly capital, including state-monopoly capital, which had been the foundation of the fascist regime, was left intact and developed at still greater speed. At present, the enterprises run by state-monopoly capital or jointly by state and private monopoly capital constitute about thirty percent of Italy's economy.

What conclusions should Marxist-Leninists draw from the development of state-monopoly capital? In Italy, can nationalized enterprise, i.e., state-monopoly capital, stand "in opposition to the monopolies,"³⁰⁷ can it be "the expression of the popular masses,"³⁰⁸ and can it become "a more effective instrument for opposing monopolistic development,"³⁰⁹ as stated by Togliatti and certain other comrades of the CPI?

No Marxist-Leninist can possibly draw such conclusions.

State-monopoly capitalism is monopoly capitalism in which monopoly capital has merged with the political power of the state. Taking full advan-

³⁰⁷ A. Pesenti, "Is It a Question of the Structure or of the Superstructure?"

³⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁹ A. Pesenti, "Direct and Indirect Forms of State Intervention."

tage of state power, it accelerates the concentration and aggregation of capital, intensifies the exploitation of the working people, the devouring of small and medium enterprises, and the annexation of some monopoly capitalist groups by others, and strengthens monopoly capital for international competition and expansion. Under the cover of “state intervention in economic life” and “opposition to monopoly,” and using the name of the state to deceive, it cleverly transfers huge profits into the pockets of the monopoly groups by underhand methods.

The chief means by which state-monopoly capital serves the monopoly capitalists are as follows:

1. It uses the funds of the state treasury, and the taxes paid by the people, to protect the capitalists against risk to their investments, thus guaranteeing large profits to the monopoly groups.

For example, on all the bonds issued to raise funds for the Istituto per la Ricostruzione Industriale, the biggest state-monopoly organization of Italy, the state both pays interest and guarantees the principal. The bond-holders generally receive a high rate of interest, as high as 4.5 to 8 percent per annum. In addition, they draw dividends when the enterprises make a profit.

2. Through legislation and the state budget a substantial proportion of the national income is redistributed in ways favorable to the monopoly capitalist organizations, ensuring that the various monopoly groups get huge profits.

For example, in 1955 about one-third of the total state budget was allocated by the Italian Government for purchasing and ordering goods from private monopoly groups.

3. Through the alternative forms of purchase and sale, the state on certain occasions takes over those enterprises which are losing money or going bankrupt or whose nationalization will benefit particular monopoly groups, and on other occasions sells to the private monopoly groups those enterprises which are profitable.

For example, according to statistics compiled by the Italian economist Gino Longo, between 1920 and 1955, successive Italian governments paid a total of 1,647,000 million lire (in terms of 1953 prices) to purchase the shares of failing banks and enterprises, a sum equal to more than 50 percent of the total nominal capital in 1955 of all the Italian joint-stock compa-

nies with a capital of 50 million lire or more. On the other hand, from its establishment to 1958, the Istituto per la Ricostruzione Industriale alone sold back to private monopoly organizations shares in profitable enterprises amounting to a total value of 491,900 million lire (in terms of 1953 prices), according to incomplete statistics.

4. By making use of state authority, state-monopoly capital intensifies the concentration and aggregation of capital and accelerates the annexation of small and medium enterprises by monopoly capital.

For example, from 1948 to 1958, the total nominal capital of the ten biggest monopoly groups, which control the lifelines of the Italian economy, multiplied 15 times. The Fiat Company multiplied its nominal capital 25 times and the Italcemento 40 times. Although the ten biggest companies in Italy constituted only 0.04 percent of the total number of joint-stock companies, they directly held or controlled 64 percent of the total private shareholding capital in Italy. During the same period, the number of small and medium enterprises which went bankrupt constantly increased.

5. Internationally, state-monopoly capital battles fiercely for markets, utilizing the name of the state and its diplomatic measures, and thus serves Italian monopoly capital as a useful tool for extending its neo-colonialist penetration.

For example, in the period of 1956-61 alone, the Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi obtained the right to explore and exploit oil resources, to sell oil or to build pipe-lines and refineries in the United Arab Republic, Iran, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, Ethiopia, Sudan, Jordan, India, Yugoslavia, Austria, Switzerland, etc. In this way, it has secured for the Italian monopoly capitalists a place in the world oil market.

The facts given above make it clear that state monopoly and private monopoly are in fact two mutually supporting forms used by the monopoly capitalists for the extraction of huge profits. The development of state monopoly capital aggravates the inherent contradictions of the imperialist system and can never, as Togliatti and the other comrades assert, "limit and break up the power of the leading big monopoly groups"³¹⁰ or change the contradictions inherent in imperialism.

In Italy there is a view current among certain people that contemporary Italian capitalism is different from the capitalism of fifty years ago and has

³¹⁰ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

entered a “new stage.” They call contemporary Italian capitalism “neocapitalism.” They insist that under “neo-capitalism,” or in the “new stage” of capitalism, such fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles as those concerning class struggle, socialist revolution, seizure of state power by the proletariat and proletarian dictatorship are no longer of any use. In their view, this “neo-capitalism” can apparently perform the function of resolving the fundamental contradictions of capitalism within the capitalist system itself, by such means as “programming,” “technical progress,” “full employment” and the “welfare state,” and through “international alliance.” It was the Catholic movement and the social reformists who first advocated and spread these theories in Italy. Actually, it was in these so-called theories that Togliatti and the other comrades found a new basis for their “theory of structural reform.”

Togliatti and the other comrades maintain that “the concepts of planning and programming the economy, considered at one time a socialist prerogative, are more and more extensively discussed and accepted today.”³¹¹

It is Comrade Togliatti’s opinion (1) that there can be planned development of the national economy not only in socialist countries but also under capitalism, and (2) that the economic planning and programming characteristic of socialism can be accepted in capitalist Italy.

Marxist-Leninists have always held that the capitalist state finds it both possible and necessary to adopt policies which in some way regulate the national economy in the interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole. This idea is contained in the passages quoted above from Engels. In the era of monopoly capital, this regulatory function of the capitalist state mainly serves the interests of the monopoly capitalists. Although such regulation may sometimes sacrifice the interests of certain monopoly groups, it never harms, but on the contrary represents, the overall interests of the monopoly capitalists.

Here is Lenin’s excellent exposition of this point. He said:

The erroneous bourgeois reformist assertion that monopoly capitalism or state-monopoly capitalism is no longer capitalism, but can already be termed “state socialism,” or something of that sort, is most widespread. The trusts, of course, never produced, do not now produce, and cannot produce complete planning. But however much they do plan, however much the

³¹¹ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

capitalist magnates calculate in advance the volume of production on a national and even on an international scale, and however much they systematically regulate it, we still remain under *capitalism*—capitalism in its new stage, it is true, but still, undoubtedly, capitalism.³¹²

However, some comrades of the CPI maintain that, by carrying out “planning” in Italy under the rule of the monopoly capitalists, it is possible to solve the major problems posed by Italian history, including “the problems of the liberty and emancipation of the working class.”³¹³ How is this miracle possible?

Comrade Togliatti says:

State-monopoly capitalism, which is the modern aspect of the capitalist regime in almost all the big countries, is that stage—as Lenin has affirmed—beyond which, in order to go forward, there is no other way but socialism. But from this objective necessity it is necessary to make a conscious movement arise.³¹⁴

There is the well-known statement by Lenin that “capitalism... advanced from capitalism to imperialism, from monopoly to state control. All this has brought the socialist revolution nearer and has created the objective conditions for it.”³¹⁵ He also made similar statements elsewhere. Clearly, Lenin meant that the development of state-monopoly capitalism serves only to prove “the proximity... of the socialist revolution, and not at all as an argument in favor of tolerating the repudiation of such a revolution and the efforts to make capitalism look more attractive, an occupation in which all the reformists are engaged.”³¹⁶ In talking about “structural reform” and “conscious movement,” Comrade Togliatti is using ambiguous language exactly as the reformists do to evade the question of socialist revolution posed by Marxism-Leninism, and he is doing his best to make Italian capitalism look more attractive.

³¹² V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

³¹³ Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

³¹⁴ Togliatti's report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

³¹⁵ V. I. Lenin, “The Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the RSDLP(B.)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIV.

³¹⁶ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

REMEMBER WHAT THE GREAT LENIN TAUGHT

From the above series of questions it can be seen that the “theory of structural reform” advanced by Togliatti and the other comrades is an out-and-out total revision of Marxism-Leninism on the fundamental question of the state and revolution.

Comrade Togliatti publicly hoisted the flag of total revision of Marxism-Leninism as early as 1956. In June of that year, at the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the CPI, he said:

First Marx and Engels and later on Lenin, when developing this theory [the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat—*Hongqi* ed.], said that the bourgeois state apparatus cannot be used for building a socialist society. This apparatus must be smashed and destroyed by the working class, and replaced by the apparatus of the proletarian state, i.e., of the state led by the working class itself. This was not the original position of Marx and Engels. It was the position they took after the experience of the Paris Commune and it was developed in particular by Lenin. Does this position remain completely valid today? This is a theme for discussion. In fact, when we affirm that a road of advance to socialism is possible not merely over democratic ground but also through utilizing parliamentary forms, it is evident that we correct something of this position, taking into account the changes which have taken place and which are still in the process of being realized in the world.

Here Comrade Togliatti was posing as a historian of Marxism while fundamentally distorting the history of Marxism.

Consider the following facts.

In the *Communist Manifesto*, which was written in 1847, Marx and Engels stated very clearly that “the first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.”³¹⁷ Lenin said of this statement:

Here we have a formulation of one of the most remarkable and most important ideas of Marxism on the subject of the state,

³¹⁷ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party & Principles of Communism*, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

namely, the idea of the “dictatorship of the proletariat” (as Marx and Engels began to call it after the Paris Commune).³¹⁸

Subsequently, after summing up the experience of the period 1848-51, Marx raised the question of smashing the old state machine. As Lenin said, here “the question is treated in a concrete manner, and the conclusion is extremely precise, definite, practical and palpable: all the revolutions which have occurred up to now perfected the state machine, whereas it must be broken, smashed.” Lenin added, “This conclusion is the chief and fundamental point in the Marxian teaching on the state.”³¹⁹

Basing himself on the experience of 1848-51, Marx came to the conclusion that, unlike previous revolutions, the proletarian revolution would not merely transfer the military-bureaucratic machine from one group of people to another. Marx did not then give a specific answer to the question of what should replace the smashed state machine. The reason, as Lenin remarked, was that in presenting the question Marx did not base himself simply on logical reasoning but stayed strictly on the firm ground of historical experience.³²⁰ For this specific question, in 1852 there was nothing in previous experience which could be drawn on, but the experience of the Paris Commune in 1871 put the question on the agenda. “The Commune is the first attempt of a proletarian revolution to *smash* the bourgeois state machine; and it is the political form ‘at last discovered,’ by which the smashed state machine can and must be replaced.”³²¹

From this we see that there are two questions, the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, and what should replace it, and Marx answered first one and then the other, on the basis of the historical experience of different periods. Comrade Togliatti says that it was only after the experience of the Paris Commune in 1871 that Marx and Engels held it was necessary for the proletariat to smash the bourgeois state machine. This is a distortion of the facts of history.

Like Kautsky, Comrade Togliatti believes in “the possibility of power being seized *without* destroying the state machine.”³²² He holds that the

³¹⁸ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

³²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

³²² *Ibid.*, p. 105.

bourgeois state machine can be preserved and the objectives of the proletariat can be achieved by using this ready-made state machine. It would be well if Comrade Togliatti noted how Lenin repeatedly repudiated Kautsky on this point. Lenin said:

Kautsky either rejects the assumption of state power by the working class altogether, or he concedes that the working class may take over the old, bourgeois state machine; but he will by no means concede that it must break it up, smash it, and replace it by a new, proletarian machine. Whichever way Kautsky's arguments are "interpreted," or "explained," his rupture with Marxism and his desertion to the bourgeoisie are obvious.³²³

Since Comrade Togliatti boasts that their program is a "deepening and development of Marxism-Leninism," it must be noted that the so-called theory of structural reform was in fact first devised by Kautsky. In his pamphlet *The Social Revolution*, Kautsky said:

It goes without saying that we shall not achieve supremacy under the present conditions. Revolution itself presupposes a long and deep-going struggle, which, as it proceeds, will change our present political and social structure.

It is evident that Kautsky tried long ago to substitute the theory of structural reform for the theory of proletarian revolution and that Comrade Togliatti has simply inherited his mantle. Nevertheless, if we carefully examine their respective views, we shall find that Comrade Togliatti has jumped ahead of Kautsky—Kautsky admitted "we shall not achieve supremacy under the present conditions," whereas Comrade Togliatti maintains that they can achieve supremacy precisely "under the present conditions."

Togliatti and other comrades hold that what is needed for Italy to advance to socialism is to establish a "new democratic regime" under the marvelous Italian Constitution and at the same time to form a "new historical bloc," or a "new bloc of social and political leading forces."³²⁴ They maintain it is this "new historical bloc" rather than the Italian proletariat that is the "bearer of

³²³ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, p. 44.

³²⁴ Cf. Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI

an intellectual and moral, as well as a political revolution”³²⁵ in Italy. No one knows what this “new historical bloc” actually is or how it is to be formed. At times Togliatti and other comrades say that it is “under the leadership of the working class”³²⁶ and at times that this “new historical bloc” is itself the “bloc of leading forces.” Is such a bloc a class organization of the proletariat, or is it an alliance of classes? Is it under the leadership of the working class, or of the bourgeoisie, or of some other class? Heaven alone knows! In the final analysis, the purpose of their fanciful and elusive formulation is simply to get away from the basic Marxist-Leninist ideas of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship.

Comrade Togliatti’s idea is: (1) there is no need to smash the bourgeois state machine, and (2) there is no need to set up a proletarian state machine. He thus repudiates the experience of the Paris Commune.

After Marx and Engels, Lenin repeatedly elucidated the experience of the Paris Commune and always insisted that it held good universally for the proletariat of all countries. Lenin did not separate the experience of the Russian Revolution from that of the Paris Commune but regarded it as a continuation and development of the experience of the Paris Commune. He saw in the Soviets “the type of state which was being evolved by the Paris Commune,”³²⁷ and held that “the Paris Commune took the first epochal step along this path [the path of smashing the old state machine]; the Soviet Government has taken the second step.”³²⁸

In repudiating the experience of the Paris Commune, Comrade Togliatti is of necessity directly counterposing his ideas to Marxism-Leninism and flatly repudiating the experience of the October Revolution and of the people’s revolutions in various countries since the October Revolution; thus he counterposes his so-called Italian road to the common road of the international proletariat.

³²⁵ Ibid.

³²⁶ Ibid.

³²⁷ V. I. Lenin, “The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI.

³²⁸ V. I. Lenin, “First Congress of the Communist International” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVIII.

Comrade Togliatti says, “The problem of doing what was done in Russia is not posed to the Italian workers.”³²⁹ Here we have the essence of the question.

The Elements for a Programmatic Declaration adopted by the Eighth Congress of the CPI in 1956 stated, “In the first years after World War I, the revolutionary conquest of power by the methods that had led to victory in the Soviet Union revealed itself to be impossible.” Here again we have the essence of the question.

Referring to the experience of the Chinese revolution, Comrade Togliatti said that in the period of the Chinese people’s struggle for state power, the Chinese Communist Party applied a political line “which corresponded not at all to the strategic and tactical line followed by the Bolsheviks in the course of their revolution from March to October (1917).”³³⁰ This is a distortion of the history of the Chinese revolution. Since it has occurred in the specific conditions of China, the Chinese revolution has had its own characteristics. However, as Comrade Mao Zedong has repeatedly explained, the principle on which the political line of our Party has been formulated is the integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. The Chinese revolution we have always held, is a continuation of the Great October Revolution, and it goes without saying that it is also a continuation of the cause of the Paris Commune. With regard to the most fundamental question concerning the theory of the state and revolution, that is, the question of smashing the old military-bureaucratic state machine and setting up the state machine of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the basic experience of the Chinese revolution wholly corresponds to that of the October Revolution and the Paris Commune. As Comrade Mao Zedong said in 1949 in his famous essay *On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship*, “Follow the path of the Russians—that was the conclusion.”³³¹ To defend his revision of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, or his “modifications” as he and others put it, Comrade Togliatti says the experience of the Chinese revolution and the experience of the October Revolution are two different matters which do “not at all cor-

³²⁹ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

³³⁰ Togliatti’s concluding speech at the Xth Congress of the CPI.

³³¹ Mao Zedong, “On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 415.

respond” to each other. But how can this distortion possibly help the theory of structural reform of Togliatti and other comrades?

This theory is one of “peaceful transition” or, in their own words, of “advance towards socialism in democracy and in peace.”³³² Their whole theory and their entire program are replete with praise of “class peace” in capitalist society and contain absolutely nothing about “advance towards socialism”; there is only class “peace,” and no social “transition” at all.

Marxism-Leninism is the science of proletarian revolution, and it develops continuously in revolutionary practice, and individual principles or conclusions are bound to be replaced by new principles or conclusions suited to the new historical conditions. But this does not imply that the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism can be discarded or revised. The Marxist-Leninist theory of the state and revolution is absolutely not an individual principle or conclusion, but a fundamental principle derived from the Marxist-Leninist summing-up of the experience of the struggles of the international proletariat. To discard or revise this fundamental principle is to turn one’s back completely on Marxism-Leninism.

Here we would humbly offer Comrade Togliatti some sincere advice. Do not be so arrogant as to declare that you will not do what was done in the Russian October Revolution. Be a little more modest, and remember what the great Lenin taught in 1920, “on certain very essential questions of the proletarian revolution, *all* countries will inevitably have to perform what Russia has performed.”³³³

To support the principles of proletarian strategy put forward by Lenin and corroborated by the victory of the Great October Revolution, or to oppose them—here is the fundamental difference between the Leninists on the one hand and the modern revisionists and their followers on the other.

³³² Theses for the Xth Congress of the CPI.

³³³ V. I. Lenin, “*Left-Wing*” *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, p. 14.

VI. DESPISE THE ENEMY STRATEGICALLY, TAKE HIM SERIOUSLY TACTICALLY

AN ANALYSIS OF HISTORY

Lately, some people who call themselves Marxist-Leninists again burst out in noisy opposition to the thesis of the Chinese Communists that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers. One moment they say this is “underestimation of imperialism” and “demobilizing the masses,” and the next moment they say this is “slighting the strength of socialism.” One moment they call it a “pseudo-revolutionary” attitude and the next moment a thesis based on “fear.” These people are now vying to outshout and outdo each other, with the latecomers striving to be first and prove they are not falling behind. Their arguments are full of inconsistencies and practically nonsensical—and all for the purpose of demolishing this thesis. But all their arguments suffer from one fatal weakness—they never dare to touch seriously on Lenin’s scientific conclusion that imperialism is parasitic, decaying and moribund capitalism.

Comrade Togliatti started this attack at the Tenth Congress of the CPI. He said, “It is wrong to state that imperialism is simply a paper tiger which can be overthrown by a mere push of the shoulder.”³³⁴ He also said, “If they are paper tigers, why so much work and so many struggles to combat them?”³³⁵ Now if Comrade Togliatti were a schoolboy answering a question about the meaning of a word in his language lesson, his answer that a paper tiger is a tiger made of paper might well gain him a good mark. But when it comes to examining theoretical questions, philistinism will not do. Comrade Togliatti claims “to have made a positive contribution to the deepening and development of Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary doctrine of the working class,”³³⁶ and yet he gives a school-boy’s answer to a serious theoretical question. Could there be anything more ludicrous?

Comrade Mao Zedong’s thesis that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers has always been crystal-clear. This is what he said:

³³⁴ Togliatti’s report to the Xth Congress of the CPI.

³³⁵ Togliatti, “Let Us Lead the Discussion Back to Its Real Limit.”

³³⁶ *Ibid.*

For struggle against the enemy, we formed over a long period the concept that strategically we should despise all our enemies, but that tactically we should take them all seriously. This also means that in regard to the whole we should despise the enemy but that in regard to each and every concrete question we must take them seriously. If with regard to the whole we do not despise the enemy we shall be committing the error of opportunism. Marx and Engels were only two persons. Yet in those early days they declared that capitalism would be overthrown all over the world. But in dealing with concrete problems and particular enemies we shall be committing the error of adventurism if we do not take them seriously.³³⁷

There are none so deaf as those who will not hear the truth. Who has ever said that imperialism can be overthrown by a mere push of the shoulder? Who has ever said that it is not necessary to exert effort or wage struggles in order to overthrow imperialism?

Here we should like to quote another passage from Comrade Mao Zedong:

Just as there is not a single thing in the world without a dual nature (this is the law of the unity of opposites), so imperialism and all reactionaries have a dual nature—they are real tigers and paper tigers at the same time. In past history, before they won state power and for some time afterwards, the slave-owning class, the feudal landlord class and the bourgeoisie were vigorous, revolutionary and progressive; they were real tigers. But with the lapse of time, because their opposites—the slave class, the peasant class and the proletariat—grew in strength step by step, struggled against them and became more and more formidable, these ruling classes changed step by step into the reverse, changed into reactionaries, changed into backward people, changed into paper tigers. And eventually they were overthrown or will be overthrown, by the people. The reactionary, backward, decaying classes retained this dual nature even in their last life-and-death struggles against the people. On

³³⁷ Mao Zedong, “All Reactionaries are Paper Tigers” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. V, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 501.

the one hand, they were real tigers; they ate people, ate people by the millions and tens of millions. The cause of the people's struggle went through a period of difficulties and hardships, and along the path there were many twists and turns. To destroy the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism in China took the Chinese people more than a hundred years and cost them tens of millions of lives before the victory in 1949. Look! Were these not living tigers, iron tigers, real tigers? But in the end they changed into paper tigers, dead tigers, bean-curd tigers. These are historical facts. Have people not seen or heard about these facts? There have indeed been thousands and tens of thousands of them! Thousands and tens of thousands! Hence, imperialism and all reactionaries, looked at in essence, from a long-term point of view, from a strategic point of view, must be seen for what they are—paper tigers. On this we should build our strategic thinking. On the other hand, they are also living tigers, iron tigers, real tigers which can eat people. On this we should build our tactical thinking.³³⁸

This passage shows the dual nature of the three major exploiting classes not only in the various stages of their historical development but also in their last life-and-death struggle with the people. Clearly, this is a Marxist-Leninist analysis of history.

THE WATERSHED BETWEEN REVOLUTIONARIES AND REFORMISTS

History teaches us that all revolutionaries—including, of course, bourgeois revolutionaries—come to be revolutionaries because in the first place they dare to despise the enemy, dare to struggle and dare to seize victory. Those who fear the enemy and dare not struggle, dare not seize victory, can only be cowards, can only be reformists or capitulationists; they can certainly never be revolutionaries.

Historically, all true revolutionaries have dared to despise the reactionaries, to despise the reactionary ruling classes, to despise the enemy, because in the historical conditions then obtaining which confronted the people with a new historical task, they had begun to be aware of the necessity of

³³⁸ Mao Zedong, "Talk With the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 88-89 (footnote).

replacing the old system with a new one. When there is need for change, change becomes irresistible and comes about sooner or later whether one likes it or not. Marx said, "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness."³³⁹ The necessity for social change calls forth revolutionary consciousness in men. Before the historical conditions have made a change necessary, no one can arbitrarily pose the task of revolution or make a revolution, however hard he tries. But when the historical conditions have made a change necessary, revolutionaries and vanguard fighters of the people come forward who dare to denounce the reactionary ruling classes and dare to regard them as paper tigers. And in everything they do, these revolutionaries always raise the people's spirits and puncture the enemy's arrogance. This is historical necessity, this is the inevitability of social revolution. As to when the revolution will break out, and whether after its outbreak it succeeds quickly or takes a long time to succeed or whether it meets many serious difficulties, setbacks and even failures before final victory, etc.—all these questions depend upon various specific historical factors. But even if they meet with serious difficulties, setbacks and failures in the course of a revolution, all true revolutionaries will nevertheless dare to despise the enemy and will remain firm in their conviction that the revolution will triumph.

After the defeat of the Chinese revolution in 1927 the Chinese people and the Chinese Communist Party were in extreme difficulties. At that time, Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out to us, as a proletarian revolutionary should, the future course of development of the revolution and the prospects of victory. He maintained that it would be one-sided and wrong to exaggerate the subjective strength of the revolution and belittle the strength of the counter-revolution. At the same time, he stressed that it would be one-sided and wrong to exaggerate the strength of the counter-revolution and underestimate the potential strength of the revolution. Comrade Mao Zedong's appraisal was later confirmed by the development and victory of the Chinese revolution. At present, the world situation as a whole is most favorable for the people of all countries. It is strange that in this favorable situation certain people should concentrate their efforts on wantonly attacking the thesis of despising the enemy strategically, should exaggerate the

³³⁹ K. Marx, *Preface and Introduction to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1976, p. 3.

strength of imperialism, abet the imperialists and all reactionaries and help the imperialists to frighten the revolutionary people. Instead of enhancing the people's spirits and puncturing the enemy's arrogance, they are encouraging the enemy's arrogance and trying to dampen the people's spirits.

Lenin said, "Do you want a revolution? Then you *must* be strong!"³⁴⁰ Why must revolutionaries be strong, why are they necessarily strong? Because revolutionaries represent the new and rising forces in society, because they believe in the strength of the people and because their mainstay is the great strength of the people. The reactionaries are weak, and inevitably so, because they are divorced from the people; however strong they may appear at the moment, they are bound to be defeated in the end. "The dialectical method regards as important primarily not that which at the given moment seems to be durable and yet is already beginning to die away, but that which is arising and developing, even though at the given moment it may not appear to be durable, for the dialectical method considers invincible only that which is arising and developing."³⁴¹

Why did Lenin refer time and again to imperialism with such metaphors as a "colossus with feet of clay" and a "bugbear?" In the last analysis, it was because Lenin based himself on the objective laws of social development and believed that the newborn forces of society would eventually defeat the decaying forces of society and that the forces of the people would eventually triumph over the forces ranged against them. And is this not so?

We would like to say to those who are trying to demolish the Chinese Communists' thesis that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers: You ought first to demolish Lenin's thesis. Why don't you directly refute Lenin's thesis that imperialism is a "colossus with feet of clay" and a "bugbear?" What else does this show other than your cowardice in the face of the truth?

For every sober-minded Marxist-Leninist, the metaphors used in Lenin's formulation that imperialism is a "colossus with feet of clay" and a "bugbear" and the metaphor in the Chinese Communists' formulation that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers are valid metaphors. These

³⁴⁰V. I. Lenin, "No Falsehood! Our Strength Lies in Stating the Truth!" in *Collected Works*, Vol. IX.

³⁴¹ Joseph Stalin, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism & Questions of Leninism*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 3.

metaphors are based on the laws of social development and are meant to explain the essence of the problem in popular language. Great Marxist-Leninists and scientists and philosophers constantly use metaphors in their explanations, and often in a very precise and profound way.

While compelled to profess agreement with the metaphors used by Lenin to describe the essence of imperialism, some people single out for opposition the metaphor used by the Chinese Communists. Why? Why do these people keep on nagging at it? Why are they making such a hullabaloo about it just now? Besides revealing their ideological poverty, this of course shows that they have a specific purpose of their own.

What is it?

Since the end of World War II the socialist camp has grown much stronger. In the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America, revolutions against the imperialists and their running dogs have been advancing. The manifold irreconcilable contradictions which beset the imperialist countries both internally and externally are like volcanoes constantly threatening the rule of monopoly capital. The imperialist countries are stepping up the armaments race and doing their best to militarize their national economies. All this is leading imperialism into an impasse. The brain trusts of the imperialists have produced plan after plan to save their masters from the fate that is now confronting them or will confront them, but they have been unable to find for imperialism a real way out of its predicament. In this international situation, certain people, although calling themselves Marxist-Leninists, have in actual fact become muddled and have allowed a kind of *fin de siècle* pessimism to take the place of cool reason. They have no intention of leading the people in delivering themselves from the disasters created by imperialism, and they have no confidence that the people can overcome these disasters and build a new life for themselves. It would be nearer to the truth to say that they are concerned about the fate of imperialism and all reactionaries than to say that they are concerned about the fate of socialism and the people of all countries. Their purpose in boosting and exaggerating the strength of the enemy and beating the drums for imperialism as they do today is not to oppose "adventurism" but simply to prevent the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations from rising in revolution; their so-called opposition to adventurism is merely a pretext to achieve their purpose of opposing revolution.

Speaking of the liberal parties in the Russian Duma (the Tsarist Parliament) in 1906, Lenin said:

The liberal parties in the Duma only inadequately and timidly back the strivings of the people; they are more concerned to allay and weaken the revolutionary struggle now proceeding than to destroy the people's enemy.³⁴²

Today we find in the ranks of the working-class movement just such liberals as Lenin referred to, to wit, bourgeois liberals. They are more concerned with allaying and weakening the widespread revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations than with destroying the imperialists and the other enemies of the people. Naturally, such persons can hardly be expected to understand the thesis that Marxist-Leninists should despise the enemy strategically.

MAGNIFICENT MODELS

After railing at the Chinese Communists' thesis of "despising the enemy strategically," some heroes go on to pour out their wrath on the thesis of "taking the enemy seriously tactically." They say that the formulation of "despising the enemy strategically while taking him seriously tactically" is a "double approach" and is "contrary to Marxism-Leninism." Ostensibly, they acknowledge that strategy is different from tactics and that tactics must serve strategic goals. But in actual fact they obliterate the difference between strategy and tactics and thoroughly confuse the concept of strategy with that of tactics. Instead of subordinating tactics to strategy, they subordinate strategy to tactics. They engross themselves in routine struggles, and in specific struggles they either make endless concessions to the enemy and thus commit the error of capitulationism, or act recklessly and thus commit the error of adventurism. In the last analysis, their purpose is to discard the strategic principles of revolutionary Marxist-Leninists and the strategic goals of all Communists.

We have already pointed out that historically all revolutionaries have been revolutionaries because in the first place they dared to despise the enemy, dared to wage struggle and dared to seize victory. Here we would add that, similarly, all successful revolutionaries in history have been successful

³⁴² V. I. Lenin, "Resolution (II) of the St. Petersburg Committee of the RSDLP on the Attitude Towards the State Duma" in *Collected Works*, Vol. X.

not only because they dared to despise the enemy but also because on each particular question and in each specific struggle they took the enemy seriously and adopted a prudent attitude. In general, unless revolutionaries, and proletarian revolutionaries in particular, are able to do this, they cannot steer the revolution forward smoothly, but are liable to commit the error of adventurism, thus bringing losses or even defeat to the revolution.

Throughout their lifelong struggles in the cause of the proletariat, Marx, Engels and Lenin always despised the enemy strategically, while taking full account of him tactically. They always fought on two fronts according to the concrete circumstances against Right opportunism and capitulationism and also against “Left” adventurism. In this respect, they are magnificent models for us.

Marx and Engels ended the *Communist Manifesto* with the celebrated passage:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.³⁴³

This has always been the general strategic principle and goal of the whole international communist movement. But in the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels also took careful account of the different conditions the Communists in different countries faced. They did not lay down a stereotyped, rigid formula and force it on the Communists of all countries. Marxists have always held that the Communists in each country must define their own specific strategic and tactical tasks at each stage of history in the light of the conditions prevailing in their own country.

Marx and Engels themselves took direct part in the mass revolutionary struggles of 1848-49. While they regarded the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the time as the prelude to a proletarian socialist revolution, they opposed making the slogan, “For a Workers’ Republic,” an immediate demand. Such was their specific strategy at that time. On the other hand, they opposed attempts to start a revolution in Germany by armed

³⁴³ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party & Principles of Communism*, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

force from outside, characterizing this approach as “playing at revolution.” They proposed that the German workers abroad should return to their own country “singly” and throw themselves into the mass revolutionary struggle there. In other words, when it came to concrete tactics, the proposals and the approach of Marx and Engels were radically different from those of the “Left” adventurists. On matters concerning any specific struggle, Marx and Engels always did their best to proceed from a solid basis.

For a while in the spring of 1850, appraising the situation after the failure of the 1848-49 revolution, Marx and Engels held that another revolution was imminent. But by the summer, they saw that an immediate recurrence of revolution was no longer possible. Some people disregarded the objective possibilities and tried to conjure up an “artificial revolution,” substituting revolutionary phraseology for the actual state of revolutionary development. They told the workers that they had to seize state power right away, or otherwise they might as well all go to sleep. Marx and Engels firmly opposed such adventurism. As Lenin said:

When the revolutionary era of 1848-49 ended, Marx opposed every attempt to play at revolution (the fight he put up against Schapper and Willich), and insisted on ability to work in the new phase which in a seemingly “peaceful” way was preparing for new revolutions.³⁴⁴

In September 1870, a few months prior to the Paris Commune, Marx warned the French proletariat against an untimely uprising. But when the workers were compelled to rise, in March 1871, Marx paid glowing tribute to the heaven-storming heroism of the workers of the Paris Commune. In a letter to L. Kugelmann, Marx wrote:

What elasticity, what historical initiative, what a capacity for sacrifice in these Parisians! After six months of hunger and ruin, caused by internal treachery more even than by the external enemy, they rise, beneath Prussian bayonets, as if there had never been a war between France and Germany and the enemy were not still at the gates of Paris! History has no like example

³⁴⁴ V. I. Lenin, “Karl Marx” in *Marx, Engels, Marxism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1978, p. 41.

of like greatness! If they are defeated only their “good nature” will be to blame.³⁴⁵

See how Marx eulogized the workers of the Paris Commune for their heroic scorn of the enemy! Marx made this evaluation of the Paris Commune in the light of the general strategic goal of the international communist movement and said of the struggle of the Paris Commune that “history has no like example of like greatness!”

True, the Paris Commune made several mistakes during the uprising; it failed to march immediately on counter-revolutionary Versailles, and the Central Committee relinquished power too soon. The Paris Commune failed. Yet the banner of proletarian revolution unfurled by the Commune will be forever glorious.

Marx wrote in *The Civil War in France*:

Working men’s Paris, with its Commune, will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them.³⁴⁶

Writing in commemoration of the 21st anniversary of the Paris Commune, Engels stated:

Its highly internationalist character imparted historical greatness to the Commune. It was a bold challenge to every kind of expression of bourgeois chauvinism. And the proletariat of all countries unerringly understood this.³⁴⁷

But now our Comrade Togliatti seems to feel that Marx’s and Engels’ high appraisal of the Paris Commune as of universal significance for the revolutionary cause of the world proletariat is no longer worth mentioning.

³⁴⁵ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Marx to Ludwig Kugelmann” in *Selected Letters*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1977, p. 36.

³⁴⁶ K. Marx, *The Civil War in France*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 91.

³⁴⁷ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Greetings to the French Workers on the Occasion of the 21st Anniversary of the Paris Commune” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII, Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, p. 275.

As Engels pointed out, after the defeat of the Paris Commune the Parisian workers needed a long respite to build up their strength. But the Blanquists advocated for a new uprising regardless of the circumstances. This adventurism was sharply criticized by Engels.

During the period of peaceful development of capitalism in Europe and America, Marx and Engels continued their fight on two fronts in the working-class movement. On the one hand, they severely condemned empty talk about revolution and urged that bourgeois legality should be turned to advantage in the fight against the bourgeoisie; on the other hand, they severely—indeed even more severely—condemned the opportunist thinking then dominant in the social-democratic parties, because these opportunists had lost all proletarian revolutionary staunchness, confined themselves to legal struggles, and lacked the determination to use illegal means as well in the fight against the bourgeoisie.

From this it is evident that while Marx and Engels unwaveringly adhered to the strategic principles of proletarian revolution at all times, including periods of peaceful development, they also took care to adopt flexible tactics in accordance with the specific conditions of a given period.

As a great Marxist, Lenin most lucidly formulated the revolutionary strategy of the Russian proletariat when he entered the historical arena of proletarian revolutionary struggle. In the concluding remarks of his first famous work, *What the “Friends of the People” Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, he said:

When its advanced representatives have mastered the ideas of scientific socialism, the idea of the historical role of the Russian worker, when these ideas become widespread, and when stable organizations are formed among the workers to transform the workers’ present sporadic economic war into conscious class struggle—then the Russian **worker**, rising at the head of all the democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and lead the **Russian proletariat** (side-by-side with the proletariat of **all countries**) *along the straight road of open political struggle to the victorious communist revolution.*³⁴⁸

³⁴⁸ V. I. Lenin, *What the “Friends of the People” Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1978, p. 218.

This strategic principle of Lenin's remained the general guide for the vanguard of the Russian proletariat and for the Russian people throughout their struggle for emancipation.

Lenin always firmly upheld this strategic principle. In doing so, he waged uncompromising struggle against the Narodniks, the "legal Marxists," the Economists, the Mensheviks, the opportunists and revisionists of the Second International, and against Trotsky and Bukharin.

In 1902, when the program of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party was being drawn up, serious differences arose between Lenin and Plekhanov over principles of proletarian strategy. Lenin insisted that the Party program should include the dictatorship of the proletariat and demanded that it should clearly define the leading role of the working class in the revolution.

During the 1905 Revolution, Lenin in his book, *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, reflected the heroic spirit of the Russian proletariat, which had dared to lead the struggle and to seize victory. He put forward a comprehensive theory of proletarian leadership in the democratic revolution and of a worker-peasant alliance under the leadership of the working class, thus developing Marxist theory on the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution.

During World War I, Lenin raised proletarian thinking on strategy to a new level in *The Collapse of the Second International*, in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* and other most important Marxist classics. He held that imperialism was the eve of the proletarian socialist revolution and that it was possible for the proletarian revolution to achieve victory first in one country or in a few countries. These strategic concepts paved the way for the triumph of the Great October Revolution.

There are many more similar examples.

On specific questions of tactics, Lenin always charted a course of action for the proletariat in the light of varying conditions—for example, conditions in which the political party of the proletariat should participate in and in which it should boycott parliament; conditions in which it should form one kind of alliance or another; conditions in which it should make necessary compromises and in which it should reject compromises; in which circumstances it should wage legal struggles and in which illegal struggles, and how it should flexibly combine the two forms of struggle; when to attack

and when to retreat or advance by a roundabout path; etc. In his book, *“Left-Wing” Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Lenin elucidated these questions profoundly and systematically.

He rightly stated:

First, that in order to fulfil its task the revolutionary class must be able to master *all* forms, or aspects, of social activity without any exception;

second, that the revolutionary class must be ready to pass from one form to another in the quickest and most unexpected manner.³⁴⁹

Discussing the various forms of struggle, Lenin said further that it was necessary for all Communists to investigate, study, seek, divine and grasp that which is peculiarly national, specifically national in the concrete manner in which each country approaches the fulfillment of the single international task, in which it approaches the victory over opportunism and “Left” doctrinarism within the working-class movement, the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, and the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. It was absolutely wrong not to take the national characteristics of one’s own country into account in the struggle.

In the light of Lenin’s ideas, it can be seen that the concrete tactics of proletarian parties all have as their aim the organization of the masses by the millions, the maximum mobilization of allies, and the maximum isolation of the enemies of the people, the imperialists and their running dogs, so as to attain the general strategic goal of the emancipation of the proletariat and the people. To use Lenin’s own words:

The *forms* of the struggle may and do constantly change in accordance with varying, relatively particular and temporary causes, but the *substance* of the struggle, its class *content*, positively *cannot* change while classes exist.³⁵⁰

THE STRATEGIC AND TACTICAL THINKING OF THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Basing themselves on the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the Chinese Communists formulated the strategy and tactics of the Chinese revolution in concrete revolutionary practice.

³⁴⁹ V. I. Lenin, *“Left-Wing” Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

³⁵⁰ V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

Comrade Mao Zedong outlined the strategic and tactical thinking of the Chinese Communists in the following passage:

Imperialism throughout the world and the rule of the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek clique in China are already rotten and have no future. We have reason to despise them and we are confident and certain that we shall defeat all the domestic and foreign enemies of the Chinese people. But with regard to each part, each specific struggle (military, political, economic or ideological), we must never take the enemy lightly; on the contrary, we should take the enemy seriously and concentrate all our strength for battle in order to win victory. While we correctly point out that, strategically, with regard to the whole, we should take the enemy lightly, we must never take the enemy lightly in any part, in any specific struggle. If, with regard to the whole, we overestimate the strength of our enemy and hence do not dare to overthrow him and do not dare to win victory, we shall be committing a Right opportunist error. If, with regard to each part, each specific problem, we are not prudent, do not carefully study and perfect the art of struggle, do not concentrate all our strength for battle and do not pay attention to winning over all the allies that should be won over (middle peasants, small independent craftsmen and traders, the middle bourgeoisie, students, teachers, professors and ordinary intellectuals, ordinary government employees, professionals and enlightened gentry), we shall be committing a “Left” opportunist error.³⁵¹

Comrade Mao Zedong here provides a very clear-cut and unequivocal explanation of the struggle of the proletariat as a whole, that is, of the question of strategy, and an equally clear-cut and unequivocal explanation of each part, each specific problem, in the struggle of the proletariat, that is, of the question of tactics.

Why is it that when taking the situation as a whole, i.e., strategically, we can despise the enemy? Because imperialism and all reactionaries are decaying, have no future and can be overthrown. Failure to see this results in lack of courage to wage revolutionary struggle, loss of confidence in the

³⁵¹ Mao Zedong, “On Some Important Problems of the Party’s Present Policy” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

revolution and the misleading of the people. Why is it that in specific struggles, i.e., tactically, we must not take the enemy lightly but must take him seriously? Because the imperialists and the reactionaries still control their apparatus for ruling and all the armed forces, and can still deceive the people. To overthrow the rule of imperialism and reaction, the proletariat and the masses of the people must go through bitter and tortuous struggles. The imperialists and the reactionaries will not automatically tumble from their thrones.

A revolutionary party will never carry on revolutionary struggle if it has abandoned the strategic goal of overthrowing the old system, and no longer believes that the enemy can be overthrown or that victory can be won. A revolutionary party will never achieve the hoped for victory if it merely proclaims the target of revolution without seriously and prudently coming to grips with the enemy in the course of revolutionary struggle and without gradually building up and expanding the revolutionary forces, if it treats revolution simply as a matter for talk, or if it simply strikes out blindly. This is even more true of proletarian parties. If a proletarian party takes full account of the enemy on each and every concrete problem of revolutionary struggle and is skillful in combating him while adhering to proletarian strategic principles, then, to use Comrade Mao Zedong's words, "as time goes on, we shall become superior as a whole,"³⁵² even though the proletariat may be inferior in strength at the outset. In other words, if the enemy is taken seriously in matters of tactics, on concrete questions of struggle, and if every effort is made to win in each specific struggle, the victory of the revolution can be accelerated, and it will not be retarded or postponed.

By taking full account of the enemy tactically and winning victories in specific struggles, the proletarian parties enable the masses in ever greater number to learn from their own experience that the enemy can be defeated, that there is every reason and every basis for despising the enemy. In China there are the ancient proverbs: Great undertakings have small beginnings; a huge tree grows from tiny roots; the nine-story castle begins as a pile of earth; a thousand-*li* journey starts with one step. These hold true for revolutionary people who want to overthrow the reactionaries, that is to say, they can achieve their objective of finally defeating the reactionaries only by

³⁵² Mao Zedong, "The Present Situation and Our Tasks" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

waging one struggle after another, by waging innumerable specific struggles, and by striving for victory in each one of them.

In *Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War*, Comrade Mao Zedong said, "Our strategy is 'pit one against ten' and our tactics are 'pit ten against one'—this is one of our fundamental principles for gaining mastery over the enemy." He added, "We use the few to defeat the many—this we say to the rulers of China as a whole. We use the many to defeat the few—this we say to each separate enemy force on the battlefield."³⁵³ Here he was dealing with principles of military struggle, but they also apply to the political struggle. History shows that, to begin with, all revolutionaries, including bourgeois revolutionaries, are always in the minority, and the forces they lead are always comparatively small and weak. If in their strategy they lack the will to "use the few to defeat the many" and to "pit one against ten" in the struggle against the enemy, they grow flabby, impotent, and are incapable of accomplishing anything, and they will never become the majority. On the other hand, in their tactics, that is, in specific struggle, unless revolutionaries learn to organize the masses, to rally all possible allies, and to utilize the objectively existing contradictions among the enemies, unless they can apply the method of "using the many to defeat the few" and of "pitting ten against one" in struggle, and unless they are able to make all the necessary preparations for specific struggles, they will never be able to gain victory in each specific struggle and multiply their small victories into large ones, and there will be the danger that their own forces will be smashed one by one by the enemy and the strength of the revolution dissipated.

A MIRROR

To sum up on the matter of the relationship between strategy and tactics, it is vital that the party of the proletariat pay the greatest attention to the ultimate goal of emancipating the working people and that it possess the courage and the conviction needed to overwhelm the enemy. It should not become so engrossed in minor and immediate gains and victories as to lose sight of the ultimate goal, and it should never lose faith in the triumph of the people's revolution merely because of the enemy's temporary and outward strength. At the same time, the party of the proletariat must

³⁵³ Mao Zedong, "Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. I, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 216.

pay serious attention to the very small, day-to-day struggles, even if they do not appear to be very noteworthy. In every specific struggle, it must prepare adequately, do a good job of uniting the masses, study and perfect the art of struggle and do all it can to win, so that the masses will receive constant education and inspiration. It should take full cognizance of the fact that a large number of specific struggles, including the very small ones, can merge and develop into a force that will rock the old system.

It is, therefore, perfectly clear that strategy and tactics are different from each other and, at the same time, united. This is an expression of the very dialectics with which Marxist-Leninists examine questions. Certain people describe “despising the enemy strategically and taking him seriously tactically” as “scholastic philosophy” or a “double approach.” But just what kind of “philosophy” and what “single approach” they have are beyond us.

In his essay, *Our Revolution*, Lenin had the following to say about the heroes of opportunism:

They all call themselves Marxists, but their conception of Marxism is impossibly pedantic. They have completely failed to understand what is decisive in Marxism: namely, its revolutionary dialectics.³⁵⁴

In the same article, Lenin also said:

Their whole conduct betrays them as cowardly reformists, who are afraid to take the smallest step away from the bourgeoisie, let alone break with it, and at the same time mask their cowardice by the wildest rhetoric and braggadocio.³⁵⁵

To those who are attacking the Chinese Communist Party we commend these lines of Lenin’s for careful reading. Assuredly, they may well serve as a political mirror for certain people.

³⁵⁴ V. I. Lenin, “On Our Revolution” in *Marx, Engels, Marxism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1978, p. 563.

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 564.

VIII. A STRUGGLE ON TWO FRONTS

MODERN REVISIONISM IS THE MAIN DANGER IN THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

The Communist Party of Italy is one of the largest parties in the capitalist world today. It conducted heroic struggles in the extremely dark days of fascist rule. It has a glorious tradition of struggle. During World War II it led the Italian people in courageous armed uprisings and guerrilla warfare against fascism. The people's armed forces arrested Mussolini and sentenced that fascist monster to death.

It is only natural that with this record of militant struggle the Italian Communist Party has won the sympathy and support of the people.

Since World War II, capitalism in Italy has found itself in a period of peaceful development, during which the CPI has done a great deal of work, utilizing legal forms of struggle. In the activities of working-class parties, positive use can be made of conditions of legal struggle, but if while waging legal struggle the working-class party is lacking in revolutionary vigilance and firmness, these conditions may produce a contrary and negative effect. Marx, Engels and Lenin all constantly alerted the proletariat to guard against this.

Why is it that since World War II revisionism has been publicly recognized as the main danger in the international working-class movement? Because first, the legal struggles in many countries have made available manifold historical experience and taught many lessons; second, the conditions that breed opportunism and revisionism actually exist; and third, there has in fact emerged modern revisionism, represented by the Tito clique.

Judging from the views of Togliatti and certain other comrades, we may say frankly that the danger of revisionism exists in the Communist Party of Italy, too. Certain comrades in the French Communist Party have recently written a series of articles attacking revolutionary Marxist-Leninists and attacking the Chinese Communists. The points they make on a number of basic questions concerning the international communist movement virtually duplicate those made by Togliatti and other comrades. Moreover, certain other people have recently come to the fore in the international communist movement who, as Lenin put it, "all belong to the same family, all extol each other, learn from each other, and together take up arms against 'dogmatic'

Marxism.”³⁵⁶ This is a strange phenomenon, but if one has some knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and if one analyzes this phenomenon, one can see clearly that it is not accidental.

Modern revisionism has appeared in some capitalist countries, and it can appear in socialist countries, too. The Tito clique was the first to hoist the revisionist flag, and they have made previously socialist Yugoslavia gradually change its character. Politically, the Tito clique has long since become an accomplice of the United States and other imperialist countries, and, economically, it has turned Yugoslavia into an appendage of US imperialism, gradually transforming her economy into what the imperialists call a liberalized economy.

At the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party in May 1921 Lenin said:

Milyukov was right. He very soberly takes into account the degree of political development and says that stepping stones in the shape of Socialist-Revolutionism and Menshevism are necessary for the reversion to capitalism. The bourgeoisie needs such stepping stones, and whoever does not understand this is stupid.³⁵⁷

These telling words of Lenin’s read like a prophecy of what the Tito clique was to do a few decades later.

How is it that revisionism can appear in socialist countries, too? As the Moscow Declaration of 1957 points out, “The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source.”

Reiterating the important thesis of the Moscow Declaration that revisionism is the main danger in the international working-class movement, the Moscow Statement of 1960 condemns the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism. The Statement is completely correct in pointing out:

After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist program to the Dec-

³⁵⁶ V. I. Lenin, *What Is to Be Done?*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 7.

³⁵⁷ V. I. Lenin, “Tenth All-Russian Conference of the RCP(B)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXII.

laration of 1957; they set the LCY against the international communist movement as a whole, severed their country from the socialist camp, made it dependent on so-called "aid" from US and other imperialists, and thereby exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through a heroic struggle. The Yugoslav revisionists carry on subversive work against the socialist camp and the world communist movement. Under the pretext of an extra-bloc policy, they engage in activities which prejudice the unity of all the peace-loving forces and countries.

The Moscow Statement also says:

Further exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists and active struggle to safeguard the communist movement and the working-class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists remains an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

This solemn document bears the signatures of the delegates of eighty-one Parties, including the Italian and French Parties, as well as of the parties of the socialist countries. But the ink was hardly dry on these signatures when the leading members of some of these parties rushed to fraternize with the Tito clique.

Comrade Togliatti has openly declared that the stand taken in the 1960 Moscow Statement towards the Tito clique of Yugoslavia was "mistaken," saying that "to direct invectives against 'the Tito clique' will not enable us to advance one step, but will make us go back a great deal."³⁵⁸ Some people have said that "the Yugoslav Communists have taken steps towards rapprochement and unity with the entire world communist movement," and that between the Tito clique and themselves there is "coincidence and proximity" of positions "on a series of vitally important international problems." What they are doing belies their commitments; they are treating the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement merely as empty official formalities. In order to justify themselves, they have no scruples about prostituting the Moscow Statement and, instead of regarding revisionism as the main danger in the international communist movement and working-class movement

³⁵⁸ "Apropos the Criticism of the 'Tito Clique'" in *Rinascita*, October 13, 1962.

today, they allege that “latterly the danger of dogmatism and sectarianism has become the main danger.”³⁵⁹ At the recent Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, when the Chinese Communist Party delegate in his speech upheld the Moscow Statement and condemned the revisionism of the Tito clique, he was treated with extreme rudeness. But the delegate of the Tito clique to the Congress was given a wild ovation. Can this be called “consistent observance of the commonly coordinated line of the communist movement?” Everybody knows that this action, which can only grieve our own people and gladden the enemy, was deliberately planned.

The result of all this is that the market price of the Tito clique has suddenly shot up tenfold. The purpose of those who have brought this about is to install the Tito clique as their ideological center; they are trying to replace Marxism-Leninism by modern revisionism as represented by the Tito clique and to replace the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement by the Tito clique’s modern revisionist program, or by something else.

Don’t some people frequently say that we ought to “synchronize our watches?” Now there are two watches: one is Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration and Statement, and the other is modern revisionism as represented by the Tito clique. Which is to be the master watch? The watch of Marxism-Leninism, of the Moscow Declaration and Statement, or the watch of modern revisionism?

Some people forbid us to fight modern revisionism, or even to mention the old-line revisionism of the period of the Second International, while they themselves revive the tunes of the old-line revisionists and revel in playing them over and over again. Writing of Proudhonism in the preface to the second edition of *The Housing Question*, Engels said, “Whoever occupies himself in any detail with modern socialism must also acquaint himself with the ‘surmounted standpoints’ of the movement.”³⁶⁰ He believed that these standpoints or the tendencies emanating from them would inevitably reappear time and again so long as the conditions giving rise to them remained in society. “And if later on this tendency takes on a firmer shape and more clearly defined contours... it will have to go back to its predecessors for the

³⁵⁹ The resolution adopted by the session of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party on December 14, 1962.

³⁶⁰ F. Engels, *The Housing Question*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 4.

formulation of its program.”³⁶¹ Since we are fighting modern revisionism, we must naturally study its predecessors, the lessons of history, and how the modern revisionists have gone back to their predecessors. Should we not do so? Why is this “a completely impermissible historical comparison?” Does it violate any taboo?

Since they are replaying the tunes of such old revisionists as Bernstein and Kautsky, and are using the latter’s viewpoints, methods and language to attack and smear the Chinese Communists and all Marxist-Leninists, they cannot reasonably forbid us to answer them with Lenin’s criticism of the old revisionists.

Lenin said:

In exactly the same way the Bernsteinians have been dinning into our ears that it is they who understand the proletariat’s true needs and the tasks of building up its forces, the task of deepening all the work, preparing the elements of a new society, and the task of propaganda and agitation. Bernstein says: We demand a frank recognition of that which is, thus sanctifying “movement” without any “ultimate aim,” sanctifying defensive tactics alone, preaching the tactics of fear “lest the bourgeoisie recoil.” So the Bernsteinians raised an outcry against the “Jacobinism” of the revolutionary Social-Democrats, against “publicists” who fail to understand the “workers’ initiative,” etc., etc. In reality, as everyone knows, revolutionary Social-Democrats have never even thought of abandoning day-by-day, petty work, the mustering of forces, etc., etc. All they demanded was a clear understanding of the ultimate aim, a clear presentation of the revolutionary tasks; they wanted to raise the semi-proletarian and semi-petit-bourgeois strata to the revolutionary level of the proletariat—not to reduce the latter level to that of opportunist considerations such as “lest the bourgeoisie recoil.” Perhaps the most vivid expression of this rift between the intellectual opportunist wing and the proletarian revolutionary wing of the Party was the question: *dürfen wir siegen?* “Dare we win?” Is it permissible for us to win? Would it not be dangerous for us to win? Ought we to win? This question, so strange at first sight,

³⁶¹ Ibid., p. 6.

was however raised and had to be raised, because the opportunists were afraid of victory, were frightening the proletariat away from it, predicting that trouble would come of it and ridiculing slogans that straightforwardly called for it.³⁶²

This quotation from Lenin can very well explain the revival of Bernsteinism in a new historical context and the essence of the difference between Marxist-Leninists and the modern revisionists.

“OUR THEORY IS NOT A DOGMA, BUT A GUIDE TO ACTION”

Some people who call themselves creative Marxist-Leninists say that times have changed, that conditions are no longer the same and that there is no need to repeat the fundamental principles stated by Marx and Lenin. They object to our quoting from the Marxist-Leninist classics to explain issues, and brand this practice “dogmatism.”

To discard Marxism-Leninism on the pretext of shaking off the chains of dogma is a convenient trick. Lenin exposed this trick of the opportunists long ago:

What a handy little word “dogma” is! One need only slightly twist an opposing theory, cover up this twist with the bogy of “dogma”—and there you are!³⁶³

We all know that the days when Lenin lived and fought were greatly different from the days of Marx and Engels. Lenin developed Marxism comprehensively and carried it forward to a new stage, the stage of Leninism. In line with the new conditions and the new features of his own time, Lenin wrote many outstanding works which greatly enriched the treasury of Marxist theory and our ideas on the strategy and tactics of the proletarian revolution, and he advanced new policies and tasks for the international working-class movement. Lenin quoted abundantly and repeatedly from Marx and Engels in order to defend the fundamental principles of Marxism, to safeguard its purity and to oppose its distortion and adulteration by the opportunists and revisionists. For example, in *The State and Revolution* in particular, a great work of fundamental importance for Marxist theory, Lenin was not sparing in the use of quotations. In the very first chapter he wrote:

³⁶² V. I. Lenin, *Two Tactics of the Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 112-113.

³⁶³ V. I. Lenin, “Revolutionary Adventurism” in *Collected Works*, Vol. VI.

In view of the unprecedentedly widespread distortion of Marxism, our prime task is to *re-establish* what Marx really taught on the subject of the state. For this purpose it will be necessary to quote at length from the works of Marx and Engels themselves. Of course, long quotations will render the text cumbersome and will not help at all to make it popular reading, but we cannot possibly avoid them. All, or at any rate, all the most essential passages in the works of Marx and Engels on the subject of the state must without fail be quoted as fully as possible, in order that the reader may form an independent opinion of the totality of the views of the founders of scientific Socialism and of the development of those views, and in order that their distortion by the now prevailing “Kautskyism” may be documentarily proved and clearly demonstrated.³⁶⁴

It can be seen that Lenin quoted at great length from Marx and Engels at a time when Marxism was being outrageously adulterated. Today, when Leninism is being outrageously adulterated, no revolutionary Marxist-Leninist can fail to quote from Lenin. The reason is that this practice sharply brings out the contrast between the truth of Marxism-Leninism and the fallacies of revisionism and opportunism.

Clearly, it is no crime to quote from the literature of Marxism-Leninism, as some people allege. The question is whether quotations are called for, how Marxist-Leninist literature is quoted and whether it is quoted correctly.

There are people who deliberately evade the themes we are confirming by our quotations from the literature of Marxism-Leninism. They dare not even publish the quotations, but simply attack us for “citing paragraph after paragraph.”³⁶⁵ *L'Humanité*, the organ of the French Communist Party, has gone so far as to accuse the Chinese Communist Party of “denaturing Marxism-Leninism to the point of retaining only rigid formulas, and assuming the right to be high priests in charge of enunciating dogmas.”³⁶⁶ What does it actually signify—this lashing out at us with acrimonious phrases in which they so obviously revel? It simply reflects their state of mind and their feelings, that is, the violent repugnance with which they react the moment

³⁶⁴ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8.

³⁶⁵ “In What Epoch Do We Live?” in *France Nouvelle*, January 16, 1963.

³⁶⁶ “Our Unity and Our Discipline,” *L'Humanité*, January 16, 1963.

they see the words of Marx, Engels and Lenin. These people who object to others as priests of Marxism-Leninism are themselves serving as priests of anti-Marxism-Leninism and of bourgeois ideology.

While violently attacking us for quoting from the literature of Marxism-Leninism to explain fundamental Marxist-Leninist truths, some people constantly repeat what is in essence the language of Bernstein, Kautsky and Tito, from whom they have borrowed many of their basic ideas.

There are even those who violently assail what they term “dogmatism,” yet who delight in biblical dogmas. Their heads are full of the Bible and similar matter but contain not a shadow of Marxism-Leninism.

Lenin constantly cited the words of Marx and Engels, “Our theory is not a dogma, but a guide to action.” Now that certain persons are spreading the notion that we are “dogmatists,” we have to tell them bluntly: The Chinese Communist Party is rich in experience in combating dogmatism. More than twenty years ago, under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong, we fought an outstanding struggle against dogmatism, and ever since we have paid attention to struggles of this kind.

The true Marxist-Leninist does not recline on a bed of books. He should be skillful in using the Marxist-Leninist method to analyze the concrete environment, situation and conditions of the time both at home and abroad, in studying the varied experience of actual struggles, and in thus working out his own line of action. Comrade Mao Zedong has repeatedly reminded us of Lenin’s celebrated dictum: “The most essential thing in Marxism, the living soul of Marxism, is the concrete analysis of concrete conditions.”³⁶⁷ He criticized the dogmatists in our ranks as “lazybones” who “refuse to undertake any painstaking study of concrete things.”³⁶⁸

In a speech in 1942, *Rectify the Party’s Style of Work*, Comrade Mao Zedong criticized dogmatism in these sharp terms:

Even now, there are not a few people who still regard odd quotations from Marxist-Leninist works as a ready-made panacea which, once acquired, can easily cure all maladies. These people show childish ignorance, and we should conduct a campaign to

³⁶⁷ V. I. Lenin, “*Kommunismus* Journal of the Communist International” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

³⁶⁸ Mao Zedong, “On Contradiction” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. I, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

enlighten them. It is precisely such ignorant people who take Marxism-Leninism as a religious dogma. To them we should say bluntly, “Your dogma is worthless.” Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have repeatedly stated that our theory is not a dogma but a guide to action. But such people prefer to forget this statement which is of the greatest, indeed the utmost importance. Chinese Communists can be regarded as linking theory with practice only when they become good at applying the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method and the teachings of Lenin and Stalin concerning the Chinese revolution and when, furthermore, through serious research into the realities of China’s history and revolution, they do creative theoretical work to meet China’s needs in different spheres. Merely talking about linking theory and practice without actually doing anything about it is of no use, even if one goes on talking for a hundred years. To oppose the subjectivist, one-sided approach to problems, we must demolish dogmatist subjectiveness and one-sidedness.³⁶⁹

Those who are now vigorously railing at dogmatism have absolutely no idea of what it really is, let alone of how to combat it. They keep on proclaiming that times and conditions have changed and that one must “develop Marxism-Leninism creatively,” but actually they are using bourgeois pragmatism to revise Marxism-Leninism. They are utterly unable to grasp the essence of the changed times and conditions, to understand the contradictions in the contemporary world or to locate the focus of these contradictions. They cannot grasp the laws of development of things that objectively exist and they stagger to and fro, plunging now into capitulationism and now into adventurism. Adapting themselves to the immediate turn of events, they forget the fundamental interests of the proletariat, and this is characteristic both of their thinking and their actions. Thus they do not have a policy founded on principle, frequently fail to differentiate between the enemy, ourselves and our friends, and even reverse the relationships between the three, treating enemies as if they were our own people and vice versa.

³⁶⁹ Mao Zedong, “Rectify the Party’s Style of Work” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. II, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 31.

Lenin said that the philistine “is never guided by a definite world outlook, by principles of integral party tactics. He always swims with the stream, blindly obeying the mood of the moment.”³⁷⁰ Now, are not these people exactly the same?

INTEGRATING THE UNIVERSAL TRUTH OF MARXISM-LENINISM WITH THE
CONCRETE PRACTICE OF THE REVOLUTION IN ONE’S OWN COUNTRY

The well-known thesis of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution was formulated in our Party by Comrade Mao Zedong more than twenty years ago. It sums up the experience of the Chinese Communist Party in its long struggle on two fronts, against both Right opportunism and “Left” opportunism.

This thesis, the integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution in one’s own country, has two aspects. On the one hand, it is necessary at all times to adhere to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, or otherwise the error of Right opportunism or revisionism will be committed; on the other hand, it is necessary at all times to start from real life, link oneself closely with the masses, constantly sum up the experience of mass struggle and examine one’s work in the light of practical experience, or otherwise the error of dogmatism will be committed.

Why must one adhere to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism? Why must one adhere to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism? Lenin said:

The Marxian doctrine is omnipotent because it is true. It is complete and harmonious, and provides men with an integral world conception which is irreconcilable with any form of superstition, reaction, or defense of bourgeois oppression.³⁷¹

The universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, or in other words, its fundamental principles, are not figments of the imagination or subjective fancies; they are scientific conclusions that sum up the experience of mankind in

³⁷⁰ V. I. Lenin, “The Political Situation and the Tasks of the Working Class” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XI.

³⁷¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism” in *Marx, Engels, Marxism, op. cit.*, p. 68.

its entire history of struggle and sum up the experience of the international proletarian struggle.

From Bernstein onwards, all sorts of revisionists and opportunists have used the pretext of so-called new changes and new situations to assert that the universal truth of Marxism has been outmoded. Yet events throughout the world in the past century and more have all proved the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism to be valid everywhere. It applies both to the West and to the East; it has been confirmed not only by the Great October Revolution but also by the Chinese revolution and by all the triumphant revolutions in other countries; it has been confirmed not only by the entire record of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries of Europe and America but also by the great revolutionary struggles which are going on in many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In 1913 Lenin wrote in *The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx* that each period of world history since the birth of Marxism “has brought Marxism new confirmation and new triumphs. But a still greater triumph awaits Marxism, as the doctrine of the proletariat, in the period of history that is now ensuing.”³⁷²

In 1922 Lenin stated in his article *On the Significance of Militant Materialism*:

Marx... applied [dialectics] so successfully that now every day of the awakening to life and struggle of new classes in the East (Japan, India and China)—i.e., the hundreds of millions of human beings who form the greater part of the population of the world and whose historical passivity and historical torpor have hitherto been conditions responsible for stagnation and decay in many advanced European countries—every day of the awakening to life of new peoples and new classes serves as a fresh confirmation of Marxism.³⁷³

The events of recent decades have further confirmed Lenin’s conclusions.

³⁷² V. I. Lenin, “The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx” in *Marx, Engels, Marxism, op. cit.*, p. 79.

³⁷³ V. I. Lenin, “On the Significance of Militant Materialism” in *Marx, Engels, Marxism, op. cit.*, p. 576.

The Moscow Declaration of 1957 sums up our historical experience and sets forth the principal laws universally applicable to the countries advancing on the road to socialism. The first general law thus stated in the Declaration is: “Guidance of the working masses by the working class, the core of which is the Marxist-Leninist party, in effecting a proletarian revolution in one form or another and establishing one form or another of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” What Togliatti and other comrades call “the Italian road to socialism” is precisely the abandonment of this most fundamental principle, the principle of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, and a negation of this most fundamental law reaffirmed in the Moscow Declaration.

Those who oppose the universal truth and the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism inevitably oppose the integral Marxist-Leninist world outlook and “undermine its basic theoretical foundations—dialectics, the doctrine that historical development is all-embracing and full of contradictions.”³⁷⁴

This is what the Moscow Declaration says with regard to the Marxist-Leninist world outlook:

The theory of Marxism-Leninism derives from dialectical materialism. This world outlook reflects the universal law of development of nature, society and human thinking. It is valid for the past, the present, and the future. Dialectical materialism is countered by metaphysics and idealism. Should the Marxist political party in its examination of questions base itself not on dialectics and materialism, the result will be one-sidedness and subjectivism, stagnation of human thought, isolation from life and loss of ability to make the necessary analysis of things and phenomena, revisionist and dogmatist mistakes and mistakes in policy. Application of dialectical materialism in practical work and the education of the party functionaries and the broad masses in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism are urgent tasks of the communist and workers’ parties .

Today, there are people who treat this extremely important thesis in the Moscow Declaration with the utmost contempt and place themselves in

³⁷⁴ V. I. Lenin, “Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism” in *Marx, Engels, Marxism, op. cit.*, p. 300.

opposition to the Marxist-Leninist world outlook. They detest materialist dialectics, dismissing it as a “double approach” and “a scholastic philosophy.” They are just like the old-line revisionists who “treated Hegel as a ‘dead dog’, and while they themselves preached idealism, only an idealism a thousand times more petty and banal than Hegel’s, they contemptuously shrugged their shoulders at dialectics.”³⁷⁵ It is clear that these people attack materialist dialectics because they want to sell their modern revisionist stuff.

Of course, the Marxist-Leninist world outlook is opposed to dogmatism as well as to revisionism.

Adhering to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, we must oppose dogmatism, because dogmatism is divorced from actual revolutionary practice and regards Marxism-Leninism as a lifeless formula.

Marxism-Leninism is full of vitality, and it is invincible because it grows out of and develops in revolutionary practice, ceaselessly drawing new lessons from new revolutionary practice and therefore ceaselessly enriching itself.

Lenin often said that Marxism combines the greatest scientific strictness with the revolutionary spirit. He said:

Marxism differs from all other socialist theories in that it represents a remarkable combination of complete scientific soundness in the analysis of the objective conditions of things and of the objective course of evolution and the very definite recognition of the significance of the revolutionary energy, the revolutionary creative genius and the revolutionary initiative of the masses—and also, of course, of individuals, groups, organizations and parties which are able to discover and establish contact with these classes.³⁷⁶

Here Lenin explained in exact terms that we must adhere to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and at the same time oppose dogmatism, which is divorced from revolutionary practice and from the masses of the people.

Comrade Mao Zedong’s explanation of the interrelationship between adherence to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and opposition to

³⁷⁵ V. I. Lenin, “Marxism and Revisionism” in *Marx, Engels, Marxism, op. cit.*, p. 254.

³⁷⁶ V. I. Lenin, “Against Boycott” in *Marx, Engels, Marxism, op. cit.*, p. 240.

dogmatism fully conforms with Lenin's view. In discussing the question of cognition, Comrade Mao Zedong has said:

As regards the sequence in the movement of men's knowledge, there is always a gradual expansion from the knowledge of individual and particular things to the knowledge of things in general. Only after man knows the particular essence of many different things can he proceed to generalization and know the common essence of things.

When man attains the knowledge of this common essence, he uses it as a guide and proceeds to study various concrete things which have not yet been studied, or studied thoroughly, and to discover the particular essence of each; only thus is he able to supplement, enrich, and develop his knowledge of the common essence and prevent that knowledge from withering or petrifying.³⁷⁷

The mistake of the dogmatists lies in turning the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, i.e., the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, into something withered and petrified.

Dogmatists distort Marxism-Leninism in another way. Divorcing themselves from reality, they contrive abstract, empty formulas, or mechanically take the experience of foreign countries and force it on the masses. Thereby, they cramp the mass struggle and prevent it from achieving the results it should. Leaving time, place and conditions out of account, they obstinately stick to one form of struggle. They fail to understand that in every country the mass revolutionary movement takes highly complex forms and that all the forms of struggle required have to be used simultaneously and complement each other; they fail to understand that when the situation changes it is necessary to replace old forms of struggle by new ones, or to utilize the old forms but fill them with new content. Therefore, they very often cut themselves off from the masses and from potential allies, so falling into errors of sectarianism, and they just as often act recklessly, so falling into errors of adventurism.

³⁷⁷ Mao Zedong, "On Contradiction" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. I, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

If the leading body of a party commits errors of dogmatism, it becomes unable to grasp the laws of the actual revolutionary movement. In the field of theory, it is bound to be lifeless, and in the field of tactics, it is bound to make all kinds of mistakes. A party of this kind cannot possibly lead the people's revolutionary movement in its country to victory.

During the struggle against dogmatism inside the Chinese Communist Party, Comrade Mao Zedong placed stress on integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution; he pointed out that the Marxist-Leninist attitude is to employ the Marxist-Leninist theory and method for systematic and comprehensive investigation and study of the environment. He said:

With this attitude, one studies the theory of Marxism-Leninism with a purpose, that is, to integrate Marxist-Leninist theory with the actual movement of the Chinese revolution and to seek from this theory the stand, viewpoint and method with which to solve the theoretical and tactical problems of the Chinese revolution. Such an attitude is one of shooting the arrow at the target. The "target" is the Chinese revolution, the "arrow" is Marxism-Leninism. We Chinese Communists have been seeking this arrow because we want to hit the target of the Chinese revolution and of the revolution of the East. To take such an attitude is to seek truth from facts. "Facts" are all the things that exist objectively. "Truth" means their internal relations, that is, the laws governing them, and "to seek" means to study. We should proceed from the actual conditions inside and outside the country, the province, county or district, and derive from them, as our guide to action, laws which are inherent in them and not imaginary, that is, we should find the internal relations of the events occurring around us. And in order to do that we must rely not on subjective imagination, not on momentary enthusiasm, not on lifeless books, but on facts that exist objectively; we must appropriate the material in detail and, guided by the general principles of Marxism-Leninism, draw correct conclusions from it.³⁷⁸

³⁷⁸ Mao Zedong, "Reform Our Study" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. III, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

The history of the Chinese Communist Party, the history of the triumph of the Chinese revolution, is one of ever-closer integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. Without such integration it is inconceivable that the Chinese revolution could have triumphed.

PRINCIPLE AND FLEXIBILITY

It is a well-known precept of Lenin's that "a policy based on principle is the only correct policy." Marxism was able to triumph over all sorts of opportunist trends and become predominant in the international working-class movement precisely because Marx and Engels persevered in policies based on principle. Leninism was able to continue to triumph over all sorts of revisionist and opportunist trends, to guide the October Revolution to victory and become predominant in the international working-class movement in the new era precisely because Lenin, and Stalin after him, carrying forward the cause of Marx and Engels, persevered in policies based on principle.

What does policy based on principle mean? It means that every policy we put forward and decide upon must be based on the class stand of the proletariat, on the fundamental interests of the proletariat, on the theory of Marxism-Leninism and on the fundamental standpoint of Marxism-Leninism. The party of the proletariat must not confine its attention to immediate interests, veer with the wind and abandon fundamental interests. It must not simply submit to the immediate turn of events, approving or advocating one thing today and another tomorrow, and trading in principles as though they were commodities. In other words, the party of the proletariat must maintain its political independence, differentiating itself ideologically and politically from all other classes and their political parties—not only from the landlords and the bourgeoisie, but also from the petit bourgeoisie. Inside the party, the Marxist-Leninists must draw a line between themselves and both the Right and "Left" opportunists, who reflect various shades of non-proletarian ideology.

Only yesterday, some people put their signatures to the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, expressing approval of the fundamental revolutionary principles set forth in these two documents, and yet today they are trampling these principles underfoot. Hardly had they signed the Moscow Statement and agreed to the conclusion that the leaders of the League

of Communists of Yugoslavia have betrayed Marxism-Leninism when they turned round and treated the Titoite renegades as dearly beloved brothers. They concurred in the conclusion in the Statement that "US imperialism is the chief bulwark of world reaction and an international gendarme, that it has become an enemy of the peoples of the whole world," and yet soon afterwards they maintained that the destiny of mankind depended on "cooperation," "confidence" and "agreement" between the heads of the two powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. They concurred in the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries laid down in the Declaration and the Statement, and yet soon afterwards they abandoned these principles and at their own Party congress publicly and willfully condemned another fraternal party and country. Though talking glibly about never allowing ideological differences between fraternal parties to spread to the economic field and to state relations, these people have wantonly torn up numerous economic and technological contracts between fraternal countries, and have even gone to such lengths as virtually breaking off diplomatic relations with a fraternal country. They concurred in the conclusion in the Declaration and the Statement that revisionism is the main danger in the international working-class movement, and yet soon afterwards they began to spread the idea that "dogmatism is the main danger" far and wide. And so on and so forth. Is there any principle in these actions of theirs? What kind of principles are their policies based on?

While adhering to policies based on principle, the party of the proletariat must also exercise flexibility. In revolutionary struggle, it is wrong to refuse to adjust to changing circumstances or reject roundabout ways of advance. The difference between Marxist-Leninists and the opportunists and revisionists is that the former stand for flexibility in carrying out policies based on principle, while the latter practice a flexibility which is actually the abandonment of principled policies.

Flexibility based on principle is not opportunism. On the contrary, one can make opportunist mistakes if one does not know how to exercise the necessary flexibility and to suit the action to the moment, in the light of the specific conditions and on the basis of persevering in principle, and one will thus bring unwarranted losses to the revolutionary struggle.

Compromise is an important problem in the practice of flexibility.

Marxist-Leninists approach the question of compromise as follows: They never reject any necessary compromise that serves the interests of the revolution, namely, principled compromise, but they will never tolerate a compromise that amounts to betrayal, namely, unprincipled compromise.

Lenin well said:

It is not without cause that Marx and Engels are considered to be the founders of scientific socialism. They were merciless enemies of all phrase-mongering. They taught us to pose the questions of socialism (including those of socialist tactics) in a scientific way. And in the seventies of the last century, when Engels had to analyze the revolutionary manifesto of the French Blanquists, refugees after the Commune, he said without mincing words that their boastful declaration “no compromises” was an empty phrase. One must not renounce compromise. The problem is to be able, through all the compromises which are sometimes necessarily imposed by force of circumstances even on the most revolutionary party of the most revolutionary class, through all such compromises to be able to preserve, strengthen, temper and develop the revolutionary tactics and organization, the revolutionary consciousness, determination and preparedness of the working class and its organized vanguard, the Communist Party.³⁷⁹

How can a Marxist-Leninist Party which conscientiously seeks truth from facts reject all compromises indiscriminately? The editorial on *Leninism, and Modern Revisionism* in the first issue of *Hongqi* for 1963 contains this passage:

In the course of our protracted revolutionary struggle, we Chinese Communists reached compromises on many occasions with our enemies, internal and external. For example, we came to a compromise with the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek clique. We also came to a compromise with the US imperialists in the struggle to aid Korea and resist US aggression.

It continues:

³⁷⁹ V. I. Lenin, “On Compromises” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXV.

It is precisely in accordance with Lenin's teachings that we Chinese Communists distinguish between different kinds of compromise, favoring those which are in the interests of the people's cause and of world peace, and opposing those that are in the nature of treachery. It is perfectly clear that only those guilty now of adventurism, now of capitulationism, are the ones whose ideology is Trotskyism, or Trotskyism in a new guise.

As is well known, Trotsky played a most despicable role in connection with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk as well as in the entire history of the Russian revolution and of Soviet construction. He opposed Lenin and Leninism on all the main problems. He denied that the socialist revolution and socialist construction could triumph first in one country. He lacked all principles on the question of revolutionary strategy and tactics, and this manifested itself now in "Left" adventurism, now in Right capitulationism. In the case of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, he first blindly pressed for an adventurist policy; then, in violation of Lenin's directive, he refused to sign the treaty at the Brest-Litovsk negotiations and at the same time made the traitorous statement to the German side that the Soviet Republic was preparing to end the war and demobilize. The German aggressors thereupon became more arrogant and laid down even more onerous terms. Such was Trotskyism in the matter of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk.

Now certain people have arbitrarily lumped together the Cuban events and those of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, although the two were completely different in nature, and they have drawn an historical analogy in which they liken themselves to Lenin and brand those who opposed sacrificing the sovereignty of another country as Trotskyites. This is most absurd.

Lenin was perfectly right in wanting the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk to be signed. Lenin's purpose was to win time to consolidate the victory of the October Revolution. In his *Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War* written in 1936, Comrade Mao Zedong strongly criticized "Left" opportunist errors. Referring to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, he said:

After the October Revolution, if the Russian Bolsheviks had acted on the opinions of the "Left Communists" and refused to

sign the peace treaty with Germany, the newborn Soviets would have been in danger of early death.³⁸⁰

Events confirmed Lenin's foresight, and the signing of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk proved to be a revolutionary compromise.

How about the Cuban events? That was a completely different story. In the Cuban events, the Cuban people and their leaders were determined to fight to the death to defend the sovereignty of their fatherland; they displayed great heroism and high principle. They did not commit the error of adventurism, nor did they commit the error of capitulationism. But during the Cuban events certain people first committed the error of adventurism, and then committed the error of capitulationism, wanting the Cuban people to accept humiliating terms which would have meant the sacrifice of the sovereignty of their country. These persons have tried to cover themselves by using the example of Lenin's conclusion of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, but this has turned out to be a clumsy sleight-of-hand, for they have actually uncovered themselves all the more clearly.

Comrade Liu Shaoqi explained the relation between principle and flexibility, on the basis of the experience of the Chinese revolution, in the following remarks which he made at the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of China:

Our flexibility is based on definite principles. Flexibility without principle, concessions and compromises that go beyond principle, and ambiguity or confusion of principle, are all wrong. The criterion or measure for all changes in policy or tactics is party principle. And party principle is the criterion and the measure of flexibility. For example, one of our unchangeable principles is to fight for the greatest interests of the largest majority of the people. This unchangeable principle is the criterion and the measure by which the correctness of all changes in policy or tactics should be judged. All changes in keeping with this principle are correct while those conflicting with it are wrong.³⁸¹

³⁸⁰ Mao Zedong, "Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. I, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

³⁸¹ Liu Shaoqi, "On the Party" in *Three Essays on Party-Building*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1980, pp. 298-299.

This is our view on the relation between principle and flexibility, and we believe it to be the Marxist-Leninist view.

VIII. WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

“Workers of All Countries, Unite!” The great call made by Marx and Engels more than a century ago will forever remain the guiding principle which the international proletariat must observe.

The Chinese Communist Party consistently upholds the unity of the international communist movement, the safeguarding of which it regards as its sacred duty. We reaffirmed our stand on this question in the editorial of *Renmin Ribao* on January 27, 1963:

Are the ranks of the international communist movement to be united or not? Is there to be genuine unity or sham unity? On what basis is there to be unity—is there to be unity on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, or “unity” on the basis of the Yugoslav revisionist program or on some other basis? In other words, are differences to be ironed out and unity strengthened, or are differences to be widened and a split created?

The Chinese Communists, all Marxist-Leninists and all progressive mankind unanimously desire to uphold unity and oppose a split, to secure genuine unity and oppose a sham unity, to defend the common foundation of the unity of the international communist movement and oppose the undermining of this foundation, and to uphold and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

This is the unswerving position of the Chinese Communist Party on the question of the unity of the international communist movement.

After launching and organizing a series of preposterous attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties, certain people have suddenly begun to strike up the tune of “unity.” But what they call unity consists of giving themselves permission to abuse others, while not allowing the others to reason with them. By “calling a halt to open polemics,” they mean permission for themselves to attack others as they please, while the

others are forbidden to make whatever reply is called for. While talking of unity, they continue to undermine unity; while talking of calling a halt to open polemics, they continue their open attacks. What is more, they say threateningly that unless those whom they attack keep their mouths shut, it will be “imperative to continue and even step up decisive struggle against them.”

But when it comes to the Tito clique, these people really seek unity. Their desire is unity with the Tito clique, not the unity of the international communist movement; they desire unity on the basis of modern revisionism as represented by the Tito clique, or unity on the basis of the baton of certain people, and not unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. In practice, therefore, their unity is a pseudonym for split. Using unity as a smokescreen, they are trying to cover up their actual splitting activities.

Revisionism represents the interests of the labor aristocracy, and hence also the interests of the reactionary bourgeoisie. Revisionist trends run counter to the interests of the proletariat, of the masses of the people and of all oppressed peoples and nations. Ever since the days of Bernstein, Marxism-Leninism has been repeatedly assailed by revisionist and opportunist trends, each in its day stirring up a commotion. But history has confirmed that Marxism-Leninism represents the highest interests of the largest number of people and is invincible. One after the other, all the revisionists and opportunists who challenged revolutionary Marxism-Leninism have collapsed in the face of the truth and have been spurned by the people. Bernstein was a failure and so were Kautsky, Plekhanov, Trotsky, Bukharin, Chen Duxiu, Browder, and all the others. Those who are launching the new attacks on revolutionary Marxism-Leninism today are just as overbearing and arrogant; yet, if they continue to turn a deaf ear to all advice and persist in their wrong course, it can be said for certain that their end will be no better than that of the old revisionists and opportunists.

There are people who are working frantically to create a split by resorting to many dishonest tricks, spreading rumors, slinging mud, and sowing dissension. But the overwhelming majority of the people of the world want unity in the international communist movement and are opposed to a split. The activities of certain people in creating a split, attacking the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties, and undermining the unity

of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement, go against the desires of the overwhelming majority of the people of the world and are extremely unpopular. People can see through their tactics of sham unity and actual splitting. Historically, none of the splitters who betrayed Marxism-Leninism ever came to a good end. We have already advised those who are working to create a split to “rein in at the brink of the precipice,” but certain people are unwilling to take our advice. They believe they are not yet at the “brink,” and they are not ready “to rein in.” Apparently they are very much interested in continuing their splitting activities. Let them go on creating trouble if they must. The masses, and history, will pass judgment on them.

Something very interesting is happening on a wide scale in the international communist movement today. What is this interesting phenomenon? The doughty warriors who claim to possess the totality of Marxist-Leninist truth are mortally afraid of the articles written in reply to their attacks by the so-called dogmatists, sectarians, splitters, nationalists, and Trotskyites whom they have so vigorously condemned. They dare not publish these articles in their own newspapers and journals. As cowardly as mice, they are scared to death. They dare not let the people of their own countries read our articles, and they have tried to impose a watertight embargo. They are even using powerful stations to jam our broadcasts and prevent their people from listening to them. Dear friends and comrades, who claim to possess the whole truth! Since you are quite definite that our articles are wrong, why don't you publish all these erroneous articles and then refute them point by point, so as to inculcate hatred among your people against the “heresies” you call dogmatism, sectarianism and anti-Marxism-Leninism? Why do you lack the courage to do this? Why such a stringent embargo? You fear the truth. The huge specter you call “dogmatism,” i.e., genuine Marxism-Leninism, is haunting the world, and it threatens you. You have no faith in the people, and the people have no faith in you. You are divorced from the masses. That is why you fear the truth and carry your fear to such absurd lengths. Friends, comrades! If you are men enough, step forward! Let each side in the debate publish all the articles in which it is criticized by the other side, and let the people in our own countries and the whole world think over and judge who is right and who is wrong. That is what we are doing, and we hope you will follow our example. We are not afraid to publish everything of yours in full.

We publish all the “masterpieces” in which you rail at us. Then, in reply we either refute them point by point, or refute their main points. Sometimes we publish your articles without a word in answer, leaving the readers to judge for themselves. Isn't that fair and reasonable? You, modern revisionist masters! Dare you to do the same? If you are men enough, you will. But having a guilty conscience and an unjust case, being fierce of visage but faint of heart, outwardly as tough as bulls but inwardly as timid as mice, you will not dare. We are sure you will not dare. Isn't that so? Please answer!

The Chinese Communist Party believes that there is a way to settle the differences. It is the way pointed out in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. As we are nearing the end of this article, we should like to quote one of the important conclusions of the Moscow Declaration:

After exchanging views, the participants in the meeting arrived at the conclusion that in present conditions it is expedient, besides bilateral meetings of leading workers and exchange of information, to hold, as the need arises, more representative conferences of communist and workers' parties to discuss current problems, share experience, study each other's views and attitudes and concert action in the joint struggle for the common goals—peace, democracy and socialism.

We should also like to quote the paragraphs of the Moscow Statement dealing with the fundamental principles guiding relations among fraternal parties:

At a time when imperialist reaction is joining forces to fight communism it is particularly imperative vigorously to consolidate the world communist movement. Unity and solidarity redouble the strength of our movement and provide a reliable guarantee that the great cause of communism will make victorious progress and all enemy attacks will be effectively repelled.

Communists throughout the world are united by the great doctrine of Marxism-Leninism and by a joint struggle for its realization. The interests of the communist movement require solidarity in adherence by every Communist Party to the estimates and conclusions concerning the common tasks in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism, jointly reached by the fraternal parties at their meetings.

The interests of the struggle for the working-class cause demand ever closer unity of the ranks of each communist party and of the great army of communists of all countries; they demand of them unity of will and action. It is the supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist party to work continuously for greater unity in the world communist movement.

A resolute defense of the unity of the world communist movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and the prevention of any actions which may undermine that unity, are a necessary condition for victory in the struggle for national independence, democracy and peace, for the successful accomplishment of the tasks of the socialist revolution and of the building of socialism and communism. Violation of these principles would impair the forces of communism.

All the Marxist-Leninist parties are independent and have equal rights; they shape their policies according to the specific conditions in their respective countries and in keeping with Marxist-Leninist principles, and support each other. The success of the working-class cause in any country is unthinkable without the internationalist solidarity of all Marxist-Leninist parties. Every party is responsible to the working class, to the working people of its country, to the international working-class and communist movement as a whole.

The communist and workers' parties hold meetings whenever necessary to discuss urgent problems, to exchange experience, acquaint themselves with each other's views and positions, work out common views through consultations and coordinate joint actions in the struggle for common goals.

Whenever a party wants to clear up questions relating to the activities of another fraternal party, its leadership approaches the leadership of the party concerned; if necessary, they hold meetings and consultations.

The experience and results of the meetings of representatives of the communist parties held in recent years, particularly the results of the two major meetings—that of November 1957 and

this Meeting—show that in present-day conditions such meetings are an effective form of exchanging views and experience, enriching Marxist-Leninist theory by collective effort and elaborating a common attitude in the struggle for common objectives.

Since the incident over a year ago where one Party at its own congress publicly attacked another fraternal Party, we have appealed many times for the resolution of the differences between the fraternal parties in accordance with the principles and procedures set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, as just quoted. We have pointed out many times that public and unilateral attacks on any fraternal party are not helpful in resolving problems, and are not helpful to unity. We have constantly maintained that the fraternal parties having disputes or differences ought to stop the public debate and return to the course of inter-party consultation, and that in particular the Party which first launched the attack ought to take the initiative. Our opinion today remains the same.

In April 1962, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party stated to the fraternal party concerned that we whole-heartedly supported the proposal made by several parties that a meeting of the fraternal parties be convened, and that we believed it was appropriate to consider the convening of a meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of all countries to discuss problems of common concern.

At that time, we said that the convening of a meeting of the fraternal parties and the success of such a meeting would depend on the prior overcoming of many difficulties and obstacles and on the doing of a great deal of preparatory work.

At that time, we expressed the hope that the fraternal parties and fraternal countries which had disputes would thenceforth take steps, however small, to help ease relations and restore unity, so as to improve the atmosphere and prepare the conditions for the convening of such a meeting and for its successful outcome.

At that time, we proposed that the fraternal parties concerned should stop making public attacks.

At that time, we maintained that for some of the fraternal parties to conduct such bilateral or multilateral talks as were needed to exchange opinions would also help to make such a meeting successful.

These views which we put before the fraternal party concerned in April 1962 are entirely reasonable and fully conform with the provisions on the settlement of differences between fraternal parties set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. We have since explained these views many times, and we now do so again.

Recently, the leaders of certain parties have expressed a certain degree of acceptance of our views. If this is sincere and if the deeds suit the words, that will certainly be very good. It is what we have always hoped for.

We hold that the ranks of the international communist movement must unite. They will certainly unite!

Let us proclaim:

Workers of all countries, unite!

All oppressed nations and all oppressed peoples, unite!

All Marxist-Leninists, unite!

A Comment on the Statement of the Communist Party of the USA

RENMIN RIBAO EDITORIAL

March 8, 1963

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, March 8, 1963, p. 1.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, March 15, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 10-11,
pp. 58-62.

On January 9 of this year, the Communist Party of the United States of America issued a statement publicly attacking the Communist Party of China. Certain comrades of the CPUSA have also made a number of other attacks on the Chinese Communist Party in recent months.

The CPUSA statement was particularly vicious in slandering the Chinese Communist Party for the position it took on the Caribbean crisis. It said that the Chinese Communist Party had advocated “a policy leading to thermonuclear war,” and that “this pseudo-Left dogmatic and sectarian line of our Chinese comrades dovetails with that of the most adventurous US imperialists and gives the latter encouragement.”

What kind of talk is this? People cannot help being amazed that US Communists should utter such shameful slanders.

The position of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people on the Caribbean crisis was very clear. We supported the five just demands of the Cuban Revolutionary Government, we were against putting any faith in Kennedy's sham “guarantee,” and we were against imposing “international inspection” on Cuba. From the outset we directed the spearhead of our struggle against US imperialism, which was committing aggression against Cuba. We neither advocated the sending of missiles to Cuba, nor obstructed the withdrawal of so-called offensive weapons. We opposed adventurism, and we also opposed capitulationism. We would like to ask: What was wrong with this correct position of ours? How can it be described as “a policy leading to thermonuclear war?” What was there about it that “dovetails” with the line of US imperialism?

It is not hard to see that there is a line which does dovetail with that of US imperialism. On the question of the Caribbean crisis, certain leaders of

the CPUSA direct the spearhead of their struggle, not against US imperialism, the criminal aggressor against Cuba, but against the Chinese Communist Party, resolute supporter of Cuba. In this respect, aren't they really cheek by jowl with the most adventurous US imperialists?

Since you describe the Chinese comrades, who resolutely oppose US imperialism, as being "pseudo-Left," we would like to ask: What do you consider to be the genuine Left? Can it be that those using the sovereignty of another country as a counter for political bargaining with US imperialism are to be considered the genuine Left? To act in that way is indeed to be through-and-through pseudo-Left, or rather, genuinely Right.

It is no accident that certain leaders of the CPUSA have attacked the Chinese Communist Party on the question of the Caribbean crisis. This action is a reflection of their completely wrong understanding of US imperialism and their completely incorrect class stand.

For a considerable period, certain leaders of the CPUSA, in their reports and statements, have been doing their utmost to prettify US imperialism, to prettify Kennedy, the US imperialist chieftain, and to affirm their loyalty to the US ruling class.

They spoke highly of Kennedy's idea of the "New Frontier," which extends US spheres of influence over all six continents, saying that "to speak of a New Frontier, as Kennedy does, is good."³⁸²

They praised Kennedy's Inaugural Speech, which called on the people of the United States to make sacrifices to promote the cause of US imperialism, saying that it was "a possible opening on the road to peace."³⁸³

They sang the praises of Kennedy's State of the Union message of 1961, where he proclaimed the dual tactics of counter-revolution in the words, "The American eagle holds in his right talon the olive branch, while in his left is held a bundle of arrows," and they said it was "welcomed by the overwhelming majority of the American people."³⁸⁴

They held that the Kennedy Administration's "main mass support" is "the working class, the Negro people and the peace forces," and they wished for

³⁸² Gus Hall's report to the National Committee of the CPUSA, *Political Affairs*, February 1961.

³⁸³ *The Worker*, January 29, 1961.

³⁸⁴ *The Worker*, February 5, 1961.

“a shift in policy... in the direction of peace and democracy” on the part of the Kennedy government.³⁸⁵

From Kennedy’s 1962 State of the Union message, in which he announced the stepping up of armaments to realize the US goal of world domination, they drew the conclusion that the Kennedy Administration “can be compelled to yield to the pressures from the people.”³⁸⁶

They described Kennedy’s action supporting the Rockefeller group in its attack on the Morgan group during the 1962 incident concerning steel prices as having “awakened anew the anti-monopoly tradition of Americans” and “rendered a great service.”³⁸⁷

Commenting on Kennedy’s 1963 State of the Union message in which he expressed the intention of using nuclear blackmail to establish “a world of order” led by the United States, they played up his statement that “we seek not the world-wide victory of one nation or system but a world-wide victory of man” and described this deceitful rubbish as Kennedy’s “recognition of world realities,” which “most people were happy to hear” and which inspired “hopefulness.”³⁸⁸

They said that they would “any day and every day” take an oath not to advocate using violence to overthrow the US Government. When someone asked, “If the Soviet Union attacked the US whom would you support?,” the answer was, “I would defend my country if I thought it was being attacked...”³⁸⁹

Statements of this sort by certain leaders of the CPUSA, prettifying US imperialism and affirming their loyalty to it, have nothing in common with the Marxist-Leninist conclusions about US imperialism set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

Presenting a scientific analysis of US imperialism, the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement clearly point out that US imperialism is the greatest international exploiter, the center of world reaction, the chief bulwark of modern colonialism, the international gendarme, the main force of aggression and war, and the enemy of the people of the world.

³⁸⁵ Policy Statement by Gus Hall, *The Worker*, July 16, 1961.

³⁸⁶ *Political Affairs*, February 1962.

³⁸⁷ *The Worker*, April 22, 1962.

³⁸⁸ *The Worker*, January 20, 1963.

³⁸⁹ *The Worker*, February 24, 1963.

Under the cover of “peace” and “disarmament” US imperialism is stepping up arms expansion and war preparation. It is preparing for wars of all types, for all-out nuclear war as well as for limited wars, and it is already waging “special warfare.” In order to suppress and sabotage the national-democratic revolutionary movement and to promote neo-colonialism all over the world, and especially in Asia, Africa and Latin America, US imperialism is using dual counter-revolutionary tactics—using the dollar and armed force both alternately and simultaneously—and is employing the revisionist clique of Yugoslavia as its special detachment for this purpose. US imperialism is voraciously plundering the wealth of many countries, not even sparing its own allies. Since World War II, US imperialism has taken the place of German, Japanese and Italian fascism and rallied around itself all the most reactionary and decadent forces of the world. Today it is the most parasitic, most decadent and most reactionary of all capitalisms. It is the main source of aggression and war.

From the reactionary nature of US imperialism, from its policies of aggression and war and from world realities, more and more people everywhere are coming to see ever more clearly that US imperialism is the most ferocious enemy of all oppressed people and nations, the common enemy of the people of the world and the chief enemy of world peace.

Some leaders of the CPUSA will probably say they do not deny that US imperialism is perpetrating the crimes of aggression and war in various parts of the world. When they mention these criminal activities, however, they always hasten to add that these evils are not the work of the President of the United States, but of the “ultra-Rights,” or are done by the President under the pressure of the “ultra-Rights.” They have described the former US President, Eisenhower, and the present President, Kennedy, as being “sober-minded,” “realistic” and “sensible.” These leaders of the CPUSA often speak of “two power centers in Washington, one in the White House, the other in the Pentagon,” and speak of “the Pentagon generals and admirals and their coalition partners among the ultra-Rights, the Republican leaders and Wall Street” as forces independent of the White House. We should like to ask: Do the leaders of the CPUSA still accept the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state and admit that the US state apparatus is the tool of monopoly capital for class rule? And if so, how can there be a president independent of

monopoly capital, how can there be a Pentagon independent of the White House, and how can there be two opposing centers in Washington?

Let us consider, for instance, the present US President Kennedy. He is himself a big capitalist. It is he who ordered the armed invasion of Cuba in 1961, and who ordered the military blockade and war provocations against Cuba in 1962. It is he who has carried on the inhuman "special war" in southern Vietnam, who has used the "United Nations force" to suppress the national liberation movement in the Congo, and who has organized "special forces" in a frantic effort to crush the national-democratic revolutionary movement in various Latin American countries. Every year since he became president, Kennedy has greatly increased US military spending. Kennedy's 1963-64 budget calls for military expenditures of over \$60 billion, or over 30 percent more than the \$45.9 billion for military expenditures provided in Eisenhower's 1959-60 budget. These facts show that the Kennedy Administration is still more adventurous in pursuing policies of aggression and war.

In trying so hard to portray Kennedy as "sensible," are not these CPUSA leaders serving as willing apologists for US imperialism and helping it to deceive the people of the world?

The fact that certain leaders of the CPUSA are so eager to prettify US imperialism and so eager to affirm their loyalty to the ruling class of the United States recalls to mind Browder's revisionism, which existed in the CPUSA for some time. This renegade from the working class, Browder, denied Lenin's basic thesis that imperialism is parasitic, decaying and moribund capitalism, and denied that US capitalism is imperialist in its nature, maintaining that it "retains some of the characteristics of a young capitalism" and would play a progressive role and be a force for world peace for a long time. Why don't these leaders of the CPUSA stop and consider: What is the difference between your present embellishment of US imperialism and Browder's revisionism?

It is obvious that differences of principle exist in the international communist movement today as to how to appraise and how to deal with US imperialism, the archenemy of the people of the world.

We have always held that, basing ourselves on Marxism-Leninism and taking things as they really are, we must constantly expose the reactionary nature of US imperialism, constantly expose the policies of aggression

and war pursued by US imperialism, including its government leaders, and clearly point out that US imperialism is the chief enemy of the people of the world. We must ceaselessly carry on revolutionary propaganda among the masses of the people, arm them ideologically, enhance their revolutionary staunchness and vigilance, and mobilize them in waging the struggle against US imperialism.

However, there are certain persons who, while calling themselves Marxist-Leninists, do their utmost not only to prettify US imperialism, but also to stop others from unmasking it. They smear revolutionary propaganda against US imperialism as being nothing but “curses,” “vilification,” “verbal weapons,” “incantations,” “cardboard swords,” etc., etc. And they add, “vituperation alone, however just, will not weaken imperialism.” In the eyes of these persons, aren’t all the revolutionary propaganda undertaken by Communists since the time of the Communist Manifesto, all the writings of Marx and Engels exposing capitalism, all Lenin’s works exposing imperialism, the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement jointly drawn up by the communist parties of the world—aren’t they all only “cardboard swords?” These persons completely fail to understand that once the theory of Marxism-Leninism grips the masses of the people, a tremendous material force is generated. Once armed with revolutionary ideas, the masses of the people will dare to struggle and to seize victory, and they will accomplish earth-shaking feats. What then is the purpose of these persons in opposing the exposure of imperialism and in opposing revolutionary propaganda of any kind? It can only be to prevent the people from waging a revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Clearly, such a stand is completely contrary to Marxism-Leninism.

We have always held, moreover, that we must rely on the masses of the people to wage a tit-for-tat struggle against imperialism and its running dogs. This is the basic lesson the Chinese people have drawn from their 120 years of struggle against imperialism and its running dogs. It is also the common lesson which all oppressed nations and people of the world have drawn from their struggles against imperialism and its running dogs. The imperialists and the reactionaries in every country use every available means and method against the revolutionary people. It is therefore imperative for the revolutionary people of all countries to study and master every means and method of struggle that can hurt the enemy and protect and

develop their own forces. Examples are: to oppose the counter-revolutionary united front of imperialism and its running dogs by a revolutionary united front of the masses against imperialism and its running dogs, to oppose dual counter-revolutionary tactics with dual revolutionary tactics, to counter a war of aggression with a war of self-defense, to counter negotiation with negotiation, to oppose counter-revolutionary propaganda with revolutionary propaganda, etc. That is what we mean by “tit for tat.” Experience has demonstrated that only thus can we temper and expand the forces of the people, accumulate and enrich our revolutionary experience and win victory for the revolutionary cause. And only thus can we puncture the arrogance of imperialism, stop imperialist aggression and safeguard world peace.

Certain persons, however, deliberately misrepresent and attack our view that a tit-for-tat struggle has to be waged against imperialism, charging that we are opposed to negotiations with the imperialists. Following them, the CPUSA in its statement also misrepresents and attacks this view of ours without any valid grounds. Actually, these people are not unaware that the Chinese Communist Party has consistently approved of negotiations between socialist and imperialist countries, including summit meetings of great powers, in order to settle international disputes peacefully and relax international tension. They are also aware that the Chinese Government has made positive efforts and important contributions to this end.

Why then do these people keep on distorting and attacking this correct stand of ours?

The basic reason is that there is a difference of principle between them and us on the question of the fundamental policy for fighting imperialism and defending world peace. We place our confidence in the great strength of the masses. We hold that in fighting imperialism and defending world peace we should rely mainly on the unity and struggle of the people of all countries, and on the concerted struggle of the socialist camp, the international working class, the national-liberation movements and all peace-loving forces. In contrast, these persons have no confidence in the masses and pin their hopes not on the unity and struggle of the masses, but mainly on the “wisdom” and “goodwill” of the imperialists and on talks between the heads of two great powers. They are infatuated with the idea of summit meetings of great powers and laud them as marking “a new stage,” “a turning point in the history of mankind” and opening “a new stream in world history.”

In their opinion, the course of history and the fate of mankind are determined by two great powers and two “great men.” In their opinion, the statement that all countries are independent and equal irrespective of size is an empty phrase, and the hundred and more countries in the world ought to allow themselves to be ordered about by these two great powers. In their opinion, the statement that the masses are the makers of history is another empty phrase, and every matter under the sky can be settled if the two “great men” sit together. Isn’t this great-power chauvinism? Isn’t this the doctrine of power politics? Does this have anything in common with Marxism-Leninism? Actually, there is nothing new about this view, it has been copied from the renegade Browder. Browder said long ago that the “alliance” of the two greatest powers in the world “will be a great fortress for the collective security and progress of all peoples in the post-war world,” and that “the future of the world” depended upon the “friendship, understanding and cooperation” of the two greatest powers.

With an ulterior purpose, the statement of the CPUSA referred to Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macao. It said that the Chinese comrades were “correctly, not following the adventurous policy in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macao that they advocate for others. Why this double standard approach?”

We know from what quarter they have learned this ridiculous charge. And we know, too, the purpose of the person who manufactured it.

Here we should like to answer all those who have raised this matter.

For us there never has been a question of a “double standard.” We have only one standard, whether in dealing with the question of Taiwan, whether in dealing with the questions of Hong Kong and Macao, or whether in dealing with all international questions, and that standard is Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism, the interests of the Chinese people and of the people of the world, the interests of world peace and the revolutionary cause of the people of all countries. In international struggles we are opposed both to adventurism and to capitulationism. These two hats can never fit our heads.

Inasmuch as some persons have mentioned Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macao, we are obliged to discuss a little of the history of imperialist aggression against China.

In the hundred years or so prior to the victory of the Chinese revolution, the imperialist and colonial powers—the United States, Britain, France,

Tsarist Russia, Germany, Japan, Italy, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Spain and Portugal—carried out unbridled aggression against China. They compelled the governments of old China to sign a large number of unequal treaties—the Treaty of Nanjing of 1842, the Treaty of Aigun of 1858, the Treaty of Tianjin of 1858, the Treaty of Beijing of 1860, the Treaty of Ili of 1881, the Protocol of Lisbon of 1887, the Treaty of Shimonoseki of 1895, the Convention for the Extension of Hong Kong of 1898, the International Protocol of 1901, etc. By virtue of these unequal treaties, they annexed Chinese territory in the north, south, east and west and held leased territories on the seaboard and in the hinterland of China. Some seized Taiwan and the Penghu Islands, some occupied Hong Kong and forcibly leased Kowloon, some put Macao under perpetual occupation, etc., etc.

At the time the People's Republic of China was inaugurated, our Government declared that it would examine the treaties concluded by previous Chinese governments with foreign governments, treaties that had been left over by history, and would recognize, abrogate, revise or renegotiate them according to their respective contents. In this respect, our policy towards the socialist countries is fundamentally different from our policy towards the imperialist countries. When we deal with various imperialist countries, we take differing circumstances into consideration and make distinctions in our policy. As a matter of fact, many of these treaties concluded in the past either have lost their validity, or have been abrogated or have been replaced by new ones. With regard to the outstanding issues, which are a legacy from the past, we have always held that, when conditions are ripe, they should be settled peacefully through negotiations and that, pending a settlement, the status quo should be maintained. Within this category are the questions of Hong Kong, Kowloon and Macao and the questions of all those boundaries which have not been formally delimited by the parties concerned in each case. As for Taiwan and the Penghu Islands, they were restored to China in 1945, and the question now is the US imperialist invasion and occupation of them and US imperialist interference in China's internal affairs. We Chinese people are determined to exercise our sovereign right to liberate our own territory of Taiwan; at the same time, through the ambassadorial talks between China and the United States in Warsaw we are striving to solve the question of effecting the withdrawal of US armed forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits. Our position as described above accords not only with

the interests of the Chinese people but also with the interests of the people of the socialist camp and the people of the whole world.

Why is it that after the Caribbean crisis this correct policy of ours suddenly became a topic of discussion among certain persons and a theme for their anti-China campaign?

These heroes are apparently very pleased with themselves for having picked up a stone from a cesspool, with which they believe they can instantly fell the Chinese. But whom has this filthy stone really hit?

You are not unaware that such questions as those of Hong Kong and Macao relate to the category of unequal treaties left over by history, treaties which the imperialists imposed on China. It may be asked: In raising questions of this kind, do you intend to raise all the questions of unequal treaties and have a general settlement? Has it ever entered your heads what the consequences would be? Can you seriously believe that this will do you any good?

Superficially, you seem to agree with China's policy on Hong Kong and Macao. Yet, you compare it with India's liberation of Goa. Anyone with a discerning eye can see at once that your sole intention is to prove that the Chinese are cowards. To be frank, there is no need for the Chinese people to prove their courage and staunchness in combating imperialism by making a show of force on the questions of Hong Kong and Macao. The imperialists, and the US imperialists in particular, have had occasion to sample our courage and staunchness. Shoulder to shoulder with the Korean people, the finest sons and daughters of the Chinese people fought for three years and shed their blood on the battlefields of Korea to repulse the US aggressors. Don't you feel it "stupid" and "deplorable" on your part to taunt us on the questions of Hong Kong and Macao?

We know very well, and you know too, that you are, to put it plainly, bringing up the questions of Hong Kong and Macao merely as a fig-leaf to hide your disgraceful performance in the Caribbean crisis. But all this is futile. There is an objective criterion for truth, just as there is for error. What is right cannot be made to look wrong, nor can wrong be made to look right. To glory in your disgraceful performance will not add to your prestige. How can the correct policy of the Chinese people on the questions of Hong Kong and Macao be mentioned in the same breath with your erroneous policy on the Caribbean crisis? How can such a comparison help you to

whitewash yourselves? Our resolute defense of our sovereignty in the matter of Taiwan is completely consistent with our resolute support of the Cuban people in defending their sovereignty during the Caribbean crisis. How can this be described as having a “double standard?”

We say to these friends who are acting the hero, it is you, and not we, who really have a “double standard.” With regard to the US imperialists, one day you call them pirates and the next you say they are concerned for peace. As for revolutionary Cuba, you say that you support her five demands for safeguarding her independence and sovereignty, but you try to impose “international inspection” on her. With regard to the Sino-Indian boundary dispute, you speak of “fraternal China” and “friendly India” on the one hand, but on the other you maliciously attack China and support the Indian reactionaries in diverse ways. As for Hong Kong and Macao, while you ostensibly speak for China, you are actually stabbing her in the back. Are you not applying a “double standard” in all your actions? Is this not a manifestation of dual personality?

The Chinese Communists and the Chinese people and the Communists and people of the United States are fighting on the same front against US imperialism. We highly esteemed Comrade William Z. Foster, builder of the CPUSA and outstanding leader of the US proletariat. We have not forgotten that the US Communists represented by him warmly supported us Chinese people in the difficult years of our revolution and laid the foundation for friendship between the Chinese and the US Parties and between the Chinese and American peoples. US Communists are now being savagely persecuted by the US Government; we have great sympathy for them in their difficult position. In a statement issued a year ago, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party condemned the US Government for its outrageous persecution of the US Communists. The Chinese people also launched a mass movement in support of the US Communist Party. But, for reasons beyond us, the leaders of the CPUSA did not think it worthwhile to inform its members and the people of the United States of the support given to the US Party by the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people.

The leaders of the CPUSA assert that they are conscious of their international obligations in the heartland of the world’s most powerful and arrogant imperialism. We will of course be glad if they indeed have a correct

understanding of their obligations. In the United States, there is a powerful working class, there are extensive democratic and progressive social forces, and there are many fair-minded and progressive people in the fields of science, art, journalism, literature and education. In the United States, there are large-scale workers' struggles, there is the ever-growing struggle of the Negro people, and there is the movement for peace, democracy and social progress. In the United States, there is a social basis for a broad united front against monopoly capital and against the US imperialist policies of aggression and war. And there are not a small number of genuine Communists, both inside and outside the Communist Party of the United States, who firmly adhere to Marxism-Leninism and oppose revisionism and dogmatism.

The leaders of the CPUSA can show that they really understand their international obligations and are fulfilling them, if they carry on and enrich the revolutionary tradition of Comrade Foster; if they identify themselves with the masses, rely on them and do arduous revolutionary work among them; if they combat the corrosive influence of the bourgeoisie and the poison of reformism in the working-class movement and eliminate the revisionist influence of the Lovestones and Browders from their ranks; and if they develop the revolutionary struggle of the American people against their imperialist ruling class and coordinate this struggle in the heartland of US imperialism with the international fight of all people against US imperialism. The Chinese people and the people throughout the world have the highest hopes for the working class and the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists of the United States.

Today, the urgent task confronting the Communists of all countries is to unite the people of the whole world, including the American people, in the broadest possible united front against imperialism headed by the United States. The great slogan "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" inspires the people of the socialist countries and the proletariat of all countries, inspires the oppressed people and nations throughout the world, and rallies them all to fight shoulder to shoulder in the common struggle against imperialism headed by the United States.

We Communists throughout the world must unite. We must unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement and direct the spearhead of our struggle against the imperialists headed by the United

States. We must carry through to final victory the great cause of the people of all countries for world peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism.

A Mirror for Revisionists

RENMIN RIBAO EDITORIAL

March 9, 1963

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, March 9, 1963, p. 1.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, March 15, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 10-11,
pp. 63-66.

In the past twelve months, the revisionist clique headed by Dange have seized the leadership of the Communist Party of India by taking advantage of the large-scale campaign launched by the ruling groups of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords against China, against communism and against the Indian people. They have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, betrayed the revolutionary cause of the Indian proletariat and the Indian people and embarked on the road of national chauvinism and class capitulationism, thus creating complete chaos in the Indian Communist Party. Their intention is to turn the Indian Communist Party into an appendage of India's big bourgeoisie and big landlords and a lackey of the Nehru government.

How low have Dange and company sunk? Let us first look at Dange's letter of greetings to Nehru, dated November 14, 1962, on the occasion of the latter's birthday.

Here is the full text:

My dear Panditji,

Allow me to convey our heartfelt congratulations to you on behalf of the Communist Party of India on your 73rd birthday.

You have inspired and led heroically the Indian nation in its struggle for national freedom.

In the post-independence period you have laid the foundations of a new Indian nation pledged to the policies of planned development, democracy, socialism, peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism.

Today, in this hour of grave crisis created by the Chinese aggression, the nation has mustered around you as a man to safeguard its honor, integrity and sovereignty.

The Communist Party of India pledges its unqualified support to your policies of national defense and national unity.

May you live long to realise your ideals of building a prosperous and socialist India.

Yours sincerely,

S. A. Dange Chairman, CPI

This is not an ordinary courtesy letter. In his letter, (1) Dange completely sides with the Indian reactionaries and violently opposes socialist China; (2) Dange pledges the Indian Communist Party's support to the Nehru government's "policies of national defense and national unity" which are directed against China, against communism and against the Indian people, and what is more, he pledges, not support in general, but "unqualified support"; and (3) Dange places his reliance on Nehru, the representative of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords, to bring about socialism in India.

This letter is the Dange clique's political oath of betrayal of the Indian proletariat; it is an indenture by which they sell themselves to the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords and the Nehru government.

The Dange clique have revealed their revisionist features more and more clearly ever since the Nehru government provoked the Sino-Indian border conflict in 1959. For the past three years or so, they have identified themselves with the stand of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords and served as the apologists and hatchet men of the Nehru government in the anti-China campaign.

- (1) In complete disregard of the historical background and the actual situation with regard to the Sino-Indian boundary, the Dange clique have unconditionally supported the Nehru government in its territorial claims on China. With regard to the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, they assert that the illegal McMahon Line is a "virtually demarcated border line" and that it constitutes the "border of India." With regard to the western and middle sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary, they describe the Nehru government's unjustified claims as "correct."

- (2) In complete disregard of the fact that the Indian ruling groups have deliberately provoked the border conflict to meet their internal and external political requirements, the Dange clique have tried to shift the responsibility for the border conflict on to China, alleging that China “has a wrong political assessment of the Indosituation” and “hence this dispute was created.”
- (3) Instead of revealing the truth about the constant encroachments on China by Indian troops over the past three years and more, the Dange clique, following Nehru, have on a number of occasions most viciously slandered and attacked China to suit the wishes of the reactionary ruling groups of India. They have asserted that China “has committed a breach of faith,” that China wants to “settle a border dispute with India by force of arms,” that China “insists on the old maps of all their old emperors,” that China is given to “a fanatic ambition to restore what it considers its historical, geographical national-state form,” that China “will lay down his life and fight against his neighbor and brother” “even for an inch of a hedge,” that China has been “overcome by something of Bonapartism,” that China has taken a “militarist and recalcitrant attitude” and “now threatens even world peace,” and so on and so forth.
- (4) Instead of condemning the Nehru government for its obstinate stand in perpetuating tension along the Sino-Indian border and spurning a peaceful settlement, the Dange clique have done their utmost to justify the Nehru government’s attitude in rejecting negotiations. They have expressed their “full support” for the precondition which the Nehru government laid down for the resumption of negotiations.
- (5) The Dange clique have shamelessly provided cover for the large-scale attacks launched by Indian troops against China. Seven days after the order issued by Nehru on October 12, 1962 to “free” Chinese territory of the Chinese frontier guards who were safeguarding it, Dange issued a statement, talking about “intrusion by the Chinese forces to the south of the McMahon Line, thus violating Indian territory,” and saying that “we take the Indian Government’s report as true in this respect.”

- (6) After the Nehru government had mounted a large-scale armed attack on China, the Dange clique clamored for the “defense of the Motherland.” On November 1 and December 2, 1962 and on February 12, 1963, they issued successive anti-China resolutions which pledge full support to the Nehru government’s “policies of national defense and national unity,” inveigle the people into making “greater voluntary sacrifices,” support the Nehru government in “buying arms from any country” and back its policy of ganging up with US imperialism.

It is only too clear that, cloaked as Communists, the Dange clique have played a role which the Nehru government cannot play in deceiving the people, stirring up reactionary nationalist sentiment and undermining the friendship between China and India. No wonder the Home Minister of the Nehru government said gleefully not long ago: “What better reply could be given to China than the leader of the Communist Party in this country, Mr. Dange, himself condemning the Chinese stand and upholding the viewpoint of the Government of India?”

The national chauvinism of the Dange clique runs counter not only to the interests of the Indian proletariat but also to the interests of the overwhelming majority of the Indian people, that is, to the national interests of India. Internally, the national chauvinism of the Dange clique serves the reactionary nationalist purposes of India’s big bourgeoisie and big landlords; externally, it serves the purposes of US imperialism which is promoting neo-colonialism in India. Their chauvinistic policy is a policy that provides support for the Nehru government in repressing the Indian people and in hiring itself to imperialism at the cost of national independence. Their policy constitutes a betrayal of the international proletariat as well as a betrayal of the Indian people.

From the very first day the Nehru government launched its massive armed attack, the Dange clique, going further and further, have unfolded a whole series of activities in support of the Nehru government’s “policies of national defense and national unity,” and they have pursued their line of class capitulation ever more thoroughly.

Here is a striking example. Four days after the all-out attack by the Indian forces on the Chinese border, and after Nehru had called upon all workers “not to indulge in strikes,” Dange, in his capacity as the General Secretary of the All-India Trade Union Congress, rushed in with a letter to

Nehru. He proposed that a tripartite conference of representatives of workers, employers and the government be held to discuss “the problems of the production front and defense.” The Nehru government readily accepted his advice and lost no time in calling such a tripartite meeting. The meeting adopted a unanimous resolution prohibiting the workers from engaging in strikes or slow-downs and urging them to work extra hours, contribute to the “National Defense Fund” and subscribe to “Defense Bonds.”

By this action Dange directly assisted the Indian big bourgeoisie to sabotage the workers’ movement, deprive the workers of their basic rights and intensify the exploitation and enslavement of the working people. This shameless action which Dange took as Chairman of the Communist Party of India and General Secretary of the All-India Trade Union Congress proves that he has wholly turned himself into an instrument of the ruling class for repressing the working class and the working people.

Here is another striking example. In November 1962, S. G. Sardesai, a member of the Dange clique on the Central Executive Committee of the Indian Communist Party, had a leaflet distributed, which reads in part:

Our moral responsibility to defend our country when a socialist country attacks us is greater than that of our other compatriots, not less.

It is our sincere and fervent appeal to the ruling party, the National Congress, as also to all other patriotic parties, that we must set aside all our differences at this crucial hour and unite under the common national flag. The only test and consideration at the moment must be national defense.

We declare explicitly that even if we are excluded from the collective efforts for national defense, we shall still devote all our energy to the same cause... We shall carry it out without expecting the slightest reward, even if some of our own compatriots attempt to treat us as pariahs.

The crucial need of the day, the acid test of our patriotism, is... to give monolithic support to Prime Minister Nehru, to strengthen his hands, and to carry out his behests. He is the country’s supreme field marshal, its commander-in-chief.

Look! How perfect is the devotion of the Dange clique to Nehru! How disgustingly they fawn upon the Indian Congress Party! And what fanatical

national chauvinism! They are straining themselves to serve the interests of the big bourgeoisie and the big landlords of India and to drive the broad masses of the Indian people to take a stand against socialist China. Does this have anything in common with proletarian internationalism or with genuine Indian patriotism?

Here is yet another striking example. In November 1962 in a report to the General Council of the All-India Trade Union Congress Dange said:

We do not lay down conditions for defending our country. Because the country belongs to the people. I do not hold the view that in a condition like ours, we should decide our behavior by asking whether the country is ours or of the national bourgeoisie.

We unconditionally support the war effort... My unconditional support to Nehru Government is there in the matter of defense.

We have to stand by our nationalism...

Under conditions of the national emergency, defense and near-war conditions require that the trade unions of the AITUC do modify temporarily their normal relations with the bourgeoisie, their functioning and approach to the questions of the working class.

We as the working class say that for the time being, we suspend the question of strike struggles and protecting our class interests by that method.

Industrial truce is, in a sense, "class collaboration." But it is consciously accepted.

The question of unstinted support to national bourgeoisie at this juncture of history was not a matter contradictory to the principles of working-class movement.

So we support the war effort, we are with the national bourgeoisie... Don't hesitate. The more you hesitate, the more you will be confused.

Here Dange, completely denying the class nature of the state, openly describes as belonging to the people a state which is under the dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords. He has completely gone over to the

side of the bourgeoisie and has publicly called for unstinted support of the bourgeoisie. Completely abandoning the Marxist-Leninist theory of class struggle, he openly advocates class collaboration. Dange and company have thoroughly degenerated and become cat's-paws of the Indian big bourgeoisie.

What is even more shocking is that, while closing ranks with the Nehru government under the slogan of "national unity," Dange and company have used the power of the Indian ruling groups to push aside the people who disagree with them within the Indian Communist Party and to split the Party wide apart. After China had effected a ceasefire and withdrawn her frontier guards on her own initiative, the Nehru government, acting on a list of names previously furnished to it, made nation-wide arrests, throwing into prison eight or nine hundred members and leading cadres of different levels of the Indian Communist Party, who are loyal to the cause of the proletariat and the people. While "calling on all members of the Party not to be provoked by the arrests but carry out the policies of the Party with calm and cool determination," the Dange clique exploited the situation and sent their trusted followers, on the heels of the police, to take over the leading organs of the party committees in a number of states. The purpose of these actions by the Dange clique was to reconstitute the Indian Communist Party and wreck the Indian revolutionary movement so as to serve the ends of the big bourgeoisie.

Furthermore, Dange and company are assisting the Nehru government to hoodwink the people with its sham "socialism." They laud Nehru as "the symbol of national unity" and say, "When you have such a person at the head of the nation, and we [Dange and company] take our correct position inside the common front, the front grows into a leading force for future development. What future development? For Socialism!"

The Moscow Statement clearly points out that Communists should expose the demagogic use by bourgeois politicians of socialist slogans. But Dange and company have done nothing to expose Nehru's so-called socialism; on the contrary, they have tried to convince the Indian Communists and the Indian people that Nehru is really pursuing a policy of socialism and should be given unstinted support. They have publicly asked the Congress Party to cooperate with the Indian Communist Party in order to build socialism in India under the leadership of the Nehru government. We would

like to ask: If the Dange clique believe that Nehru and his Congress Party can be depended upon to realize socialism, what need is there for a communist party controlled by Dange and company?

The series of facts just cited make it evident that the Dange clique are sliding farther and farther down the path of revisionism. They have replaced the theory of class struggle by the slogan of class collaboration, and they have replaced proletarian socialism by bourgeois socialism. They are devotedly defending the dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords, and have cast to the winds the revolutionary cause of the Indian proletariat and the Indian people. They are giving unconditional support to the Nehru government in its policy of hiring itself to US imperialism and have totally abandoned the task of fighting imperialism. They are trampling underfoot the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples and are acting as buglers for Nehru's anti-China campaign. For proletarian internationalism they have substituted bourgeois chauvinism. In brief, the Dange clique have already gone so far in their degeneration that they have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and they are sinking deeper and deeper into the swamp of class capitulationism and national chauvinism.

This is not the first time in history that revisionists like Dange and company have turned up in a communist party.

Since World War II, revisionist trends have afflicted the communist parties of a number of countries. Renegades from Marxism-Leninism, like Browder and Gates in the United States, Larsen in Denmark and Shojiro Kasuga in Japan have appeared in a good many parties. And it is not only in communist parties of capitalist countries that such renegades have made their appearance; in Yugoslavia where the proletariat once held power, there emerged the revisionist Tito clique which betrayed Marxism-Leninism. It is important for Communists throughout the world to draw lessons from the damage these traitorous cliques have inflicted on the cause of communism.

The Tito clique provides a mirror. It reveals how a group of renegades following a revisionist line corrupt a party and cause a socialist country to degenerate into a capitalist country.

The Dange clique provides another mirror. It reveals how the leaders of a communist party in a capitalist country take the road of revisionism, slide down it and end up as the servants and the tail of the bourgeoisie.

Today, the Indian Communists and the Indian people find themselves in a most difficult situation. The Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people have a deep concern and profound sympathy for the Indian Communists who are persisting in their struggle for the communist cause, and for the Indian proletariat and the Indian people who have a glorious revolutionary tradition. No reactionaries, no revisionists can block the advance of the Indian people. Relying on the proletariat and the broad masses of the people, the forces of Marxism-Leninism will in the end overcome all difficulties, and develop and expand through complex and tortuous struggles. History will prove that the genuine representatives of the interests of the Indian people and the Indian nation are those who are firmly upholding truth and justice and firmly adhering to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. India's future is in their hands.

Today, the relations between China and India are also passing through a difficult period. The Indian reactionaries and revisionists are trying hard to undermine the friendship between the peoples of China and India. The imperialists are also doing their best to fish in troubled waters and to sow dissension. But there is every reason not to underestimate the strength of the great friendship which exists between the two peoples and which has a long tradition. Compared with the great strength of this friendship, the Indian reactionaries and the Dange revisionist clique are a handful of pygmies. In the last analysis, nobody can undermine the friendship between the peoples of China and India or the friendship between the Chinese Communists and the Indian Communists.

Appendix 1

Declaration of Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries³⁹⁰

November 1957

Source: *Political Affairs*, December 1957, pp. 83-95.

Representatives of the Albanian Party of Labor, the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Vietnamese Working People's Party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Communist Party of China, the Korean Party of Labor, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the Polish United Workers' Party, the Rumanian Workers' Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia discussed their relations, current problems of the international situation and the struggle for peace and socialism.

The exchange of opinions revealed identity of views of the parties on all the questions examined at the meeting and unanimity in their assessment of the international situation. In the course of the discussion the meeting also touched upon general problems of the international Communist movement. In drafting the declaration the participants in the meeting consulted with representatives of the fraternal parties in the capitalist countries. The fraternal parties not present at this meeting will assess and themselves decide what action they should take on the considerations expressed in the declaration.

I.

The main content of our epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism which was begun by the great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. Today more than a third of the population of the world—over 950,000,000 people—have taken the road of socialism and are building a new life. The tremendous growth of the forces of socialism has stimulated the rapid extension of the anti-imperialist national movement in the post-war peri-

³⁹⁰ Representatives of communist and workers' parties of Socialist countries met in Moscow, November 14-16, 1957.

od. During the last twelve years, besides the Chinese People's Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Korean People's Democratic Republic, over 700,000,000 people have shaken off the colonial yoke and established national independent states.

The peoples of the colonial and dependent countries, still languishing in slavery, are intensifying the struggle for national liberation. The progress of socialism and of the national liberation movement has greatly accelerated the disintegration of imperialism. With regard to the greater part of mankind imperialism has lost its onetime domination. In the imperialist countries society is rent by deep-going class contradictions and by antagonisms between those countries, while the working class is putting up increasing resistance to the policy of imperialism and the monopolies, fighting for better conditions, democratic rights, for peace and socialism.

In our epoch, world development is determined by the course and results of the competition between two diametrically opposed social systems. In the past forty years socialism has demonstrated that it is a much higher social system than capitalism. It has insured development of the productive forces at a rate unprecedented and impossible for capitalism, and the raising of the material and cultural levels of the working people.

The Soviet Union's strides in economics, science and technology and the results achieved by the other Socialist countries in Socialist construction are conclusive evidence of the great vitality of socialism. In the Socialist states the broad masses of the working people enjoy genuine freedom and democratic rights. People's power insures political unity of the masses, equality and friendship among the nations and a foreign policy aimed at preserving universal peace and rendering assistance to the oppressed nations in their emancipation struggle. The world Socialist system, which is growing and becoming stronger, is exerting ever greater influence upon the international situation in the interests of peace and progress and the freedom of the peoples.

While socialism is on the upgrade, imperialism is heading toward decline. The positions of imperialism have been greatly weakened as a result of the disintegration of the colonial system. The countries that have shaken off the yoke of colonialism are defending their independence and fighting for economic sovereignty, for international peace.

The existence of the Socialist system and the aid rendered by the Socialist nations to these countries on principles of equality and cooperation between them and the Socialist nations in the struggle for peace and against aggression help them to uphold their national freedom and facilitate their social progress.

In the imperialist countries the contradictions between the productive forces and production relations have become acute. In many respects modern science and engineering are not being used in the interests of social progress for all mankind, because capitalism fetters and deforms the development of the productive forces of society.

The world capitalist economy remains shaky and unstable. The relatively good economic activity still observed in a number of capitalist countries is due in large measure to the arms drive and other transient factors. However, the capitalist economy is bound to encounter deeper slumps and crises. The temporary high business activity helps to keep up the reformist illusions among part of the workers in the capitalist countries.

In the post-war period some sections of the working class in the more advanced capitalist countries, fighting against increased exploitation and for a higher standard of living, have been able to win certain wage increases, though in a number of these countries real wages are below the pre-war level. However, in the greater part of the capitalist world, particularly in the colonial and dependent countries, millions of working people still live in poverty. The broad invasion of agriculture by the monopolies and the price policy dictated by them, the system of bank credits and loans and the increased taxation caused by the arms drive have resulted in the steady ruin and impoverishment of the main mass of the peasantry.

There is a sharpening of contradiction, not only between the bourgeois and the working class but also between the monopoly bourgeoisie and all sections of the people, between the United States monopoly bourgeoisie on the one hand and the peoples, and even the bourgeoisie of the other capitalist countries on the other.

The working people of the capitalist countries live in such conditions that, increasingly, they realize that the only way out of their grave situation lies through socialism. Thus, increasingly favorable conditions are being created for bringing them into the active struggle for socialism.

The aggressive imperialist circles of the United States, by pursuing the so-called “positions of strength” policy, seek to bring most countries of the world under their sway and to hamper the onward march of mankind in accordance with the laws of social development. On the pretext of “combating communism,” they are angling to bring more and more countries under their dominion, instigating destruction of democratic freedoms, threatening the national independence of the developed capitalist countries, trying to enmesh the liberated peoples in new forms of colonialism and systematically conducting subversive activities against the Socialist countries.

The policy of certain aggressive groups in the United States is aimed at rallying around them all the reactionary forces of the capitalist world. Acting in this way they are becoming the center of world reaction, the sworn enemies of the people. By this policy these anti-popular, aggressive imperialist forces are courting their own ruin, creating their own grave-diggers.

So long as imperialism exists there will always be soil for aggressive wars. Throughout the post-war years the American, British, French and other imperialists and their hirelings have conducted and are conducting wars in Indochina, Indonesia, Korea, Malaya, Kenya, Guatemala, Egypt, Algeria, Oman and Yemen.

At the same time the aggressive imperialist forces flatly refuse to cut armaments, to prohibit the use and production of atomic and hydrogen weapons, to agree on immediate discontinuation of the tests of these weapons; they are continuing the “cold war” and arms drive, building more military bases and conducting the aggressive policy of undermining peace and creating the danger of a new war. Were a world war to break out before agreement on prohibition of nuclear weapons is reached, it would inevitably become a nuclear war unprecedented in destructive force.

In West Germany militarism is being revived with United States help, giving rise to a hotbed of war in the heart of Europe. The struggle against West German militarism and revanchism, which are now threatening peace, is a vital task facing the peace-loving forces of the German people and all the nations of Europe. An especially big role in this struggle belongs to the German Democratic Republic—the first worker-peasant state in German history—with which the participants in the meeting express their solidarity and which they fully support.

Simultaneously the imperialists are trying to impose on the freedom-loving peoples of the Middle East the notorious "Eisenhower-Dulles Doctrine," thereby creating the danger of war in this area. They are plotting conspiracies and provocations against independent Syria. The provocations against Syria and Egypt and other Arab countries pursue the aim of dividing and isolating the Arab countries in order to abolish their freedom and independence.

The SEATO aggressive bloc is a source of war danger in East Asia.

The question of war or peaceful coexistence is now the crucial question of world policy. All the nations must display the utmost vigilance in regard to the war danger created by imperialism.

At present the forces of peace have so grown that there is a real possibility of averting wars, as was demonstrated by the collapse of the imperialist designs in Egypt. The imperialist plans to use the counterrevolutionary forces for the overthrow of the people's democratic system in Hungary have failed as well.

The cause of peace is upheld by the powerful forces of our era: the invincible camp of Socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union; the peace-loving countries of Asia and Africa taking an anti-imperialist stand and forming, together with the Socialist countries, a broad peace zone; the international working class and above all its vanguard, the Communist parties; the liberation movement of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies; the mass peace movement of the peoples; the peoples of the European countries who have proclaimed neutrality, the peoples of Latin America and the masses in the imperialist countries are putting up increasing resistance to the plans for a new war.

An alliance of these mighty forces could prevent war, but should the bellicose imperialist maniacs venture, regardless of anything, to unleash a war, imperialism will doom itself to destruction, for the peoples will not tolerate a system that brings them so much suffering and exacts so many sacrifices.

The Communist and Workers' parties taking part in the meeting declare that the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of the two systems, which has been further developed and brought up to date in the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, is the sound basis of the foreign policy of the Socialist countries and the dependable pillar of peace and friendship among the peoples. The idea of peaceful coexistence

coincides with the five principles advanced jointly by the Chinese People's Republic and the Republic of India and with the program adopted by the Bandung Conference of African-Asian countries. Peace and peaceful coexistence have now become the demands of the broad masses in all countries.

The Communist parties regard the struggle for peace as their foremost task. They will do all in their power to prevent war.

II.

The meeting considers that in the present situation the strengthening of the unity and fraternal cooperation of the Socialist countries, the Communist and Workers' parties and the solidarity of the international working class, national liberation and democratic movements acquire special significance.

In the bedrock of the relations between the countries of the world Socialist system and all the Communist and Workers parties lie the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the principles of proletarian internationalism which have been tested by life. Today the vital interests of the working people of all countries call for their support of the Soviet Union and all the Socialist countries who, pursuing a policy of preserving peace throughout the world, are the mainstay of peace and social progress. The working class, the democratic forces and the working people everywhere are interested in tirelessly strengthening fraternal contacts for the sake of the common cause, in safeguarding from enemy encroachments the historic political and social gains effected. in the Soviet Union—the first and mightiest Socialist power—in the Chinese People's Republic and in all the Socialist countries, in seeing these gains extended and consolidated.

The Socialist countries base their relations on principles of complete equality, respect for territorial integrity, state independence and sovereignty and non-interference in one another's affairs. These are vital principles. However, they do not exhaust the essence of relations between them. Fraternal mutual aid is part and parcel of these relations. This aid is a striking expression of Socialist internationalism.

On a basis of complete equality, mutual benefit and comradely mutual assistance, the Socialist states have established between themselves extensive economic and cultural cooperation that plays an important part in promoting the economic and political independence of each Socialist country and

the Socialist commonwealth as a whole. The Socialist states will continue to extend and improve economic and cultural cooperation among themselves.

The Socialist states also advocate for all-round expansion of economic and cultural relations with all other countries, provided they desire it, on a basis of equality, mutual benefit and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

The solidarity of the Socialist countries is not directed against any other country. On the contrary, it serves the interests of all the peace-loving peoples, restrains the aggressive strivings of the bellicose imperialist circles and supports and encourages the growing forces of peace. The Socialist countries are against the division of the world into military blocs. But in view of the situation that has taken shape, with the Western powers refusing to accept the proposals of the Socialist countries for mutual abolition of military blocs, the Warsaw Pact Organization, which is of a defensive nature, serves the security of the peoples of Europe and supports peace throughout the world, must be preserved and strengthened.

The Socialist countries are united in a single community by the fact that they are taking the common Socialist road, by the common class essence of the social and economic system and state authority, by the requirements of mutual aid and support, identity of interests and aims in the struggle against imperialism, for the victory of socialism and communism and by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism which is common to all.

The solidarity and close unity of the Socialist countries constitute a reliable guarantee of the sovereignty and independence of each. Stronger fraternal relations and friendship between the Socialist countries call for a Marxist-Leninist internationalist policy on the part of the communist and workers parties, for educating all the working people in the spirit of combining internationalism with patriotism and for a determined effort to overcome the survivals of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism. All issues pertaining to relations between the Socialist countries can be fully settled through comradely discussion, with strict observance of the principles of socialist internationalism.

III.

The victory of socialism in the USSR and progress in Socialist construction in the People's Democracies find deep sympathy among the working class and the working people of all countries. The ideas of socialism are winning additional millions of people. In these conditions the imperialist bourgeoisie attaches increasing importance to the ideological molding of the masses; it misrepresents socialism and smears Marxism-Leninism, misleads and confuses the masses. It is a prime task to intensify Marxist-Leninist education of the masses, combat bourgeois ideology, expose the lies and slanderous fabrications of imperialist propaganda against socialism and the Communist movement and widely propagate in simple and convincing fashion the ideas of socialism, peace and friendship among nations.

The meeting confirmed the identity of views of the communist and workers' parties on the cardinal problems of the Socialist revolution and Socialist construction. The experience of the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries has fully borne out the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist proposition that the processes of the Socialist revolution and the building of socialism are governed by a number of basic laws applicable in all countries embarking on a socialist course. These laws manifest themselves everywhere, alongside a great variety of historic national peculiarities and traditions which must by all means be taken into account.

These laws are: Guidance of the working masses by the working class, the core of which is the Marxist-Leninist party in effecting a proletarian revolution in one form or another and establishing one form or other of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the alliance of the working class and the bulk of the peasantry and other sections of the working people; the abolition of capitalist ownership and the establishment of public ownership of the basic means of production; gradual Socialist reconstruction of agriculture; planned development of the national economy aimed at building socialism and communism, at raising the standard of living of the working people; the carrying out of the Socialist revolution in the sphere of ideology and culture and the creation of a numerous intelligentsia devoted to the working class, the working people and the cause of socialism; the abolition of national oppression and the establishment of equality and fraternal friendship between the peoples; defense of the achievements of socialism against attacks by external and internal enemies; solidarity of the working class of

the country in question with the working class of other countries, that is, proletarian internationalism.

Marxism-Leninism calls for a creative application of the general principles of the Socialist revolution and Socialist construction depending on the concrete conditions of each country, and rejects mechanical imitation of the policies and tactics of the Communist parties of other countries.

Lenin repeatedly called attention to the necessity of correctly applying the basic principles of communism, in keeping with the specific features of the nation, of the national state concerned. Disregard of national peculiarities by the proletarian party inevitably leads to its divorce from reality, from the masses, and is bound to prejudice the cause of socialism and, conversely, exaggeration of the role of these peculiarities or departure, under the pretext of national peculiarities, from the universal Marxist-Leninist truth on the Socialist revolution and Socialist construction is just as harmful to the Socialist cause.

The participants in the meeting consider that both these tendencies should be combated simultaneously. The communist and workers parties of the Socialist countries should firmly adhere to the principle of combining the above universal Marxist-Leninist truth _with the specific revolutionary practice in their countries, creatively apply the general laws governing the Socialist revolution and Socialist construction in accordance with the concrete conditions of their countries, learn from each other and share experience. Creative application of the general laws of socialist construction tried and tested by experience and the variety of forms and methods of building socialism used in different countries, represents a collective contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory.

The theory of Marxism-Leninism derives from dialectical materialism. This world outlook reflects the universal law of development of nature, society and human thinking. It is valid for the past, the present, and the future. Dialectical materialism is countered by metaphysics and idealism. Should the Marxist political party in its examination of questions base itself not on dialectics and materialism, the result will be one-sidedness and subjectivism, stagnation of thought, isolation from life and loss of ability to make the necessary analysis of things and phenomena, revisionist and dogmatist mistakes and mistakes in policy. Application of dialectical materialism in practical work and the education of the party functionaries and the broad masses

in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism are urgent tasks of the Communist and Workers parties.

Of vital importance in the present stage is intensified struggle against opportunist trends in the working class and Communist movement. The meeting underlines the necessity of resolutely overcoming revisionism and dogmatism in the ranks of the Communist and Workers' parties. Revisionism and dogmatism in the working-class and Communist movement are today, as they have been in the past, international phenomena. Dogmatism and sectarianism hinder the development of Marxist-Leninist theory and its creative application in the changing conditions, replace the study of the concrete situation with merely quoting classics and sticking to books and lead to the isolation of the party from the masses. A party that has withdrawn into the shell of sectarianism and that has lost contact with the masses cannot bring victory to the cause of the working class.

In condemning dogmatism, the Communist parties believe that the main danger at present is revisionism or, in other words, Right-wing opportunism, which as a manifestation of bourgeois ideology paralyzes the revolutionary energy of the working class and demands the preservation or restoration of capitalism. However, dogmatism and sectarianism can also be the main danger at different phases of development in one party or another. It is for each Communist party to decide what danger threatens it more at a given time.

It should be pointed out that the conquest of power by the proletariat is only the beginning of the revolution, not its conclusion. After the conquest of power, the working class is faced with the serious tasks of effecting the Socialist reconstruction of the national economy and laying the economic and technical foundation of socialism. At the same time the overthrown bourgeoisie always endeavors to make a comeback, the influence exerted on society by the bourgeoisie, the petit bourgeoisie and their intelligentsia, is still great. That is why a fairly long time is needed to resolve the issue of who will win—capitalism or socialism. The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source.

Modern revisionism seeks to smear the great teachings of Marxism-Leninism, declares that it is “outmoded” and alleges that it has lost its significance for social progress. The revisionists try to exorcise the revolutionary

spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and the working people in general. They deny the historical necessity for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, deny the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, reject the principles of proletarian internationalism and call for rejection of the Leninist principles of party organization and, above all, of democratic centralism, for transforming the Communist Party from a militant revolutionary organization into some kind of debating society.

The experience of the international Communist movement shows that resolute defense by the Communist and Workers parties of the Marxist-Leninist unity of their ranks and the banning of factions and groups sapping unity guarantee the successful solution of the tasks of the socialist revolution, the establishment of socialism and communism.

IV.

The communist and workers' parties are faced with great historic tasks. The carrying out of these tasks necessitates closer unity not only of the Communist and Workers parties but of the entire working class, necessitates cementing the alliance of the working class and peasantry, rallying the working people and progressive mankind, the freedom and peace-loving forces of the world.

The defense of peace is the most important world-wide task of the day. The communist and workers parties in all countries stand for joint action on the broadest possible scale with all forces favoring peace and opposed to war. The participants in the meeting declare that they support the efforts of all states, parties, organizations, movements and individuals who champion peace and oppose war, who want peaceful coexistence, collective security in Europe and Asia, reduction of armaments and prohibition of the use and tests of nuclear weapons.

The communist and workers' parties are loyal defenders of the national and democratic interests of the peoples of all countries. The working class and the peoples of many countries are still confronted with the historic tasks of struggle for national independence against colonial aggression and feudal oppression. What is needed here is a united anti-imperialist and anti-feudal front of the workers, peasants, urban petit bourgeoisie, national bourgeoisie

and other patriotic democratic forces. Numerous facts show that the greater and stronger the unity of the various patriotic and democratic forces, the greater the guarantee of victory in the common struggle.

At present the struggle of the working class and the masses of the people against the war danger and for their vital interests is spearheaded against the big monopoly group of capital as those chiefly responsible for the arms race, as those who organize or inspire plans for preparing a new world war and who are the bulwark of aggression and reaction. The interests and the policy of this handful of monopolies conflict increasingly not only with the interests of the working class, but the other sections of capitalist society: the peasants, intellectuals, petty and middle urban bourgeoisie.

In those capitalist countries where the American monopolies are out to establish their hegemony and in the countries already suffering from the US policy of economic and military expansion, the objective conditions are being created for uniting, under the leadership of the working class and its revolutionary parties, broad sections of the population to fight for peace, the defense of national independence and democratic freedoms, to raise the standard of living, to carry through radical land reforms and to overthrow the rule of the monopolies who betray the national interests.

The profound historic changes and decisive switch in the balance of forces in the international sphere in favor of socialism and the tremendous growth of the power of attraction exerted by Socialist ideas among the working class, working peasantry and working intelligentsia create more favorable conditions for the victory of socialism.

The forms of the transition of socialism may vary for different countries. The working class and its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist party—seek to achieve the Socialist revolution by peaceful means. This would accord with the interests of the working class and the people as a whole as well as with the national interests of the country.

Today in a number of capitalist countries the working class headed by its vanguard has the opportunity, given a united working-class and popular front or other workable forms of agreement and political cooperation between the different parties and public organizations, to unite a majority of the people, to win state power without civil war and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people. It has this opportunity while relying on the majority of the people and decisively

rebuffing the opportunist elements incapable of relinquishing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords. The working class then, can defeat the reactionary, anti-popular forces, secure a firm majority in parliament, transform parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the working people, launch a non-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realization of the socialist revolution.

All this will be possible only by broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle of the workers, peasant masses and the urban middle strata against big monopoly capital, against reaction, for profound social reforms, for peace and socialism.

In the event of the ruling classes resorting to violence against people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or another stage of the struggle for socialism.

The possibility of one or another way to socialism depends on the concrete conditions in each country. In the struggle for better conditions for the working people, for preservation and extension of democratic rights, winning and maintaining national independence and peace among nations, and also in the struggle for winning power and building socialism, the communist parties seek cooperation with the Socialist parties. Although the Right-Wing Socialist Party leaders are doing their best to hamper this cooperation, there are increasing opportunities for cooperation between the Communists and Socialists on many issues. The ideological differences between the Communist and the Socialist parties should not keep them from establishing unity of action on the many pressing issues that confront the working-class movement.

In the Socialist countries where the working class is in power, the communist and workers' parties which have the opportunity to establish close relations with the broad masses of the people should constantly rely on them and make the building and defense of socialism the cause of millions who

fully realize that they are masters of their country. Of great importance for enhancing the activity and creative initiative of the broad masses and their solidarity, for consolidating the Socialist system and stepping up Socialist construction are the measures taken in recent years by the Socialist countries to expand Socialist democracy and encourage criticism and self-criticism.

To bring about real solidarity of the working class, of all working people and the whole of progressive mankind, of the freedom-loving and peace-loving forces of the world, it is necessary above all to promote the unity of the communist and workers' parties, to foster solidarity between the communist and workers parties of all countries. This solidarity is the core of still greater solidarity, it is the main guarantee of the victory of the cause of the working class.

The communist and workers' parties have a particularly important responsibility with regard to the destinies of the world Socialist system and the International Communist movement. The communist and workers' parties represented at the meeting declare that they will tirelessly promote their unity and comradely cooperation with a view to further consolidating the commonwealth of Socialist states and in the interests of the international working-class movement, of peace and socialism.

The meeting notes with satisfaction that the International Communist movement has grown, withstood numerous serious trials and won a number of major victories. By their deeds the Communists have demonstrated to the working people on a world-wide scale the vitality of the Marxist-Leninist theory and their ability not only to propagate the great ideals of socialism but also to realize them in exceedingly strenuous conditions.

Like any progressive movement in human society, the Communist movement is bound to encounter difficulties and obstacles. However, as in the past, no difficulties or obstacles can change now, nor will they be able to change in the future, the objective laws governing historical progress or affect the determination of the working class to transform the old world and create a new one. Ever since they began their struggle, the Communists have been baited and persecuted by the reactionary forces, but the Communist movement heroically repels all attacks, emerging from the trials stronger and more steeled. The Communists, by further consolidating their unity, counter attempts by the reactionary imperialist forces to prevent human society from marching toward a new era.

Contrary to the absurd assertions of imperialism about a so-called crisis of communism, the Communist movement is growing and gathering strength. The historic decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU are of tremendous importance, not only to the CPSU and to the building of communism in the USSR; they have opened a new stage in the world communist movement and pushed ahead its further development along Marxist-Leninist lines. The results of the congresses of the communist parties of China, France, Italy and other countries in recent times have clearly demonstrated the unity and solidarity of the party ranks and their loyalty to the principles of proletarian internationalism. This meeting of the representatives of communist and workers' parties testifies to the international solidarity of the Communist movement.

After exchanging views, the participants in the meeting arrived at the conclusion that in present conditions it is expedient, besides bilateral meetings of leading personnel and exchange of information, to hold, as the need arises, more representative conferences of communist and workers' parties to discuss current problems, share experience, study each other's views and attitudes and concert action in the joint struggle for the common goals, peace, democracy and socialism.

The participants in the meeting unanimously express their firm confidence that, by closing their ranks and thereby rallying the working class and the peoples of all countries, the communist and workers' parties will surmount all obstacles in their onward movement and accelerate further big victories for the cause of peace, democracy and socialism.

Appendix 2

Peace Manifesto

November 1957

Source: *New Times*, No. 48, 1957, pp. 1-3.

Workers and peasants! Men of science and culture! People of good will in all countries!

We, the representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties, gathered in Moscow for the 40th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, address you, appealing both to your reason and to your hearts.

The calamity of the second world war is still fresh in mind. Its bloody consequences have not yet completely disappeared, and already hovering over the homes of peaceful towns and villages is the sinister specter of another, a hundred times more destructive, war. The threat of another war, darkening the joy of life, overhangs every country. In every home the question is asked:

What will happen tomorrow, a month or a year from now? Will the flames of war again envelop us? Will the all-destructive atomic and hydrogen bombs bring sudden death to us and to our children?

The peoples have already had the bitter experience of two world wars. It is always the ordinary people who make the heaviest sacrifices in war. They know that each succeeding war brings with it greater suffering, ruins more countries, kills more people, and leaves a trail of still more dreadful and lasting consequences.

The first world war, caused by the big imperialist powers and unleashed by German militarism, took a toll of ten million lives. Tens of millions were maimed and deprived of health. Entire nations were subject to hunger and privation.

The second world war, for which German fascism bears the chief guilt, not only hurled huge armies to destruction. Bombs destroyed open cities, killed hundreds of thousands of civilians, while millions of men, women and children perished behind the barbed wire and in the gas chambers of Hitler's concentration camps. Enormous material riches, with which it would have been possible to build thousands of beautiful towns and feed

and clothe entire nations, were used for purposes of death and destruction. Over 30 million human lives, not counting the wounded and the maimed, were swallowed in the holocaust of the second world war. And, during its last days, the first two atom bombs fell on open Japanese cities, the tangible omen of wholesale human slaughter in future conflicts.

It requires neither the knowledge of the scientist nor the imagination of the poet to say that the next war—should the peoples ever allow it to break out would surpass in destruction anything that mankind has yet experienced. The peoples of Europe and America, Asia, Africa and Australia know that man has released such tremendous natural forces and possesses such powerful means that their destructive action could be let loose on any part of the globe. In the next war there will be no shelter or safety. The flames of nuclear and rocket war would engulf all the peoples and bring untold sufferings for generations to come.

People all over the world, irrespective of nationality and political views, religious belief or color, want to live in peace, and ordinary people all over the world say surely man, whose victorious mind is wresting from Nature all her secrets, subordinating her more and more, who, now with the launching of the Soviet Earth satellites, may soon reach the stars, surely man can prevent war and self-destruction!

We, the representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties, fully conscious of our responsibility for human destiny, declare:

War is not inevitable. War can be prevented, peace can be preserved and made secure.

We are gathered in the capital of the country which, 40 years ago, opened a new era in human history. In the year 1917 for the first time the socialist revolution triumphed on Russian soil. The working people took power into their own hands and set out to destroy all forms of oppression and exploitation of man by man.

The workers and peasants of Russia, under the leadership of the Party of Lenin, inscribed peace on their banners and have always remained faithful to it. In the course of its 40 years the Soviet Union has opened the way to peace for all peoples, and has sought—despite all imperialist obstacles—peaceful co-existence with all other countries irrespective of their social system. The workers of the capitalist countries, upholding their vital interests, took an active part in the struggle for peace. This noble cause was supported

by progressive people all over the world. However, the peace forces did not succeed in saving mankind from a new catastrophe, the second world war. These forces were not sufficiently strong at the time, and the Soviet Union was then the only country steadfastly fighting for peace.

We Communists say that now it is possible to prevent war, possible to safeguard peace. We say this with full confidence because the world situation today is different and the balance of forces has changed.

The Land of Soviets, born of the Great October Revolution, no longer stands alone. Out of the victory over fascism came the vast world of socialism with a population of nearly one thousand million. Marching shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union for peace, international cooperation and peaceful coexistence of the different social systems, is another big socialist power—People's China. Working for the same peaceful aims are the European and Asian countries of people's democracy.

The unprecedented development of industry, science and technology in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries serves peace and acts as a powerful brake on war.

Another new force has made its appearance in the world arena—the colonial peoples awakened by the October Revolution; some of them have already thrown off and others are in the process of throwing off their age-old yoke of dependence; they want to live in peace and will not allow any imperialist interference in their internal affairs. In order to put an end to their backwardness and poverty they are pursuing a policy of peace and neutrality, the policy of the well-known five principles—mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence.

It is not only the socialist countries, and not only the nations of the East that do not want war. It is hated also by the peoples of the Western capitalist countries, who have twice experienced it.

The peace forces are legion. They can prevent war and safeguard peace. However, we, the Communists, believe that it is our duty to warn all the people of the world that the danger of a monstrous and all—destroying war has not passed.

Where does the threat to peace and the security of the peoples come from? From the capitalist monopolies who have a vested interest in war and amassed unprecedented riches from the two world wars and the current

arms drive. The arms drive, which brings huge profits to the monopolists, weighs heavily on the working people and seriously worsens the economy of the countries. The ruling circles of some capitalist countries, under pressure of the monopolies, and especially those of the US, have rejected proposals for disarmament, prohibition of nuclear weapons, and other measures aimed at preventing a new war. Not a few excellent proposals by the peace-loving nations have been submitted to the United Nations, acceptance of which would have strengthened peace and lessened the danger of war. No one can deny that the submission to the United Nations of proposals aimed at ending the arms race, removing the threat of an atomic war, and promoting peaceful coexistence of states and economic cooperation between states which is a decisive factor in creating proper confidence in international relations, is in keeping with the vital interests of all nations. The destiny of the world and the destinies of the future generations hinge on the solutions of these problems. These proposals are actively resisted only by those interested in maintaining international tension.

Thousands of newspapers and radio stations daily instill into the minds of the people of the United States, Britain, France, Italy and other countries the claim that "world communism" is endangering their freedom, their way of life, and their peaceful existence.

However, neither the Communist parties nor any of the socialist countries have any motive or reason for launching wars or military attacks on other countries, for seizing alien soil. The Soviet Union and People's China both have vast expanses of land and untold natural riches. In all the socialist countries there are no classes or social groups interested in war. Power is in the hands of the workers and peasants, who in all wars have been the greatest sufferers. Is it possible that they could desire another war? The aim of the Communists is to build a society that will ensure universal well-being, the blossoming of all nations and eternal peace between them. In order to build this society the socialist countries need a lasting and stable peace. There are, therefore, no more consistent enemies of war, no stauncher champions of peace than the Communists.

The socialist countries do not intend to enforce their social or political system on any other nations. They are firmly convinced that socialism is bound to win, but they know that socialism cannot be implanted from without, that it will come, above all, as a result of struggle by the working class

and all other progressive forces within each country. That is why the socialist states have no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, just as they will not allow others to interfere in their internal affairs. Hence the contention that the socialist countries are the threat to peace, that they want to impose their system upon others, is merely an attempt to mislead those desiring peace.

Peace can be preserved on the one condition that all to whom it is dear combine their forces, sharpen their vigilance in relation to the machinations of the war instigators and become fully conscious that their sacred duty is to intensify the struggle for peace which is threatened.

Having in mind the well-being of the people throughout the world and desirous of progress and a bright future for all nations, we address ourselves:

To men and women,
 To workers and peasants,
 To men of science and art,
 To teachers and office workers,
 To the youth,
 To handicraftsmen, traders and industrialists,
 To Socialists, Democrats and Liberals,
 To all, irrespective of political and religious convictions,
 To all who love their country,
 To all who do not want war,
 To all people of good will
 With the call:

Demand an end to the arms drive, which daily intensifies the danger of war and of which you, the common people, bear the burden;

Demand prohibition of the manufacture and use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and, as a first step, an immediate end to the testing of these weapons;

Demand that an end be put to the policy of military blocs and the creation of military bases in other countries;

Demand that the German militarists, chiefly responsible for the last war, are not allowed to rearm in the very heart of Europe;

Demand an end to the plotting and military provocations of the imperialists in the Middle East;

Support the policy of collective security, of peaceful coexistence of different social systems, and the widest economic and cultural cooperation of all peoples.

We address ourselves to all of you with the call:

Demand from your governments that in the United Nations they pursue a policy of peace and opposition to the cold war.

We address ourselves to all people of good will throughout the world:

Organize and work for;

1) Immediate cessation of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests;

2) Unconditional and speedy prohibition of the manufacture and use of these weapons.

We, the Communists, have devoted our lives to the cause of socialism. We, the Communists, are firmly convinced that this noble cause will triumph. And it is because we believe in the triumph of our ideas—the ideas of Marx and Lenin, the ideas of proletarian internationalism, that we want peace and are working for peace. War is our enemy.

From now on let the countries with different social systems compete with one another in developing science and technology for peace. Let them demonstrate their superiority not on the field of battle, but in competition for progress and for raising living standards.

We extend a hand to all people of good will. By a common effort let us get rid of the burden of armaments which oppresses the peoples. Let us rid the world of the danger of war, death, and annihilation. Before us is a bright and happy future of mankind marching forward to progress.

Peace to the world!

Adopted by the delegations of the Communist and Workers' parties of Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Britain, Bulgaria, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Korea, Luxemburg, Malaya, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, San Marino, Soviet Union, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria and the Leb-

anon, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Vietnam
and Yugoslavia.

Appendix 3

Statement of 81 Communist and Workers Parties— Meeting in Moscow, USSR³⁹¹

1960

Source: *Statement of 81 Communist and Workers Parties Meeting in Moscow, USSR, 1960*. New York, New Century Publishers, 1961.

Representatives of the communist and workers' parties have discussed at this Meeting urgent problems of the present international situation and of the further struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

The Meeting has shown unity of views among the participants on the issues discussed. The communist and workers' parties have unanimously reaffirmed their allegiance to the Declaration and Peace Manifesto adopted in 1957. These program documents of creative Marxism-Leninism determined the fundamental positions of the international Communist movement on the more important issues of our time and contributed in great measure toward uniting the efforts of the communist and workers' parties in the struggle to achieve common goals. They remain the banner and guide to action for the whole of the international Communist movement.

The course of events in the past three years has demonstrated the correctness of the analysis of the international situation and the outlook for world development as given in the Declaration and Peace Manifesto, and the great scientific force and effective role of creative Marxism-Leninism.

The chief result of these years is the rapid growth of the might and international influence of the world socialist system, the vigorous process of disintegration of the colonial system under the impact of the national-liberation movement, the intensification of class struggles in the capitalist world, and the continued decline and decay of the world capitalist system. The superiority of the forces of socialism

³⁹¹ Representatives of 81 communist and workers' parties consulted together for an extended period of time in November 1960. On December 5, 1960, these Parties unanimously adopted a Statement; this historic document is printed in full in the following pages in an authorized translation —*Editor*.

over those of imperialism, of the forces of peace over those of war, is becoming ever more marked in the world arena.

Nevertheless, imperialism, which is intent on maintaining its positions, sabotages disarmament, seeks to prolong the cold war and aggravate it to the utmost, and persists in preparing a new world war. This situation demands ever closer joint efforts and resolute actions on the part of the socialist countries, the international working class, the national anti-imperialist movement, all peace-loving countries and all peace champions, to prevent war and assure a peaceful life for people. It demands the further consolidation of all revolutionary forces in the fight against imperialism, for national independence, and for socialism.

I

Our time, whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is a time of struggle between the two opposing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, a time of the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, a time of transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale.

It is the principal characteristic of our time that the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society.

The strength and invincibility of socialism have been demonstrated in recent decades in titanic battles between the new and old worlds. Attempts by the imperialists and their shock force—fascism—to check the course of historical development by force of arms ended in failure. Imperialism proved powerless to stop the socialist revolutions in Europe and Asia. Socialism became a world system. The imperialists tried to hamper the economic progress of the socialist countries, but their schemes were foiled. The imperialists did all in their power to preserve the system of colonial slavery, but that system is falling apart. As the world socialist system grows stronger, the international situation changes more and more in favor of the peoples fighting for independence, democracy and social progress.

Today it is the world socialist system and the forces fighting against imperialism, for a socialist transformation of society, that determine the main content, main trend and main features of the historical development of society. Whatever

efforts imperialism makes, it cannot stop the advance of history. A reliable basis has been provided for further decisive victories for socialism. The complete triumph of socialism is inevitable.

The course of social development proves right Lenin's prediction that the countries of victorious socialism would influence the development of world revolution chiefly by their economic construction. Socialism has made unprecedented constructive progress in production, science and technology and in the establishment of a new, free community of people, in which their material and spiritual requirements are increasingly satisfied. The time is not far off when socialism's share of world production will be greater than that of capitalism.

Capitalism will be defeated in the decisive sphere of human endeavor, the sphere of material production.

The consolidation and development of the socialist system exert an ever-increasing influence on the struggle of the peoples in the capitalist countries. By the force of its example, the world socialist system is revolutionizing the thinking of the working people in the capitalist countries; it is inspiring them to fight against capitalism and is greatly facilitating that fight. In the capitalist countries the forces fighting for peace and national independence and for the triumph of democracy and the victory of socialism, are gaining in numbers and strength.

The world capitalist system is going through an intense process of disintegration and decay. Its contradictions have accelerated the development of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism. By tightening the monopolies' grip on the life of the nation, state-monopoly capitalism closely combines the power of the monopolies with that of the state with the aim of saving the capitalist system and increasing the profits of the imperialist bourgeoisie to the utmost by exploiting the working class and plundering large sections of the population.

But no matter what methods it resorts to, the monopoly bourgeoisie cannot rescue capitalism. The interests of a handful of monopolies are in irreconcilable contradiction to the interests of the entire nation. The class and national antagonisms, and the internal and external contradictions of capitalist society, have sharpened greatly. Attempts to prop the decayed pillars of capitalism by militarism are aggravating these contradictions still further.

Never has the conflict between the productive forces and relations of production in the capitalist countries been so acute. Capitalism impedes more and more the use of the achievements of modern science and technology in the interests of social progress. It turns the discoveries of human genius against mankind itself by converting them into formidable means of destructive warfare.

The instability of capitalist economy is growing. Although production in some capitalist countries is increasing to some degree or other, the contradictions of capitalism are becoming more acute on a national as well as international scale. Some capitalist countries are faced with the threat of new economic upheavals while still grappling with the consequences of the recent economic crisis. The anarchical nature of capitalist production is becoming more marked. Capitalist concentration is assuming unprecedented dimensions, and monopoly profits and superprofits are growing. Monopoly capital has greatly intensified the exploitation of the working class in new forms, above all through intensification of labor. Automation and "rationalization" under capitalism bring the working people further calamities. Only by a stubborn struggle has the working class in some countries succeeded in winning a number of its pressing demands. In many capitalist countries, however, the standard of life is still below pre-war. Despite the promises made by the bourgeoisie, full employment was provided only in some of the capitalist countries, and only temporarily. The domination of the monopolies is causing increasing harm to the interests of the broad peasant masses and large sections of the small and middle bourgeoisie. In the capitalist countries, including some of the more developed, economically underdeveloped areas still exist where the poverty of the masses is appalling, and these, moreover, continue to expand.

These facts once again refute the lies which bourgeois ideologists and revisionists spread to the effect that modern capitalism has become "people's capitalism," that it has established a so-called "welfare state" capable of overcoming the anarchy of production and economic crisis and assuring well-being for all working people.

The uneven course of development of capitalism is continuously changing the balance of forces between the imperialist countries. The narrower the sphere of imperialist domination, the stronger the antagonisms between the imperialist powers. The problem of markets has become more acute

than ever. The new inter-state organizations which are established under the slogan of “integration” actually lead to increased antagonisms and struggle between the imperialist countries. They are new forms of division of the world capitalist market among the biggest capitalist combines, of penetration by stronger imperialist states of the economy of their weaker partners.

The decay of capitalism is particularly marked in the United States of America, the chief imperialist country of today. US monopoly capital is clearly unable to use all the productive forces at its command. The richest of the developed capitalist countries of the world—the United States of America—has become a land of especially big chronic unemployment. Increasing under-capacity operation in industry has become permanent in that country. Despite the enormous increase in military appropriations, which is achieved at the expense of the standard of life of the working people, the rate of growth of production has been declining in the post-war years and has been barely above the growth of population. Over-production crises have become more frequent. The most developed capitalist country has become a country of the most distorted, militarized economy. More than any other capitalist country, the United States drains Asia, and especially Latin America, of their riches, holding up their progress. US capitalist penetration into Africa is increasing. *US imperialism has become the biggest international exploiter.*

The US imperialists seek to bring many states under their control, by resorting chiefly to the policy of military blocs and economic “aid.” They violate the sovereignty of developed capitalist countries as well. The dominant monopoly bourgeoisie in the more developed capitalist countries, which has allied itself with US. imperialism, sacrifices the sovereignty of their countries, hoping with support from the US imperialists to crush the revolutionary liberation forces, deprive the working people of democratic freedoms and impede the struggle of the masses for social progress. US imperialism involves those countries in the arms race, in a policy of preparing a new war of aggression and carrying on subversive activities against socialist and neutral countries.

The pillars of the capitalist system have become so decayed that the ruling imperialist bourgeoisie in many countries can no longer resist on its own the forces of democracy and progress, which are gaining in scope and strength. The imperialists form military-political alliances under US leadership to

fight in common against the socialist camp and to strangle the national-liberation, working-class and socialist movements. *International developments in recent years have furnished many new proofs of the fact that US imperialism is the chief bulwark of world reaction and an international gendarme, that it has become an enemy of the peoples of the whole world.*

The system of military blocs set up by the United States is being weakened both by the struggle going on between their members and as a result of the struggle which the people are waging for the abolition of these blocs. The US imperialists seek to strengthen aggressive blocs, which causes increased resistance on the part of the people. The United States remains the main economic, financial and military force of modern imperialism, although its share in capitalist economy is diminishing. The British and French imperialists are making stubborn efforts to uphold their positions. The monopolies of West Germany and Japan, which have recovered their might and which are closely linked with the US monopolies, are stepping up expansion. The West German monopolies, in pursuing their imperialist policy, seek more and more to exploit the underdeveloped countries.

The peoples are rising with growing determination to fight imperialism. A great struggle is getting under way between the forces of labor and capital, of democracy and reaction, of freedom and colonialism. The victory of the popular revolution in Cuba has become a splendid example for the peoples of Latin America. An anti-colonial movement for freedom and national independence is expanding irresistibly in Africa. The anti-imperialist national uprising in Iraq has been crowned with success. A powerful movement of the people against the Japanese-US military affiance, for peace, democracy and national independence, is under way in Japan. Vigorous actions by the masses in Italy in defense of democracy show the militant resolve of the working people. The struggle for democracy, against the reactionary regime of personal power, is gathering momentum in France. There have been big working-class strikes in the USA., Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, India, Britain, Canada, Belgium and other capitalist countries. The actions of the Negro people in the United States for their fundamental rights are assuming a mass character. There is a growing desire to unite the national forces against the fascist dictatorships in Spain and Portugal, and the democratic movement is gaining strength in Greece. Tyrannical military regimes have been overthrown in Colombia and Venezuela, a blow has been dealt to frankly

pro-American puppet governments in South Korea and Turkey. A national-democratic movement, directed against the US imperialists and their flunkies, is developing in South Vietnam and Laos. The Indonesian people are doing away with the economic positions the imperialists still retain in that country, particularly the positions held by the Dutch colonialists. The mass movement in defense of peace is gaining ground in all continents. All this is graphic evidence that the tide of anti-imperialist, national-liberation, anti-war and class struggles is rising ever higher.

A new stage has begun in the development of the general crisis of capitalism. This is shown by the triumph of socialism in a large group of European and Asian countries embracing one-third of mankind, the powerful growth of the forces fighting for socialism throughout the world and the steady weakening of the imperialists' positions in the economic competition with socialism; the tremendous new upsurge of the national-liberation struggle and the mounting disintegration of the colonial system; the growing instability of the entire world economic system of capitalism; the sharpening contradictions of capitalism resulting from the growth of state-monopoly capitalism and militarism; the increasing contradictions between monopolies and the interests of the nation as a whole; the curtailment of bourgeois democracy and the tendency to adopt autocratic and fascist methods of government; and a profound crisis in bourgeois politics and ideology. This stage is distinguished by the fact that it has set in not as a result of the world war, but in the conditions of competition and struggle between the two systems, an increasing change in the balance of forces in favor of socialism, and a marked aggravation of all the contradictions of imperialism. It has taken place at a time when a successful struggle by the peace-loving forces to bring about and promote peaceful coexistence has prevented the imperialists from undermining world peace by their aggressive actions, and in an atmosphere of growing struggle by the broad masses of the people for democracy, national liberation and socialism.

All the revolutionary forces are rallying against imperialist oppression and exploitation. The peoples who are building socialism and communism, the revolutionary movement of the working class in the capitalist countries, the national-liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples and the general democratic movement—these great forces of our time are merging into one powerful current that undermines and destroys the world imperialist sys-

tem. The central factors of our day are the international working class and its chief creation, the world socialist system. They are an earnest of victory in the struggle for peace, democracy, national liberation, socialism and human progress.

II

A new stage has begun in the development of the world socialist system. The Soviet Union is successfully carrying on the full-scale construction of a communist society. Other countries of the socialist camp are successfully laying the foundations of socialism, and some of them have already entered the period of construction of a developed socialist society.

The socialist system as a whole has scored decisive victories. These victories signify the triumph of Marxism-Leninism; they show clearly to all the peoples who are under the domination of capital that a society based on this science opens up immense opportunities for the fullest development of economy and culture, for the provision of a high standard of living and a peaceful and happy life for people.

The Soviet people, successfully carrying out the Seven-Year Economic Development Plan, are rapidly building up a material and technical basis for communism. Soviet science has ushered in what is virtually a new era in the development of world civilization; it has initiated the exploration of outer space, furnishing impressive evidence of the economic and technical might of the socialist camp. The Soviet Union is the first country in history to be blazing a trail to communism for all mankind. It is the most striking example and most powerful bulwark for the peoples of the world in their struggle for peace, democratic freedoms, national independence and social progress.

The people's revolution in China dealt a crushing blow at the positions of imperialism in Asia and contributed in great measure to the balance of the world forces changing in favor of socialism. By giving a further powerful impetus to the national-liberation movement, it exerted tremendous influence on the peoples, especially those of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The people's democratic republics of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, which, together with the great

Soviet Union, form the mighty socialist camp, have within a historically short period made remarkable progress in socialist construction.

People's government in these countries has proved its unshakable solidity. Socialist relations of production predominate in the national economy; the exploitation of man by man has been abolished forever or is being abolished. The success of the policy of socialist industrialization has led to a great economic upsurge in the socialist countries, which are developing their economy much faster than the capitalist countries. All these countries have established a developed industry; agrarian in the past, they have become, or are becoming, industrial-agrarian countries.

In recent years all the People's Democracies have solved, or have been successfully solving, the most difficult problem of socialist construction, that of transferring the peasantry, on a voluntary basis, from the road of small private farming to the road of large-scale cooperative farming on socialist lines. Lenin's cooperative plan has proved its great vitality both for countries where the peasants' attachment to private land ownership was a long-standing tradition and for countries that have recently put an end to feudal relations. The fraternal alliance of workers and peasants, which is led by the working class, and the maintenance and consolidation of which is, as Lenin taught, a supreme principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat, has grown stronger. In the course of socialist construction this alliance of two classes of working people, which constitutes the political foundation of the socialist system, develops continuously, and further strengthens people's rule under the leadership of the working class and promotes the socialist reorganization of agriculture in accordance with the Leninist principle of voluntary cooperation of the peasantry.

Historic changes have taken place in the social structure of society. The classes of landlords and capitalists no longer exist in the People's Democracies. The working class has become the main force of society; its ranks are growing; its political consciousness and maturity have increased. Socialism has delivered the peasantry from age-long poverty and has made it an active force in social progress. A new, socialist intelligentsia, flesh of the flesh of the working people, is arising. All citizens have free access to knowledge and culture. Socialism has thus created not only political but material conditions for the cultural development of society, for the all-round and complete

development of the gifts and abilities of man. The standard of life of the people is improving steadily thanks to economic progress.

An unbreakable alliance of the working people of all nationalities has formed and has been consolidated in multi-national socialist states. The triumph of Marxist-Leninist national policy in the socialist countries, genuine equality of nationalities, and their economic and cultural progress serve as an inspiring example for the peoples fighting against national oppression.

In the People's Democracies, socialist ideology has achieved notable successes in its struggle against bourgeois ideology. It is a long struggle that will go on until the complete emancipation of the minds of people from the survivals of bourgeois ideology.

The moral and political unity of society, which for the first time in history has come into existence and firmly established itself in the Soviet Union, is growing now in the other socialist countries as well. This makes it possible to use the creative energy of free workers most effectively for promoting the growth of the productive forces and the prosperity of socialist society.

Socialist society is improving steadily and becoming more and more mature; day after day it gives rise to a Communist attitude to labor and other elements of the future Communist society. The methods of socialist economic management and economic planning are steadily improving. Socialist democracy continues to develop; the masses are playing an increasing role in directing economic and cultural development; certain functions of the state are being gradually transferred to public organizations.

Today the restoration of capitalism has been made socially and economically impossible not only in the Soviet Union, but in the other socialist countries as well. The combined forces of the socialist camp reliably safeguard every socialist country against encroachments by imperialist reaction. Thus the rallying of the socialist states in one camp and the growing unity and steadily increasing strength of this camp ensure complete victory for socialism within the entire system.

Thanks to the heroic effort of the working class and the peasantry and to the tremendous work of the communist and workers' parties, most favorable objective opportunities have been provided in the past years for the further rapid development of the productive forces, for gaining the maximum time and achieving victory for the socialist countries in peaceful economic competition with capitalism. The Marxist-Leninist parties heading the socialist countries consider it their duty to make proper use of these opportunities.

Having achieved major victories and withstood serious tests, the communist parties have gained ample and varied experience in directing socialist construction. The socialist countries and the socialist camp as a whole owe their achievements to the proper application of the general objective laws governing socialist construction, with due regard to the historical peculiarities of each country and to the interests of the entire socialist system; they owe them to the efforts of the peoples of those countries, to their close fraternal cooperation and mutual internationalist assistance, and above all, to the fraternal, internationalistic assistance from the Soviet Union.

The experience of development of the socialist countries is added evidence that mutual assistance and support, and utilization of all the advantages of unity and solidarity among the countries of the socialist camp, are a primary international condition for their achievements and successes. Imperialist, renegade and revisionist hopes of a split within the socialist camp are built on sand and doomed to failure. All the socialist countries cherish the unity of the socialist camp like the apple of their eye.

The world economic system of socialism is united by common socialist relations of production and is developing in accordance with the economic laws of socialism. Its successful development requires consistent application, in socialist construction, of the law of planned, proportionate development; encouragement of the creative initiative of the people; continuous improvement of the system of international division of labor through the coordination of national economic plans, specialization and cooperation in production within the world socialist system on the basis of voluntary participation, mutual benefit and vigorous improvement of the scientific and technological standard. It requires study of collective experience; extended cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance; gradual elimination, along these lines, of historical differences in the levels of economic development, and the provision of a material basis for a more or less simultaneous transition of all the peoples of the socialist system to communism.

Socialist construction in the various countries is a source of collective experience for the socialist camp as a whole. A thorough study of this experience by the fraternal parties, and its proper utilization and elaboration with due regard to specific conditions and national peculiarities are an immutable law of the development of every socialist country.

In developing industrial and agricultural production in their countries at a high rate in keeping with the possibilities they have, the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries consider it their internationalist duty to make full use of all the advantages of the socialist system and the internal resources of every country to carry out, by joint effort and as speedily as possible, the historic task of surpassing the world capitalist system in overall industrial and agricultural production and then outstrip the economically most developed capitalist countries in per capita output and in the standard of living. To carry out this task, it is necessary steadily to improve political and economic work, continuously to improve the methods of economic management and to run the socialist economy along scientific lines. This calls for higher productivity of labor to be achieved through continuous technical progress, economic planning, strict observance of the Leninist principle of providing material incentives and moral stimuli to work for the good of society by heightening the political consciousness of the people, and for control over the measure of labor and consumption.

To provide a material basis for the transition of the socialist countries to communism, it is indispensable to achieve a high level of production through the use of the latest techniques, electrification of the national economy, and mechanization and automation of production, without which it is impossible to provide the abundance of consumer goods required by a communist society. On this basis, it is necessary to develop communist social relations, vigorously promote the political consciousness of the people and educate the members of the new communist society.

The socialist camp is a social, economic and political community of free and sovereign peoples united by the close bonds of international socialist solidarity, by common interests and objectives, and following the path of socialism and communism. It is an inviolable law of the mutual relations between socialist countries strictly to adhere to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. Every country in the socialist camp is ensured genuinely equal rights and independence. Guided by the principles of complete equality, mutual advantage and comradely mutual assistance, the socialist states improve their all-round economic, political and cultural cooperation, which meets both the interests of each socialist country and those of the socialist camp as a whole.

One of the greatest achievements of the world socialist system is the practical confirmation of the Marxist-Leninist thesis that national antagonisms diminish with the decline of class antagonisms. In contrast to the laws of the capitalist system, which is characterized by antagonistic contradictions between classes, nations and states leading to armed conflicts, there are no objective causes in the nature of the socialist system for contradictions and conflicts between the peoples and states belonging to it. Its development leads to greater unity among the states and nations and to the consolidation of all the forms of cooperation between them. Under socialism, the development of national economy, culture and statehood goes hand in hand with the strengthening and development of the entire world socialist system, and with an ever greater consolidation of the unity of nations. The interests of the socialist system as a whole and national interests are harmoniously combined. It is on this basis that the moral and political unity of all the peoples of the great socialist community has arisen and has been growing. Fraternal friendship and mutual assistance of peoples, born of the socialist system have superseded the political isolation and national egoism typical of capitalism.

The common interests of the peoples of the socialist countries and the interests of peace and socialism demand the proper combination of the principles of socialist internationalism and socialist patriotism in politics. Every communist party that has become the ruling party in the state, bears historical responsibility for the destinies of both its country and the entire socialist camp.

The Declaration of 1957 points out quite correctly that undue emphasis on the role of national peculiarities and departure from the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism regarding the socialist revolution and socialist construction prejudices the common cause of socialism. The Declaration also states quite correctly that Marxism-Leninism demands creative application of the general principles of socialist revolution and socialist construction depending on the specific historical conditions in the country concerned, and does not permit of a mechanical copying of the policies and tactics of the communist parties of other countries. Disregard of national peculiarities may lead the party of the proletariat to being isolated from reality, from the masses, and many injure the socialist cause.

Manifestations of nationalism and national narrow-mindedness do not disappear automatically with the establishment of the socialist system. If fraternal relations and friendship between the socialist countries are to be strengthened, it is necessary that the communist and workers' parties pursue a Marxist-Leninist internationalist policy, that all working people be educated in a spirit of internationalism and patriotism, and that a resolute struggle be waged to eliminate the survivals of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism.

The communist and workers' parties tirelessly educate the working people in the spirit of socialist internationalism and intolerance of all manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism. Solid unity of the communist and workers' parties and of the peoples of the socialist countries, and their loyalty to Marxism-Leninism are the main source of the strength and invincibility of each socialist country and the socialist camp as a whole.

In blazing a trail to communism, the peoples of the socialist countries are creating a prototype of a new society for all mankind. The working people of the capitalist world are following the constructive effort of the builders of socialism and communism with keen interest. This makes the Marxist-Leninist parties and the peoples of the socialist countries accountable to the international working-class movement for the successful building of socialism and communism.

The communist and workers' parties see it as their task indefatigably to strengthen the great socialist community of nations, whose international role in and influence upon the course of world events are growing from year to year.

The time has come when the socialist states have, by forming a world system, become an international force exerting a powerful influence on world development. There are now real opportunities of solving cardinal problems of modern times in a new way, in the interest of peace, democracy and socialism.

III

The problem of war and peace is the most burning problem of our time.

War is a constant companion of capitalism. The system of exploitation of man by man and the system of extermination of man by man are two aspects of the capitalist system. Imperialism has already inflicted two devastating

world wars on mankind and now threatens to plunge it into an even more terrible catastrophe. Monstrous means of mass annihilation and destruction have been developed which, if used in a new war, can cause unheard-of destruction to entire countries and reduce key centers of world industry and culture to ruins. Such a war would bring death and suffering to hundreds of millions of people, among them people in countries not involved in it. Imperialism spells grave danger to the whole of mankind.

The peoples must now be more vigilant than ever. As long as imperialism exists there will be soil for wars of aggression.

The peoples of all countries know that the danger of a new world war still persists. US imperialism is the main force of aggression and war. Its policy embodies the ideology of militant reaction. The US imperialists, together with the imperialists of Britain, France and West Germany, have drawn many countries into NATO, CENTO, SEATO and other military blocs under the guise of combating the "communist menace"; it has enmeshed the so-called "free world," that is, capitalist countries which depend on them, in a network of military bases spearheaded first and foremost against the socialist countries. The existence of these blocs and bases endangers universal peace and security and not only encroaches upon the sovereignty but also imperils the very life of those countries which put their territory at the disposal of the US militarists.

The imperialist forces of the USA., Britain and France have made a criminal deal with West-German imperialism. In West Germany, militarism has been revived and the restoration is being pushed ahead of a vast regular army under the command of Hitler's generals, which the US imperialists are equipping with nuclear and rocket weapons and other modern means of mass annihilation, a fact which draws emphatic protests from the peace-loving peoples. Military bases are being provided for this aggressive army in France and other West-European countries. The threat to peace and the security of the European nations from West-German imperialism is increasing. The West-German revenge-seekers openly declare their intention to revise the borders established after the Second World War. Like the Hitler clique in its day, the West-German militarists are preparing war against the socialist and other countries of Europe, and strive to effect their own aggressive plans. West Berlin has been transformed into a seat of international

provocation. The Bonn state has become the chief enemy of peaceful coexistence, disarmament and relaxation of tension in Europe.

The aggressive plans of the West-German imperialists must be opposed by the united might of all the peace-loving countries and nations of Europe. An especially big part in the struggle against the aggressive designs of the West-German militarists is played by the German Democratic Republic. The Meeting regards it as the duty of all the countries of the socialist camp and of all the peace-loving peoples to defend the German Democratic Republic—the outpost of socialism in Western Europe and the true expression of the peace aspirations of the German nation.

The US imperialists are also busy reviving the hotbed of war in the Far East. Trampling upon the national independence of the Japanese people and contrary to their will, they have, in collusion with the Japanese reactionary ruling circles, imposed upon Japan a new military treaty which pursues aggressive aims against the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and other peace-loving countries. The US invaders have occupied the island of Taiwan, which belongs to the Chinese People's Republic, and South Korea and are interfering more and more in the affairs of South Viet-Nam; they have turned them into hotbeds of dangerous military provocations and gambles. Threatening Cuba with aggression and interfering in the affairs of the peoples of Latin America, Africa and the Middle East, the US imperialists strive to create new seats of war in different parts of the world. They use such forms of regional alliance as, for example, the Organization of American States, to retain their economic and political control and to involve the peoples of Latin America in the realization of their aggressive schemes.

The US imperialists have set up a huge war machinery and refuse to allow its reduction. The imperialists frustrate all constructive disarmament proposals by the Soviet Union and other peaceful countries. The arms race is going on. Stockpiles of nuclear weapons are becoming dangerously large. Defying protests from their own people and the peoples of other countries, particularly on the African continent, the French ruling circles are testing and manufacturing atomic weapons. The US militarists are preparing to resume disastrous atomic tests; military provocations that threaten serious international conflicts continue.

The US ruling circles have wrecked the Paris meeting of the Heads of Government of the four Great Powers by their policy of provocations and

aggressive acts, and have set out to increase international tension and aggravate the cold war. The war menace has grown.

The imperialist provocations against peace have aroused the indignation and resistance of the peoples. US imperialism has exposed itself still more and its influence in the world has sustained fresh and telling blows.

The aggressive nature of imperialism has not changed. But real forces have appeared that are capable of foiling its plans of aggression. War is not fatally inevitable. Had the imperialists been able to do what they wanted, they would already have plunged mankind into the abyss of the calamities and horrors of a new world war. But the time is past when the imperialists could decide at will whether there should or should not be war. More than once in the past years the imperialists have brought mankind to the brink of world catastrophe by starting local wars. The resolute stand of the Soviet Union, of the other socialist states and of all the peaceful forces put an end to the Anglo-Franco-Israeli intervention in Egypt, and averted a military invasion of Syria, Iraq and some other countries by the imperialists. The heroic people of Algeria continue their valiant battle for independence and freedom. The peoples of the Congo and Laos are resisting the criminal acts of the imperialists with increasing firmness. Experience shows that it is possible to combat effectively the local wars started by the imperialists, and to stamp out successfully the hotbeds of such wars.

The time has come when the attempts of the imperialist aggressors to start a world war can be curbed. World war can be prevented by the joint efforts of the world socialist camp, the international working class, the national-liberation movement, all the countries opposing war and all peace-loving forces.

The development of international relations in our day is determined by the struggle of the two social systems—the struggle of the forces of socialism, peace and democracy against the forces of imperialism, reaction and aggression—a struggle in which the superiority of the forces of socialism, peace and democracy is becoming increasingly obvious.

For the first time in history, war is opposed by great and organized forces: the mighty Soviet Union, which now leads the world in the decisive branches of science and technology; the entire socialist camp, which has placed its great material and political might at the service of peace; a growing number of peace-loving countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which have a vital interest in preserving peace; the international working

class and its organizations, above all the communist parties; the national-liberation movement of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries; the world peace movement; and the neutral countries which want no share in the imperialist policy of war, and advocate for peaceful coexistence. The policy of peaceful coexistence is also favored by a definite section of the bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist countries, which takes a sober view of the relationship of forces and of the dire consequences of a modern war. The broadest possible united front of peace supporters, fighters against the imperialist policy of aggression and war inspired by US imperialism, is essential to preserve world peace. Concerted and vigorous actions of all the forces of peace can safeguard the peace and prevent a new war.

The democratic and peace forces today have no task more pressing than that of safeguarding humanity against a global thermonuclear disaster. The unprecedented destructive power of modern means of warfare demands that the main actions of the anti-war and peace-loving forces be directed towards preventing war. The struggle against war cannot be put off until war breaks out, for then it may prove too late for many areas of the globe and for their population to combat it. *The struggle against the threat of a new war must be waged now and not when atom and hydrogen bombs begin to fall, and it must gain in strength from day to day. The important thing is to curb the aggressors in good time, to prevent war, and not to let it break out.*

To fight for peace today means to maintain the greatest vigilance, indefatigably to lay bare the policy of the imperialists, to keep a watchful eye on the intrigues and maneuvers of the warmongers, arouse the righteous indignation of the peoples against those who are heading for war, organize the peace forces still better, continuously intensify mass actions for peace, and promote cooperation with all countries which have no interest in new wars. In the countries where the imperialists have established war bases, it is necessary to step up the struggle for their abolition, which is an important factor for fortifying national independence, defending sovereignty, and preventing war. The struggle of the peoples against the militarization of their countries should be combined with the struggle against the capitalist monopolies connected with the US imperialists. Today as never before, it is important to fight perseveringly in all countries to make the peace movement thrive and extend to towns and villages, factories and offices.

The peace movement is the broadest movement of our time, involving people of diverse political and religious creeds, of diverse classes of society, who are all united by the noble urge to prevent new wars and to secure enduring peace.

Further consolidation of the world socialist system will be of prime importance in preserving durable peace. So long as there is no disarmament, the socialist countries must maintain their defense potential at an adequate level.

In the opinion of Communists the tasks which must be accomplished first of all if peace is to be safeguarded are to stop the arms race, ban nuclear weapons, their tests and production, dismantle foreign war bases and withdraw foreign troops from other countries, disband military blocs, conclude a peace treaty with Germany, turn West Berlin into a demilitarized free city, thwart the designs of the West-German revanchists, and prevent the revival of Japanese militarism.

History has placed a great responsibility forwarding off a new world war first and foremost on the international working class. The imperialists plot and join forces to start a thermonuclear war. The international working class must close its ranks to save mankind from the disaster of a new world war. *No political, religious or other differences should be an obstacle to all the forces of the working class uniting against the war danger. The hour has struck to counter the forces of war by the mighty will and joint action of all the contingents and organizations of the world proletariat, to unite its forces to avert world war and safeguard peace.*

The communist parties regard the fight for peace as their prime task. They call on the working class, trade unions, cooperatives, women's and youth leagues and organizations, on all working people, irrespective of their political and religious convictions, firmly to repulse by mass struggles all acts of aggression on the part of the imperialists.

But should the imperialist maniacs start war, the peoples will sweep capitalism out of existence and bury it.

The foreign policy of the socialist countries rests on the firm foundation of the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence and economic competition between the socialist and capitalist countries. In conditions of peace, the socialist system increasingly reveals its advantages over the capitalist system in all fields of economy, culture, science and technology. The near future

will bring the forces of peace and socialism new successes. The USSR will become the leading industrial power of the world. China will become a mighty industrial state. The socialist system will be turning out more than half the world's industrial product. The peace zone will expand. The working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement in the colonies and dependencies will achieve new victories. The disintegration of the colonial system will become completed. The superiority of the forces of socialism and peace will be absolute. *In these conditions a real possibility will have arisen to exclude world war from the life of society even before socialism achieves complete victory on earth, with capitalism still existing in a part of the world.* The victory of socialism all over the world will completely remove the social and national causes of all wars.

The Communists of all the world uphold peaceful coexistence unanimously and consistently, and battle resolutely for the prevention of war. The Communists must work untiringly among the masses to prevent underestimation of the possibility of averting a world war, underestimation of the possibility of peaceful coexistence and, at the same time, underestimation of the danger of war.

In a world divided into two systems, the only correct and reasonable principle of international relations is the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems advanced by Lenin and further elaborated in the Moscow Declaration and the Peace Manifesto of 1957, in the decisions of the 10th and 21st Congresses of the CPSU, and in the documents of other communist and workers' parties.

The Five Principles jointly advanced by the Chinese People's Republic and the Republic of India, and the propositions adopted at the Bandung Conference accord with the interests of peace and the peace-loving peoples.

Peaceful coexistence of countries with different systems or destructive war—this is the alternative today. There is no other choice. Communists emphatically reject the US doctrine of “cold war” and “brinkmanship,” for it is a policy leading to thermonuclear catastrophe. By upholding the principle of peaceful coexistence, Communists fight for the complete cessation of the cold war, disbandment of military blocs, and dismantling of military bases, for general and complete disarmament under international control, the settlement of international disputes through negotiation, respect for the

equality of states and their territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, extensive development of trade, cultural and scientific ties between nations.

The policy of peaceful coexistence meets the basic interests of all peoples, of all who want no new cruel wars and seek durable peace. This policy strengthens the positions of socialism, enhances the prestige and international influence of the socialist countries and promotes the prestige and influence of the communist parties in the capitalist countries. Peace is a loyal ally of socialism, for time is working for socialism against capitalism.

The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace. Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle as the revisionists claim. The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism. In conditions of peaceful coexistence favorable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. In their turn, the successes of the revolutionary class and national-liberation struggle promote peaceful coexistence. The Communists consider it their duty to fortify the faith of the people in the possibility of furthering peaceful coexistence, their determination to prevent world war. They will do their utmost for the people to weaken imperialism and limit its sphere of action by an active struggle for peace, democracy and national liberation.

Peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems does not mean conciliation of the socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the communist parties, for the triumph of socialist ideas. But ideological and political disputes between states must not be settled through war.

The meeting considers that the implementation of the program for general and complete disarmament put forward by the Soviet Union would be of historic importance for the destinies of mankind. To realize this program means to eliminate the very possibility of waging wars between countries. It is not easy to realize owing to the stubborn resistance of the imperialists. Hence it is essential to wage an active and determined struggle against the aggressive imperialist forces with the aim of carrying this program into practice. It is necessary to wage this struggle on an increasing scale and to strive persever-

ingly to achieve tangible results—the banning of the testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons, the abolition of military blocs and war bases on foreign soil and a substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments, all of which should pave the way to general disarmament. Through an active, determined struggle by the socialist and other peace-loving countries, by the international working class and the broad masses in all countries, it is possible to isolate the aggressive circles, foil the arms race and war preparations, and force the imperialists into an agreement on general disarmament.

The arms race is not a war-deterrent, nor does it make for a high degree of employment and well-being of the population. It leads to war. Only a handful of monopolies and war speculators are interested in the arms race. In the capitalist countries, the people constantly demand that military expenditures be reduced and the funds thus released be used to improve the living conditions of the masses. In each country, it is necessary to promote a broad mass movement, for the use of the funds and resources to be released through disarmament for the needs of civilian production, housing, health, public education, social security, scientific research, etc. Disarmament has now become a fighting slogan of the masses, a pressing historical necessity. By an active and resolute struggle, the imperialists must be made to meet this demand of the peoples.

The communist and worker's parties of the socialist countries will go on consistently pursuing the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and doing their utmost to spare the peoples the horrors and calamities of a new war. They will display the greatest vigilance towards imperialism, vigorously strengthen the might and defensive capacity of the entire socialist camp and take every step to safeguard the security of the peoples and preserve peace.

The Communists regard it as their historical mission not only to abolish exploitation and poverty on a world scale and rule out for all time the possibility of any kind of war in the life of human society, but also to deliver mankind from the nightmare of a new world war already in our time. The communist parties will devote all their strength and energy to this great historical mission.

IV

National-liberation revolutions have triumphed in vast areas of the world. About forty new sovereign states have arisen in Asia and Africa in the

fifteen post-war years. The victory of the Cuban revolution has powerfully stimulated the struggle of the Latin-American peoples for complete national independence. A new historical period has set in in the life of mankind: the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America that have won their freedom have begun to take an active part in world politics.

The complete collapse of colonialism is imminent. The breakdown of the system of colonial slavery under the impact of the national-liberation movement is a development ranking second in historic importance only to the formation of the world socialist system.

The Great October Socialist Revolution aroused the East and drew the colonial peoples into the common current of the world-wide revolutionary movement. This development was greatly facilitated by the Soviet Union's victory in the Second World War, the establishment of people's democracy in a number of European and Asian countries, the triumph of the socialist revolution in China, and the formation of the world socialist system. The forces of world socialism contributed decisively to the struggle of the colonial and dependent peoples for liberation from imperialist oppression. The socialist system has become a reliable shield for the development of the peoples who have won freedom. The national-liberation movement receives powerful support from the international working-class movement.

The face of Asia has changed radically. The colonial order is collapsing in Africa. A front of active struggle against imperialism has opened in Latin America. Hundreds of millions of people in Asia, Africa and other parts of the world have won their independence in hard-fought battles with imperialism. Communists have always recognized the progressive, revolutionary significance of national-liberation wars; they are the most active champions of national independence. The existence of the world socialist system and the weakening of the positions of imperialism have provided the oppressed peoples with new opportunities for winning independence.

The peoples of the colonial countries win their independence both through armed struggle and by non-military methods, depending on the specific conditions in the country concerned. They secure durable victory through a powerful national-liberation movement. The colonial powers never bestow freedom on the colonial peoples and never leave of their own free will the countries they are exploiting.

The United States is the mainstay of colonialism today. The imperialists, headed by the US, make desperate efforts to preserve colonial exploitation of the peoples of the former colonies by new methods and in new forms. The monopolies try to retain their hold on the levers of economic control and political influence in Asian, African and Latin American countries. These efforts are aimed at preserving their positions in the economy of the countries which have gained freedom, and at capturing new positions under the guise of "economic aid," drawing them into military blocs, implanting military dictatorships and setting up war bases there. The imperialists endeavor to emasculate and undermine the national sovereignty of the newly free countries, to misrepresent the principle of self-determination of nations, to impose new forms of colonial domination under the spurious slogan of "inter-dependence," to put their puppets in power in these countries and bribe a section of the bourgeoisie. They resort to the poisoned weapon of national strife to undermine the young states that are not yet strong enough. They make ample use of aggressive military blocs and bilateral military alliances to achieve these ends. The imperialists' accomplices are the most reactionary sections of the local exploiting classes.

The urgent tasks of national rebirth facing the countries that have shaken off the colonial yoke cannot be effectively accomplished unless a determined struggle is waged against imperialism and the remnants of feudalism by all the patriotic forces of the nations united in a single national-democratic front. The national democratic tasks on the basis of which the progressive forces of the nation can and do unite in the countries which have won their freedom, are: the consolidation of political independence, the carrying out of agrarian reforms in the interest of the peasantry, elimination of the survivals of feudalism, the uprooting of imperialist economic domination, the restriction of foreign monopolies and their expulsion from the national economy, the creation and development of a national industry, improvement of the living standard, the democratization of social life, the pursuance of an independent and peaceful foreign policy, and the development of economic and cultural cooperation with the socialist and other friendly countries.

The working class, which has played an outstanding role in the fight for national liberation, demands the complete and consistent accomplishment of the tasks of the national, anti-imperialist, democratic revolution, and resists reactionary attempts to check social progress.

The solution of the peasant problem, which directly affects the interests of the vast majority of the population, is of the utmost importance to these countries. Without radical agrarian reforms it is impossible to solve the food problem and sweep away the remnants of medievalism which fetter the development of the productive forces in agriculture and industry. The creation and extension on a democratic basis of the state sector in the national economy, particularly in industry, a sector independent from foreign monopolies and gradually becoming a determining factor in the country's economy, is of great importance in these countries.

The alliance of the working class and the peasantry is the most important force in winning and defending national independence, accomplishing far-reaching democratic transformations and ensuring social progress. This alliance is called upon to be the basis of a broad national front. The extent to which the national bourgeoisie participates in the liberation struggle also depends to no small degree upon its strength and stability. A big role can be played by the national-patriotic forces, by all elements of the nation prepared to fight for national independence, against imperialism.

In present conditions, the national bourgeoisie of the colonial and dependent countries unconnected with imperialist circles, is objectively interested in the principal tasks of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution, and therefore retains the capacity of participating in the revolutionary struggle against imperialism and feudalism. In that sense it is progressive. But it is unstable; though progressive, it is inclined to compromise with imperialism and feudalism. Owing to its dual nature, the extent to which the national bourgeoisie participates in revolution differs from country to country. This depends on concrete conditions, on changes in the relationship of class forces, on the sharpness of the contradictions between imperialism, feudalism, and the people, and on the depth of the contradictions between imperialism, feudalism and the national bourgeoisie.

After winning political independence the peoples seek solutions to the social problems raised in life and to the problems of reinforcing national independence. Different classes and parties offer different solutions. Which course of development to choose is the internal affair of the peoples themselves. As social contradictions grow the national bourgeoisie inclines more and more to compromising with domestic reaction and imperialism. The people, however, begin to see that the best way to abolish age-long back-

wardness and improve their living standard is that of non-capitalist development. Only thus can the peoples free themselves from exploitation, poverty and hunger. The working class and the broad peasant masses are to play the leading part in solving this basic social problem.

In the present historical situation, favorable domestic and international conditions arise in many countries for the establishment of an independent national democracy, that is, a state which consistently upholds its political and economic independence, fights against imperialism and its military blocs, against military bases on its territory; a state which fights against the new forms of colonialism and the penetration of imperialist capital; a state which rejects dictatorial and despotic methods of government; a state in which the people are ensured broad democratic rights and freedoms (freedom of speech, press, assembly, demonstrations, establishment of political parties and social organizations), the opportunity to work for the enactment of an agrarian reform and other democratic and social changes, and for participation in shaping government policy. The formation and consolidation of national democracies enables the countries concerned to make rapid social progress and play an active part in the peoples' struggle for peace against the aggressive policies of the imperialist camp for the complete abolition of the colonial yoke.

The communist parties are working actively for a consistent completion of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic revolution, for the establishment of national democracies, for a radical improvement in the living standard of the people. They support those actions of national governments leading to the consolidation of the gains achieved and undermining the imperialists' positions. At the same time they firmly oppose anti-democratic, anti-popular acts and those measures of the ruling circles which endanger national independence. Communists expose attempts by the reactionary section of the bourgeoisie to represent its selfish, narrow class interests as those of the entire nation; they expose the demagogic use by bourgeois politicians of socialist slogans for the same purpose; they work for a genuine democratization of social life and rally all the progressive forces to combat despotic regimes or to curb tendencies towards setting up such regimes.

The aims of the Communists accord with the supreme interests of the nation. The reactionaries' effort to break up the national front under the slogan of "anti-communism" and isolate the Communists, the foremost con-

tingent of the liberation movement, is contrary to the national interests of the people and is fraught with the loss of national gains.

The socialist countries are true and sincere friends of the peoples fighting for liberation and of those who have thrown off the imperialist yoke. While rejecting on principle any interference in the internal affairs of young national states, they consider it their internationalist duty to help the peoples in strengthening their independence. They help and support these countries generously in achieving progress, creating a national industry, developing and consolidating the national economy and training national personnel, and cooperate with them in the struggle for world peace, against imperialist aggression:

The class-conscious workers of the colonial powers, who realized that “no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations,” fought consistently for the self-determination of the nations oppressed by the imperialists. Now that these nations are taking the path of national independence, it is the internationalist duty of the workers and all democratic forces in the industrially developed capitalist countries to assist them vigorously in their struggle against the imperialists, for national independence, for its consolidation, and to assist them in effectively solving the problems of their economic and cultural rebirth. In so doing, they defend the interests of the popular masses in their own countries.

The entire course of the world history of recent decades prompts the complete and final abolition of the colonial system in all its forms and manifestations. All the peoples still languishing in colonial bondage must be given every support in winning their national independence. All forms of colonial oppression must be abolished. The abolition of colonialism will also be of great importance in easing international tension and consolidating universal peace. This Meeting expresses solidarity with all the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania who are carrying on a heroic struggle against imperialism. The Meeting hails the peoples of the young states of Africa who have achieved political independence—an important step towards complete emancipation. The Meeting extends heart-felt regards and support to the heroic Algerian people fighting for freedom and national independence, and demands an immediate cessation of the aggressive war against Algeria. It wrathfully condemns the inhuman system of racial persecution and tyranny in the Union of South Africa (apartheid) and urges democrats throughout

the world to actively support the peoples of South Africa in their struggle for freedom and equality. The Meeting demands noninterference in the sovereign rights of the peoples of Cuba, the Congo and all the other countries that have won their freedom.

All the socialist countries and the international working-class and Communist movement see it as their duty to render the fullest moral and material assistance to the peoples fighting to free themselves from imperialist and colonial tyranny.

V

The new balance of world forces offers the communist and workers' parties new opportunities of carrying out the historic tasks they face in the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

The communist parties determine the prospects and tasks of revolution in keeping with the concrete historical and social conditions obtaining in their respective countries and with due regard for the international situation. They are waging a selfless struggle, doing everything already in present conditions, without waiting until socialism triumphs, to defend the interests of the working class and the people, improve their living conditions and extend the democratic rights and freedoms of the people. Knowing that the brunt of the struggle for the liberation of its people from capitalist oppression rests upon it, the working class and its revolutionary vanguard will with increasing energy press forward its offensive against the domination of oppressors and exploiters in every field of political, economic and ideological activity in each country. In the process of this struggle, the masses are prepared and conditions arise for decisive battles for the overthrow of capitalism, for the victory of socialist revolution.

The main blow in present conditions is directed with growing force at the capitalist monopolies, which are chiefly responsible for the arms race and which constitute the bulwark of reaction and aggression, at the whole system of state monopoly capitalism, which defends their interests.

In some non-European developed capitalist countries which are under the political, economic and military domination of US imperialism, the working class and the people direct the main blow against US imperialist domination, and also against monopoly capital and other domestic reactionary forces that betray the interests of the nation. In the course of this

struggle all the democratic, patriotic forces of the nation come together in a united front fighting for the victory of a revolution aimed at achieving genuine national independence and democracy, which create conditions for passing on to the tasks of socialist revolution.

The big monopolies encroach on the interests of the working class and the people in general all along the line. The exploitation of working people is gaining in intensity; so is the process in which the broad peasant masses are being ruined. At the same time, the difficulties experienced by the small and middle urban bourgeoisie are growing more acute. The oppression of the big monopolies is becoming increasingly heavier for all sections of the nation. As a result, the contradiction between the handful of monopoly capitalists and all sections of the people is now growing more pronounced, along with the sharpening of the basic class contradiction of bourgeois society—that between labor and capital.

The monopolies seek to abolish, or cut down to a bare minimum, the democratic rights of the masses. The reign of open fascist terror continues in some countries. In a number of countries, fascism is expanding in new forms: dictatorial methods of government are combined with fictitious parliamentary practices that have been stripped of democratic content and reduced to pure form. Many democratic organizations are outlawed and are compelled to go underground, thousands of fighters for the working-class cause and champions of peace are in prison.

On behalf of all the Communists of the world, this Meeting expresses proletarian solidarity with the courageous sons and daughters of the working class and the fighters for democracy, languishing behind prison bars in the US, Spain, Portugal, Japan, West Germany, Greece, Iran, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic, Jordan, Iraq, Argentina, Paraguay, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, the Union of South Africa, the Sudan and other countries. The Meeting urges launching a powerful, world-wide campaign to secure the release of these champions of peace, national independence and democracy.

The working class, peasantry, intellectuals and the petit and middle urban bourgeoisie are vitally interested in the abolition of monopoly domination. Hence there are favorable conditions for rallying these forces.

Communists hold that this unity is quite feasible on the basis of the struggle for peace, national independence, the protection and extension of

democracy, nationalization of the key branches of economy and democratization of their management, the use of the entire economy for peaceful purposes in order to satisfy the needs of the population, implementation of radical agrarian reforms, improvement of the living conditions of the working people, protection of the interests of the peasantry and the petty and middle urban bourgeoisie against the tyranny of the monopolies.

These measures would be an important step along the path of social progress and would meet the interests of the majority of the nation. All these measures are democratic by nature. They do not eliminate the exploitation of man by man. But if realized, they would limit the power of the monopolies, enhance the prestige and political weight of the working class in the country's affairs, help to isolate the most reactionary forces and facilitate the unification of all the progressive forces. As they participate in the fight for dramatic reforms, large sections of the population come to realize the necessity of unity of action with the working class and become more active politically. It is the prime duty of the working class and its Communist vanguard to head the economic and political struggle of the masses for democratic reforms, for the overthrow of the power of the monopolies, and assure its success.

Communists advocate for general democratization of the economic and social scene and of all the administrative, political and cultural organizations and institutions.

Communists regard the struggle for democracy as a component of the struggle for socialism. In this struggle they continuously strengthen their bonds with the masses, increase their political consciousness and help them understand the tasks of the socialist revolution and realize the necessity of accomplishing it. This sets the Marxist-Leninist parties completely apart from the reformists, who consider reforms within the framework of the capitalist system as the ultimate goal and deny the necessity of socialist revolution. Marxists-Leninists are firmly convinced that the peoples in the capitalist countries will in the course of their daily struggle ultimately come to understand that socialism alone is a real way out for them.

Now that more sections of the population are joining in an active class struggle, it is of the utmost importance that Communists should extend their work in trade unions and cooperatives, among the peasantry, the youth, the women, in sports organizations, and the unorganized sections of

the population. There are new opportunities now to draw the younger generation into the struggle for peace and democracy, and for the great ideals of communism. Lenin's great behest—to go deeper into the masses, to work wherever there are masses, to strengthen the ties with the masses in order to lead them—must become a major task for every communist party.

The restoration of unity in the trade-union movement in countries where it is split, as well as on the international scale, is essential for heightening the role of the working class in political life and for the successful defense of its interests. The working people may belong to different trade unions, but they have common interests. Whenever different trade-union associations fought in common in the greatest class battles of recent years, they usually succeeded, precisely because of their unity, in having the demands of the working people met. The communist parties believe that there are real prerequisites for reestablishing trade-union unity, and will work perseveringly to bring it about. In those countries where no trade-union democracy exists in practice, the struggle for trade-union unity calls for continuous efforts aimed at achieving trade-union independence and recognition and observance of the trade-union rights of all working people without political and any other discrimination.

It is also essential to peace and social progress that the national and international unity of all the other mass democratic movements be restored. Unity among the mass organizations may be achieved through joint action in the struggle for peace, national independence, the preservation and extension of democratic rights, the improvement of living conditions and the extension of the working people's social rights.

The decisive role in the struggle of the popular masses of capitalist countries for the accomplishment of their tasks is played by the alliance of the working class and the working peasantry, which represents the main motive force of social revolution.

The split in the ranks of the working class, which the ruling classes, the Right-wing Social-Democratic leadership and reactionary trade-union leaders are interested to maintain on a national and international scale, remains the principal obstacle to the accomplishment of the goals of the working class. Communists work resolutely to eliminate this spirit.

The imperialists and reactionaries in various countries resort, along with means of suppression, to means of deception and bribery in order to split

and disrupt the solidarity of the working class. The events of the last few years have again confirmed that this split undermines the positions of the working class and is advantageous only to imperialist reaction.

Some Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders have openly adopted imperialist views, defend the capitalist system and split the working class. Owing to their hostility to communism and their fear of the mounting influence of socialism in world affairs, they are capitulating to the reactionary, conservative forces. In some countries the Right-wing leadership has succeeded in making the social-democratic parties adopt programs in which they openly disowned Marxism, the class struggle and the traditional socialist slogans. Thereby they have again done a service to the bourgeoisie. Resistance to this policy of the Right-wing leaders is mounting in the social-democratic parties. The opposition also embraces a section of the social-democratic party functionaries. The forces favoring joint action by the working class and other working people in the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress are growing. The overwhelming majority in the social-democratic parties, particularly the workers, are friends of peace and social progress.

Communists will continue to criticize the ideological positions and Right-wing opportunist practices of the Social-Democrats; they will continue activities aimed at inducing the Social-Democratic masses to adopt positions of consistent class struggle against capitalism, for the triumph of socialism. The Communists are firmly convinced that the ideological differences obtaining between themselves and the Social-Democrats must not hinder exchanges of opinion on the pressing problems of the working-class movement and the joint struggle, especially against the war danger.

Communists regard Social-Democrats among the working people as their class brothers. They often work together in trade unions and other organizations, and fight jointly for the interests of the working class and the people as a whole.

The vital interests of the working-class movement demand that the communist and social-democratic parties take joint action on a national and international scale to bring about the immediate prohibition of the manufacture, testing and use of nuclear weapons, the establishment of atom-free zones, general and complete disarmament under international control, the abolition of military bases on foreign soil and the withdrawal of foreign troops, to assist the national-liberation movement of the peoples of colo-

nial and dependent countries, to safeguard national sovereignty, promote democracy and resist the fascist menace, improve the living standards of the working people, secure a shorter working week without wage cuts, etc. Millions of social-democrats and some social-democratic parties have already in some form or another come out in favor of solving these problems. It is safe to say that *on overcoming the split in its ranks, on achieving unity of action of all its contingents, the working class of many capitalist countries could deliver a staggering blow to the policy of the ruling circles in the capitalist countries and make them stop preparing a new war, repel the offensive of monopoly capital, and have its daily vital and democratic demands met.*

Both in the struggle for the improvement of the living conditions of working people, the extension and preservation of their democratic rights, the achievement and defense of national independence, for peace among nations, and also in the struggle to win power and build socialism, the communist parties advocate for cooperation with the socialist parties. The Communists have the great doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, a doctrine that is consistent, scientifically sustained and borne out by life, and rich international experience in socialist construction. They are prepared to hold discussions with Social-Democrats, for they are certain that this is the best way to compare views, ideas and experience with the aim of removing deep-rooted prejudices and the split among the working people, and of establishing cooperation.

The imperialist reactionaries, who seek to arouse distrust for the Communist movement and its ideology, continue to intimidate the masses by alleging that the Communists need wars between states to overthrow the capitalist system and establish a socialist system. *The communist parties emphatically reject this slander. The fact that both world wars, which were started by the imperialists, ended in socialist revolutions by no means implies that the way to social revolution goes necessarily through world war, especially now that there exists a powerful world system of socialism. Marxists-Leninists have never considered that the way to social revolution lies through wars between states.*

The choice of social system is the inalienable right of the people of each country. Socialist revolution is not an item of import and cannot be imposed from without. It is a result of the internal development of the country concerned, of the utmost sharpening of social contradictions in it. The communist parties, which guide themselves by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, have

always been against the export of revolution. At the same time they fight resolutely against imperialist export of counter-revolution. They consider it their internationalist duty to call on the peoples of all countries to unite, to rally all their internal forces, to act vigorously and, relying on the might of the world socialist system, to prevent or firmly resist imperialist interference in the affairs of any people who have risen in revolution.

The Marxist-Leninist parties head the struggle of the working class, the masses of working people, for the accomplishment of the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one form or another. The forms and course of development of the socialist revolution will depend on the specific balance of the class forces in the country concerned, on the organization and maturity of the working class and its vanguard, and on the extent of the resistance put up by the ruling classes. Whatever form of dictatorship of the proletariat is established, it will always signify an extension of democracy, a transition from formal bourgeois democracy to genuine democracy, to democracy for working people.

The communist parties reaffirm the propositions put forward by the Declaration of 1957 with regard to the forms of transition of different countries from capitalism to socialism.

The Declaration points out that the working class and its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist Party—seek to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means. This would accord with the interests of the working class and the people as a whole, with the national interests of the country.

Today in a number of capitalist countries the working class, headed by its vanguard, has the opportunity, given a united working-class and popular front or other workable forms of agreement and political cooperation between the different parties and public organizations, to unite a majority of the people, win state power without civil war and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people. Relying on the majority of the people and resolutely rebuffing the opportunist elements incapable of relinquishing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, the working class can defeat the reactionary, anti-popular forces, secure a firm majority in parliament, transform parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the working people, launch an extra-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for

peaceful realization of the socialist revolution. All this will be possible only by broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle of the workers, peasant masses and the urban middle strata against big monopoly capital, against reaction, for profound social reforms, for peace and socialism.

In the event of the exploiting classes resorting to violence against people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or another stage of the struggle for socialism.

The actual possibility of the one or the other way of transition to socialism in each individual country depends on the concrete historical conditions.

In our time, when communism is not only the most advanced doctrine but an actually existing social system which has proved its superiority over capitalism, conditions are particularly favorable for expanding the influence of the communist parties, vigorously exposing anti-communism, a slogan under which the capitalist class wages its struggle against the proletariat, and winning the broadest sections of the working masses for Communist ideas.

Anti-communism arose at the dawn of the working-class movement as the principal ideological weapon of the capitalist class in its struggle against the proletariat and Marxist ideology. As the class struggle grew in intensity, particularly with the formation of the world socialist system, anti-communism became more vicious and refined. Anti-communism, which is indicative of a deep ideological crisis in and extreme decline of bourgeois ideology, resorts to monstrous distortions of Marxist doctrine and crude slander against the socialist social system, presents Communist policies and objectives in a false light, and carries on a witch-hunt against the democratic peaceful forces and organizations.

To effectively defend the interests of the working people, maintain peace and realize the socialist ideals of the working class, it is indispensable to wage a resolute struggle against anti-communism—that poisoned weapon which the bourgeoisie uses to fence off the masses from socialism. A greater effort is required in explaining the ideas of socialism to the masses, to educate the

working people in a revolutionary spirit, to develop their revolutionary class consciousness and to show all working people the superiority of socialist society by referring to the experience of the countries of the world socialist system, demonstrating in concrete form the benefits which socialism will actually give to workers, peasants and other sections of the population in each country.

Communism assures people freedom from fear of war; lasting peace, freedom from imperialist oppression and exploitation, from unemployment and poverty; general wellbeing and a high standard of living; freedom from fear of economic crisis; a rapid growth of the productive forces for the benefit of society as a whole; freedom from the tyranny of the moneybag over the individual; all-round spiritual development of man; the fullest development of talent; unlimited scientific and cultural progress of society. All the sections of the population, with the exception of a handful of exploiters, stand to gain from the victory of the new social system, and this must be brought home to millions of people in the capitalist countries.

VI

The world Communist movement has become the most influential political force of our time, a most important factor in social progress. As it fights bitterly against imperialist reaction, for the interests of the working class and all working people, for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism, the Communist movement is making steady headway, is becoming consolidated and steeled.

There are now communist parties active in 87 countries of the world. Their total membership exceeds 36,000,000. This is a signal victory for Marxism-Leninism and a tremendous achievement of the working class. Like-minded Marxists are rallying in the countries which have shaken off colonial tyranny and taken the path of independent development. communist parties consider it their internationalist duty to promote friendship and solidarity between the working class of their countries and the working-class movement of the countries which have won their freedom in the common struggle against imperialism.

The growth of the communist parties and their organizational consolidation, the victories of the communist parties in a number of countries in the struggle against deviations, elimination of the harmful consequences of the

personality cult, the greater influence of the world communist movement open new prospects for the successful accomplishment of the tasks facing the communist parties.

Marxist-Leninist parties regard it as an inviolable law of their activity steadfastly to observe the Leninist standards of party life in keeping with the principle of democratic centralism; they consider that they must cherish party unity like the apple of their eye, strictly to adhere to the principle of party democracy and collective leadership, for they attach, in keeping with the organizational principles of Leninism, great importance to the role of the leading party bodies in the life of the party, to work indefatigably for the strengthening of their bonds with the party membership and with the broad masses of the working people, not to allow the personality cult, which shackles creative thought and initiative of Communists, vigorously to promote the activity of Communists, and to encourage criticism and self-criticism in their ranks.

The communist parties have ideologically defeated the revisionists in their ranks who sought to divert them from the Marxist-Leninist path. Each communist party and the international Communist movement as a whole have become still stronger, ideologically and organizationally, in the struggle against revisionism, Right-wing opportunism.

The communist parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist "theories" in concentrated form. After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist program to the Declaration of 1957; they set the LCY against the international Communist movement as a whole, severed their country from the socialist camp, made it dependent on so-called "aid" from US and other imperialists, and thereby exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through a heroic struggle. The Yugoslav revisionists carry on subversive work against the socialist camp and the world Communist movement. Under the pretext of an extra-bloc policy, they engage in activities which prejudice the unity of all the peace-loving forces and countries. Further exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists and active struggle to safeguard the Communist movement and the working-class movement from the anti-Leninist

ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists remains an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The practical struggles of the working class and the entire course of social development have furnished a brilliant new proof of the great all-conquering power and vitality of Marxism-Leninism, and have thoroughly refuted all modern revisionist “theories.”

The further development of the Communist and working-class movement calls, as stated in the Moscow Declaration of 1957, for continuing a determined struggle on two fronts—against revisionism, which remains the main danger, and against dogmatism and sectarianism.

Revisionism, Right-wing opportunism, which mirrors the bourgeois ideology in theory and practice, distorts Marxism-Leninism, emasculates its revolutionary essence, and thereby paralyzes the revolutionary will of the working class, disarms and demobilizes the workers, the masses of the working people, in their struggle against oppression by imperialists and exploiters, for peace, democracy and national-liberation, for the triumph of socialism.

Dogmatism and sectarianism in theory and practice can also become the main danger at some stage of development of individual parties, unless combated unrelentingly. They rob revolutionary parties of the ability to develop Marxism-Leninism through scientific analysis and apply it creatively according to the specific conditions; they isolate Communists from the broad masses of the working people, doom them to passive expectation or Leftist, adventurist actions in the revolutionary struggle, prevent them from making a timely and correct estimate of the changing situation and of new experience, using all opportunities to bring about the victory of the working class and all democratic forces in the struggle against imperialism, reaction and war danger, and thereby prevent the peoples from achieving victory in their just struggle.

At a time when imperialist reaction is joining forces to fight communism, it is particularly imperative vigorously to consolidate the world Communist movement. Unity and solidarity redouble the strength of our movement and provide a reliable guarantee that the great cause of communism will make victorious progress and all enemy attacks will be effectively repelled.

Communists throughout the world are united by the great doctrine of Marxism-Leninism and by a joint struggle for its realization. The interests of

the Communist movement require solidarity in adherence by every communist party to the estimates and conclusions concerning the common tasks in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism, jointly reached by the fraternal parties at their meetings.

The interests of the struggle for the working-class cause demand ever closer unity of the ranks of each communist party and of the great army of Communists of all countries; they demand of them unity of will and action. It is the supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist party to work continuously for greater unity in the world Communist movement.

A resolute defense of the unity of the world Communist movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and the prevention of any actions which may undermine that unity, are a necessary condition for victory in the struggle for national independence, democracy and peace, for the successful accomplishment of the tasks of the socialist revolution and of the building of socialism and communism. Violation of these principles would impair the forces of communism.

All the Marxist-Leninist parties are independent and have equal rights; they shape their policies according to the specific conditions in their respective countries and in keeping with Marxist-Leninist principles, and support each other. The success of the working-class cause in any country is unthinkable without the internationalist solidarity of all Marxist-Leninist parties. Every party is responsible to the working class, to the working people of its country, to the international working-class and Communist movement as a whole.

The communist and workers' parties hold meetings whenever necessary to discuss urgent problems, to exchange experience, acquaint themselves with each other's views and positions, work out common views through consultations and coordinate joint actions in the struggle for common goals.

Whenever a party wants to clear up questions relating to the activities of another fraternal party, its leadership approaches the leadership of the party concerned; if necessary, they hold meetings and consultations.

The experience and results of the meetings of representatives of the communist parties held in recent years, particularly the results of the two major meetings—that of November 1957 and this Meeting—show that in present-day conditions such meetings are an effective form of exchanging views

and experience, enriching Marxist-Leninist theory by collective effort and elaborating a common attitude in the struggle for common objectives.

The communist and workers' parties unanimously declare that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been, and remains, the universally recognized vanguard of the world Communist movement, being the most experienced and steeled contingent of the international Communist movement. The experience which the CPSU has gained in the struggle for the victory of the working class, in socialist construction and in the full-scale construction of communism, is of fundamental significance for the whole of the world Communist movement. The example of the CPSU and its fraternal solidarity inspire all the communist parties in their struggle for peace and socialism, and represent the revolutionary principles of proletarian internationalism applied in practice. The historic decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU are not only of great importance for the CPSU and communist construction in the USSR, but have initiated a new stage in the world Communist movement, and have promoted its development on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

All communist and workers' parties contribute to the development of the great theory of Marxism-Leninism. Mutual assistance and support in relations between all the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties embody the revolutionary principles of proletarian internationalism applied in practice.

Ideological issues are of especial significance today. The exploiting class tries to counteract the achievements of socialism by exerting ever greater ideological pressure on the masses as it seeks to keep them in spiritual bondage to bourgeois ideology. Communists regard it as their task to launch a determined offensive on the ideological front, to work for the emancipation of the masses from the spiritual bondage of all types and forms of bourgeois ideology, including the pernicious influence of reformism, to disseminate among the masses progressive ideas making for social advancement, the ideas of democratic freedom, the ideology of scientific socialism.

Historical experience shows that the survivals of capitalism in the minds of people persist over a long period even after the establishment of a socialist system. This demands extensive work by the party on the Communist education of the masses and a better Marxist-Leninist training and steeling of party and government cadres.

Marxism-Leninism is a great integral revolutionary doctrine, the lodestar of the working class and working people of the whole world at all stages of their great battle for peace, freedom and a better life, for the establishment of the most just society, communism. Its great creative, revolutionizing power lies in its unbreakable link with life, in its continuous enrichment through a comprehensive analysis of reality. On the basis of Marxism-Leninism, the community of socialist countries and the international Communist, working-class and liberation movements have achieved great historic success, and it is only on its basis that all the tasks facing the communist and workers' parties can be effectively accomplished.

The meeting sees the further consolidation of the communist parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, of proletarian internationalism, as a primary condition for the unification of all working-class, democratic and progressive forces, as a guarantee of new victories in the great struggle waged by the world Communist and working-class movement for a happy future for the whole of mankind, for the triumph of the cause of peace and socialism.

Collection “Colorful Classics”

1. *Marxism-Leninism-Maoism
Basic Course: Revised Edition*
Communist Party of India
(Maoist)
2. *Philosophical Trends in the
Feminist Movement*
Anuradha Ghandy
3. *Minimanual of the Urban
Guerrilla*
Carlos Marighella
4. *The Communist Necessity*
J. Moufawad-Paul
5. *Maoists in India: Writings
& Interviews*
Azad
6. *Five Golden Rays*
Mao Zedong
7. *Stand for Socialism Against
Modern Revisionism*
Armando Liwanag
8. *Strategy for the Liberation
of Palestine*
PFLP
9. *Against Avakianism*
Ajith
10. *Specific Characteristics of our
People’s War*
Jose Maria Sison
11. *Rethinking Socialism: What is
Socialist Transition?*
Deng-Yuan Hsu & Pao-yu
Ching
12. *Fedai Guerillas Speak on
Armed Struggle in Iran*
Dehghani, Ahmadzadeh,
Habash, Pouyan, Ashraf
13. *Revolutionary Works*
Seamus Costello
14. *Urban Perspective*
Communist Party of India
(Maoist)
15. *Five Essays on Philosophy*
Mao Zedong
16. *Post-Modernism Today*
Siraj
17. *The National Question*
Ibrahim Kaypakkaya
18. *Historic Eight Documents*
Charu Mazumdar
19. *A New Outlook on Health
Advocators*
20. *Basic Principles of Marxism-
Leninism: A Primer*
Jose Maria Sison
21. *Toward a Scientific Analysis of
the Gay Question*
Los Angeles Research Group
22. *Activist Study—Araling Aktibista
(ARAK)*
PADEPA
23. *Education to Govern*
Advocators

Collection “Foundations”

1. *The Foundations of Leninism*
Joseph Stalin
2. *Wage Labour and Capital
& Wages, Price and Profit*
Karl Marx
3. *Reform or Revolution?*
Rosa Luxemburg
4. *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*
Frederick Engels
5. *The State and Revolution*
V. I. Lenin
6. *Labour in Irish History*
James Connolly
7. *Anarchism or Socialism?
& Trotskyism or Leninism?*
Joseph Stalin
8. *Manifesto of the Communist Party
& Principles of Communism*
Karl Marx & Frederick Engels
9. *Essays in Historical Materialism*
George Plekhanov
10. *The Fascist Offensive
& Unity of the Working Class*
George Dimitrov
11. *Imperialism, the Highest
Stage of Capitalism*
V. I. Lenin
12. *The Origin of the Family, Private
Property and the State*
Frederick Engels
13. *The Housing Question*
Frederick Engels
14. *The Modern Prince
& Other Writings*
Antonio Gramsci
15. *What is to be Done?*
V. I. Lenin
16. *Critique of the Gotha Program*
Karl Marx
17. *Elementary Principles
of Philosophy*
Georges Politzer
18. *Militarism & Anti-Militarism*
Karl Liebknecht
19. *History and Class Consciousness*
Georg Lukács
20. *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy
in the Democratic Revolution*
V. I. Lenin
21. *Dialectical and Historical Materialism
& Questions of Leninism*
Joseph Stalin
22. *The Re-Conquest of Ireland*
James Connolly
23. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of
Louis Bonaparte*
Karl Marx
24. *The Right to Be Lazy
& Other Studies*
Paul Lafargue
25. *The Civil War in France*
Karl Marx
26. *Anti-Dühring*
Frederick Engels
27. *The Proletarian Revolution and
the Renegade Kautsky*
V. I. Lenin
28. *Marxism and the National and
Colonial Question*
Joseph Stalin

Collection “Works of Maoism”

1. *Collected Works (1968-1987)*
Communist Party of Peru
2. *Selected Works, Volume VI*
Mao Tse-tung
3. *Selected Works, Volume VII*
Mao Tse-tung
4. *Selected Works, Volume VIII*
Mao Tse-tung
5. *Selected Works, Volume IX*
Mao Tse-tung
6. *Selected Works, Volume I*
Mao Tse-tung
7. *Selected Readings from the Works*
Jose Maria Sison
8. *Selected Works, Volume II*
Mao Tse-tung
9. *Selected Works, Volume III*
Mao Tse-tung
10. *Selected Works, Volume IV*
Mao Tse-tung
11. *Selected Works, Volume V*
Mao Tse-tung
12. *Documents of the CPC,
The Great Debate, Vol. I*

Collection “New Roads”

1. *From Victory to Defeat: China’s
Socialist Road and Capitalist
Reversal*
Pao-yu Ching
2. *Silage Choppers and Snake
Spirits*
Dao-yuan Chou
3. *Which East is Red?*
Andrew Smith
4. *Mao Zedong’s “On Contradiction”
Study Companion*
Redspark Collective
5. *Critique of Maoist Reason*
J. Moufawad-Paul
6. *Like Ho Chi Minh! Like Che
Guevara!*
Ian Scott Horst
7. *Critiquing Brahmanism*
K. Murali (Ajith)
8. *Operation Green Hunt*
Adolfo Naya Fernández
9. *Of Concepts and Methods*
K. Murali (Ajith)
10. *The German Communist
Resistance*
T. Derbent

DOCUMENTS OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

THE GREAT DEBATE

Volume II — 1963-1964

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

DOCUMENTS OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

THE GREAT DEBATE

Volume II — 1963-1964

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
Collection “Works of Maoism” #14

Contact — flpress@protonmail.com
<https://foreignlanguages.press>

Paris, 2022

First edition, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2022

ISBN: 978-2-493844-01-9



This book is under license Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International
(CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

Note from Foreign Languages Press

This second volume of the *Documents of the CPC – The Great Debate* covers the period from the first exchange of letters between the CPC and the CPSU regarding the general line of the International Communist Movement (February-March 1963) to Khrushchev's dismissal in October 1964, and the conclusions that the CPC drew about the man who liquidated socialism and restored capitalism in Russia.

Studying these letters, you will notice that they are of two different kinds: open letters that were spread publicly in various reviews to stir up a theoretical debate, and intra-party letters that were not supposed to be publicly spread, containing criticisms regarding the way the debate was being conducted. The CPC made the letters public in May 1964, after the CPSU began quoting parts of them out of context in articles in the *Pravda* to discredit the CPC.

The intra-party letters have no titles and were simply published with the description: "Letter of the CC of the CPC/CPSU to the CC of the CPC/CPSU." We kept these descriptions, adding the date they were written to prevent confusion.

In the first volume of this series, we published exclusively the writings of the CPC, as we believe they are enough on their own to understand the ongoing struggle. For this volume we decided to also add different letters from the CPSU (after the appendices) to give the reader a deeper understanding of the two-line struggle. However, we believe the letters of the CPC to be sufficient to have a clear understanding of the struggle, and recommend the CPSU letters to comrades doing more in-depth research on the Great Debate.

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

Contents

1963

<i>March 9</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPC of March 9, 1963	1
<i>June 14</i>	A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement	7
<i>September 6</i>	The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves	51
<i>September 13</i>	On the Question of Stalin	89
<i>September 26</i>	Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country?	107
<i>October 22</i>	Apologists of Neo-Colonialism?	143
<i>November 19</i>	Two Different Lines on the Question of War and Peace	171
<i>December 12</i>	Peaceful Coexistence—Two Diametrically Opposed Policies	201

1964

<i>February 4</i>	The Leaders of the CPSU are the Greatest Splitters of our Times	235
<i>February 20</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPC of February 20, 1964	279
<i>February 27</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPC of February 27, 1964	281
<i>February 29</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPC of February 29, 1964	285
<i>March 31</i>	The Proletarian Revolution and Khrushchev's Revisionism	299
<i>May 7</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPC of May 7, 1964	343
<i>July 14</i>	On Khrushchev's Phony Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World	351
<i>July 28</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPC of July 28, 1964	403
<i>August 30</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPC of August 30, 1964	419
<i>November 21</i>	Why Khrushchev Fell	423

Appendix

<i>Nov. 10, 1957</i>	Outline of Views on the Question of Peaceful Transition	433
<i>June 26, 1960</i>	Statement of the Delegation of the CPC at the Bucharest Meeting of Fraternal Parties	437
<i>Sept. 10, 1960</i>	The Five Proposals for Settlement of the Differences and Attainment of Unity Contained in the Letter of the CC of the CPC in Reply to the Letter of Information of the CC of the CPSU	441

Letters of the CPSU

<i>Feb. 21, 1963</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPSU of February 21, 1963	445
<i>Mar. 30, 1963</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPSU of March 30, 1963	451
<i>Jul. 14, 1963</i>	Open Letter of the CC of the CPSU to all Party Organizations, to all Communists of the Soviet Union	477
<i>Nov. 29, 1963</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPSU of November 29, 1963	527
<i>Feb. 22, 1964</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPSU of February 22, 1964	535
<i>Mar. 7, 1964</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPSU of March 7, 1964	541
<i>Jun. 15, 1964</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPSU of June 15, 1964	551
<i>Jul. 30, 1964</i>	Letter of the CC of the CPSU of July 30, 1964	567

Letter of the CC of the CPC of March 9, 1963

March 9, 1963

Source: *People's Daily (Renmin Ribao)*, March 14, 1963, p. 1.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, March 22, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 12, pp. 7-8.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has received the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated February 21, 1963.

When Comrade Mao Zedong received Comrade Chervonenko, the Soviet Ambassador to China, on February 23, he explained our estimation of your letter.

We welcome your letter. We welcome the desire for unity expressed in it; we welcome the normal attitude of equality towards fraternal parties as shown in it; we welcome your definite approval of the proposal to call a meeting of representatives of all the communist and workers' parties of the world.

To safeguard the unity of the socialist camp, to safeguard the unity of the international communist movement, to safeguard the unity of our two Parties and two countries—this is and has been the consistent position of the Communist Party of China. We have never spared our efforts in the interest of unity. We are always distressed by and opposed to anything that is not in the interest of unity. We always rejoice at and support anything that is in the interest of unity.

We ought to face the fact that at present there are serious differences in the international communist movement on a series of important questions of principle. As for the causes of these differences, which your letter says “can be explained by the different conditions in which this or that detachment of the world communist movement is working,” the more important factor, in our opinion, is the question of how Marxism-Leninism is understood and what attitude is taken towards it, and the question of how the Moscow

Declaration and the Moscow Statement are understood, and what attitude is taken towards them.

The Chinese Communist Party has always advocated that when differences on questions of principle arise between fraternal parties, the fraternal parties should start with the desire for unity, carry on comradely discussion and mutual criticism so as to distinguish right from wrong, and reach the goal of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. That is to say, differences between fraternal parties should be settled inside the international communist movement through consultation on an equal footing in bilateral or multilateral talks or at a meeting of the fraternal parties, in accordance with the principles, and methods set forth in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

The Chinese Communist Party is and always has been opposed to public exposure of differences between fraternal parties before the enemy. We are even more strongly opposed to the inflammation of debate and the complication of matters by the use of such methods as the convening of party congresses, the issuance of resolutions or statements by party Central Committees, and the publication of articles and speeches by party and state leaders. We knew full well, and have said more than once, that such practices would gladden our enemy and create difficulties for our own ranks, and especially for the fraternal parties in capitalist countries. Events have proved that our concern was not uncalled for. More and more fraternal parties have now expressed the wish that public polemics should cease. This is a good sign. We ardently hope that the public polemics among the fraternal parties will cease in the shortest possible time.

The international communist movement has indeed reached a critical juncture. The time has indeed come when the differences among the fraternal parties have to be settled.

We have before us a very good international situation, one that is most favorable for revolution in the world. There is no reason why we should not eliminate our differences and strengthen our unity.

In the world balance of forces, the superiority is on the side of socialism and the revolutionary people, and not on the side of imperialism and its lackeys.

Two great historical currents of our time, the forces of socialism and the forces of the national democratic revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin Amer-

ica, are battering the wall of the reactionary rule of imperialism, headed by the United States of America.

The contradictions among the imperialist powers, and especially those between US imperialism and the other imperialist powers, are becoming deeper and sharper, and new conflicts are developing among them.

In this situation, what is of decisive significance for the international cause of the proletariat as a whole is the struggle against imperialism headed by the United States and the support for the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In this situation, the possibility of preventing a new world war and preserving world peace will increase with the further development of the strength of the socialist countries, the further development of the national-liberation movement, of the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples, of the movement in defense of world peace and, at the same time, with the full utilization of the contradictions in the imperialist camp.

In this situation, what is necessary first of all is to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and the unity of the international communist movement. With the unity of Marxist-Leninists as the nucleus, the strengthening of the unity of the world proletariat, the strengthening of the unity between the world proletariat and all the oppressed nations and peoples and the strengthening of the great unity of all the people in the world who favor opposition to imperialism these are the guarantee for the victory of our common cause.

The Moscow Declaration and Statement set forth the common line, course and policies for our common struggle. These two documents present clear-cut conclusions on the nature of the present epoch; on the socialist camp; on the common laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction; on the struggle against imperialism; on war and peace; on peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems; on the national-liberation movement; on the tasks and tactics of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries; on the struggle against revisionism as the main danger at present and the struggle against dogmatism; on continuing the struggle against Yugoslav revisionism, which has betrayed Marxism-Leninism; on the guiding principles for relations among fraternal parties and fraternal countries' independence, equality and attainment of unanimity through consultation; etc. In our words and deeds, we Chinese Communists have unwaveringly followed and maintained this correct line, this correct course and these

correct policies. We are very glad that the comrades of the CPSU, too, have in their letter expressed their loyalty to these two programmatic documents.

To eliminate differences and to strengthen unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement accords with the interests of the people of the whole world, with the interests of the Communists of all countries, with the interests of the people of the socialist camp, and with the interests of the people of China and the Soviet Union. Conversely, if the differences should be further exacerbated and unity further undermined, it is not only future generations that would not forgive us, we would not be forgiven by the masses of the people of our own time.

With the purpose of eliminating differences and strengthening unity, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party wrote a letter to the Central Committee of the CPSU on April 7, 1962. In that letter, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party expressed its support for the proposal to convene a meeting of the fraternal parties put forward by the Communist Party of Indonesia, the Workers' Party of Viet Nam, the Communist Party of Sweden, the Communist Party of Great Britain and the Communist Party of New Zealand, and explicitly proposed that a meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of all countries be convened to discuss problems of common concern. We are very glad that in its recent letter the Central Committee of the CPSU also favors calling a meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties.

In our letter of April 7, 1962, we also pointed out that, in order to convene and make a success of a meeting of the fraternal parties, many obstacles would have to be overcome beforehand and much preparatory work would have to be done. At that time, we advanced the following points:

First, the fraternal parties and countries having disputes should take steps, however small, that will help ease relations and restore unity, so as to improve the atmosphere and prepare the conditions for the convening and the success of a meeting of the fraternal parties.

Second, we support the proposal of the Workers' Party of Viet Nam that public attacks should cease.

Third, where needed, certain fraternal parties should hold bilateral or multilateral talks to exchange opinions.

Fourth, we sincerely hope that the Soviet comrades and the Albanian comrades will both take positive steps to remove their differences and restore

normal relations between the two Parties and the two countries. In this connection, it seems necessary for the Soviet comrades to take the initiative.

Fifth, according to the decision of the meeting of the fraternal parties in 1957, the CPSU is responsible for convening meetings of representatives of the communist and workers' parties, after consultation with the fraternal parties.

At present, we still hold that the foregoing points are important for the success of a meeting of the fraternal parties.

We are very glad that in its recent letter the Central Committee of the CPSU has also advanced valuable proposals for making the meeting of the fraternal parties successful.

We agree with your view that "it is especially important to take immediate concrete practical steps to ensure our unity, to improve the climate in the relations between all fraternal parties."

In order to create a favorable atmosphere for the convening of the meeting of the fraternal parties, we have decided that, apart from the articles which we have already published as replies, we will from now on temporarily suspend public replies in our newspapers and periodicals to the public attacks which were directed by name against the Chinese Communist Party by comrades of the CPSU and other fraternal parties. It goes without saying that, basing ourselves on the principle of equality and reciprocity between fraternal parties, we reserve the right to make public replies to all the statements of fraternal parties publicly attacking the Chinese Communist Party by name. On the suspension of public polemics, it is also necessary that our two Parties and the fraternal parties concerned should have some discussion and reach an agreement that is fair and acceptable to all.

We welcome the proposal in your letter that talks be held between the Chinese and Soviet Parties. We hold that such talks constitute a necessary preparatory step for the convening of a meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of all countries. In his conversation with Comrade Chervonenko, Comrade Mao Zedong expressed the hope that Comrade Khrushchev, while making his visit to Cambodia, would stop over in Beijing for talks between our two Parties and an exchange of views. If this is not convenient for you, another responsible comrade of the Central Committee of the CPSU can lead a delegation to Beijing, or we can send a delegation to Moscow.

We agree with your view that “during the talks it would be possible to take up point by point all the major questions of interest to both Parties, especially those relating to the common tasks of our struggle.” We hold that the questions that need to be discussed in the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties are also the questions that need to be discussed at the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers’ parties of all countries, and that they are, first of all, the following: the question of strategy and tactics of revolution in the contemporary world, the question of opposing imperialism and defending world peace, the question of the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples, the question of strengthening the power and unity of the socialist camp, the question of strengthening the unity of the international communist movement, and other questions of common interest. All these questions ought to be discussed in a comradely way, point by point, to the full and in detail, in accordance with the fundamental teachings of Marxism-Leninism and with the revolutionary principles set forth in the Moscow Declaration and Statement; and the consultation ought not to be a mere formality but should be conducted on a footing of real equality. Whatever is agreed upon by both sides can be settled at once and an agreement can be concluded. Existing differences that cannot be settled immediately may be laid aside, pending later settlement. We propose that if we cannot finish our discussions in one session, several should be held, or that our Parties should hold further bilateral talks.

It is the common desire of the people of China and the Soviet Union, of all the people in the socialist camp, of the Communists of all countries, and of all the oppressed nations and peoples the world over to strengthen the unity of the international communist movement, to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp, and especially to strengthen the unity between our two Parties and countries. We are conscious of the responsibility that falls on our two Parties; we must not disappoint these expectations. Let us unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, on the basis of proletarian internationalism and on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

With communist greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China**

A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement

**LETTER OF THE CC OF THE CPC IN REPLY TO THE LETTER OF THE CC
OF THE CPSU OF MARCH 30, 1963**

June 14, 1963

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 12, 1963.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, June 21, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 25, pp. 6-22.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has studied the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union of March 30, 1963.

All who have the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement at heart are deeply concerned about the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and hope that our talks will help to eliminate differences, strengthen unity and create favorable conditions for convening a meeting of representatives of all the communist and workers' parties.

It is the common and sacred duty of the communist and workers' parties of all countries to uphold and strengthen the unity of the international communist movement. The Chinese and Soviet Parties bear a heavier responsibility for the unity of the entire socialist camp and international communist movement and should of course make commensurately greater efforts.

A number of major differences of principle now exist in the international communist movement. But however serious these differences, we should exercise sufficient patience and find ways to eliminate them so that we can unite our forces and strengthen the struggle against our common enemy.

It is with this sincere desire that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China approaches the forthcoming talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties.

In its letter of March 30, the Central Committee of the CPSU systematically presents its views on questions that need to be discussed in the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties, and in particular raises the question of the general line of the international communist movement. In this letter we too would like to express our views, which constitute our proposal on the general line of the international communist movement and on some related questions of principle.

We hope that this exposition of views will be conducive to mutual understanding by our two Parties and to a detailed, point-by-point discussion in the talks.

We also hope that this will be conducive to the understanding of our views her the fraternal parties and to a full exchange of ideas at an international meeting of fraternal parties.

1. The general line of the international communist movement must take as its guiding principle the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory concerning the historical mission of the proletariat and must not depart from it.

The Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960 adopted the Declaration and the Statement respectively after a full exchange of views and in accordance with the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation. The two documents point out the characteristics of our epoch and the common laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction, and lay down the common line of all the communist and workers' parties. They are the common program of the international communist movement.

It is true that for several years there have been differences within the international communist movement in the understanding of, and the attitude towards, the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960. The central issue here is whether or not to accept the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement. In the last analysis, it is a question of whether or not to accept the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, whether or not to recognize the universal significance of the road of the October Revolution, whether or not to accept the fact that the people still living under the imperialist and capitalist system, who comprise two-thirds of the world's population, need to make revolution, and whether or not to accept the fact that the people already on the socialist road, who comprise one-third of the world's population, need to carry their revolution forward to the end.

It has become an urgent and vital task of the international communist movement resolutely to defend the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

Only by strictly following the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the general road of the October revolution is it possible to have a correct understanding of the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement and a correct attitude towards them.

2. What are the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement? They may be summarized as follows:

Workers of all countries, unite; workers of the world, unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations; oppose imperialism and reaction in all countries; strive for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism; consolidate and expand the socialist camp; bring the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory; and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the exploitation of man by man.

This, in our view, is the general line of the international communist movement at the present stage.

3. This general line proceeds from the actual world situation taken as a whole and from a class analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world, and is directed against the counter-revolutionary global strategy of US imperialism.

This general line is one of forming a broad united front, with the socialist camp and the international proletariat as its nucleus, to oppose the imperialists and reactionaries headed by the United States; it is a line of boldly arousing the masses, expanding the revolutionary forces, winning over the middle forces and isolating the reactionary forces.

This general line is one of resolute revolutionary struggle by the people of all countries and of carrying the proletarian world revolution forward to the end; it is the line that most effectively combats imperialism and defends world peace.

If the general line of the international communist movement is one-sidedly reduced to "peaceful coexistence," "peaceful competition," and "peaceful transition" this is to violate the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, to discard the historical mission of proletarian

world revolution, and to depart from the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism.

The general line of the international communist movement should reflect the general law of development of world history. The revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the people in various countries go through different stages and they all have their own characteristics but they will not transcend the general law of development of world history. The general line should point out the basic direction for the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and people of all countries.

While working out its specific line and policies, it is most important for each Communist or Workers' Party to adhere to the principle of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution and construction in its own country.

4. In defining the general line of the international communist movement, the starting point is the concrete class analysis of world politics and economics as a whole and of actual world conditions, that is to say, of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world.

If one avoids a concrete class analysis, seizes at random on certain superficial phenomena, and draws subjective and groundless conclusions, one cannot possibly reach correct conclusions with regard to the general line of the international communist movement but will inevitably slide onto a track entirely different from that of Marxism-Leninism. What are the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world? Marxist-Leninists consistently hold that they are:

- the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp;
- the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries;
- the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism; and
- the contradictions among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

The contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp is a contradiction between two fundamentally different social systems, socialism and capitalism. It is undoubtedly very sharp. But Marxist-Leninists must not regard the contradictions in the world as consisting solely and simply

of the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp. The international balance of forces has changed and has become increasingly favorable to socialism and to all the oppressed peoples and nations of the world, and most unfavorable to imperialism and the reactionaries of all countries. Nevertheless, the contradictions enumerated above still objectively exist.

These contradictions and the struggles to which they give rise are inter-related and influence each other. Nobody can obliterate any of these fundamental contradictions or subjectively substitute one for all the rest.

It is inevitable that these contradictions will give rise to popular revolutions, which alone can resolve them.

5. The following erroneous views should be repudiated on the question of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world:

- a. the view which blots out the class content of the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps and fails to see this contradiction as one between states under the dictatorship of the proletariat and states under the dictatorship of the monopoly capitalists
- b. the view which recognizes only the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps, while neglecting or underestimating the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist world between the oppressed nations and imperialism, among the imperialist countries and among the monopoly capitalist groups, and the struggles to which these contradictions give rise;
- c. the view which maintains with regard to the capitalist world that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie can be resolved without a proletarian revolution in each country and that the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism can be resolved without revolution by the oppressed nations;
- d. the view which denies that the development of the inherent contradictions in the contemporary capitalist world inevitably leads to a new situation in which the imperialist countries are locked in an intense struggle and asserts that the contradictions among the imperialist countries can be

reconciled, or even eliminated, by “international agreements among the big monopolies”; and

- e. the view which maintains that the contradiction between the two world systems of socialism and capitalism will automatically disappear in the course of “economic competition,” that the other fundamental world contradictions will automatically do so with the disappearance of the contradiction between the two systems, and that a “world without wars,” a new world of “all-round cooperation,” will appear.

It is obvious that these erroneous views inevitably lead to erroneous and harmful policies and hence to setbacks and losses of one kind or another to the cause of the people and of socialism.

6. The balance of forces between imperialism and socialism has undergone a fundamental change since World War II. The main indication of this change is that the world now has not just one socialist country but a number of socialist countries forming the mighty socialist camp, and that the people who have taken the socialist road now number not two hundred million but a thousand million, or a third of the world’s population.

The socialist camp is the outcome of the struggles of the international proletariat and working people. It belongs to the international proletariat and working people as well as to the people of the socialist countries.

The main common demands of the people of the countries in the socialist camp and the international proletariat and working people are that all the communist and workers’ parties in the socialist camp should:

- Adhere to the Marxist-Leninist line and pursue correct Marxist-Leninist domestic and foreign policies;
- Consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and the worker-peasant alliance led by the proletariat and carry the socialist revolution forward to the end on the economic, political and ideological fronts;
- Promote the initiative and creativeness of the broad masses, carry out socialist construction in a planned way, develop production, improve the people’s livelihood and strengthen national defense;

- Strengthen the unity of the socialist camp on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, and support other socialist countries on the basis of proletarian internationalism;
- Oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war, and defend world peace;
- Oppose the anti-Communist, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary policies of the reactionaries of all countries; and
- Help the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed classes and nations of the world.

All communist and workers' parties in the socialist camp owe it to their own people and to the international proletariat and working people to fulfil these demands.

By fulfilling these demands the socialist camp will exert a decisive influence on the course of human history. For this very reason, the imperialists and reactionaries invariably try in a thousand and one ways to influence the domestic and foreign policies of the countries in the socialist camp, to undermine the camp and break up the unity of the socialist countries and particularly the unity of China and the Soviet Union. They invariably try to infiltrate and subvert the socialist countries and even entertain the extravagant hope of destroying the socialist camp.

The question of what is the correct attitude towards the socialist camp is a most important question of principle confronting all communist and workers' parties.

It is under new historical conditions that the communist and workers' parties are now carrying on the task of proletarian internationalist unity and struggle. When only one socialist country existed and when this country was faced with hostility and jeopardized by all the imperialists and reactionaries because it firmly pursued the correct Marxist-Leninist line and policies, the touchstone of proletarian internationalism for every Communist Party was whether or not it resolutely defended the only socialist country. Now there is a socialist camp consisting of thirteen countries, Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Under these circumstances, the touchstone of proletarian internationalism for every Communist

Party is whether or not it resolutely defends the whole of the socialist camp, whether or not it defends the unity of all the countries in the camp on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and whether or not it defends the Marxist-Leninist line and policies which the socialist countries ought to pursue.

If anybody does not pursue the correct Marxist-Leninist line and policies, does not defend the unity of the socialist camp but on the contrary creates tension and splits within it, or even follows the policies of the Yugoslav revisionists, tries to liquidate the socialist camp or helps capitalist countries to attack fraternal socialist countries, then he is betraying the interests of the entire international proletariat and the people of the world.

If anybody, following in the footsteps of others, defends the erroneous opportunist line and policies pursued by a certain socialist country instead of upholding the correct Marxist-Leninist line and policies which the socialist countries ought to pursue, defends the policy of split instead of upholding the policy of unity, then he is departing from Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

7. Taking advantage of the situation after World War II, the US imperialists stepped into the shoes of the German, Italian and Japanese fascists, and have been trying to erect a huge world empire such as has never been known before. The strategic objectives of US imperialism have been to grab and dominate the intermediate zone lying between the United States and the socialist camp, put down the revolutions of the oppressed peoples and nations, proceed to destroy the socialist countries, and thus to subject all the peoples and countries of the world, including its allies, to domination and enslavement by US monopoly capital.

Ever since World War II, the US imperialists have been conducting propaganda for war against the Soviet Union and the socialist camp. There are two aspects to this propaganda. While the US imperialists are actually preparing such a war, they also use this propaganda as a smokescreen for their oppression of the American people and for the extension of their aggression against the rest of the capitalist world.

The 1960 Statement points out:

- US imperialism has become the biggest international exploiter.
- The United States is the mainstay of colonialism today.
- US imperialism is the main force of aggression and war.

- International developments in recent years have furnished many new proofs of the fact that US imperialism is the chief bulwark of world reaction and an international gendarme, that it has become an enemy of the peoples of the whole world.

US imperialism is pressing its policies of aggression and war all over the world, but the outcome is bound to be the opposite of that intended—it will only be to hasten the awakening of the people in all countries and to hasten their revolutions.

The US imperialists have thus placed themselves in opposition to the people of the whole world and have become encircled by them. The international proletariat must and can unite all the forces that can be united, make use of the internal contradictions in the enemy camp and establish the broadest united front against the US imperialists and their lackeys.

The realistic and correct course is to entrust the fate of the people and of mankind to the unity and struggle of the world proletariat and to the unity and struggle of the people in all countries.

Conversely, to make no distinction between enemies, friends and ourselves and to entrust the fate of the people and of mankind to collaboration with US imperialism is to lead people astray. The events of the last few years have exploded this illusion.

8. The various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America; these are the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm centers of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism.

The national democratic revolutionary movement in these areas and the international socialist revolutionary movement are the two great historical currents of our time.

The national democratic revolution in these areas is an important component of the contemporary proletarian world revolution.

The anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America are pounding and undermining the foundations of the rule of imperialism and colonialism, old and new, and are now a mighty force in defense of world peace.

In a sense, therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people

of these areas who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population.

Therefore, the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America is definitely not merely a matter of regional significance but one of overall importance for the whole cause of proletarian world revolution.

Certain persons now go so far as to deny the great international significance of the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples and, on the pretext of breaking down the barriers of nationality, color and geographical location, are trying their best to efface the line of demarcation between oppressed and oppressor nations and between oppressed and oppressor countries and to hold down the revolutionary struggles of the peoples in these areas. In fact, they cater to the needs of imperialism and create a new "theory" to justify the rule of imperialism in these areas and the promotion of its policies of old and new colonialism. Actually, this "theory" seeks not to break down the barriers of nationality, color and geographical location but to maintain the rule of the "superior nations" over the oppressed nations. It is only natural that this fraudulent "theory" is rejected by the people in these areas.

The working class in every socialist country and in every capitalist country must truly put into effect the fighting slogans, "Workers of all countries, unite!" and "Workers and oppressed nations of the world, unite!"; it must study the revolutionary experience of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, firmly support their revolutionary actions and regard the cause of their liberation as a most dependable support for itself and as directly in accord with its own interests. This is the only effective way to break down the barriers of nationality, color and geographical location and this is the only genuine proletarian internationalism.

It is impossible for the working class in the European and American capitalist countries to liberate itself unless it unites with the oppressed nations and unless those nations are liberated. Lenin rightly said:

The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would actually be a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and America were not closely and completely

united with the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of “colonial” slaves who are oppressed by capital.¹

Certain persons in the international communist movement are now taking a passive or scornful or negative attitude towards the struggles of the oppressed nations for liberation. They are in fact protecting the interests of monopoly capital, betraying those of the proletariat, and degenerating into social democrats.

The attitude taken towards the revolutionary struggles of the people in the Asian, African and Latin American countries is an important criterion for differentiating those who want revolution from those who do not and those who are truly defending world peace from those who are abetting the forces of aggression and war.

9. The oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are faced with the urgent task of fighting imperialism and its lackeys.

History has entrusted to the proletarian parties in these areas the glorious mission of holding high the banner of struggle against imperialism, against old and new colonialism and for national independence and people’s democracy, of standing in the forefront of the national democratic revolutionary movement and striving for a socialist future.

In these areas, extremely broad sections of the population refuse to be slaves of imperialism. They include not only the workers, peasants, intellectuals and petit bourgeoisie, but also the patriotic national bourgeoisie and even certain kings, princes and aristocrats, who are patriotic.

The proletariat and its party must have confidence in the strength of the masses and, above all, must unite with the peasants and establish a solid worker-peasant alliance. It is of primary importance for advanced members of the proletariat to work in the rural areas, help the peasants to act organized, and raise their class consciousness and their national self-respect and self-confidence.

On the basis of the worker-peasant alliance the proletariat and its party must unite all the strata that can be united and organize a broad united front against imperialism and its lackeys. In order to consolidate and expand this united front it is necessary that the proletarian party should maintain

¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Second Congress of the Communist International” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

its ideological, political and organizational independence and insist on the leadership of the revolution.

The proletarian party and the revolutionary people must learn to master all forms of struggle, including armed struggle. They must defeat counter-revolutionary armed force with revolutionary armed force whenever imperialism and its lackeys resort to armed suppression.

The nationalist countries which have recently won political independence are still confronted with the arduous tasks of consolidating it, liquidating the forces of imperialism and domestic reaction, carrying out agrarian and other social reforms and developing their national economy and culture. It is of practical and vital importance for these countries to guard and fight against the neo-colonialist policies which the old colonialists adopt to preserve their interests, and especially against the neo-colonialism of US imperialism.

In some of these countries, the patriotic national bourgeoisie continues to stand with the masses in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism and introduce certain measures of social progress. This requires the proletarian party to make a full appraisal of the progressive role of the patriotic national bourgeoisie and strengthen unity with them.

As the internal social contradictions and the international class struggle sharpen, the bourgeoisie, and particularly the big bourgeoisie, in some newly independent countries increasingly tend to become retainers of imperialism and to pursue anti-popular, anti-Communist and counter-revolutionary policies. It is necessary for the proletarian party resolutely to oppose these reactionary policies.

Generally speaking, the bourgeoisie in these countries have a dual character. When a united front is formed with the bourgeoisie, the policy of the proletarian party should be one of both unity and struggle. The policy should be to unite with the bourgeoisie, in so far as they tend to be progressive, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal, but to struggle against their reactionary tendencies to compromise and collaborate with imperialism and the forces of feudalism.

On the national question the world outlook of the proletarian party is internationalism, and not nationalism. In the revolutionary struggle it supports progressive nationalism and opposes reactionary nationalism. It must always draw a clear line of demarcation between itself and bourgeois nationalism, to which it must never fall captive.

The 1960 Statement says,

Communists expose attempts by the reactionary section of the bourgeoisie to represent its selfish, narrow class interests as those of the entire nation; they expose the demagogic use by bourgeois politicians of socialist slogans for the same purpose...

If the proletariat becomes the tail of the landlords and bourgeoisie in the revolution, no real or thorough victory in the national democratic revolution is possible, and even if victory of a kind is gained, it will be impossible to consolidate it.

In the course of the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples, the proletarian party must put forward a program of its own which is thoroughly against imperialism and domestic reaction and for national independence and people's democracy, and it must work independently among the masses, constantly expand the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the reactionary forces; only thus can it carry the national democratic revolution through to the end and guide the revolution on to the road of socialism.

10. In the imperialist and the capitalist countries, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are essential for the thorough resolution of the contradictions of capitalist society.

In striving to accomplish this task the proletarian party must under the present circumstances actively lead the working class and the working people in struggles to oppose monopoly capital, to defend democratic rights, to oppose the menace of fascism, to improve living conditions, to oppose imperialist arms expansion and war preparations, to defend world peace and actively to support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations.

In the capitalist countries which US imperialism controls or is trying to control, the working class and the people should direct their attacks mainly against US imperialism, but also against their own monopoly capitalists and other reactionary forces who are betraying the national interests.

Large-scale mass struggles in the capitalist countries in recent years have shown that the working class and working people are experiencing a new awakening. Their struggles, which are dealing blows at monopoly capital and reaction, have opened bright prospects for the revolutionary cause in their own countries and are also a powerful support for the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples and for the countries of the socialist camp.

The proletarian parties in imperialist or capitalist countries must maintain their own ideological, political and organizational independence in leading revolutionary struggles. At the same time, they must unite all the forces that can be united and build a broad united front against monopoly capital and against the imperialist policies of aggression and war.

While actively leading immediate struggles, Communists in the capitalist countries should link them with the struggle for long-range and general interests, educate the masses in a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary spirit, ceaselessly raise their political consciousness and undertake the historical task of the proletarian revolution. If they fail to do so, if they regard the immediate movement as everything, determine their conduct from case to case, adapt themselves to the events of the day and sacrifice the basic interests of the proletariat, that is out-and-out social democracy.

Social democracy is a bourgeois ideological trend. Lenin pointed out long ago that the social democratic parties are political detachments of the bourgeoisie, its agents in the working-class movement and its principal social prop. Communists must at all times draw a clear line of demarcation between themselves and social democratic parties on the basic question of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and liquidate the ideological influence of social democracy in the international working-class movement and among the working people. Beyond any shadow of doubt, Communists must win over the masses under the influence of the social democratic parties and must win over those left and middle elements in the social democratic parties who are willing to oppose domestic monopoly capital and domination by foreign imperialism and must unite with them in extensive joint action in the day-to-day struggle of the working-class movement and in the struggle to defend world peace.

In order to lead the proletariat and working people in revolution, Marxist-Leninist parties must master all forms of struggle and be able to substitute one form for another quickly as the conditions of struggle change. The vanguard of the proletariat will remain unconquerable in all circumstances only if it masters all forms of struggle—peaceful and armed, open and secret, legal and illegal, parliamentary struggle and mass struggle, etc. It is wrong to refuse to use parliamentary and other legal forms of struggle when they can and should be used. However, if a Marxist-Leninist party falls into legalism or parliamentary cretinism, confining the struggle within the limits permit-

ted by the bourgeoisie, this will inevitably lead to renouncing the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

11. On the question of transition from capitalism to socialism, the proletarian party must proceed from the stand of class struggle and revolution and base itself on the Marxist-Leninist teachings concerning the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Communists would always prefer to bring about the transition to socialism by peaceful means. But can peaceful transition be made into a new world-wide strategic principle for the international communist movement? Absolutely not.

Marxism-Leninism consistently holds that the fundamental question in all revolutions is that of state power. The 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement both clearly point out, “Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily.” The old government never topples even in a period of crisis, unless it is pushed. This is a universal law of class struggle.

In specific historical conditions, Marx and Lenin did raise the possibility that revolution may develop peacefully. But, as Lenin pointed out, the peaceful development of revolution is an opportunity “very seldom to be met with in the history of revolutions.”

As a matter of fact, there is no historical precedent for peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism.

Certain persons say there was no precedent when Marx foretold that socialism would inevitably replace capitalism. Then why can we not predict a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism despite the absence of a precedent? This parallel is absurd. Employing dialectical and historical materialism, Marx analyzed the contradictions of capitalism, discovered the objective laws of development of human society and arrived at a scientific conclusion, whereas the prophets who pin all their hopes on “peaceful transition” proceed from historical idealism, ignore the most fundamental contradictions of capitalism, repudiate the Marxist-Leninist teachings on class struggle, and arrive at a subjective and groundless conclusion. How can people who repudiate Marxism get any help from Marx?

It is plain to everyone that the capitalist countries are strengthening their state machinery—and especially their military apparatus—the primary purpose of which is to suppress the people in their own countries.

The proletarian party must never base its thinking, its policies for revolution and its entire work on the assumption that the imperialists and reactionaries will accept peaceful transformation.

The proletarian party must prepare itself for two eventualities—while preparing for a peaceful development of the revolution, it must also fully prepare for a non-peaceful development. It should concentrate on the painstaking work of accumulating revolutionary strength, so that it will be ready to seize victory when the conditions for revolution are ripe or to strike powerful blows at the imperialists and the reactionaries when they launch surprise attacks and armed assaults.

If it fails to make such preparations, the proletarian party will paralyze the revolutionary will of the proletariat, disarm itself ideologically and sink into a totally passive state of unpreparedness both politically and organizationally, and the result will be to bury the proletarian revolutionary cause.

12. All social revolutions in the various stages of the history of mankind are historically inevitable and are governed by objective laws independent of man's will. Moreover, history shows that there never was a revolution which was able to achieve victory without zigzags and sacrifices.

With Marxist-Leninist theory as the basis, the task of the Proletarian party is to analyze the concrete historical conditions, put forward the correct strategy and tactics, and guide the masses in bypassing hidden reefs, avoiding unnecessary sacrifices and reaching the goal step by step. Is it possible to avoid sacrifices altogether? Such is not the case with the slave revolutions, the serf revolutions, the bourgeois revolutions, or the national revolutions; nor is it the case with proletarian revolutions. Even if the guiding line of the revolution is correct, it is impossible to have a sure guarantee against setbacks and sacrifices in the course of the revolution. So long as a correct line is adhered to, the revolution is bound to triumph in the end. To abandon revolution on the pretext of avoiding sacrifices is in reality to demand that the people should forever remain slaves and endure infinite pain and sacrifice.

Elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism tells us that the birth pangs of a revolution are far less painful than the chronic agony of the old society. Lenin rightly said that “even with the most peaceful course of events, the present [capitalist] system always and inevitably exacts countless sacrifices from the working class.”²

² V. I. Lenin, “Another Massacre” in *Collected Works*, Vol. V.

Whoever considers a revolution can be made only if everything is plain sailing, only if there is an advance guarantee against sacrifices and failure, is certainly no revolutionary.

However difficult the conditions and whatever sacrifices and defeats the revolution may suffer, proletarian revolutionaries should educate the masses in the spirit of revolution and hold aloft the banner of revolution and not abandon it.

It would be “Left” adventurism if the proletarian party should rashly launch a revolution before the objective conditions are ripe. But it would be Right opportunism if the proletarian party should not dare to lead a revolution and to seize state power when the objective conditions are ripe.

Even in ordinary times, when it is leading the masses in the day-to-day struggle, the proletarian party should ideologically, politically and organizationally prepare its own ranks and the masses for revolution and promote revolutionary struggles, so that it will not miss the opportunity to overthrow the reactionary regime and establish a new state power when the conditions for revolution are ripe. Otherwise, when the objective conditions are ripe, the proletarian party will simply throw away the opportunity of seizing victory.

The proletarian party must be flexible as well as highly principled, and on occasion it must make such compromises as are necessary in the interests of the revolution. But it must never abandon principled policies and the goal of revolution on the pretext of flexibility and of necessary compromises.

The proletarian party must lead the masses in waging struggles against the enemies, and it must know how to utilize the contradictions among those enemies. But the purpose of using these contradictions is to make it easier to attain the goal of the people’s revolutionary struggles and not to liquidate these struggles.

Countless facts have proved that, wherever the dark rule of imperialism and reaction exists, the people who form over ninety percent of the population will sooner or later rise in revolution.

If Communists isolate themselves from the revolutionary demands of the masses, they are bound to lose the confidence of the masses and will be tossed to the rear by the revolutionary current.

If the leading group in any party adopts a non-revolutionary line and converts it into a reformist party, then Marxist-Leninists inside and outside the party will replace them and lead the people in making revolution. In another

kind of situation, the bourgeois revolutionaries will come forward to lead the revolution and the party of the proletariat will forfeit its leadership of the revolution. When the reactionary bourgeoisie betrays the revolution and suppresses the people, an opportunist line will cause tragic and unnecessary losses to the Communists and the revolutionary masses.

If Communists slide down the path of opportunism they will degenerate into bourgeois nationalists and become appendages of the imperialists and the reactionary bourgeoisie.

There are certain persons who assert that they have made the greatest creative contributions to revolutionary theory since Lenin and that they alone are correct. But it is very dubious whether they have ever really given consideration to the extensive experience of the entire world communist movement, whether they have ever really considered the interests, the goal and tasks of the international proletarian movement as a whole, and whether they really have a general line for the international communist movement which conforms with Marxism-Leninism.

In the last few years the international communist movement and the national liberation movement have had many experiences and many lessons. There are experiences which people should praise and there are experiences which make people grieve. Communists and revolutionaries in all countries should ponder and seriously study these experiences of success and failure, so as to draw correct conclusions and useful lessons from them.

13. The socialist countries and the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations support and assist each other.

The national liberation movements of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the revolutionary movements of the people in the capitalist countries are a strong support to the socialist countries. It is completely wrong to deny this.

The only attitude for the socialist countries to adopt towards the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations is one of warm sympathy and active support; they must not adopt a perfunctory attitude, or one of national selfishness or of great-power chauvinism.

Lenin said, "Alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all the oppressed peoples against any and all the imperialists—such is the external policy of the proletariat."³ Whoever fails to understand this

³ V. I. Lenin, "The Foreign Policy of the Russian Revolution" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XV.

point and considers that the support and aid given by the socialist countries to the oppressed peoples and nations are a burden or charity is going counter to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The superiority of the socialist system and the achievements of the socialist countries in construction play an exemplary role and are an inspiration to the oppressed peoples and the oppressed nations.

But this exemplary role and inspiration can never replace the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations. No oppressed people or nation can win liberation except through its own staunch revolutionary struggle.

Certain persons have one-sidedly exaggerated the role of peaceful competition between socialist and imperialist countries in their attempt to substitute peaceful competition for the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations. According to their preaching, it would seem that imperialism will automatically collapse in the course of this peaceful competition and that the only thing the oppressed peoples and nations have to do is to wait quietly for the advent of this day. What does this have in common with Marxist-Leninist views?

Moreover, certain persons have concocted the strange tale that China and some other socialist countries want “to unleash wars” and to spread socialism by “wars between states.” As the Statement of 1960 points out, such tales are nothing but imperialist and reactionary slanders. To put it bluntly, the purpose of those who repeat these slanders is to hide the fact that they are opposed to revolutions by the oppressed peoples and nations of the world and opposed to others supporting such revolutions.

14. In the last few years much—in fact a great deal—has been said on the question of war and peace. Our views and policies on this question are known to the world, and no one can distort them.

It is a pity that although certain persons in the international communist movement talk about how much they love peace and hate war, they are unwilling to acquire even a faint understanding of the simple truth on war pointed out by Lenin.

Lenin said:

It seems to me that the main thing that is usually forgotten on the question of war, which receives inadequate attention, the main reason why there is so much controversy, and, I would say,

futile, hopeless and aimless controversy, is that people forget the fundamental question of the class character of the war; why the war broke out; the classes that are waging it; the historical and historico-economic conditions that gave rise to it.⁴

As Marxist-Leninists see it, war is the continuation of politics by other means, and every war is inseparable from the political system and the political struggles which give rise to it. If one departs from this scientific Marxist-Leninist proposition, which has been confirmed by the entire history of class struggle, one will never be able to understand either the question of war or the question of peace.

There are different types of peace and different types of war. Marxist-Leninists must be clear about what type of peace or what type of war is in question. Lumping just wars and unjust wars together and opposing all of them indiscriminately is a bourgeois pacifist and not a Marxist-Leninist approach.

Certain persons say that revolutions are entirely possible without war. Now which type of war are they referring to—is it a war of national liberation or a revolutionary civil war, or is it a world war?

If they are referring to a war of national liberation or a revolutionary civil war, then this formulation is, in effect, opposed to revolutionary wars and to revolution.

If they are referring to a world war, then they are shooting at a non-existent target. Although Marxist-Leninists have pointed out, on the basis of the history of the two world wars, that world wars inevitably lead to revolution, no Marxist-Leninist ever has held or ever will hold that revolution must be made through world war.

Marxist-Leninists take the abolition of war as their ideal and believe that war can be abolished.

But how can war be abolished?

This is how Lenin viewed it:

Our object is to achieve the socialist system of society, which, by abolishing the division of mankind into classes, by abolishing all exploitation of man by man, and of one nation by other nations, will inevitably abolish all possibility of war.⁵

⁴ V. I. Lenin, "War and Revolution" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIV.

⁵ *Ibid.*

The Statement of 1960 also puts it very clearly, “The victory of socialism all over the world will completely remove the social and national causes of all wars.”

However, certain persons now actually hold that it is possible to bring about “a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars” through “general and complete disarmament” while the system of imperialism and of the exploitation of man by man still exists. This is sheer illusion.

An elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism tells us that the armed forces are the principal part of the state machine and that a so-called world without weapons and without armed forces can only be a world without states. Lenin said:

Only *after* the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world-historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap heap; and the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but *only when this condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before.*⁶

What are the facts in the world today? Is there a shadow of evidence that the imperialist countries headed by the United States are ready to carry out general and complete disarmament? Are they not each and all engaged in general and complete arms expansion?

We have always maintained that, in order to expose and combat the imperialists’ arms expansion and war preparations, it is necessary to put forward the proposal for general disarmament. Furthermore, it is possible to compel imperialism to accept some kind of agreement on disarmament, through the combined struggle of the socialist countries and the people of the whole world.

If one regards general and complete disarmament as the fundamental road to world peace, spreads the illusion that imperialism will automatically lay down its arms and tries to liquidate the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations on the pretext of disarmament, then this is deliberately to deceive the people of the world and help the imperialists in their policies of aggression and war.

⁶ V. I. Lenin, “The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution” in *On War and Peace*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1970, p. 63.

In order to overcome the present ideological confusion in the international working-class movement on the question of war and peace, we consider that Lenin's thesis, which has been discarded by the modern revisionists, must be restored in the interest of combating the imperialist policies of aggression and war and defending world peace.

The people of the world universally demand the prevention of a new world war. And it is possible to prevent a new world war.

The question then is, what is the way to secure world peace? According to the Leninist viewpoint, world peace can be won only by the struggles of the people in all countries and not by begging the imperialists for it. World peace can only be effectively defended by relying on the development of the forces of the socialist camp, on the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and working people of all countries, on the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations and on the struggles of all peace-loving people and countries.

Such is the Leninist policy. Any policy to the contrary definitely will not lead to world peace but will only encourage the ambitions of the imperialists and increase the danger of world war.

In recent years, certain persons have been spreading the argument that a single spark from a war of national liberation or from a revolutionary people's war will lead to a world conflagration destroying the whole of mankind. What are the facts? Contrary to what these persons say, the wars of national liberation and the revolutionary people's wars that have occurred since World War II have not led to world war. The victory of these revolutionary wars has directly weakened the forces of imperialism and greatly strengthened the forces which prevent the imperialists from launching a world war and which defend world peace. Do not the facts demonstrate the absurdity of this argument?

15. The complete banning and destruction of nuclear weapons is an important task in the struggle to defend world peace. We must do our utmost to this end.

Nuclear weapons are unprecedentedly destructive, which is why for more than a decade now the US imperialists have been pursuing their policy of nuclear blackmail in order to realize their ambition of enslaving the people of all countries and dominating the world.

But when the imperialists threaten other countries with nuclear weapons, they subject the people in their own country to the same threat, thus arousing them against nuclear weapons and against the imperialist policies

of aggression and war. At the same time, in their vain hope of destroying their opponents with nuclear weapons, the imperialists are in fact subjecting themselves to the danger of being destroyed.

The possibility of banning nuclear weapons does indeed exist. However, if the imperialists are forced to accept an agreement to ban nuclear weapons, it decidedly will not be because of their “love for humanity” but because of the pressure of the people of all countries and for the sake of their own vital interests.

In contrast to the imperialists, socialist countries rely upon the righteous strength of the people and on their own correct policies, and have no need whatever to gamble with nuclear weapons in the world arena. Socialist countries have nuclear weapons solely in order to defend themselves and to prevent imperialism from launching a nuclear war.

In the view of Marxist-Leninists, the people are the makers of history. In the present, as in the past, man is the decisive factor. Marxist-Leninists attach importance to the role of technological change, but it is wrong to belittle the role of man and exaggerate the role of technology.

The emergence of nuclear weapons can neither arrest the progress of human history nor save the imperialist system from its doom, any more than the emergence of new techniques could save the old systems from their doom in the past.

The emergence of nuclear weapons does not and cannot resolve the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world, does not and cannot alter the law of class struggle, and does not and cannot change the nature of imperialism and reaction.

It cannot, therefore, be said that with the emergence of nuclear weapons the possibility and the necessity of social and national revolutions have disappeared, or the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, and especially the theories of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and of war and peace, have become outmoded and changed into stale “dogmas.”

16. It was Lenin who advanced the thesis that it is possible for the socialist countries to practice peaceful coexistence with the capitalist countries. It is well known that after the great Soviet people had repulsed foreign armed intervention the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government, led first by Lenin and then by Stalin, consistently pursued the policy of peaceful coexistence and that they were forced to wage a war of self-defense only when attacked by the German imperialists.

Since its founding, the People's Republic of China too has consistently pursued the policy of peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems, and it is China which initiated the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence.

However, a few years ago certain persons suddenly claimed Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence as their own "great discovery." They maintain that they have a monopoly on the interpretation of this policy. They treat "peaceful coexistence" as if it were an all-inclusive, mystical book from heaven and attribute to it every success the people of the world achieve by struggle. What is more, they label all who disagree with their distortions of Lenin's views as opponents of peaceful coexistence, as people completely ignorant of Lenin and Leninism, and as heretics deserving to be burnt at the stake.

How can the Chinese Communists agree with this view and practice? They cannot, it is impossible.

Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence is very clear and readily comprehensible by ordinary people. Peaceful coexistence designates a relationship between countries with different social systems, and must not be interpreted as one pleases. It should never be extended to apply to the relations between oppressed and oppressor nations, between oppressed and oppressor countries or between oppressed and oppressor classes, and never be described as the main content of the transition from capitalism to socialism, still less should it be asserted that peaceful coexistence is mankind's road to socialism. The reason is that it is one thing to practice peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. It is absolutely impermissible and impossible for countries practicing peaceful coexistence to touch even a hair of each other's social system. The class struggle, the struggle for national liberation and the transition from capitalism to socialism in various countries are quite another thing. They are all bitter, life-and-death revolutionary struggles which aim at changing the social system. Peaceful coexistence cannot replace the revolutionary struggles of the people. The transition from capitalism to socialism in any country can only be brought about through the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in that country.

In the application of the policy of peaceful coexistence, struggles between the socialist and imperialist countries are unavoidable in the political, economic and ideological spheres, and it is absolutely impossible to have "all-round cooperation."

It is necessary for the socialist countries to engage in negotiations of one kind or another with the imperialist countries. It is possible to reach certain agreements through negotiation by relying on the correct policies of the socialist countries and on the pressure of the people of all countries. But necessary compromises between the socialist countries and the imperialist countries do not require the oppressed peoples and nations to follow suit and compromise with imperialism and its lackeys. No one should ever demand in the name of peaceful coexistence that the oppressed peoples and nations should give up their revolutionary struggles.

The application of the policy of peaceful coexistence by the socialist countries is advantageous for achieving a peaceful international environment for socialist construction, for exposing the imperialist policies of aggression and war and for isolating the imperialist forces of aggression and war. But if the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries is confined to peaceful coexistence, then it is impossible to handle correctly either the relations between socialist countries or those between the socialist countries and the oppressed peoples and nations. Therefore it is wrong to make peaceful coexistence the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries.

In our view, the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries should have the following content: to develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance and cooperation among the countries in the socialist camp in accordance with the principle of proletarian internationalism; to strive for peaceful coexistence on the basis of the Five Principles with countries having different social systems and oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war; and to support and assist the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed peoples and nations. These three aspects are interrelated and indivisible, and not a single one can be omitted.

17. For a very long historical period after the proletariat takes power, class struggle continues as an objective law independent of man's will, differing only in form from what it was before the taking of power.

After the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out a number of times that:

- a. The overthrown exploiters always try in a thousand and one ways to recover the "paradise" they have been deprived of.
- b. New elements of capitalism are constantly and spontaneously generated in the petit-bourgeois atmosphere.

- c. Political degenerates and new bourgeois elements may emerge in the ranks of the working class and among government functionaries as a result of bourgeois influence and the pervasive, corrupting atmosphere of the petit bourgeoisie.
- d. The external conditions for the continuance of class struggle within a socialist country are encirclement by international capitalism, the imperialists' threat of armed intervention and their subversive activities to accomplish peaceful disintegration.

Life has confirmed these conclusions of Lenin's.

For decades or even longer periods after socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization, it will be impossible to say that any socialist country will be free from those elements which Lenin repeatedly denounced, such as bourgeois hangers-on, parasites, speculators, swindlers, idlers, hooligans and embezzlers of state funds; or to say that a socialist country will no longer need to perform or be able to relinquish the task laid down by Lenin of conquering "this contagion, this plague, this ulcer that socialism has inherited from capitalism."

In a socialist country, it takes a very long historical period gradually to settle the question of who will win—socialism or capitalism. The struggle between the road of socialism and the road of capitalism runs through this whole historical period. This struggle rises and falls in a wavelike manner, at times becoming very fierce, and the forms of the struggle are many and varied.

The 1957 Declaration rightly states that "the conquest of power by the working class is only the beginning of the revolution, not its conclusion."

To deny the existence of class struggle in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the necessity of thoroughly completing the socialist revolution on the economic, political and ideological fronts is wrong, does not correspond to objective reality and violates Marxism-Leninism.

18. Both Marx and Lenin maintained that the entire period before the advent of the higher stage of communist society is the period of transition from capitalism to communism, the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In this transition period, the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is

to say, the proletarian state, goes through the dialectical process of establishment, consolidation, strengthening and withering away.

In the *Critique of the Gotha Program*, Marx posed the question as follows:

Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*.⁷

Lenin frequently emphasized Marx's great theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and analyzed the development of this theory, particularly in his outstanding work, *The State and Revolution*, where he wrote:

the transition from capitalist society—which is developing towards communism—to a communist society is impossible without a “political transition period,” and the state in this period can only be the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.⁸

He further said:

The essence of Marx's teaching on the state has been mastered only by those who understand that the dictatorship of a *single* class is necessary not only for every class society in general, not only for the *proletariat* which has overthrown the bourgeoisie, but also for the entire *historical period* which separates capitalism from “classless society,” from communism.⁹

As stated above, the fundamental thesis of Marx and Lenin is that the dictatorship of the proletariat will inevitably continue for the entire historical period of the transition from capitalism to communism, that is, for the entire period up to the abolition of all class differences and the entry into a classless society, the higher stage of communist society.

What will happen if it is announced, halfway through, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary?

⁷ K. Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Program*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 25.

⁸ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 86.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

Does this not fundamentally conflict with the teachings of Marx and Lenin on the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat?

Does this not license the development of “this contagion, this plague, this ulcer that socialism has inherited from capitalism?”

In other words, this would lead to extremely grave consequences and make any transition to communism out of the question.

Can there be a “state of the whole people?” Is it possible to replace the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by a “state of the whole people?”

This is not a question about the internal affairs of any particular country but a fundamental problem involving the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism.

In the view of Marxist-Leninists, there is no such thing as a non-class or supra-class state. So long as the state remains a state, it must bear a class character; so long as the state exists, it cannot be a state of the “whole people.” As soon as society becomes classless, there will no longer be a state.

Then what sort of thing would a “state of the whole people” be?

Anyone with an elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism can understand that the so-called “state of the whole people” is nothing new. Representative bourgeois figures have always called the bourgeois state a “state of all the people,” or a “state in which power belongs to all the people.”

Certain persons may say that their society is already one without classes. We answer: No, there are classes and class struggles in all socialist countries without exception.

Since remnants of the old exploiting classes who are trying to stage a comeback still exist there, since new capitalist elements are constantly being generated there, and since there are still parasites, speculators, idlers, hooligans, embezzlers of state funds, etc., how can it be said that classes or class struggles no longer exist? How can it be said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary?

Marxism-Leninism tells us that in addition to the suppression of the hostile classes, the historical tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the course of building socialism necessarily include the correct handling of relations between the working class and peasantry, the consolidation of their political and economic alliance and the creation of conditions for the gradual elimination of the class difference between worker and peasant.

When we look at the economic base of any socialist society, we find that the difference between ownership by the whole people and collective owner-

ship exists in all socialist countries without exception, and that there is individual ownership too. Ownership by the whole people and collective ownership are two kinds of ownership and two kinds of relations of production in socialist society. The workers in enterprises owned by the whole people and the peasants on farms owned collectively belong to two different categories of laborers in socialist society. Therefore, the class difference between worker and peasant exists in all socialist countries without exception. This difference will not disappear until the transition to the higher stage of communism is achieved. In their present level of economic development all socialist countries are still far, far removed from the higher stage of communism in which “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” is put into practice. Therefore, it will take a long, long time to eliminate the class difference between worker and peasant. And until this difference is eliminated, it is impossible to say that society is classless or that there is no longer any need for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In calling a socialist state the “state of the whole people,” is one trying to replace the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state by the bourgeois theory of the state? Is one trying to replace the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by a state of a different character?

If that is the case, it is nothing but a great historical retrogression. The degeneration of the social system in Yugoslavia is a grave lesson.

19. Leninism holds that the proletarian party must exist together with the dictatorship of the proletariat in socialist countries. The party of the proletariat is indispensable for the entire historical period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The reason is that the dictatorship of the proletariat has to struggle against the enemies of the proletariat and of the people, remold the peasants and other small producers, constantly consolidate the proletarian ranks, build socialism and effect the transition to communism; none of these things can be done without the leadership of the party of the proletariat.

Can there be a “party of the entire people?” Is it possible to replace the party which is the vanguard of the proletariat by a “party of the entire people?”

This, too, is not a question about the internal affairs of any particular party, but a fundamental problem involving the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism.

In the view of Marxist-Leninists, there is no such thing as a non-class or supra-class political party. All political parties have a class character. Party spirit is the concentrated expression of class character.

The party of the proletariat is the only party able to represent the interests of the whole people. It can do so precisely because it represents the interests of the proletariat, whose ideas and will it concentrates. It can lead the whole people because the proletariat can finally emancipate itself only with the emancipation of all mankind, because the very nature of the proletariat enables its party to approach problems in terms of its present and future interests, because the party is boundlessly loyal to the people and has the spirit of self-sacrifice; hence its democratic centralism and iron discipline. Without such a party, it is impossible to maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat and to represent the interests of the whole people.

What will happen if it is announced halfway before entering the higher stage of communist society that the party of the proletariat has become a “party of the entire people” and if its proletarian class character is repudiated?

Does this not fundamentally conflict with the teachings of Marx and Lenin on the party of the proletariat?

Does this not disarm the proletariat and all the working people, organizationally and ideologically, and is it not tantamount to helping restore capitalism?

Is it not “going south by driving the chariot north” to talk about any transition to communist society in such circumstances?

20. Over the past few years, certain persons have violated Lenin’s integral teachings about the interrelationship of leaders, party, class and masses, and raised the issue of “combating the cult of the individual”; this is erroneous and harmful.

The theory propounded by Lenin is as follows:

- a. The masses are divided into classes;
- b. Classes are usually led by political parties;
- c. Political parties, as a general rule, are directed by more or less stable groups composed of the most authoritative, influential and experienced members, who are elected to the most responsible positions and are called leaders.

Lenin said, “All this is elementary.”

The party of the proletariat is the headquarters of the proletariat in revolution and struggle. Every proletarian party must practice centralism based on democracy and establish a strong Marxist-Leninist leadership before it can become an organized and battle-worthy vanguard. To raise the question of “combating the cult of the individual” is actually to counterpose the leaders to the masses, undermine the party’s unified leadership which is based on democratic centralism, dissipate its fighting strength and disintegrate its ranks.

Lenin criticized the erroneous views which counterpose the leaders to the masses. He called them “ridiculously absurd and stupid.”

The Communist Party of China has always disapproved of exaggerating the role of the individual, has advocated and persistently practiced democratic centralism within the Party and advocated the linking of the leadership with the masses, maintaining that correct leadership must know how to concentrate the views of the masses.

While loudly combating the so-called “cult of the individual,” certain persons are in reality doing their best to defame the proletarian party and the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time, they are enormously exaggerating the role of certain individuals, shifting all errors onto others and claiming all credit for themselves.

What is more serious is that, under the pretext of “combating the cult of the individual,” certain persons are crudely interfering in the internal affairs of other fraternal parties and fraternal countries and forcing other fraternal parties to change their leadership in order to impose their own wrong line on these Parties. What is all this if not great-power chauvinism, sectarianism and splittism? What is all this if not subversion?

It is high time to propagate seriously and comprehensively Lenin’s integral teachings on the interrelationship of leaders, party, class and masses.

21. Relations between socialist countries are international relations of a new type. Relations between socialist countries, whether large or small, and whether more developed or less developed economically, must be based on the principles of complete equality, respect for territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence, and non-interference in each other’s internal affairs, and must also be based on the principles of mutual support and mutual assistance in accordance with proletarian internationalism.

Every socialist country must rely mainly on itself for its construction.

In accordance with its own concrete conditions, every socialist country must rely first of all on the diligent labor and talents of its own people, utilize all its available resources fully and in a planned way, and bring all its potential into play in socialist construction. Only thus can it build socialism effectively and develop its economy speedily.

This is the only way for each socialist country to strengthen the might of the entire socialist camp and enhance its capacity to assist the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat. Therefore, to observe the principle of mainly relying on oneself in construction is to apply proletarian internationalism concretely.

If, proceeding only from its own partial interests, any socialist country unilaterally demands that other fraternal countries submit to its needs, and uses the pretext of opposing what they call “going it alone” and “nationalism,” to prevent other fraternal countries from applying the principle of relying mainly on their own efforts in their construction and from developing their economies on the basis of independence, or even goes to the length of putting economic pressure on other fraternal countries—then these are pure manifestations of national egoism.

It is absolutely necessary for socialist countries to practice mutual economic assistance and cooperation and exchange. Such economic cooperation must be based on the principles of complete equality, mutual benefit and comradesly mutual assistance.

It would be great-power chauvinism to deny these basic principles and, in the name of “international division of labor” or “specialization,” to impose one’s own will on others, infringe on the independence and sovereignty of fraternal countries or harm the interests of their people.

In relations among socialist countries it would be preposterous to follow the practice of gaining profit for oneself at the expense of others, a practice characteristic of relations among capitalist countries, or go so far as to take the “economic integration” and the “common market,” which monopoly capitalist groups have instituted for the purpose of seizing markets and grabbing profits, as examples which socialist countries ought to follow in their economic cooperation and mutual assistance.

22. The 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement lay down the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties. These are the principle of solidarity, the principle of mutual support and mutual assistance, the principle of independence and equality and the principle of reaching unanimity

through consultation—all on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

We note that in its letter of March 30 the Central Committee of the CPSU says that there are no “superior” and “subordinate” parties in the communist movement, that all communist parties are independent and equal, and that they should all build their relations on the basis of proletarian internationalism and mutual assistance.

It is a fine quality of Communists that their deeds are consistent with their words. The only correct way to safeguard and strengthen unity among the fraternal parties is genuinely to adhere to, and not to violate, the principle of proletarian internationalism and genuinely to observe, and not to undermine, the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties—and to do so not only in words but, much more important, in deeds.

If the principle of independence and equality is accepted in relations among fraternal parties, then it is impermissible for any party to place itself above others, to interfere in their internal affairs, and to adopt patriarchal ways in relations with them.

If it is accepted that there are no “superiors” and “subordinates” in relations among fraternal parties, then it is impermissible to impose the program, resolutions and line of one’s own Party on other fraternal parties as the “common program” of the international communist movement.

If the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation is accepted in relations among fraternal parties, then one should not emphasize “who is in the majority” or “who is in the minority” and bank on a so-called majority in order to force through one’s own erroneous line and carry out sectarian and splitting policies.

If it is agreed that differences between fraternal parties should be settled through inter-party consultation, then other fraternal parties should not be attacked publicly and by name at one’s own congress or at other party congresses, in speeches by party leaders, resolutions, statements, etc.; and still less should the ideological differences among fraternal parties be extended into the sphere of state relations.

We hold that in the present circumstances, when there are differences in the international communist movement, it is particularly important to stress strict adherence to the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as laid down in the Declaration and the Statement.

In the sphere of relations among fraternal parties and countries, the question of Soviet-Albanian relations is an outstanding one at present. Here the question is what is the correct way to treat a fraternal party and country and whether the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries stipulated in the Declaration and the Statement are to be adhered to. The correct solution of this question is an important matter of principle in safeguarding the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

How to treat the Marxist-Leninist fraternal Albanian Party of Labour is one question. How to treat the Yugoslav revisionist clique of traitors to Marxism-Leninism is quite another question. These two essentially different questions must on no account be placed on a par.

Your letter says that you “do not relinquish the hope that the relations between the CPSU and the Albanian Party of Labour may be improved,” but at the same time you continue to attack the Albanian comrades for what you call “splitting activities.” Clearly this is self-contradictory and in no way contributes to resolving the problem of Soviet-Albanian relations.

Who is it that has taken splitting actions in Soviet-Albanian relations?

Who is it that has extended the ideological differences between the Soviet and Albanian Parties to state relations?

Who is it that has brought the divergences between the Soviet and Albanian Parties and between the two countries into the open before the enemy?

Who is it that has openly called for a change in the Albanian Party and state leadership?

All this is plain and clear to the whole world.

Is it possible that the leading comrades of the CPSU do not really feel their responsibility for the fact that Soviet-Albanian relations have so seriously deteriorated?

We once again express our sincere hope that the leading comrades of the CPSU will observe the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries and take the initiative in seeking an effective way to improve Soviet-Albanian relations.

In short, the question of how to handle relations with fraternal parties and countries must be taken seriously. Strict adherence to the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries is the only way forcefully

to rebuff slanders such as those spread by the imperialists and reactionaries about the “hand of Moscow.”

Proletarian internationalism is demanded of all parties without exception, whether large or small, and whether in power or not. However, the larger parties and the parties in power bear a particularly heavy responsibility in this respect. The series of distressing developments which have occurred in the socialist camp in the past period have harmed the interests not only of the fraternal parties concerned but also of the masses of the people in their countries. This convincingly demonstrates that the larger countries and parties need to keep in mind Lenin’s behest never to commit the error of great-power chauvinism.

The comrades of the CPSU state in their letter that “the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has never taken and will never take a single step that could sow hostility among the peoples of our country towards the fraternal Chinese people or other peoples.” Here we do not desire to go back and enumerate the many unpleasant events that have occurred in the past, and we only wish that the comrades of the CPSU will strictly abide by this statement in their future actions.

During the past few years, our party members and our people have exercised the greatest restraint in the face of a series of grave incidents which were in violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries and despite the many difficulties and losses which have been imposed on us. The spirit of proletarian internationalism of the Chinese Communists and the Chinese people has stood a severe test.

The Communist Party of China is unswervingly loyal to proletarian internationalism, upholds and defends the principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries, and safeguards and strengthens the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

23. In order to carry out the common program of the international communist movement unanimously agreed upon by the fraternal parties, an uncompromising struggle must be waged against all forms of opportunism, which is a deviation from Marxism-Leninism.

The Declaration and the Statement point out that revisionism, or, in other words, Right opportunism, is the main danger in the international communist movement. Yugoslav revisionism typifies modern revisionism.

The Statement points out particularly:

The communist parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist “theories” in concentrated form.

It goes on to say:

After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist program to the Declaration of 1957; they set the League of Communists of Yugoslavia against the international communist movement as a whole, severed their country from the socialist camp, made it dependent on so-called “aid” from US and other imperialists.

The Statement says further:

The Yugoslav revisionists carry on subversive work against the socialist camp and the world communist movement. Under the pretext of an extra-bloc policy, they engage in activities which prejudice the unity of all the peace-loving forces and countries.

Therefore, it draws the following conclusion:

Further exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists and active struggle to safeguard the communist movement and the working-class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists, remains an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The question raised here is an important one of principle for the international communist movement.

Only recently the Tito clique has publicly stated that they are persisting in their revisionist program and anti-Marxist-Leninist stand in opposition to the Declaration and the Statement.

US imperialism and its NATO partners have spent several thousand millions of US dollars nursing the Tito clique for a long time. Cloaked as “Marxist-Leninists” and flaunting the banner of a “socialist country,” the Tito clique has been undermining the international communist movement and the revolutionary cause of the people of the world, serving as a special detachment of US imperialism.

It is-completely groundless and out of keeping with the facts to assert that Yugoslavia is showing “definite positive tendencies,” that it is a “socialist country,” and that the Tito clique is an “anti-imperialist force.”

Certain persons are now attempting to introduce the Yugoslav revisionist clique into the socialist community and the international communist ranks. This is openly to tear up the agreement unanimously reached at the 1960 meeting of the fraternal parties and is absolutely impermissible.

Over the past few years, the revisionist trend flooding the international working-class movement and the many experiences and lessons of the international communist movement have fully confirmed the correctness of the conclusion in the Declaration and the Statement that revisionism is the main danger in the international communist movement at present.

However, certain persons are openly saying that dogmatism and not revisionism is the main danger, or that dogmatism is no less dangerous than revisionism, etc. What sort of principle underlies all this?

Firm Marxist-Leninists and genuine Marxist-Leninist parties must put principles first. They must not barter away principles, approving one thing today and another tomorrow, advocating one thing today and another tomorrow.

Together with all Marxist-Leninists, the Chinese Communists will continue to wage an uncompromising struggle against modern revisionism in order to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the principled stand of the Declaration and the Statement.

While combating revisionism, which is the main danger in the international communist movement, Communists must also combat dogmatism.

As stated in the 1957 Declaration, proletarian parties, “should firmly adhere to the principle of combining... universal Marxist-Leninist truth with the specific practice of revolution and construction in their countries.”

That is to say:

On the one hand, it is necessary at all times to adhere to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism. Failure to do so will lead to Right opportunist or revisionist errors.

On the other hand, it is always necessary to proceed from reality, maintain close contact with the masses, constantly sum up the experience of mass struggles, and independently work out and apply policies and tactics suited to the conditions of one’s own country. Errors of dogmatism will be committed if one fails to do so, if one mechanically copies the policies and tactics

of another Communist Party, submits blindly to the will of others or accepts without analysis the program and resolutions of another Communist Party as one's own line.

Some people are now violating this basic principle, which was long ago affirmed in the Declaration. On the pretext of "creatively developing Marxism-Leninism," they cast aside the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism. Moreover, they describe as "universal Marxist-Leninist truths" their own prescriptions which are based on nothing but subjective conjecture and are divorced from reality and from the masses, and they force others to accept these prescriptions unconditionally.

That is why many grave phenomena have come to pass in the international communist movement.

24. A most important lesson from the experience of the international communist movement is that the development and victory of a revolution depend on the existence of a revolutionary proletarian party.

There must be a revolutionary party.

There must be a revolutionary party built according to the revolutionary theory and revolutionary style of Marxism-Leninism.

There must be a revolutionary party able to integrate the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution in its own country.

There must be a revolutionary party able to link the leadership closely with the broad masses of the people.

There must be a revolutionary party that perseveres in the truth, corrects its errors and knows how to conduct criticism and self-criticism.

Only such a revolutionary party can lead the proletariat and the broad masses of the people in defeating imperialism and its lackeys, winning a thorough victory in the national democratic revolution and winning the socialist revolution.

If a party is not a proletarian revolutionary party but a bourgeois reformist party;

If it is not a Marxist-Leninist party but a revisionist party;

If it is not a vanguard party of the proletariat but a party tailing after the bourgeoisie;

If it is not a party representing the interests of the proletariat and all the working people but a party representing the interests of the labor aristocracy;

If it is not an internationalist party but a nationalist party;

If it is not a party that can use its brains to think for itself and acquire an accurate knowledge of the trends of the different classes in its own country through serious investigation and study, and knows how to apply the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and integrate it with the concrete practice of its own country, but instead is a party that parrots the words of others, copies foreign experience without analysis, runs hither and thither in response to the baton of certain persons abroad, and has become a hodgepodge of revisionism, dogmatism and everything but Marxist-Leninist principle;

Then such a party is absolutely incapable of leading the proletariat and the masses in revolutionary struggle, absolutely incapable of winning the revolution and absolutely incapable of fulfilling the great historical mission of the proletariat.

This is a question all Marxist-Leninists, all class-conscious workers and all progressive people everywhere need to ponder deeply.

25. It is the duty of Marxist-Leninists to distinguish between truth and falsehood with respect to the differences that have arisen in the international communist movement. In the common interest of the unity for struggle against the enemy, we have always advocated solving problems through inter-party consultations and opposed bringing differences into the open before the enemy.

As the comrades of the CPSU know, the public polemics in the international communist movement have been provoked by certain fraternal party leaders and forced on us.

Since a public debate has been provoked, it ought to be conducted on the basis of equality among fraternal parties and of democracy, and by presenting the facts and reasoning things out.

Since certain party leaders have publicly attacked other fraternal parties and provoked a public debate, it is our opinion that they have no reason or right to forbid the fraternal parties attacked to make public replies.

Since certain party leaders have published innumerable articles attacking other fraternal parties, why do they not publish in their own press the articles those parties have written in reply?

Latterly, the Communist Party of China has been subjected to posterous attacks. The attackers have raised a great hue and cry and, disregarding the facts, have fabricated many charges against us. We have published these articles and speeches attacking us in our own press.

We have also published in full in our press the Soviet leader's report at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet on December 12, 1962, the *Pravda* Editorial Board's article of January 7, 1963, the speech of the head of the CPSU delegation at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany on January 16, 1963 and the *Pravda* Editorial Board's article of February 10, 1963.

We have also published the full text of the two letters from the Central Committee of the CPSU dated February 21 and March 30, 1963.

We have replied to some of the articles and speeches in which fraternal parties have attacked us, but have not yet replied to others. For example, we have not directly replied to the many articles and speeches of the comrades of the CPSU.

Between December 15, 1962 and March 8, 1963, we wrote seven articles in reply to our attackers. These articles are entitled:

- Workers of All Countries, Unite, Oppose Our Common Enemy!,
- The Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us,
- Leninism and Modern Revisionism,
- Let Us Unite on the Basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement,
- Whence the Differences?—A Reply to Thorez and Other Comrades,
- More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us—Some Important Problems of Leninism in the Contemporary World,
- A Comment on the Statement of the Communist Party of the USA.

Presumably, you are referring to these articles when towards the end of your letter of March 30 you accuse the Chinese press of making “groundless attacks” on the CPSU. It is turning things upside down to describe articles replying to our attackers as “attacks.”

Since you describe our articles as “groundless” and as so very bad, why do you not publish all seven of these “groundless attacks,” in the same way as we have published your articles, and let all the Soviet comrades and Soviet people think for themselves and judge who is right and who wrong? You are

of course entitled to make a point-by-point refutation of these articles you consider “groundless attacks.”

Although you call our articles “groundless” and our arguments wrong, you do not tell the Soviet people what our arguments actually are. This practice can hardly be described as showing a serious attitude towards the discussion of problems by fraternal parties, towards the truth or towards the masses.

We hope that the public debate among fraternal parties can be stopped. This is a problem that has to be dealt with in accordance with the principles of independence, of equality and of reaching unanimity through consultation among fraternal parties. In the international communist movement, no one has the right to launch attacks whenever he wants, or to order the “ending of open polemics” whenever he wants to prevent the other side from replying.

It is known to the comrades of the CPSU that, in order to create a favorable atmosphere for convening the meeting of the fraternal parties, we have decided temporarily to suspend, as from March 9, 1963, public replies to the public attacks directed by name against us by comrades of fraternal parties. We reserve the right of public reply.

In our letter of March 9, we said that on the question of suspending public debate, “it is necessary that our two Parties and the fraternal parties concerned should have some discussion and reach an agreement that is fair and acceptable to all.”

* * *

The foregoing are our views regarding the general line of the international communist movement and some related questions of principle. We hope, as we indicated at the beginning of this letter, that the frank presentation of our views will be conducive to mutual understanding. Of course, comrades may agree or disagree with these views. But in our opinion, the questions we discuss here are the crucial questions calling for attention and solution by the international communist movement. We hope that all these questions and also those raised in your letter will be fully discussed in the talks between our two Parties and at the meeting of representatives of all the fraternal parties.

In addition, there are other questions of common concern, such as the criticism of Stalin and some important matters of principle regarding the

international communist movement which were raised at the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, and we hope that on these questions, too, there will be a frank exchange of opinion in the talks.

With regard to the talks between our two Parties, in our letter of March 9 we proposed that Comrade Khrushchev come to Beijing; if this was not convenient, we proposed that another responsible comrade of the Central Committee of the CPSU lead a delegation to Beijing or that we send a delegation to Moscow.

Since you have stated in your letter of March 30 that Comrade Khrushchev cannot come to China, and since you have not expressed a desire to send a delegation to China, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has decided to send a delegation to Moscow.

In your letter of March 30, you invited Comrade Mao Zedong to visit the Soviet Union. As early as February 23, Comrade Mao Zedong in his conversation with the Soviet Ambassador to China clearly stated the reason why he was not prepared to visit the Soviet Union at the present time. You were well aware of this.

When a responsible comrade of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China received the Soviet Ambassador to China on May 9, he informed you that we would send a delegation to Moscow in the middle of June. Later, in compliance with the request of the Central Committee of the CPSU, we agreed to postpone the talks between our two Parties to July 5.

We sincerely hope that the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties will yield positive results and contribute to the preparations for convening the meeting of all communist and workers' parties.

It is now more than ever necessary for all Communists to unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and of the Declaration and the Statement unanimously agreed upon by the fraternal parties.

Together with Marxist-Leninist Parties and revolutionary people the world over, the Communist Party of China will continue its unremitting efforts to uphold the interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, the cause of the emancipation of the oppressed peoples and nations, and the struggle against imperialism and for world peace.

We hope that events which grieve those near and dear to us and only gladden the enemy will not recur in the international communist movement in the future.

The Chinese Communists firmly believe that the Marxist-Leninists, the proletariat and the revolutionary people everywhere will unite more closely, overcome all difficulties and obstacles and win still greater victories in the struggle against imperialism and for world peace, and in the fight for the revolutionary cause of the people of the world and the cause of international communism.

Workers of all countries, unite! Workers and oppressed peoples and nations of the world, unite! Oppose our common enemy!

With communist greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China**

The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves

**COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
CPSU (I)**

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE *PEOPLE'S DAILY* AND THE *RED FLAG*

September 6, 1963

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 17, 1963, pp. 5-28.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, September 13, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 37,
pp. 6-20.

It is more than a month since the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union published its Open Letter of July 14 to party organizations and all Communists in the Soviet Union. This Open Letter, and the steps taken by the leadership of the CPSU since its publication, have pushed Sino-Soviet relations to the brink of a split and have carried the differences in the international communist movement to a new stage of unprecedented gravity.

Now Moscow, Washington, New Delhi and Belgrade are joined in a love feast and the Soviet press is running an endless assortment of fantastic stories and theories attacking China. The leadership of the CPSU has allied itself with US imperialism, the Indian reactionaries and the renegade Tito clique against socialist China and against all Marxist-Leninist parties, in open betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, in brazen repudiation of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement and in flagrant violation of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance.

The present differences within the international communist movement and between the Chinese and Soviet Parties involve a whole series of important questions of principle. In its letter of June 14 to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Central Committee of the CPC systematically and comprehensively discussed the essence of these differences. It pointed out that, in the last analysis, the present differences within the international communist movement and between the Chinese and Soviet Parties involve the questions

of whether or not to accept the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, whether or not to accept Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, whether or not there is need for revolution, whether or not imperialism is to be opposed, and whether or not the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement is desired.

How have the differences in the international communist movement and between the leadership of the CPSU and ourselves arisen? And how have they grown to their present serious dimensions? Everybody is concerned about these questions.

In our article *Whence the Differences?*¹⁰ we dealt with the origin and growth of the differences in the international communist movement in general outline. We deliberately refrained from giving certain facts concerning this question, and particularly certain important facts involving the leadership of the CPSU, and left the leadership of the CPSU some leeway, though we were ready to provide a fuller picture and to thrash out the rights and wrongs when necessary. Now that the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU has told many lies about the origin and development of the differences and completely distorted the facts, it has become necessary for us to set forth certain facts in order to explain the matter in greater detail.

In its Open Letter, the Central Committee of the CPSU dares not state the truth to its party members and the masses of the people. Instead of being open and above-board and respecting the facts as Marxist-Leninists should, the leadership of the CPSU resorts to the customary practice of bourgeois politicians, distorting the facts and confusing truth and falsehood in its determined attempt to shift the blame for the emergence and growth of the differences on to the Chinese Communist Party.

Lenin once said, “Honesty in politics is the result of strength; hypocrisy is the result of weakness.”¹¹ Honesty and respect for the facts mark the attitude of Marxist-Leninists. Only those who have degenerated politically depend on telling lies for a living.

The facts are most eloquent. Facts are the best witness. Let us look at the facts.

¹⁰ *Documents of the CPC—The Great Debate*, Vol. I, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 285-310.

¹¹ V. I. Lenin, “Polemical Notes” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XVII.

THE DIFFERENCES BEGAN WITH THE 20TH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU

There is a saying, "It takes more than one cold day for the river to freeze three feet deep." The present differences in the international communist movement did not, of course, begin just today.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU spreads the notion that the differences in the international communist movement were started by the three articles which we published in April 1960 under the title of "Long Live Leninism!" This is a big lie.

What is the truth ?

The truth is that the whole series of differences of principle in the international communist movement began more than seven years ago.

To be specific, it began with the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU was the first step along the road of revisionism taken by the leadership of the CPSU. From the 20th Congress to the present, the revisionist line of the leadership of the CPSU has gone through the process of emergence, formation, growth and systematization. And by a gradual process, too, people have come to understand more and more deeply the revisionist line of the CPSU leadership.

From the very outset we held that a number of views advanced at the 20th Congress concerning the contemporary international struggle and the international communist movement were wrong, were violations of Marxism-Leninism. In particular, the complete negation of Stalin on the pretext of "combating the personality cult" and the thesis of peaceful transition to socialism by "the parliamentary road" are gross errors of principle.

The criticism of Stalin at the 20th Congress of the CPSU was wrong both in principle and in method.

Stalin's life was that of a great Marxist-Leninist, a great proletarian revolutionary. For thirty years after Lenin's death, Stalin was the foremost leader of the CPSU and the Soviet Government, as well as the recognized leader of the international communist movement and the standard-bearer of the world revolution. During his lifetime, Stalin made some serious mistakes, but compared to his great and meritorious deeds his mistakes are only secondary.

Stalin rendered great services to the development of the Soviet Union and the international communist movement. In the article "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" published in April 1956, we said:

After Lenin's death Stalin creatively applied and developed Marxism-Leninism as the chief leader of the Party and the state. Stalin expressed the will and aspirations of the people, and proved himself an outstanding Marxist-Leninist fighter, in the struggle in defense of the legacy of Leninism against its enemies—the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and other bourgeois agents. Stalin won the support of the Soviet people and played an important role in history primarily because, together with the other leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he defended Lenin's line on the industrialization of the Soviet Union and the collectivization of agriculture. By pursuing this line, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union brought about the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union and created the conditions for the victory of the Soviet Union in the war against Hitler; these victories of the Soviet people accorded with the interests of the working class of the world and all progressive mankind. It was therefore natural that the name of Stalin was greatly honored throughout the world.¹²

It was necessary to criticize Stalin's mistakes. But in his secret report to the 20th Congress, Comrade Khrushchev completely negated Stalin, and in doing so defamed the dictatorship of the proletariat, defamed the socialist system, the great CPSU, the great Soviet Union and the international communist movement. Far from using a revolutionary proletarian party's method of criticism and self-criticism for the purpose of making an earnest and serious analysis and summation of the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he treated Stalin as an enemy and shifted the blame for all mistakes on to Stalin alone.

Khrushchev viciously and demagogically told a host of lies in his secret report, and threw around charges that Stalin had a "persecution mania," indulged in "brutal arbitrariness," took the path of "mass repressions and terror," "knew the country and agriculture only from films" and "planned operations on a globe," that Stalin's leadership "became a serious obstacle in the path of Soviet social development," and so on and so forth. He completely obliterated the meritorious deeds of Stalin who led the Soviet people in

¹² *Documents of the CPC—The Great Debate*, Vol. I, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

waging resolute struggle against all internal and external foes and achieving great results in socialist transformation and socialist construction, who led the Soviet people in defending and consolidating the first socialist country in the world and winning the glorious victory in the anti-fascist war, and who defended and developed Marxism-Leninism.

In completely negating Stalin at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, Khrushchev in effect negated the dictatorship of the proletariat and the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism which Stalin defended and developed. It was at that Congress that Khrushchev, in his summary report, began the repudiation of Marxism-Leninism on a number of questions of principle.

In his report to the 20th Congress, under the pretext that “radical changes” had taken place in the world situation, Khrushchev put forward the thesis of “peaceful transition.” He said that the road of the October Revolution was “the only correct road in those historical conditions,” but that as the situation had changed, it had become possible to effect the transition from capitalism to socialism “through the parliamentary road.” In essence, this erroneous thesis is a clear revision of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state and revolution and a clear denial of the universal significance of the road of the October Revolution.

In his report, under the same pretext that “radical changes” had taken place in the world situation, Khrushchev also questioned the continued validity of Lenin’s teachings on imperialism and on war and peace, and in fact tampered with Lenin’s teachings.

Khrushchev pictured the US Government and its head as people resisting the forces of war, and not as representatives of the imperialist forces of war. He said, “...the advocates of settling outstanding issues by means of war still hold strong positions there [in the United States], and... they continue to exert big pressure on the President and the Administration.” He went on to say that the imperialists were beginning to admit that the positions-of-strength policy had failed and that “symptoms of a certain sobering up are appearing” among them. It was as much as saying that it was possible for the US Government and its head not to represent the interests of the US monopoly capital and for them to abandon their policies of war and aggression and that they had become forces defending peace.

Khrushchev declared: “We want to be friends with the United States and to cooperate with it for peace and international security and also in the eco-

conomic and cultural spheres.” This wrong view later developed into the line of “Soviet-US cooperation for the settlement of world problems.”

Distorting Lenin’s correct principle of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, Khrushchev declared that peaceful coexistence was the “general line of the foreign policy” of the USSR. This amounted to excluding from the general line of foreign policy of the socialist countries their mutual assistance and cooperation as well as assistance by them to the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, or to subordinating all this to the policy of so-called “peaceful coexistence.”

The questions raised by the leadership of the CPSU at the 20th Congress, and especially the question of Stalin and of “peaceful transition,” are by no means simply internal affairs of the CPSU; they are vital issues of common interest for all fraternal parties. Without any prior consultation with the fraternal parties, the leadership of the CPSU drew arbitrary conclusions; it forced the fraternal parties to accept a *fait accompli* and, on the pretext of “combating the personality cult,” crudely interfered in the internal affairs of fraternal parties and countries and subverted their readerships, thus pushing its policy of sectarianism and splittism in the international communist movement.

Subsequent developments show with increasing clarity that the revision and betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism by the leaders of the CPSU have grown out of the above errors.

The CPC has always differed in principle in its view of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, and the leading comrades of the CPSU are well aware of this. Yet the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU asserts that the Communist Party of China previously gave the 20th Congress full support, that we “have made a 180-degree turn” in our evaluation of the 20th Congress, and that our position is full of “vacillations and waverings” and is “false.”

It is impossible for the leadership of the CPSU to shut out the heavens with one palm. Let the facts speak for themselves. On many occasions in internal discussions after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, leading comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC solemnly criticized the errors of the CPSU leadership.

In April 1956, less than two months after the 20th Congress, in conversations both with Comrade Mikoyan, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and with the Soviet Ambassador

to China, Comrade Mao Zedong expressed our views on the question of Stalin. He emphasized that Stalin's "merits outweighed his faults" and that it was necessary to "make a concrete analysis" and "an all-round evaluation" of Stalin.

On October 23, 1956, on receiving the Soviet Ambassador to China, Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out, "Stalin deserves to be criticized, but we do not agree with the method of criticism, and there are some other matters we do not agree with."

On November 30, 1956, on receiving the Soviet Ambassador to China, Comrade Mao Zedong again pointed out that the basic policy and line during the period when Stalin was in power were correct and that methods that are used against enemies must not be used against one's comrades.

Both Comrade Liu Shaoqi in his conversation with leaders of the CPSU in October 1956, and Comrade Zhou Enlai in his conversations on October 1, 1956 with the delegation of the CPSU to the Eighth Congress of the CPC and on January 18, 1957 with leaders of the CPSU, also expressed our views on the question of Stalin, and both criticized the errors of the leaders of the CPSU as consisting chiefly of "total lack of an overall analysis" of Stalin, "lack of self-criticism" and "failure to consult with the fraternal parties in advance."

In internal discussions with comrades of the CPSU, leading comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC also stated where we differed on the question of peaceful transition. Furthermore, in November 1957 the Central Committee of the CPC presented the Central Committee of the CPSU with a written "Outline of Views on the Question of Peaceful Transition," comprehensively and clearly explaining the viewpoint of the CPC.

In their many internal discussions with comrades of the CPSU, leading comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC also systematically set forth our views on the international situation and the strategy of the international communist movement, with direct reference to the errors of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

These are plain facts. How can the leadership of the CPSU obliterate them by bare-faced lying?

Attempting to conceal these important facts, the Central Committee of the CPSU in its Open Letter quotes out of context public statements by

Comrades Mao Zedong, Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping to show that at one time the Chinese Communist Party completely affirmed the 20th Congress of the CPSU. This is futile.

The fact is that at no time and in no place did the Chinese Communist Party completely affirm the 20th Congress of the CPSU, agree with the complete negation of Stalin or endorse the view of peaceful transition to socialism through the “parliamentary road.”

Not long after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, on April 5, 1956, we published “On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat”; then, on December 29, 1956, we published “More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.” While refuting the anti-Communist slanders of the imperialists and reactionaries, these two articles made an all-round analysis of the life of Stalin, affirmed the universal significance of the road of the October Revolution, summed up the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and tactfully but unequivocally criticized the erroneous propositions of the 20th Congress. Is this not a widely known fact?

Since the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the Chinese Communist Party has continued to display the portrait of Stalin along with those of the other great revolutionary leaders, Marx, Engels and Lenin. Is not this, too, a widely known fact?

It needs to be said, of course, that for the sake of unity against the enemy and out of consideration for the difficult position the leaders of the CPSU were in, we refrained in those days from open criticism of the errors of the 20th Congress, because the imperialists and the reactionaries of all countries were exploiting these errors and carrying on frenzied activities against the Soviet Union, against communism and against the people, and also because the leaders of the CPSU had not yet departed so far from Marxism-Leninism as they did later. We fervently hoped at the time that the leaders of the CPSU would put their errors right. Consequently, we always endeavored to seek out positive aspects and on public occasions gave them whatever support was appropriate and necessary.

Even so, by stressing positive lessons and principles in their public speeches, leading comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC explained our position with regard to the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU asserts that in his political report to the Eighth Congress of the CPC, Comrade Liu Shaoqi

completely affirmed the 20th Congress of the CPSU. But it was in this very report that Comrade Liu Shaoqi spoke on the lessons of the Chinese revolution and explained that the road of “peaceful transition” was wrong and impracticable.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU asserts that in his report to the Eighth Congress of the CPC on the revision of the Party Constitution, Comrade Deng Xiaoping completely affirmed the “combat against the personality cult” conducted at the 20th Congress. But it was in this very report that Comrade Deng Xiaoping discussed at some length democratic centralism in the Party and the interrelationship between leaders and masses, explained the consistent and correct style of work of our Party, and thus in effect criticized the error of the 20th Congress concerning “combating the personality cult.”

Is there anything wrong in the way we acted? Have we not done exactly what a Marxist-Leninist party ought to do by persevering in principle and upholding unity?

How can this consistently correct attitude of the Chinese Communist Party towards the 20th Congress be described as full of “vacillations and waverings,” as “false” and as representing “a 180-degree turn?”

In making these charges against us in the Open Letter, perhaps the Central Committee of the CPSU thought it could deny the criticisms we made because they were known only to a few leaders of the CPSU, and that it could use falsehoods to deceive the broad masses of the CPSU membership and the Soviet people. But does this not prove its own falseness?

THE SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES OF THE 20TH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU loudly proclaims the “wonderful” and “majestic results” of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

But history cannot be altered. People not suffering from too short a memory will recall that by its errors the 20th Congress produced not “wonderful” or “majestic results” but a discrediting of the Soviet Union, of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of socialism and communism, and gave an opportunity to the imperialists, the reactionaries and all the other enemies of communism, with extremely serious consequences for the international communist movement.

After the Congress, swollen with arrogance the imperialists and reactionaries everywhere stirred up a world-wide tidal wave against the Soviet Union

against communism and against the people. The US imperialists saw the all-out attack on Stalin by the leadership of the CPSU as something that was “never so suited to our purposes,”¹³ they talked openly about using Khrushchev’s secret report as a “weapon with which to destroy the prestige and influence of the communist movement”¹⁴ and they took the opportunity to advocate “peaceful transformation” in the Soviet Union.¹⁵

The Titoites became most aggressive. Flaunting their reactionary slogan of “anti-Stalinism,” they wildly attacked the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system. They declared that the 20th Congress of the CPSU “created sufficient elements” for the “new course” which Yugoslavia had started and that “the question now is whether this course will win or the course of Stalinism will win again.”¹⁶

The Trotskyites, enemies of communism, who had been in desperate straits, feverishly resumed activity. In its *Manifesto to the Workers and Peoples of the Entire World* the so-called Fourth International said:

Today, when the Kremlin leaders are themselves admitting the crimes of Stalin, they implicitly recognize that the indefatigable struggle carried on... by the world Trotskyist movement against the degeneration of the workers’ state, was fully justified.

The errors of the 20th Congress brought great ideological confusion in the international communist movement and caused it to be deluged with revisionist ideas. Along with the imperialists, the reactionaries and the Tito clique, renegades from communism in many countries attacked Marxism-Leninism and the international communist movement.

Most striking among the events which took place during this period were the incident in Soviet-Polish relations and the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary. The two events were different in character. But the leadership of the CPSU made grave errors in both. By moving up troops in an attempt to subdue the Polish comrades by armed force it committed the error of great-power chauvinism. And at the critical moment when the Hungarian counter-revolutionaries had occupied Budapest, for a time it intended

¹³ Radio talk by T. C. Streibert, Director of the US Information Agency, June 11, 1956.

¹⁴ “The Communist Crisis,” *New York Times* editorial, June 23, 1956.

¹⁵ J. F. Dulles, Statement at the Press Conference, April 3, 1956.

¹⁶ J. B. Tito, Speech Made in Pula, November 11, 1956.

to adopt a policy of capitulation and abandon socialist Hungary to counter-revolution.

These errors of the leadership of the CPSU inflated the arrogance of all the enemies of communism, created serious difficulties for many fraternal parties and caused the international communist movement great damage.

In the face of this situation, the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties persevering in Marxism-Leninism firmly demanded repulsing the assaults of imperialism and reaction and safeguarding the socialist camp and the international communist movement. We insisted on the taking of all necessary measures to smash the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary and firmly opposed the abandonment of socialist Hungary. We insisted that in the handling of problems between fraternal parties and countries correct principles should be followed so as to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp, and we firmly opposed the erroneous methods of great-power chauvinism. At the same time, we made very great efforts to safeguard the prestige of the CPSU.

At that time the leaders of the CPSU accepted our suggestion and on October 30, 1956 issued the Soviet Government's "Declaration on the Foundations of the Development and Further Strengthening of Friendship and Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and Other Socialist Countries," in which they examined some of their own past mistakes in handling their relations with fraternal countries. On November 1, the Chinese Government issued a statement expressing support for the Soviet Government's declaration.

All this we did in the interests of the international communist movement, and also in order to persuade the leaders of the CPSU to draw the proper lessons and correct their errors in good time and not slide farther away from Marxism-Leninism. But subsequent event showed that the leaders of the CPSU nursed rancor against us and regarded the CPC which perseveres in proletarian internationalism as the biggest obstacle to their wrong line.

THE 1957 MOSCOW MEETING OF FRATERNAL PARTIES

The 1957 Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties took place in Moscow after the repulse of the heavy attacks of the imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries on the international communist movement.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU says that the 20th Congress of the CPSU played a “tremendous role” in defining the general line of the international communist movement. The facts show the very reverse. The erroneous views of the 20th Congress on many important questions of principle were rejected and corrected by the 1957 meeting of fraternal parties.

The well-known Declaration of 1957, adopted by the Moscow Meeting, summed up the experience of the international communist movement, set forth the common fighting tasks of all the communist parties, affirmed the universal significance of the road of the October Revolution, outlined the common laws governing socialist revolution and socialist construction and laid down the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries. The common line of the international communist movement which was thus worked out at the meeting embodies the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism and is opposed to the erroneous views deviating from Marxism-Leninism which were advanced by the 20th Congress. The principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries laid down in the Declaration are concrete expressions of the principle of proletarian internationalism and stand opposed to the great-power chauvinism and sectarianism of the leadership of the CPSU.

The delegation of the CPC, which was headed by Comrade Mao Zedong, did a great deal of work during the Meeting. On the one hand, it had full consultations with the leaders of the CPSU, and where necessary and appropriate waged struggle against them, in order to help them correct their errors; on the other hand, it held repeated exchanges of views with the leaders of other fraternal parties in order that a common document acceptable to all might be worked out.

At this meeting, the chief subject of controversy between us and the delegation of the CPSU was the transition from capitalism to socialism. In their original draft of the Declaration the leadership of the CPSU insisted on the inclusion of the erroneous views of the 20th Congress on peaceful transition. The original draft said not a word about non-peaceful transition, mentioning only peaceful transition; moreover, it described peaceful transition as “securing a majority in parliament and transforming parliament from an instrument of the bourgeois dictatorship into an instrument of a genuine people’s state power.” In fact, it substituted the “parliamentary road” advocated by the opportunists of the Second International for the road of the October

Revolution and tampered with the basic Marxist-Leninist theory on the state and revolution.

The Chinese Communist Party resolutely opposed the wrong views contained in the draft declaration submitted by the leadership of the CPSU. We expressed our views on the two successive drafts put forward by the Central Committee of the CPSU and made a considerable number of major changes of principle which we presented as our own revised draft. Repeated discussions were then held between the delegations of the Chinese and Soviet Parties on the basis of our revised draft before the “Joint Draft Declaration by the CPSU and the CPC” was submitted to the delegations of the other fraternal parties for their opinions.

As a result of the common efforts of the delegations of the CPC and the other fraternal parties, the Meeting finally adopted the present version of the Declaration, which contains two major changes on the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism compared with the first draft put forward by the leadership of the CPSU. First, while indicating the possibility of peaceful transition, the Declaration also points to the road of non-peaceful transition and stresses that “Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily.” Secondly, while speaking of securing “a firm majority in parliament,” the Declaration emphasizes the need to “launch an extra-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realization of the socialist revolution.”

Despite these changes, the formulation in the Declaration on the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism was still unsatisfactory. We finally conceded the point only out of consideration for the repeatedly expressed wish of the leaders of the CPSU that the formulation should show some connection with that of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

However, we presented the Central Committee of the CPSU with an outline of our views on the question of peaceful transition in which the views of the CPC were explained comprehensively and clearly. The outline emphasizes the following:

In the present situation of the international communist movement, it is advantageous from the point of view of tactics to refer to the desire for peaceful transition. But it would

be inappropriate to over-emphasize the possibility of peaceful transition.

They [the proletariat and the Communist Party] must be prepared at all times to repulse counter-revolutionary attacks and, at the critical juncture of the revolution when the working class is seizing state power, to overthrow the bourgeoisie by armed force if it uses armed force to suppress the people's revolution (generally speaking, it is inevitable that the bourgeoisie will do so).

To obtain a majority in parliament is not the same as smashing the old state machinery (chiefly the armed forces) and establishing new state machinery (chiefly the armed forces). Unless the military-bureaucratic state machinery of the bourgeoisie is smashed, a parliamentary majority for the proletariat and their reliable allies will either be impossible... or undependable.¹⁷

As a result of the common efforts of the delegations of the CPC and the other fraternal parties, the 1957 Declaration also corrected the erroneous views which the CPSU leadership had put forward at the 20th Congress on such questions as imperialism and war and peace, and it added many important points on a number of questions of principle. The main additions were the thesis that US imperialism is the center of world reaction and the sworn enemy of the people, the thesis that if imperialism should unleash a world war it would doom itself to destruction, the common laws governing the socialist revolution and the building of socialism; the principle of combining the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution and construction in different countries, the formulation on the importance of applying dialectical materialism in practical work, the thesis that the seizure of political power by the working class is the beginning of the revolution and not its end; the thesis that it will take a fairly long time to solve the question of who will win—capitalism or socialism, the thesis that the existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source; and so on.

At the same time, the delegation of the CPC made some necessary compromises. In addition to the formulation on the question of peaceful transi-

¹⁷ See Appendix 1, pp. 434-435.

tion, we did not agree with the reference to the 20th Congress of the CPSU and suggested changes. But out of consideration for the difficult position of the leadership of the CPSU at the time, we did not insist on the changes.

Who could have imagined that these concessions which we made out of consideration for the larger interest would later be used by the leadership of the CPSU as an excuse for aggravating differences and creating a split in the international communist movement?

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU constantly equates the resolution of the 20th Congress of the CPSU with the Declaration of 1957 in its attempt to substitute the wrong line of the 20th Congress for the common line of the international communist movement. We have pointed out long ago and now deem it necessary to reiterate, that in accordance with the principle that all fraternal parties are independent and equal, no one is entitled to demand of fraternal parties that they accept the resolutions of the Congress of one party or for that matter anything else; and the resolutions of a party congress, whatever the party, cannot be regarded as the common line of the international communist movement and have no binding force on other fraternal parties. Only Marxism-Leninism and the documents unanimously agreed upon constitute the common code binding us and all fraternal parties.

THE GROWTH OF THE REVISIONISM OF THE CPSU LEADERSHIP

After the Moscow Meeting of 1957 with its unanimously agreed Declaration, we hoped that the leadership of the CPSU would follow the line laid down in the Declaration and correct its errors. We regret to say that contrary to the expectations we and all other Marxist-Leninist fraternal parties entertained, the leadership of the CPSU perpetrated increasingly serious violations of the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries, and departed farther and farther from the path of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The revisionism of the leadership of the CPSU grew. This development aggravated the differences in the international communist movement and carried them to a new stage.

In complete disregard of the common conclusion of the 1957 Declaration that US imperialism is the enemy of all the people of the world, the leadership of the CPSU passionately sought collaboration with US imperialism and the settlement of world problems by the heads of the Soviet Union and

the United States. Particularly around the time of the Camp David Talks in September 1959, Khrushchev lauded Eisenhower to the skies, hailing him as a man who “enjoys the absolute confidence of his people”¹⁸ and who “also worries about ensuring peace just as we do.”¹⁹ Moreover, comrades of the CPSU energetically advertised the so-called “spirit of Camp David,” whose existence Eisenhower himself denied, alleging that it marked “a new era in international relations”²⁰ and “a turning point in history.”²¹

Completely disregarding the revolutionary line of the 1957 Declaration, in statements by Khrushchev and in the Soviet press the leaders of the CPSU vigorously advocated their revisionist line of “peaceful coexistence,” “peaceful competition” and “peaceful transition,” praised the “wisdom” and “goodwill” of the imperialists, preached that “a world without weapons without armed forces and without wars” could be brought into being while the greater part of the globe was still ruled and controlled by imperialism,²² that universal and complete disarmament could “open up literally a new epoch in the economic development of Asia, Africa and Latin America,”²³ etc., etc.

The CPSU published many books and articles in which it tampered with the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism, emasculated their revolutionary spirit and propagated its revisionist views on a whole series of important problems of principle in the fields of philosophy, political economy, socialist and communist theory, history, literature and art.

The leadership of the CPSU actively endeavored to impose its erroneous views on the international democratic organizations and to change their correct lines. An outstanding case in point was the behavior of the Soviet comrades at the Beijing session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions in June 1960.

Completely disregarding the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries which were laid down in the 1957 Declaration, the

¹⁸ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Mass Meeting in Moscow, September 28, 1959.

¹⁹ N. S. Khrushchev, Press Conference in Washington, September 27, 1959.

²⁰ A. A. Gromyko, Speech at the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, October 31, 1959.

²¹ New Year message of greetings from N. S. Khrushchev and K. Y. Voroshilov to D. D. Eisenhower, January 1, 1960.

²² N. S. Khrushchev, Replies to Questions by Roberto J. Noble, Director of the Argentine paper *Clarín*, December 30, 1959.

²³ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the UN General Assembly, September 18, 1959.

leaders of the CPSU, eager to curry favor with US imperialism, engaged in unbridled activities against China. They regarded the Chinese Communist Party, which adheres to Marxism-Leninism, as an obstacle to their revisionist line. They thought they had solved their internal problems and had “stabilized” their own position and could therefore step up their policy of “being friendly to enemies and tough with friends.”

In 1958 the leadership of the CPSU put forward unreasonable demands designed to bring China under Soviet military control. These unreasonable demands were rightly and firmly rejected by the Chinese Government. Not long afterwards, in June 1959, the Soviet Government unilaterally tore up the agreement on new technology for national defense concluded between China and the Soviet Union in October 1957, and refused to provide China with a sample of an atomic bomb and technical data concerning its manufacture.

Then, on the eve of Khrushchev’s visit to the United States, ignoring China’s repeated objections the leadership of the CPSU rushed out the TASS statement of September 9 on the Sino-Indian border incident, siding with the Indian reactionaries. In this way, the leadership of the CPSU brought the differences between China and the Soviet Union right into the open before the whole world.

The tearing up of the agreement on new technology for national defense by the leadership of the CPSU and its issuance of the statement on the Sino-Indian border clash on the eve of Khrushchev’s visit to the United States were presentation gifts to Eisenhower so as to curry favor with the US imperialists and create the so-called “spirit of Camp David.”

The leaders of the CPSU and Soviet publications also levelled many virulent attacks on the domestic and foreign policies of the Chinese Communist Party. These attacks were almost invariably led by Khrushchev himself. He insinuated that China’s socialist construction was “skipping over a stage” and was “equalitarian communism”²⁴ and that China’s People’s Communes were “in essence reactionary.”²⁵ By innuendo he maligned China as warlike, guilty of “adventurism,”²⁶ and so on and so forth. Back from the Camp David

²⁴ N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the 21st Congress of the CPSU, January 1959.

²⁵ N. S. Khrushchev, Conversation with the US Senator H. H. Humphrey, December 1, 1958.

²⁶ N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, October 1959.

Talks, he went so far as to try to sell China the US plot of “two Chinas” and, at the state banquet celebrating the Tenth Anniversary of the founding of the People’s Republic of China, he read China a lecture against “testing by force the stability of the capitalist system.”

The line of revisionism and splittism pursued by the leadership of the CPSU created serious confusion in the ranks of the international communist movement. It seemed as though US imperialism had ceased to be the most ferocious enemy of the people of the world. Eisenhower was welcomed by certain Communists as a “peace envoy.” Marxism-Leninism and the Declaration of 1957 seemed to be outmoded.

In the circumstances, in order to defend Marxism-Leninism and the 1957 Declaration and clear up the ideological confusion in the international communist movement, the Communist Party of China published “Long Live Leninism!” and two other articles in April 1960. Keeping to our consistent stand of persevering in principle and upholding unity, we concentrated on explaining the revolutionary theses of the 1957 Declaration and the fundamental Marxist-Leninist theories on imperialism, war and peace, proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The views in these three articles were totally different from the series of erroneous views that were being propagated by the leaders of the CPSU. However, for the sake of the larger interest, we refrained from publicly criticizing the comrades of the CPSU and directed the spearhead of struggle against the imperialists and the Yugoslav revisionists.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU spends much energy distorting and attacking “Long Live Leninism!” and the two other articles, but is unable to support its attacks with any convincing arguments. We should like to put this question: In those circumstances, should we have kept silent on the wrong views and absurd arguments which had become current? Did we not have the right, and indeed the duty, to come forward in defense of Marxism-Leninism and the Declaration of 1957?

THE SURPRISE ASSAULT ON THE CPC BY THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CPSU

A week after the publication of “Long Live Leninism!” and our two other articles, an American U-2 plane intruded into Soviet airspace and the United States aborted the four-power summit conference. The “spirit of Camp David” completely vanished. Thus events entirely confirmed our views.

In face of the archenemy, it was imperative for the communist parties of China and the Soviet Union and the fraternal parties of the whole world to eliminate their differences, strengthen their unity and wage a common struggle against the enemy. But that was not what happened. In the summer of 1960 there was a widening of the differences in the international communist movement, a large-scale campaign was launched against the Chinese Communist Party, and the leadership of the CPSU extended the ideological differences between the Chinese and Soviet Parties to the sphere of state relations.

In early June 1960 the Central Committee of the CPSU made the proposal that the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party to be held in Bucharest later in June, should be taken as an opportunity for representatives of the communist and workers' parties of all the socialist countries to meet and exchange views on the international situation following the miscarriage of the four-power summit conference caused by the United States. The Chinese Communist Party did not approve of this idea of a hasty meeting nor of the idea of a representative meeting of the parties of the socialist countries alone. We made the positive proposal that there should be a meeting of representatives of all the communist and workers' parties of the world and maintained that adequate preparations were necessary to make that meeting a success. Our proposal was agreed to by the CPSU. The two Parties thereupon agreed that, in preparation for the international meeting, the representatives of the fraternal parties attending the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party could provisionally exchange views on the date and place for the meeting, but not take any decision.

At Bucharest, to our amazement, the leaders of the CPSU went back on their word and unleashed a surprise assault on the Chinese Communist Party, turning the spearhead of struggle against us and not against US imperialism.

The Bucharest meeting of representatives of fraternal parties took place from June 24 to June 26. It is a plain lie for the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to describe that meeting as "comradely assistance" to the Chinese Communist Party.

Indeed, on the eve of the meeting, the Delegation of the CPSU headed by Khrushchev distributed among the representatives of some fraternal parties, and read out to those of others, a Letter of Information dated June 21 from the Central Committee of the CPSU to the Central Committee of the CPC.

This Letter of Information groundlessly slandered and attacked the CPC all along the line; it constituted a program for the anti-China campaign which was launched by the leadership of the CPSU.

In the meeting, Khrushchev took the lead in organizing a great converging onslaught on the Chinese Communist Party. In his speech, he wantonly vilified the Chinese Communist Party as “madmen,” “wanting to unleash war,” “picking up the banner of the imperialist monopoly capitalists,” being “pure nationalist” on the Sino-Indian boundary question and employing “Trotskyite ways” against the CPSU. Some of the fraternal party representatives who obeyed Khrushchev and followed his lead also wantonly charged the CPC with being “dogmatic,” “Left adventurist,” “pseudo-revolutionary,” “sectarian,” “worse than Yugoslavia,” and so on and so forth.

The anti-China campaign launched by Khrushchev at this meeting was also a surprise to many fraternal parties. The representatives of a number of Marxist-Leninist fraternal parties took exception to the wrong action of the leadership of the CPSU.

At this meeting, the delegation of the Albanian Party of Labour refused to obey the baton of the leaders of the CPSU and firmly opposed their sectarian activities. Consequently the leaders of the CPSU regarded the Albanian Party of Labour as a thorn in their side. Whereupon they took increasingly drastic steps against the Albanian Party.

Can this dastardly attack on the CPC launched by the leadership of the CPSU be called “comradely assistance?” Of course not. It was a pre-arranged anti-China performance staged by the leadership of the CPSU; it was a serious and crude violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as laid down in the 1957 Declaration: it was a large-scale attack on a Marxist-Leninist party by the revisionists, represented by the leaders of the CPSU.

In the circumstances, the Communist Party of China waged a tit-for-tat struggle against the leadership of the CPSU in defense of the positions of Marxism-Leninism and the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as laid down in the Declaration. For the sake of the larger interest, the CPC Delegation in Bucharest signed the Communiqué on the meeting, and at the same time, on June 26, 1960 distributed a written statement upon the instructions of the Central Committee of the CPC. In this statement, the CPC Delegation pointed out that Khrushchev’s behavior at the Bucharest

meeting created an extremely bad precedent in the international communist movement. It solemnly declared:

There are differences between us and Comrade Khrushchev on a series of fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The future of the international communist movement depends on the needs and the struggles of the people of all countries and on the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, and will never be decided by the baton of any individual.

...our Party believes in and obeys the truth of Marxism-Leninism and Marxism-Leninism alone, and will never submit to erroneous news which run counter to Marxism-Leninism.²⁷

The leaders of the CPSU did not reconcile themselves to their failure to subdue the Chinese Communist Party in Bucharest. Immediately after the Bucharest meeting, they brought more pressure to bear on China by taking a series of steps to extend the ideological differences between the Chinese and Soviet Parties to the sphere of state relations.

In July the Soviet Government suddenly took a unilateral decision recalling all the Soviet experts in China within one month, thereby tearing up hundreds of agreements and contracts. The Soviet side unilaterally scrapped the agreement on the publication of the magazine *Druzhiba* (Friendship) by China in the Soviet Union and of *Suzhong Youhao* (Soviet-Chinese Friendship) by the Soviet Union in China and their distribution on reciprocal terms; it took the unwarranted step of demanding the recall by the Chinese Government of a staff member of the Chinese Embassy in the Soviet Union; and it provoked troubles on the Sino-Soviet border.

Apparently the leaders of the CPSU imagined that once they waved their baton, gathered a group of hatchet-men to make a converging assault, and applied immense political and economic pressures, they could force the Chinese Communist Party to abandon its Marxist-Leninist and proletarian internationalist stand and submit to their revisionist and great-power chauvinist behests. But the tempered and long-tested Chinese Communist Party and Chinese people could neither be vanquished nor subdued. Those who

²⁷ See Appendix 2, p. 438.

tried to subjugate us by engineering a converging assault and applying pressures completely miscalculated.

We shall leave the details of the way the leadership of the CPSU sabotaged Sino-Soviet relations for other articles. Here we shall simply point out that on the subject of Sino-Soviet relations, the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU falsely charges China with extending the ideological differences to the sphere of state relations and with reducing trade between the two countries, while deliberately concealing the fact that the Soviet Government withdrew all its experts from China and unilaterally tore up hundreds of agreements and contracts, and that it was these unilateral Soviet actions which made Sino-Soviet trade shrink. For the leadership of the CPSU to deceive its members and the Soviet people in such a bare-faced way is truly sad.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE TWO LINES AT THE 1960 MEETING FRATERNAL PARTIES

In the latter half of 1960, a sharp struggle developed in the international communist movement around the meeting of representatives of communist and workers' parties. It was a struggle between the line of Marxism-Leninism and the line of revisionism and between the policy of persevering in principle and upholding unity and the policy of abandoning principle and creating splits.

It had become evident before the meeting that the leadership of the CPSU was stubbornly persisting in its wrong stand and was endeavoring to impose its wrong line on the international communist movement.

The Chinese Communist Party was keenly aware of the gravity of the differences. In the interests of the international communist movement we made many efforts, hoping that the leadership of the CPSU would not proceed too far down the wrong path.

On September 10, 1960 the Central Committee of the CPC replied to the June 21 Letter of Information of the Central Committee of the CPSU. In its reply which set forth the facts and reasoned things out, the Central Committee of the CPC systematically explained its views on a series of important questions of principle concerning the world situation and the international communist movement, refuted the attacks of the leadership of the CPSU on us, criticized its wrong views and put forward to the Central Committee of

the CPSU five positive proposals for settling the differences and attaining unity.²⁸

The Central Committee of the CPC subsequently sent a delegation to Moscow in September for talks with the delegation of the CPSU. During these talks, the delegation of the CPC pointed out that, while prettifying US imperialism, the leadership of the CPSU was actively vilifying China and extending the ideological differences between the two Parties to state relations, and was thus treating enemies as brothers and brothers as enemies. Again and again the delegation of the CPC urged the leaders of the CPSU to change their wrong stand, return to the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries, and strengthen the unity between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and between the two countries in order to fight the common enemy. However, the leaders of the CPSU showed not the slightest intention of correcting their errors.

Thus a sharp struggle became inevitable. This struggle first unfolded in the Drafting Committee, attended by the representatives of 26 fraternal parties, which prepared the documents for the meeting of fraternal parties, and later grew to unprecedented acuteness at the meeting of the representatives of 81 fraternal parties.

In the meetings of the Drafting Committee in Moscow during October, the leaders of the CPSU attempted to force through their own draft statement, which contained a whole string of erroneous views. As a result of principled struggle by the delegations of the CPC and some other fraternal parties, the Drafting Committee after heated debates made many important changes of principle in the draft statement put forward by the CPSU. The committee reached agreement on most of the draft. However, in their determination to continue the debate, the leadership of the CPSU refused to arrive at agreement on several important points at issue in the draft and, moreover, on Khrushchev's return from New York, even scrapped the agreements which had already been reached on some questions.

The meeting of the representatives of the 81 fraternal parties was held in Moscow in November 1960. Ignoring the desire of the Chinese and many other delegations to eliminate the differences and strengthen unity, on the eve of the meeting the leadership of the CPSU distributed among the representatives of the fraternal parties gathered in Moscow a letter of more than

²⁸ For the five proposals, see Appendix 3, pp. 441-442.

sixty thousand words, which attacked the Chinese Communist Party more savagely than ever, thus provoking still sharper controversy.

Such was the most unnatural atmosphere in which the meeting of the representatives of the 81 fraternal parties was held. By their base conduct, the leaders of the CPSU brought the meeting to the brink of rupture. But the meeting finally reached agreement and achieved positive results, because the delegations of the Chinese Communist Party and some other fraternal parties kept to principle, persevered in struggle and upheld unity, and because the majority of the delegations of the fraternal parties demanded unity and were against a split.

In its Open Letter, the Central Committee of the CPSU declares that at this meeting the delegation of the CPC “signed the Statement only when the danger arose of its full isolation.” This is another lie.

What was the actual state of affairs?

It is true that, both before and during the meeting, the leadership of the CPSU engineered converging assaults on the Chinese Communist Party by a number of representatives of fraternal parties, and relying on a so-called majority endeavored to bring the delegations of the Chinese and other Marxist-Leninist parties to their knees and compel them to accept its revisionist line and views. However, the attempts by the leaders of the CPSU to impose things on others met with failure, both in the Drafting Committee of the 26 fraternal parties and in the meeting of the representatives of the 81 fraternal parties.

The fact remains that many of the wrong theses they put forward in their draft statement were rejected. Here are some examples:

The wrong thesis of the leadership of the CPSU that peaceful coexistence and economic competition form the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries was rejected.

Its wrong thesis that the emergence of a new stage in the general crisis of capitalism is the result of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition was rejected.

Its wrong thesis that there is a growing possibility of peaceful transition was rejected.

Its wrong thesis about opposing the policy of “going it alone” on the part of the socialist countries, which in effect meant opposing the policy of their relying mainly on themselves in construction, was rejected.

Its wrong thesis concerning opposition to so-called “cliquish activities” and “factional activities” in the international communist movement was rejected. In effect this thesis meant demanding that fraternal parties should obey its baton, liquidating the principles of independence and equality in relations among fraternal parties, and replacing the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation by the practice of subduing the minority by the majority.

Its wrong thesis of under-estimating the serious danger of modern revisionism was rejected.

The fact remains that many correct views on important principles set forth by the delegations of the Chinese and other fraternal parties were written into the Statement. The theses on the unaltered nature of imperialism; on US imperialism as the enemy of the people of the whole world; on the formation of the most extensive united front against US imperialism; on the national liberation movement as an important force in preventing world war; on the thoroughgoing completion by the newly independent countries of their national democratic revolutions; on support by the socialist countries and the international working-class movement for the national liberation struggle; on the need for the working class and the masses in certain advanced capitalist countries under US imperialist political, economic and military domination to direct their chief blows at US imperialist domination and also at the monopoly capital and other reactionary forces at home which betray their national interests; on the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation among fraternal parties; against the revisionist emasculation of the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism; on the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia; and so on—all these theses are in the Statement as a result of the acceptance of the views of the Chinese and some other delegations.

It is, of course, necessary to add that after the leaders of the CPSU agreed to drop their erroneous propositions and accepted the correct propositions of other parties, the delegations of the CPC and some other fraternal parties also made certain concessions. For instance, we differed on the questions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and of the forms of transition from capitalism to socialism, but out of consideration for the needs of the CPSU and certain other fraternal parties we agreed to the inclusion of the same wording on these two questions as that used in the 1957 Declaration. But we made it plain at the time to the leaders of the CPSU that this would be the last time

we accommodated ourselves to such a formulation about the 20th Congress; we would never do so again.

From all the above it can be seen that the struggle between the two lines in the international communist movement dominated the 1960 Moscow Meeting from beginning to end. The errors of the leadership of the CPSU as revealed at this meeting had developed further. From the draft statement of the leaders of the CPSU and their speeches during the meeting, it could be clearly seen that the main political content of the wrong line they were attempting to impose on the fraternal parties consisted of the erroneous theories of “peaceful coexistence,” “peaceful competition” and “peaceful transition,” while its organizational content consisted of erroneous sectarian and splitting policies. It was a revisionist line in fundamental conflict with Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The delegations of the Chinese and other Marxist-Leninist parties resolutely opposed it and firmly upheld the line of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The outcome of the struggle at this meeting was that the revisionist line and views of the leadership of the CPSU were in the main repudiated and that the Marxist-Leninist line gained a great victory. The revolutionary principles embodied in the Statement adopted at the meeting are powerful weapons in the hands of all fraternal parties in the struggles against imperialism and for world peace, national liberation, people’s democracy and socialism; they are also powerful weapons in the hands of Marxist-Leninists throughout the world in combating modern revisionism.

At the meeting the fraternal parties which upheld Marxism-Leninism earnestly criticized the erroneous views of the leadership of the CPSU and compelled it to accept many of their correct views; in doing so they changed the previous highly abnormal situation, in which not even the slightest criticism of the errors of the leadership of the CPSU was tolerated and its word was final. This was an event of great historical significance in the international communist movement.

The Central Committee of the CPSU asserts in its Open Letter that the delegation of the CPC was “completely isolated” at the meeting. This is merely an impudent attempt on the part of the leadership of the CPSU to represent its defeat as a victory.

The principles of mutual solidarity as well as independence and equality among fraternal parties and of reaching unanimity through consultation were observed at the meeting and the mistaken attempt of the leaders of the

CPSU to use a majority to overrule the minority and to impose their views on other fraternal parties was frustrated. The meeting demonstrated once again that in resolving differences among fraternal parties it is highly necessary for Marxist-Leninist parties to stick to principle, persevere in struggle and uphold unity.

THE REVISIONISM OF THE CPSU LEADERSHIP BECOMES SYSTEMATIZED

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU asserts that “the CPC leaders were only maneuvering when they affixed their signatures to the Statement of 1960.”

Is that really a fact? No. On the contrary, it was the leaders of the CPSU and not we who were maneuvering.

The facts have shown that at the 1960 meeting the leaders of the CPSU agreed to delete or change the erroneous propositions in their draft statement against their will and they were insincere in their acceptance of the correct propositions of fraternal parties. They did not care two hoots about the document which was jointly agreed upon by the fraternal parties. The ink was scarcely dry on their signature to the 1960 Statement before they began wrecking it. On December 1 Khrushchev signed the Statement on behalf of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and twenty-four hours later, violating what the fraternal parties had agreed on, the same Khrushchev brazenly described Yugoslavia as a socialist country at the banquet for the delegations of the fraternal parties.

After the meeting of the 81 fraternal parties, the leaders of the CPSU became more and more blatant in wrecking the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. On the one hand, they took as their friend US imperialism which the Statement declares to be the enemy of the people of the world, advocating “US-Soviet cooperation” and expressing the desire to work together with Kennedy to “set about building durable bridges of confidence, mutual understanding and friendship.”²⁹ On the other hand, they took some fraternal parties and countries as their enemies and drastically worsened the Soviet Union’s relations with Albania.

The 22nd Congress of the CPSU in October 1961 marked a new low in the CPSU leadership’s efforts to oppose Marxism-Leninism and split the

²⁹ Message of greetings from N. S. Khrushchev and L. I. Brezhnev to J. F. Kennedy on the 185th Anniversary of the Independence of the United States, July 4, 1961.

socialist camp and the international communist movement. It marked the systematization of the revisionism which the leadership of the CPSU had developed step by step from the 20th Congress onward.

The leadership of the CPSU unleashed a great public attack on the Albanian Party of Labour at the 22nd Congress. In his speech Khrushchev went so far as openly to call for the overthrow of the Albanian leadership under Comrades Enver Hoxha and Mehmet Shehu. Thus the leadership of the CPSU established the vicious precedent of a party congress being used for public attacks on other fraternal parties.

Another great thing the leadership of the CPSU did at the Congress was the renewed concentrated onslaught on Stalin five years after the complete negation of him at the 20th Congress and eight years after his death.

In the final analysis, this was done in order that the leaders of the CPSU should be able to throw the Declaration and the Statement overboard, oppose Marxism-Leninism and pursue a systematically revisionist line.

Their revisionism was expressed in concentrated form in the new Program of the CPSU which that Congress adopted.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU says that the line of the 22nd Congress was “approved at the meetings of representatives of the communist parties and reflected in the Declaration and Statement.” Is it not very careless of the leaders of the CPSU to make such a statement? How can they describe what happened in 1961 as having been “approved” or “reflected” at the Meeting of the Communist and Workers’ Parties in 1960, or as far back as that in 1957?

But leaving aside such silly self-commendation for the moment, let us first see the kind of stuff the Program adopted at the 22nd Congress is made of.

Even a cursory study of the Program and the report on it made by Khrushchev shows that it is an out-and-out revisionist program which totally violates the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement.

It runs counter to the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement on many important questions of principle. Many of the erroneous views of the leadership of the CPSU which were rejected at the 1960 meeting of fraternal parties reappear. For instance, it describes peaceful coexistence as the general principle of foreign policy, one-sidedly stresses the possibility of peaceful transition and slanders the policy of a socialist country’s relying mainly on its own efforts in construction as “going it alone.”

The Program goes a step further in systematizing the wrong line pursued by the leadership of the CPSU since its 20th Congress the main content of which is “peaceful coexistence,” “peaceful competition” and “peaceful transition.”

The Program crudely revises the essence of Marxism-Leninism, namely, the teachings on proletarian revolution, on the dictatorship of the proletariat and on the party of the proletariat, declaring that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer needed in the Soviet Union and that the nature of the CPSU as the vanguard of the proletariat has changed, and advancing preposterous theories of a “state of the whole people” and a “party of the entire people.”

It substitutes humanism for the Marxist-Leninist theory of class struggle and substitutes the bourgeois slogans of “freedom,” “equality” and “fraternity” for the ideals of communism.

It is a program which opposes revolution on the part of the people still living under the imperialist and capitalist system, who comprise two-thirds of the world’s population, and opposes the carrying of revolution through to completion on the part of the people already on the socialist road, who comprise one-third of the world’s population. It is a revisionist program for the preservation or restoration of capitalism.

The Communist Party of China resolutely opposed the errors of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. Comrade Zhou Enlai, who headed the CPC delegation to the Congress, stated our Party’s position in his speech there, and he also frankly criticized the errors of the leadership of the CPSU in subsequent conversations with Khrushchev and other leaders of the CPSU.

In his conversation with the delegation of the CPC, Khrushchev flatly turned down our criticisms and advice and even expressed undisguised support for anti-party elements in the Chinese Communist Party. He openly stated that after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, when the leaders of the CPSU were beginning to take a “road different from that of Stalin” (that is, when they were beginning to take the road of revisionism), they still needed the support of the fraternal parties. He said, “The voice of the Chinese Communist Party was then of great significance to us,” but “things are different now,” and “we are doing well” and “we shall go our own way.”

Khrushchev’s remarks showed that the leaders of the CPSU had made up their minds to go all the way down the road of revisionism and splitting. Although the Chinese Communist Party has frequently given them

comradely advice, they have simply ignored it and shown not the slightest intention of mending their ways.

AN ADVERSE CURRENT THAT IS OPPOSED TO MARXISM-LeninISM AND IS SPLITTING THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

In the Open Letter the leaders of the CPSU try hard to make people believe that after the 22nd Congress they “undertook new attempts” to improve relations between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and to strengthen unity among the fraternal parties and countries.

This is another lie.

What are the facts?

They show that since the 22nd Congress the leadership of the CPSU has become more unbridled in violating the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries and in pursuing policies of great-power chauvinism, sectarianism and splittism in order to promote its own line of systematic revisionism, which is in complete violation of Marxism-Leninism. This has brought about a continuous deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations and grave damage to the unity of the fraternal parties and countries.

The following are the main facts about how the leaders of the CPSU have sabotaged Sino-Soviet unity and the unity of fraternal parties and countries since the 22nd Congress:

1. The leaders of the CPSU have tried hard to impose their erroneous line upon the international communist movement and to replace the Declaration and the Statement with their own revisionist program. They describe their erroneous line as the “whole set of Leninist policies of the international communist movement of recent years,”³⁰ and they call their revisionist program the “real Communist Manifesto of our time”³¹ and the “common program” of the “communist and workers’ parties and of the people of countries of the socialist community.”³²

Any fraternal party which rejects the erroneous line and program of the CPSU and perseveres in the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and

³⁰ J. Y. Andropov, “The 22nd Congress of the CPSU and the Development of the World Socialist System,” *Pravda*, December 2, 1961.

³¹ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Conference of the Agricultural Workers of the Uzbek and Other Republics, November 16, 1961.

³² “Unity Multiplies Tenfold the Forces of Communism,” *Pravda* editorial, August 25, 1961.

the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement is looked upon as an enemy by the leaders of the CPSU, who oppose, attack and injure it and try to subvert its leadership by every possible means.

2. Disregarding everything, the leadership of the CPSU broke off diplomatic relations with socialist Albania, an unprecedented step in the history of relations between fraternal parties and countries.

3. The leadership of the CPSU has continued to exert pressure on China and to make outrageous attacks on the Chinese Communist Party. In its letter of February 22, 1962 to the Central Committee of the CPC, the Central Committee of the CPSU accused the CPC of taking a “special stand of their own” and pursuing a line at variance with the common course of the fraternal parties, and even made a crime out of our support for the Marxist-Leninist Albanian Party of Labour. As pre-conditions for improving Sino-Soviet relations, the leaders of the CPSU attempted to compel the CPC to abandon its Marxist-Leninist and proletarian internationalist stand, abandon its consistent line, which is in full conformity with the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement, accept their erroneous line, and also accept as a *fait accompli* their violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries. In its Open Letter, the Central Committee of the CPSU boasted of its letters to the Central Committee of the CPC during this period, of Khrushchev’s remarks about his desire for unity in October 1962 to our Ambassador to the Soviet Union and so on, but in fact these were all acts for realizing their base attempt.

4. The Central Committee of the CPSU rejected the proposal made by the fraternal parties of Indonesia, Vietnam, New Zealand, etc., that a meeting of representatives of the fraternal parties should be convened, as well as the five positive proposals made by the Central Committee of the CPC in its letter of April 7, 1962 to the Central Committee of the CPSU for the preparation for the meeting of fraternal parties. In its reply of May 30, 1962 to the Central Committee of the CPC, the Central Committee of the CPSU went so far as to make the demand that the Albanian comrades abandon their own stand as a pre-condition for improving Soviet-Albanian relations and also for convening a meeting of the fraternal parties.

5. In April and May 1962 the leaders of the CPSU used their organs and personnel in Sinkiang, China, to carry out large-scale subversive activities in the Ili region and enticed and coerced several tens of thousands of Chinese citizens into going to the Soviet Union. The Chinese Government lodged

repeated protests and made repeated representations, but the Soviet Government refused to repatriate these Chinese citizens on the pretext of “the sense of Soviet legality”³³ and “humanitarianism.”³⁴ To this day this incident remains unsettled. This is indeed an astounding event, unheard of in the relations between socialist countries.

6. In August 1962 the Soviet Government formally notified China that the Soviet Union would conclude an agreement with the United States on the prevention of nuclear proliferation. This was a joint Soviet-US plot to monopolize nuclear weapons and an attempt to deprive China of the right to possess nuclear weapons to resist the US nuclear threat. The Chinese Government lodged repeated protests against this.

7. The leadership of the CPSU has become increasingly anxious to strike political bargains with US imperialism and has been bent on forming a reactionary alliance with Kennedy, even at the expense of the interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. An outstanding example was the fact that, during the Caribbean crisis, the leadership of the CPSU committed the error of capitulationism by submitting to the nuclear blackmail of the US imperialists and accepting the US government’s demand for “international inspection” in violation of Cuban sovereignty.

8. The leadership of the CPSU has become increasingly anxious to colude with the Indian reactionaries and has been bent on forming a reactionary alliance with Nehru against socialist China. The leadership of the CPSU and its press openly sided with Indian reaction, condemned China for its just stand on the Sino-Indian border conflict and defended the Nehru government. Two-thirds of Soviet economic aid to India have been given since the Indian reactionaries provoked the Sino-Indian border conflict. Even after large-scale armed conflict on the Sino-Indian border began in the autumn of 1962, the leadership of the CPSU has continued to extend military aid to the Indian reactionaries.

9. The leadership of the CPSU has become increasingly anxious to colude with the Tito clique of Yugoslavia and has been bent on forming a reactionary alliance with the renegade Tito to oppose all Marxist-Leninist

³³ Memorandum presented to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs by the Soviet Embassy in China on August 9, 1962.

³⁴ Memorandum presented to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs by the Soviet Embassy in China on April 29, 1962.

parties. After the 22nd Congress, it took a series of steps which to reverse the verdict on the Tito clique and thus openly tore up the 1960 Statement.

10. Since November 1962 the leadership of the CPSU has launched still fiercer attacks, on an international scale, against the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties and whipped up a new adverse current in order to split the socialist camp and the international communist movement. Khrushchev made one statement after another and the Soviet press carried hundreds of articles attacking the Chinese Communist Party on a whole set of issues. Directed by the leaders of the CPSU, the Congresses of the fraternal parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Italy and the Democratic Republic of Germany became stages for anti-China performances. and more than forty fraternal parties published resolutions, statements or articles attacking the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

The facts cited above cannot possibly be denied by the leaders of the CPSU. These iron-clad facts prove that the “new attempts” they made after the 22nd Congress of the CPSU were aimed, not at improving Sino-Soviet relations and strengthening unity between the fraternal parties and countries, but on the contrary, at further ganging up with the US imperialists, the Indian reactionaries and the renegade Tito clique in order to create a wider split in the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

In these grave circumstances, the Chinese Communist Party had no alternative but to make open replies to the attacks of some fraternal parties. Between December 15, 1962 and March 8, 1963 we published seven such replies. In these articles we continued to leave some leeway and did not criticize the leadership of the CPSU by name.

Despite the serious deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations resulting from the errors of the leadership of the CPSU, the Chinese Communist Party agreed to send its delegation to Moscow for the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties, and, in order that there might be a systematic exchange of views in the talks, put forward its proposal concerning the general line of the international communist movement in its letter of reply to the Central Committee of the CPSU dated June 14.

As subsequent facts have shown, the leaders of the CPSU were not only insincere about eliminating differences and strengthening unity, but used the talks as a smokescreen for covering up their activities to further worsen Sino-Soviet relations.

On the eve of the talks, the leaders of the CPSU publicly attacked the Chinese Communist Party by name, through statements and resolutions. At the same time, they unjustifiably expelled a number of Chinese Embassy personnel and research students from the Soviet Union.

On July 14, that is, on the eve of the US-British-Soviet talks, while the Sino-Soviet talks were still in progress, the leadership of the CPSU hastily published the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to Party Organizations and All Communists in the Soviet Union and launched unbridled attacks on the Chinese Communist Party.

This was another precious presentation gift made by the leaders of the CPSU to the US imperialists in order to curry favor with them.

Immediately afterwards in Moscow, the leadership of the CPSU signed the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests with the United States and Britain in open betrayal of the interests of the Soviet people, the people in the socialist camp including the Chinese people, and the peace-loving people of the world; there was a flurry of contacts between the Soviet Union and India; Khrushchev went to Yugoslavia for a "vacation"; the Soviet press launched a frenzied anti-China campaign; and so on and so forth. This whole train of events strikingly demonstrates that, disregarding everything, the leadership of the CPSU is allying with the imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the renegade Tito clique in order to oppose fraternal socialist countries and fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties. All this completely exposes the revisionist and splitting line which the leadership of the CPSU is following.

At present, the "anti-China chorus" of the imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the revisionists is making a lot of noise. And the campaign led by Khrushchev to oppose Marxism-Leninism and split the socialist camp and the international communist ranks is being carried on with growing intensity.

WHAT HAVE THE FACTS OF THE PAST SEVEN YEARS DEMONSTRATED?

In the foregoing we have reviewed at some length the origin and development of the differences. Our aim is to clarify the facts which were distorted in the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU and to help our party members and our people and also the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people of the world to see the truth.

The facts of the past seven years have amply proved that the differences between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and within the international com-

unist movement have arisen solely because the leadership of the CPSU has departed from Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement and pursued a revisionist and splitting line in leadership of the CPSU that has harmed the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

It is not just today that the Chinese Communists have begun to discover the errors of the CPSU leadership. Ever since the 20th Congress of the CPSU, we have watched with concern as the CPSU leadership took the road of revisionism.

Confronted with this grave situation, our Party has scores of times and for a long period considered: what should we do?

We asked ourselves, should we follow the CPSU leadership and suit all our actions to its wishes? In that case, the leadership of the CPSU would of course rejoice, but would not we ourselves then turn into revisionists?

We also asked ourselves, should we keep silent about the errors of the CPSU leadership? We believed that the errors of the CPSU leadership were not just accidental, individual and minor errors, but rather a whole series of errors of principle, which endanger the interests of the entire socialist camp and international communist movement. As a member in the ranks of the international communist movement, how could we be indifferent and keep silent about these errors? If we should do that, would not we be abandoning our duty to defend Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism?

We foresaw that if we criticized the errors of the leaders of the CPSU, they would certainly strike at us vindictively and thus inevitably cause serious damage to China's socialist construction. But should Communists take a stand of national egoism and not dare to uphold truth for fear of vindictive blows? Should Communists barter away principles?

We took into consideration the fact that the CPSU was built by Lenin, that it is the Party of the first socialist state, and that it enjoyed high prestige in the international communist movement and among the people of the whole world. Therefore, over a considerable period of time, we were particularly careful and patient in criticizing the leaders of the CPSU, trying our best to confine such criticism to inter-party talks between the leaders of the Chinese and Soviet Parties and to solve the differences through internal discussions without resorting to open polemics.

But all the comradely criticism and advice given to the leaders of the CPSU by responsible comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC in

scores of inter-party talks did not succeed in enabling them to return to the correct path. The CPSU leaders went farther and farther down the road of revisionism and splittism. In return for the advice we gave in goodwill, they applied a succession of political, economic and military pressures against us and launched attacks which became increasingly violent.

The CPSU leaders have a bad habit: they indiscriminately stick labels on anyone who criticizes them.

They say, "You are anti-Soviet!" No, friends! The label "anti-Soviet" cannot be stuck on us. Our criticism of your errors is precisely for the sake of defending the great CPSU and the great Soviet Union and preventing the prestige of the CPSU and the Soviet Union from being badly damaged by you. To put it plainly, it is you, and not we, who are really anti-Soviet and who are defaming and discrediting the CPSU and the Soviet Union. Ever since the complete negation of Stalin at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, you have committed innumerable foul deeds. Not all the water in the Volga can wash away the great shame you have brought upon the CPSU and upon the Soviet Union.

They say, "You are trying to seize the leadership!" No, friends! It is not at all clever of you to make this slander. The way you put it, it would seem that some people are contending with you for some such thing as "the leadership." Is this not tantamount to shamelessly claiming that some sort of "leadership" exists in the international communist movement and that you have this "leadership"? It is a very, very bad habit of yours thus to put on the airs of a patriarchal party. It is entirely illegitimate. The 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement clearly state that all communist parties are independent and equal. According to this principle, the relations among fraternal parties should under no circumstances be like the relations between a leading party and the led, and much less like the relations between a patriarchal father and his son. We have always opposed any one Party commanding other fraternal parties, and it has never occurred to us that we ourselves should command other fraternal parties, and so the question of contending for leadership simply does not arise. What confronts the international communist movement now is not whether this or that Party should assume leadership, but whether to respond to the baton of revisionism or to uphold the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement and persevere in the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism. Our criticism of the leadership of the CPSU concerns its attempt to lord it over fraternal parties and to impose its line of

revisionism and splittism on them. What we desire is merely the independent and equal status of the fraternal parties stipulated in the Declaration and the Statement and their unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

It is the leaders of the CPSU who have provoked and extended the present great debate in the international communist movement and forced it on us. Since they have levelled large-scale attacks and all kinds of unscrupulous slanders against us, and since they have openly betrayed Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and torn up the Declaration and the Statement, they cannot expect us to abstain from replying, from refuting their slanders, from safeguarding the Declaration and the Statement and from defending Marxism-Leninism. The debate is on, and right and wrong must be thoroughly clarified.

We Chinese Communists persevere in principle and uphold unity; we did so in the past, we do so now and we shall continue to do so in the future. While engaging in polemics with the leaders of the CPSU, we still hope they will realize that they have taken a most dangerous road by abandoning revolution, abandoning the revolutionary people of the world, abandoning the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement and eagerly collaborating with the US imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the renegade Tito clique.

The interests of the Chinese and Soviet peoples, of the socialist camp, of the international communist movement, and of the people throughout the world demand that all communist and workers' parties should become united and oppose the common enemy.

We hereby appeal once again to the leadership of the CPSU to correct its errors and return to the path of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the path of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 statement.

The international communist movement is going through an important period. The present debate has a vital bearing on the future of the proletarian world revolution and the destiny of mankind. As history will prove, after this great debate Marxism-Leninism will shine forth more brilliantly and the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat and the people of the world will win still greater victories.

On the Question of Stalin

COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
CPSU (II)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE *PEOPLE'S DAILY* AND THE *RED FLAG*

September 13, 1963

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 18, 1963, pp. 1-12.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, September 20, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 38,
pp. 8-15.

The question of Stalin is one of world-wide importance which has had repercussions among all classes in every country and which is still a subject of much discussion today, with different classes and their political parties and groups taking different views. It is likely that no final verdict can be reached on this question in the present century. But there is virtual agreement among the majority of the international working class and of revolutionary people, who disapprove of the complete negation of Stalin and more and more cherish his memory. This is also true of the Soviet Union. Our controversy with the leaders of the CPSU is with a section of people. We hope to persuade them in order to advance the revolutionary cause. This is our purpose in writing the present article.

The Communist Party of China has always held that when Comrade Khrushchev completely negated Stalin on the pretext of "combating the personality cult," he was quite wrong and had ulterior motives.

The Central Committee of the CPC pointed out in its letter of June 14 that the "struggle against the personality cult" violates Lenin's integral teachings on the interrelationship of leaders, party, class, and masses, and undermines the Communist principle of democratic centralism.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU avoids making any reply to our principled arguments, but merely labels the Chinese Communists as "defenders of the personality cult and peddlers of Stalin's erroneous ideas."

When he was fighting the Mensheviks, Lenin said, "Not to reply to an argument of one's opponent on a question of principle, and to ascribe only

‘pathos’ to him, means not to argue but to turn to abuse.”³⁵ The attitude shown by the Central Committee of the CPSU in its Open Letter is exactly like that of the Mensheviks.

Even though the Open Letter resorts to abuse in place of debate, we on our part prefer to reply to it with principled arguments and a great many facts.

The great Soviet Union was the first state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the beginning, the foremost leader of the Party and the Government in this state was Lenin. After Lenin’s death, it was Stalin.

After Lenin’s death, Stalin became not only the leader of the Party and Government of the Soviet Union but the acknowledged leader of the international communist movement as well.

It is only forty-six years since the first socialist state was inaugurated by the October Revolution. For nearly thirty of these years Stalin was the foremost leader of this state. Whether in the history of the dictatorship of the proletariat or in that of the international communist movement, Stalin’s activities occupy an extremely important place.

The Chinese Communist Party has consistently maintained that the question of how to evaluate Stalin and what attitude to take towards him is not just one of appraising Stalin himself; more importantly, it is a question of how to sum up the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the international communist movement since Lenin’s death.

Comrade Khrushchev completely negated Stalin at the 20th Congress of the CPSU. He failed to consult the fraternal parties in advance on this question of principle, which involves the whole international communist movement, and afterwards tried to impose a *fait accompli* on them. Whoever makes an appraisal of Stalin different from that of the leadership of the CPSU is charged with “defense of the personality cult” as well as “interference” in the internal affairs of the CPSU. But no one can deny the international significance of the historical experience of the first state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the historical fact that Stalin was the leader of the international communist movement; consequently, no one can deny that the appraisal of Stalin is an important question of principle involving the whole international communist movement. On what ground, then, do the leaders

³⁵ V. I. Lenin, “Some Remarks of the ‘Reply’ by P. Maslov” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XV.

of the CPSU forbid other fraternal parties to make a realistic analysis and appraisal of Stalin?

The Communist Party of China has invariably insisted on an overall, objective and scientific analysis of Stalin's merits and demerits by the method of historical materialism and the presentation of history as it actually occurred, and has opposed the subjective, crude and complete negation of Stalin by the method of historical idealism and the willful distortion and alteration of history.

The Communist Party of China has consistently held that Stalin did commit errors, which had their ideological as well as social and historical roots. It is necessary to criticize the errors Stalin actually committed, not those groundlessly attributed to him, and to do so from a correct stand and with correct methods. But we have consistently opposed improper criticism of Stalin, made from a wrong stand and with wrong methods.

Stalin fought tsarism and propagated Marxism during Lenin's lifetime; after he became a member of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party headed by Lenin; he took part in the struggle to pave the way for the 1917 Revolution; after the October Revolution he fought to defend the fruits of the proletarian revolution.

Stalin led the CPSU and the Soviet people, after Lenin's death, in resolutely fighting both internal and external foes, and in safeguarding and consolidating the first socialist state in the world.

Stalin led the CPSU and the Soviet people in upholding the line of socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization and in achieving great successes in socialist transformation and socialist construction.

Stalin led the CPSU, the Soviet people, and the Soviet army in an arduous and bitter struggle to the great victory of the anti-fascist war.

Stalin defended and developed Marxism-Leninism in the fight against various kinds of opportunism, against the enemies of Leninism, the Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, and other bourgeois agents.

Stalin made an indelible contribution to the international communist movement in a number of theoretical writings which are immortal Marxist-Leninist works.

Stalin led the Soviet Party and Government in pursuing a foreign policy which on the whole was in keeping with proletarian internationalism and in greatly assisting the revolutionary struggles of all peoples, including the Chinese people.

Stalin stood in the forefront of the tide of history guiding the struggle and was an irreconcilable enemy of the imperialists and all reactionaries.

Stalin's activities were intimately bound up with the struggles of the great CPSU and the great Soviet people and inseparable from the revolutionary struggles of the people of the whole world.

Stalin's life was that of a great Marxist-Leninist, a great proletarian revolutionary.

It is true that while he performed meritorious deeds for the Soviet people and the international communist movement, Stalin, a great Marxist-Leninist and proletarian revolutionary, also made certain mistakes. Some were errors of principle and some were errors made in the course of practical work; some could have been avoided and some were scarcely avoidable at a time when the dictatorship of the proletariat had no precedent to go by.

In his way of thinking, Stalin departed from dialectical materialism and fell into metaphysics and subjectivism on certain questions and consequently he was sometimes divorced from reality and from the masses. In struggles inside as well as outside the Party, on certain occasions and on certain questions he confused two types of contradictions which are different in nature, contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and contradictions among the people, and also confused the different methods needed in handling them. In the work led by Stalin of suppressing the counter-revolution, many counter-revolutionaries deserving punishment were duly punished, but at the same time there were innocent people who were wrongly convicted; and in 1937 and 1938 there occurred the error of enlarging the scope of the suppression of counter-revolutionaries. In the matter of party and government organization, he did not fully apply proletarian democratic centralism and, to some extent, violated it. In handling relations with fraternal parties and countries, he made some mistakes. He also gave some bad counsel in the international communist movement. These mistakes caused some losses to the Soviet Union and the international communist movement.

Stalin's merits and mistakes are matters of historical, objective reality. A comparison of the two shows that his merits outweighed his faults. He was primarily correct, and his faults were secondary. In summing up Stalin's thinking and his work in their totality, surely every honest Communist with a respect for history will first observe what was primary in Stalin. Therefore, when Stalin's errors are being correctly appraised, criticized and overcome, it

is necessary to safeguard what was primary in Stalin's life, to safeguard Marxism-Leninism, which he defended and developed.

It would be beneficial if the errors of Stalin, which were only secondary, are taken as historical lessons so that the Communists of the Soviet Union and other countries might take warning and avoid repeating those errors or commit fewer errors. Both positive and negative historical lessons are beneficial to all Communists, provided they are drawn correctly and conform with and do not distort historical facts.

Lenin pointed out more than once that Marxists were totally different from the revisionists of the Second International in their attitude towards people like Bebel and Rosa Luxemburg, who, for all their mistakes, were great proletarian revolutionaries. Marxists did not conceal these people's mistakes but through such examples learned "how to avoid them and live up to the more rigorous requirements of revolutionary Marxism."³⁶ By contrast, the revisionists "crowed" and "cackled" over the mistakes of Bebel and Rosa Luxemburg. Ridiculing the revisionists, Lenin quoted a Russian fable in this connection. "Sometimes eagles may fly lower than hens, but hens can never rise to the height of eagles."³⁷ Bebel and Rosa Luxemburg were "great Communists" and, in spite of their mistakes, remained "eagles," while the revisionists were a flock of "hens" "in the backyard of the working class movement, among the dung heaps."³⁸

The historical role of Bebel and Rosa Luxemburg is by no means comparable to that of Stalin. Stalin was the great leader of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the international communist movement over a whole historical era, and greater care should be exercised in evaluating him.

The leaders of the CPSU have accused the Chinese Communist Party of "defending" Stalin. Yes, we do defend Stalin. When Khrushchev distorts history and completely negates Stalin, naturally we have the inescapable duty to come forward and defend him in the interests of the international communist movement.

In defending Stalin, the Chinese Communist Party defends his correct side, defends the glorious history of struggle of the first state of the dicta-

³⁶ V. I. Lenin, "Preface to the Pamphlet by Voinov (A. V. Lunacharsky) on the Attitude of the Party Towards the Trade Unions" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XIII.

³⁷ V. I. Lenin, "Notes of a Publicist" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

torship of the proletariat, which was created by the October Revolution; it defends the glorious history of struggle of the CPSU; it defends the prestige of the international communist movement among working people throughout the world. In brief, it defends the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. It is not only the Chinese Communists who are doing this; all Communists devoted to Marxism-Leninism, all staunch revolutionaries and all fair-minded people have been doing the same thing.

While defending Stalin, we do not defend his mistakes. Long ago the Chinese Communists had first-hand experience of some of his mistakes. Of the erroneous “Left” and Right opportunist lines which emerged in the Chinese Communist Party at one time or another, some arose under the influence of certain mistakes of Stalin’s, in so far as their international sources were concerned. In the late twenties, the thirties and the early and middle forties, the Chinese Marxist-Leninists represented by Comrades Mao Zedong and Liu Shaoqi resisted the influence of Stalin’s mistakes; they gradually overcame the erroneous lines of “Left” and Right opportunism and finally led the Chinese revolution to victory.

But since some of the wrong ideas put forward by Stalin were accepted and applied by certain Chinese comrades, we Chinese should bear the responsibility. In its struggle against “Left” and Right opportunism, therefore, our Party criticized only its own erring comrades and never put the blame on Stalin. The purpose of our criticism was to distinguish between right and wrong, learn the appropriate lessons and advance the revolutionary cause. We merely asked the erring comrades that they should correct their mistakes. If they failed to do so, we waited until they were gradually awakened by their own practical experience, provided they did not organize secret groups for clandestine and disruptive activities. Our method was the proper method of inner-party criticism and self-criticism; we started from the desire for unity and arrived at a new unity on a new basis through criticism and struggle, and thus good results were achieved. We held that these were contradictions among the people and not between the enemy and ourselves, and that therefore we should use the above method.

What attitude have Comrade Khrushchev and other leaders of the CPSU taken towards Stalin since the 20th Congress of the CPSU?

They have not made an overall historical and scientific analysis of his life and work but have completely negated him without any distinction between right and wrong.

They have treated Stalin not as a comrade but as an enemy.

They have not adopted the method of criticism and self-criticism to sum up experience but have blamed Stalin for all errors, or ascribed to him the “mistakes” they have arbitrarily invented.

They have not presented the facts and reasoned things out but have made demagogic personal attacks on Stalin in order to poison people’s minds.

Khrushchev has abused Stalin as a “murderer,” a “criminal” a “bandit,”³⁹ a “gambler,” a “despot of the type of Ivan the Terrible,” “the greatest dictator in Russian history,” a “fool,”⁴⁰ an “idiot,”⁴¹ etc. When we are compelled to cite all this filthy, vulgar and malicious language, we are afraid it may soil our pen and paper.

Khrushchev has maligned Stalin as “the greatest dictator in Russian history.” Does not this mean that the Soviet people lived for thirty long years under the “tyranny” of “the greatest dictator in Russian history” and not under the socialist system? The great Soviet people and the revolutionary people of the whole world completely disagree with this slander!

Khrushchev has maligned Stalin as a “despot of the type of Ivan the Terrible.” Does not this mean that the experience the great CPSU and the great Soviet people provided over thirty years for people the world over was not the experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat but that of life under the rule of a feudal “despot?” The great Soviet people, the Soviet Communists and Marxist-Leninists of the whole world completely disagree with this slander!

Khrushchev has maligned Stalin as a “bandit.” Does not this mean that the first socialist state in the world was for a long period headed by a “bandit?” The great Soviet people and the revolutionary people of the whole world completely disagree with this slander!

Khrushchev has maligned Stalin as a “fool.” Does not this mean that the CPSU which waged heroic revolutionary struggles over the past decades had a “fool” as its leader? The Soviet Communists and Marxist-Leninists of the whole world completely disagree with this slander!

³⁹ N. S. Khrushchev, Conversation with the Delegation of the CPC, October 22, 1961.

⁴⁰ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the May Day Reception of 1962 Given by the Soviet Government.

⁴¹ N. S. Khrushchev, Conversation with the Delegation of the CPC, October 22, 1961.

Khrushchev has maligned Stalin as an “idiot.” Does not this mean that the great Soviet army which triumphed in the anti-fascist war had an “idiot” as its supreme commander? The glorious Soviet commanders and fighters and all anti-fascist fighters of the world completely disagree with this slander!

Khrushchev has maligned Stalin as a “murderer.” Does not this mean that the international communist movement had a “murderer” as its teacher for decades? Communists of the whole world, including the Soviet Communists, completely disagree with this slander!

Khrushchev has maligned Stalin as a “gambler.” Does not this mean that the revolutionary peoples had a “gambler” as their standard-bearer in the struggles against imperialism and reaction? All revolutionary people of the world, including the Soviet people, completely disagree with this slander!

Such abuse of Stalin by Khrushchev is a gross insult to the great Soviet people, a gross insult to the CPSU, to the Soviet army, to the dictatorship of the proletariat and to the socialist system, to the international communist movement, to the revolutionary people the world over and to Marxism-Leninism.

In what position does Khrushchev, who participated in the leadership of the Party and the state during Stalin’s period, place himself when he beats his breast, pounds the table and shouts abuse of Stalin at the top of his voice? In the position of an accomplice to a “murderer” or a “bandit?” Or in the same position as a “fool” or an “idiot?”

What difference is there between such abuse of Stalin by Khrushchev and the abuse by the imperialists, the reactionaries in various countries, and the renegades to communism? Why such inveterate hatred of Stalin? Why attack him more ferociously than you do the enemy?

In abusing Stalin, Khrushchev is in fact wildly denouncing the Soviet system and state. His language in this connection is by no means weaker but is actually stronger than that of such renegades as Kautsky, Trotsky, Tito and Djilas.

People should quote the following passage from the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU and ask Khrushchev: “How can they say these things about the party of the great Lenin, about the motherland of socialism, about the people who were the first in the world to accomplish a socialist revolution, upheld its great gains in fierce battles against international imperialism and domestic counter-revolution, are displaying miracles

of heroism and dedication in the effort to build communism, are faithfully fulfilling their internationalist duty to the working people of the world!”

In his article, “The Political Significance of Abuse,” Lenin said, “Abuse in politics often covers up the utter lack of ideological content, the helplessness and the impotence, the annoying impotence of the abuser.” Does this not apply to the leaders of the CPSU who, feeling constantly haunted by the specter of Stalin, try to cover up their total lack of principle, their helplessness and annoying impotence by abusing Stalin?

The great majority of the Soviet people disapprove of such abuse of Stalin. They increasingly cherish the memory of Stalin. The leaders of the CPSU have seriously isolated themselves from the masses. They always feel they are being threatened by the haunting specter of Stalin, which is in fact the broad masses’ great dissatisfaction with the complete negation of Stalin. So far Khrushchev has not dared to let the Soviet people and the other people in the socialist camp see the secret report completely negating Stalin which he made to the 20th Congress of the CPSU, because it is a report which cannot bear the light of day, a report which would seriously alienate the masses.

Especially noteworthy is the fact that while they abuse Stalin in every possible way, the leaders of the CPSU regard Eisenhower, Kennedy and the like “with respect and trust.”⁴² They abuse Stalin as a “despot of the type of Ivan the Terrible” and “the greatest dictator in Russian history,” but compliment both Eisenhower and Kennedy as “having the support of the absolute majority of the American people!”⁴³ They abuse Stalin as an “idiot” but praise Eisenhower and Kennedy as “sensible!” On the one hand, they viciously lash at a great Marxist-Leninist, a great proletarian revolutionary and a great leader of the international communist movement, and on the other, they laud the chieftains of imperialism to the skies. Is there any possibility that the connection between these phenomena is merely accidental and that it does not follow with inexorable logic from the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism?

If his memory is not too short, Khrushchev ought to remember that at a mass rally held in Moscow in January 1937 he himself rightly condemned those who had attacked Stalin, saying, “In lifting their hand against Comrade Stalin, they lifted it against all of us, against the working class and the

⁴² N. S. Khrushchev, Letter in Reply to J. F. Kennedy, October 28, 1962.

⁴³ N. S. Khrushchev, Replies to the Questions by the Editors-in-Chief of *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, *Pravda*, June 15, 1963.

working people! In lifting their hand against Comrade Stalin, they lifted it against the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin!” Khrushchev himself repeatedly extolled Stalin as an “intimate friend and comrade-in-arms of the great Lenin,”⁴⁴ as “the greatest genius, teacher and leader of mankind”⁴⁵ and “the great, ever-victorious marshal,”⁴⁶ as “the sincere friend of the people”⁴⁷ and as his “own father.”⁴⁸

If one compares the remarks made by Khrushchev when Stalin was alive with those made after his death, one will not fail to see that Khrushchev has made a 180-degree turn in his evaluation of Stalin.

If his memory is not too short, Khrushchev should of course remember that during the period of Stalin’s leadership he himself was particularly active in supporting and carrying out the then prevailing policy for suppressing counter-revolutionaries.

On June 6, 1937, at the Fifth Party Conference of Moscow Province, Khrushchev declared:

Our Party will mercilessly crush the band of traitors and betrayers, and wipe out all the Trotskyist-Right dregs... The guarantee of this is the unshakable leadership of our Central Committee, the unshakable leadership of our leader Comrade Stalin... We shall totally annihilate the enemies—to the last man—and scatter their ashes to the winds.

On June 8, 1938, at the Fourth Party Conference of Kiev Province, Khrushchev declared:

The Yakyirs, Balyitskys, Lyubchenkys, Zatonkys and other scum wanted to bring Polish landowners to the Ukraine, wanted to bring here the German fascists, landlords and capitalists... We have annihilated a considerable number of enemies, but

⁴⁴ N. S. Khrushchev, “Stalin and the Great Friendship of the Peoples of the Soviet Union,” *Pravda*, December 21, 1939.

⁴⁵ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the 18th Congress of the CPSU(B), *Pravda*, March 15, 1939.

⁴⁶ N. S. Khrushchev and others, Letter to All the Officers and Men of the Soviet Red Army, *Pravda*, May 13, 1945.

⁴⁷ N. S. Khrushchev, “Stalin and the Great Friendship of the Peoples of the Soviet Union,” *op. cit.*

⁴⁸ N. S. Khrushchev, “Stalinist Friendship Among the Peoples—Guarantee of the Invincibility of Our Motherland,” *Pravda*, December 21, 1949.

still not all. Therefore, it is necessary to keep our eyes open. We should bear firmly in mind the words of Comrade Stalin, that as long as capitalist encirclement exists, spies and saboteurs will be smuggled into our country.

Why does Khrushchev, who was in the leadership of the Party and the state in Stalin's period and who actively supported and firmly executed the policy for suppressing counter-revolutionaries, repudiate everything done during this period and shift the blame for all errors on to Stalin alone, while altogether whitewashing himself?

When Stalin did something wrong, he was capable of criticizing himself. For instance, he had given some bad counsel with regard to the Chinese revolution. After the victory of the Chinese revolution, he admitted his mistake. Stalin also admitted some of his mistakes in the work of purifying the party ranks in his report to the 18th Congress of the CPSU(B) in 1939. But what about Khrushchev? He simply does not know what self-criticism is; all he does is to shift the entire blame on to others and claim the entire credit for himself.

It is not surprising that these ugly actions of Khrushchev's should have taken place when modern revisionism is on the rampage. As Lenin said in 1915 when he criticized the revisionists of the Second International for their betrayal of Marxism:

This is not at all surprising in this day of words forgotten, principles lost, philosophies overthrown, and resolutions and solemn promises discarded.⁴⁹

As the train of events since the 20th Congress of the CPSU has fully shown, the complete negation of Stalin by the leadership of the CPSU has had extremely serious consequences.

It has provided the imperialists and the reactionaries of all countries with exceedingly welcome anti-Soviet and anti-Communist ammunition. Shortly after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the imperialists exploited Khrushchev's secret anti-Stalin report to stir up a world-wide tidal wave against the Soviet Union and against communism. The imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries, the Tito clique and opportunists of various descriptions all leapt at the chance to attack the Soviet Union, the socialist camp and the commu-

⁴⁹ V. I. Lenin, "Preface to N. Bukharin's Pamphlet, *Imperialism and the World Economy*" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXII.

nist parties; thus many fraternal parties and countries were placed in serious difficulties.

The frantic campaign against Stalin by the leadership of the CPSU enabled the Trotskyites, who had long been political corpses, to come to life again and clamor for the “rehabilitation” of Trotsky. In November 1961, at the conclusion of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, the International Secretariat of the so-called Fourth International stated in a *Letter to the 22nd Congress of the CPSU and Its New Central Committee* that in 1937 Trotsky said a monument would be erected to the honor of the victims of Stalin. “Today,” it continued, “this prediction has come true. Before your Congress the First Secretary of your Party has promised the erection of this monument.” In this letter the specific demand was made that the name of Trotsky be “engraved in letters of gold on the monument erected in honor of the victims of Stalin.” The Trotskyites made no secret of their joy, declaring that the anti-Stalin campaign started by the leadership of the CPSU had “opened the door for Trotskyism” and would “greatly help the advance of Trotskyism and its organization—the Fourth International.”

In completely negating Stalin, the leaders of the CPSU have motives that cannot bear the light of day.

Stalin died in 1953; three years later the leaders of the CPSU violently attacked him at the 20th Congress, and eight years after his death they again did so at the 22nd Congress, removing and burning his remains. In repeating their violent attacks on Stalin, the leaders of the CPSU aimed at erasing the indelible influence of this great proletarian revolutionary among the people of the Soviet Union and throughout the world, and at paving the way for negating Marxism-Leninism, which Stalin had defended and developed, and for the all-out application of a revisionist line. Their revisionist line began exactly with the 20th Congress and became fully systematized at the 22nd Congress. The facts have shown ever more clearly that their revision of the Marxist-Leninist theories on imperialism, war and peace, proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies, the proletarian party, etc., is inseparably connected with their complete negation of Stalin.

It is under the cover of “combating the personality cult” that the leadership of the CPSU tries to negate Stalin completely.

In launching “the combat against the personality cult,” the leaders of the CPSU are not out to restore what they call “the Leninist standards of party

life and principles of leadership.” On the contrary, they are violating Lenin’s teachings on the interrelationship of leaders, party, class and masses and contravening the principle of democratic centralism in the Party.

Marxist-Leninists maintain that if the revolutionary party of the proletariat is genuinely to serve as the headquarters of the proletariat in struggle, it must correctly handle the interrelationship of leaders, party, class and masses and must be organized on the principle of democratic centralism. Such a party must have a fairly stable nucleus of leadership, which should consist of a group of long-tested leaders who are good at integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution.

The leaders of the proletarian party, whether members of the Central or local committees, emerge from the masses in the course of class struggles and mass revolutionary movements. They are infinitely loyal to the masses, have close ties with them and are good at correctly concentrating the ideas of the masses and then carrying them through. Such leaders are genuine representatives of the proletariat and are acknowledged by the masses. It is a sign of the political maturity of a proletarian party for it to have such leaders, and herein lies the hope of victory for the cause of the proletariat. Lenin was absolutely right in saying that “not a single class in history has achieved power without producing its political leaders, its prominent representatives able to organize a movement and lead it.”⁵⁰ He also said:

The training of experienced and most influential party leaders is a long-term and difficult task. But without this, the dictatorship of the proletariat, its “unity of will,” will remain a phrase.⁵¹

The Communist Party of China has always adhered to the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the role of the masses and the individual in history and on the interrelationship of leaders, party, class and masses, and upheld democratic centralism in the Party. We have always maintained collective leadership; at the same time, we are against belittling the role of leaders. While we attach importance to this role, we are against dishonest and excessive eulogy of individuals and exaggeration of their role. As far back as 1949 the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, on Comrade Mao Zedong’s suggestion, took a decision forbidding public celebrations of any kind on

⁵⁰ V. I. Lenin, “The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement” in *Collected Works*, Vol. IV.

⁵¹ V. I. Lenin, “A Letter to the German Communists” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXII.

the birthdays of party leaders and the naming of places, streets or enterprises after them.

This consistent and correct approach of ours is fundamentally different from the “combat against the personality cult” advocated by the leadership of the CPSU.

It has become increasingly clear that in advocating the “combat against the personality cult” the leaders of the CPSU do not intend, as they themselves claim, to promote democracy, practice collective leadership and oppose exaggeration of the role of the individual but have ulterior motives.

What exactly is the gist of their “combat against the personality cult?”

To put it bluntly, it is nothing but the following:

1. on the pretext of “combating the personality cult,” to counterpose Stalin, the leader of the Party, to the party organization, the proletariat and the masses of the people;
2. on the pretext of “combating the personality cult,” to besmirch the proletarian party, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the socialist system;
3. on the pretext of “combating the personality cult,” to build themselves up and to attack revolutionaries loyal to Marxism-Leninism so as to pave the way for revisionist schemers to usurp the party and state leadership;
4. on the pretext of “combating the personality cult,” to interfere in the internal affairs of fraternal parties and countries and strive to subvert their leadership to suit themselves; and
5. on the pretext of “combating the personality cult,” to attack fraternal parties which adhere to Marxism-Leninism and to split the international communist movement.

The “combat against the personality cult” launched by Khrushchev is a despicable political intrigue. Like someone described by Marx, “He is in his element as an intriguer, while a nonentity as a theorist.”⁵²

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU states that “while rejecting the personality cult and combating its consequences” they have “a high regard for leaders who... enjoy deserved prestige.” What does

⁵² K. Marx, F. Engels, “Marx to F. Bolte” in *Selected Letters*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1977, p. 42.

this mean? It means that, while trampling Stalin underfoot, the leaders of the CPSU laud Khrushchev to the skies.

They describe Khrushchev, who was not yet a Communist at the time of the October Revolution and who was a low ranking political worker during the Civil War, as an “active creator of the Red Army.”⁵³

They ascribe the great victory of the decisive battle in the Soviet Patriotic War entirely to Khrushchev, saying that in the Battle of Stalingrad “Khrushchev’s voice was very frequently heard”⁵⁴ and that he was “the soul of the Stalingraders.”⁵⁵

They attribute the great achievements in nuclear weapons and rocketry wholly to Khrushchev, calling him “cosmic father.”⁵⁶ But as everybody knows, the success of the Soviet Union in manufacturing the atom and hydrogen bombs was a great achievement of the Soviet scientists and technicians and the Soviet people under Stalin’s leadership. The foundations of rocketry were also laid in Stalin’s time. How can these important historical facts be obliterated? How can all credit be given to Khrushchev?

They laud Khrushchev who has revised the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and who holds that Leninism is outmoded as the “brilliant model who creatively developed and enriched Marxist-Leninist theory.”⁵⁷

What the leaders of the CPSU are doing under the cover of “combating the personality cult” is exactly as Lenin said:

In place of the old leaders, who hold ordinary human views on ordinary matters, new leaders are put forth... who talk supernatural nonsense and confusion.⁵⁸

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU slanders our stand in adhering to Marxism-Leninism, asserting that we “are trying to impose upon other parties the order of things, the ideology and morals, the forms and methods of leadership that flourished in the period of the person-

⁵³ “Life for the People,” *Zarva Vostoka*, December 17, 1961.

⁵⁴ “Created and Reared by the Party,” *Agitator*, No. 2, 1963.

⁵⁵ V. I. Chuikov, Speech at the Rally Marking the 20th Anniversary of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, *Pravda*, June 22, 1961.

⁵⁶ G. S. Titov, Speech at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, October 26, 1961.

⁵⁷ A. N. Kosygin, Speech at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, October 21, 1961.

⁵⁸ V. I. Lenin, “*Left-Wing*” *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 33.

ality cult.” This remark again exposes the absurdity of the combat against the personality cult.”

According to the leaders of the CPSU, after the October Revolution put an end to capitalism in Russia there followed a “period of the personality cult.” It would seem that the “social system” and “the ideology and morals” of that period were not socialist. In that period the Soviet working people were under a “heavy burden,” there prevailed an “atmosphere of fear, suspicion and uncertainty which poisoned the life of the people,”⁵⁹ and Soviet society was impeded in its development.

In his speech at the Soviet-Hungarian friendship rally on July 19, 1963, Khrushchev dwelt on what he called Stalin’s rule of “terror,” saying that Stalin “maintained his power with an axe.” He described the social order of the time in the following terms: “...in that period a man leaving for work often did not know whether he would return home, whether he would see his wife and children again.”

“The period of the personality cult” as described by the leadership of the CPSU was one when society was more “hateful” and “barbarous” than in the period of feudalism or capitalism.

According to the leadership of the CPSU, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system of society which were established as a result of the October Revolution failed to remove the oppression of the working people or accelerate the development of Soviet society for several decades; only after the 20th Congress of the CPSU carried out the “combat against the personality cult” was the “heavy burden” removed from the working people and “the development of Soviet society” suddenly “accelerated.”⁶⁰

Khrushchev said, “Ah! If only Stalin had died ten years earlier!”⁶¹ As everybody knows, Stalin died in 1953; ten years earlier would have been 1943, the very year when the Soviet Union began its counter-offensive in the Great Patriotic War. At that time, who wanted Stalin to die? Hitler!

It is not a new thing in the history of the international communist movement for the enemies of Marxism-Leninism to vilify the leaders of the proletariat and try to undermine the proletarian cause by using some such slo-

⁵⁹ See “Open Letter of the CC of the CPSU to all Party, Organizations, to all Communists of the Soviet Union,” p. 503 of this volume.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 501.

⁶¹ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Soviet-Hungarian Friendship Rally in Moscow, July 19, 1963.

gan as “combating the personality cult.” It is a dirty trick which people saw through long ago.

In the period of the First International the schemer Bakunin used similar language to rail at Marx. At first, to worm himself into Marx’s confidence, he wrote to him, “I am your disciple and I am proud of it.”⁶² Later, when he failed in his plot to usurp the leadership of the First International, he abused Marx and said, “As a German and a Jew, he is authoritarian from head to heels”⁶³ and a “dictator.”⁶⁴

In the period of the Second International the renegade Kautsky used similar language to rail at Lenin. He slandered Lenin, likening him to “the God of monotheists”⁶⁵ who had reduced Marxism “to the status not only of a state religion but of a medieval or oriental faith.”⁶⁶

In the period of the Third International the renegade Trotsky similarly used such language to rail at Stalin. He said that Stalin was a “tyrant”⁶⁷ and that “the Stalinist bureaucracy has created a vile leader-cult, attributing to leaders divine qualities.”⁶⁸

The modern revisionist Tito clique also use similar words to rail at Stalin, saying that Stalin was the “dictator” “in a system of absolute personal power.”⁶⁹

Thus it is clear that the issue of “combating the personality cult” raised by the leadership of the CPSU has come down through Bakunin, Kautsky, Trotsky and Tito, all of whom used it to attack the leaders of the proletariat and undermine the proletarian revolutionary movement.

⁶² M. A. Bakunin, Letter to Karl Marx, December 22, 1868, *Die Neue Zeit*, No. 1, 1900.

⁶³ Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx, the Story of His Life*, Covici Friede Publishers, New York, 1935, p. 429.

⁶⁴ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Engels to August Bebel” in *Selected Letters, op. cit.*, p. 55.

⁶⁵ Karl Kautsky, *Social Democracy Versus Communism*, Rand School Press, New York, 1946, p. 54.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁶⁷ Leon Trotsky, *Stalin, an Appraisal of the Man and His Influence*, Harper and Brothers, New York and London, 1941, p. 420.

⁶⁸ Leon Trotsky, “The Stalinist Bureaucracy and the Assassination of Kirov,” *On the Kirov Assassination*, Pioneer Publishers New York, 1956, p. 17.

⁶⁹ Edvard Kardelj, “Five Years Later,” *Borba*, June 28, 1953.

The opportunists in the history of the international communist movement were unable to negate Marx, Engels or Lenin by vilification, nor is Khrushchev able to negate Stalin by vilification.

As Lenin pointed out, a privileged position cannot ensure the success of vilification.

Khrushchev was able to utilize his privileged position to remove the body of Stalin from the Lenin Mausoleum, but try as he may, he can never succeed in removing the great image of Stalin from the minds of the Soviet people and of the people throughout the world.

Khrushchev can utilize his privileged position to revise Marxism-Leninism one way or another, but try as he may, he can never succeed in overthrowing Marxism-Leninism which Stalin defended and which is defended by Marxist-Leninists throughout the world.

We would like to offer a word of sincere advice to Comrade Khrushchev. We hope you will become aware of your errors and return from your wrong path to the path of Marxism-Leninism.

Long live the great revolutionary teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin!

Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country?

COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
CPSU (III)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE *PEOPLE'S DAILY* AND THE *RED FLAG*

September 26, 1963

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 19, 1963, pp. 5-26.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, September 27, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 39,
pp. 14-27.

Is Yugoslavia a socialist country?

This is not only a question of ascertaining the nature of the Yugoslav state, but it also involves the question of which road the socialist countries should follow: whether they should follow the road of the October Revolution and carry the socialist revolution through to the end or follow the road of Yugoslavia and restore capitalism. In addition, it involves the question of how to appraise the Tito clique: whether it is a fraternal party and a force against imperialism or a renegade from the international communist movement and a lackey of imperialism.

On this question there are fundamental differences of opinion between the leaders of the CPSU, on the one hand, and ourselves and all other Marxist-Leninists, on the other.

All Marxist-Leninists hold that Yugoslavia is not a socialist country. The leading clique of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has betrayed Marxism-Leninism and the Yugoslav people and consists of renegades from the international communist movement and lackeys of imperialism.

The leaders of the CPSU, on the other hand, hold that Yugoslavia is a socialist country and that the League of Communists of Yugoslavia bases itself on Marxism-Leninism and is a fraternal party and a force against imperialism.

In its Open Letter of July 14 the Central Committee of the CPSU declares that Yugoslavia is a "socialist country" and that the Tito clique is a "fraternal party" that "stands at the helm of the ship of state."

Recently Comrade Khrushchev paid a visit to Yugoslavia and in a number of speeches he revealed the real standpoint of the leaders of the CPSU still more clearly, and completely discarded the fig-leaf with which they had been covering themselves on this question.

In Khrushchev's opinion, Yugoslavia is not only a socialist country but an "advanced" socialist country. There, one finds not "idle talk about revolution" but "actual construction of socialism," and the development of Yugoslavia is "a concrete contribution to the general world revolutionary workers' movement,"⁷⁰ which Khrushchev rather envies and wishes to emulate.

In Khrushchev's opinion, the leaders of the CPSU and the Titoites are "not only class brothers" but "brothers tied together... by the singleness of aims confronting us." The leadership of the CPSU is a "reliable and faithful ally" of the Tito clique.⁷¹

Khrushchev believes he has discovered genuine Marxism-Leninism in the Tito clique. The Central Committee of the CPSU was merely pretending when it asserted in its Open Letter that "differences on a number of fundamental ideological questions still remain between the CPSU and the Yugoslav League of Communists." Now Khrushchev has told the Tito clique that "we belong to one and the same idea and are guided by the same theory," and that both stand on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.⁷²

Khrushchev has cast the Statement of 1960 to the winds. The Statement says:

The communist parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist "theories" in concentrated form.

It says:

After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist program to the Declaration of 1957; they set the LCY against the international communist movement as a whole.

⁷⁰ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at a Mass Rally in Velenje, Yugoslavia, August 30, 1963.

⁷¹ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at a Meeting in a Factory of Rakovica, Yugoslavia, August 21, 1963.

⁷² N. S. Khrushchev, Interview with Foreign Correspondents at Brioni, Yugoslavia, August 28, 1963, as reported by *Tanjug*.

It says:

[The leaders of the LCY were] dependent on so-called “aid” from US and other imperialists, and thereby exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through a heroic struggle.

It further says:

The Yugoslav revisionists carry on subversive work against the socialist camp and the world communist movement... they engage in activities which prejudice the unity of all the peace-loving forces and countries.

The Statement is absolutely clear, and yet the leaders of the CPSU dare to say: “In accordance with the 1960 Statement, we consider Yugoslavia a socialist country.”⁷³ How can they say such a thing?!

One would like to ask:

Can a country be socialist when, as the Statement says, it is guided by a variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist theories?

Can a country be socialist when, as the Statement says, it has betrayed Marxism-Leninism and sets itself against the international communist movement as a whole?

Can a country be socialist when, as the Statement says, it carries on subversive work against the socialist camp and the world communist movement?

Can a country be socialist when, as the Statement says, it engages in activities which prejudice the unity of all the peace-loving forces and countries?

Can a country be socialist when the imperialist countries headed by the United States have nurtured it with several billions of US dollars?

This is indeed out of the ordinary and unheard of!

Apparently, Comrade Togliatti speaks more plainly than Comrade Khrushchev, Togliatti did not mince his words; he said the position taken by the Statement of 1960 on the Tito clique was “wrong.”⁷⁴ Since Khrushchev is

⁷³ “For the Victory of Creative Marxism-Leninism and Against the Revision of the Course of the World Communist Movement,” editorial board article in *Kommunist*, Moscow, No. 11, 1963.

⁷⁴ Palmiro Togliatti, “Let Us Lead the Discussion Back to Its Real Limit,” *L’Unita*, January 10, 1963.

bent on reversing the verdict on the Tito clique, he should be more explicit; there is no need to pretend to uphold the Statement.

Is the Statement's verdict on Yugoslavia wrong and should it be reversed? Togliatti says it is wrong and should be reversed. Khrushchev in effect also says it is wrong and should be reversed. We say it is not wrong and must not be reversed. All fraternal parties adhering to Marxism-Leninism and upholding the Statement of 1960 likewise say it is not wrong and must not be reversed.

In doing so, in the opinion of the leaders of the CPSU, we are clinging to a "stereotyped formula" and to the "jungle laws" of the capitalist world⁷⁵ and are "excommunicating" Yugoslavia from socialism."⁷⁶ Furthermore, whoever does not regard Yugoslavia as a socialist country is said to be going contrary to facts and making the mistake of subjectivism,⁷⁷ whereas in shutting their eyes to the facts and asserting that Yugoslavia is a socialist country they are "proceeding from objective laws, from the teaching of Marxism-Leninism" and have drawn a conclusion based on "a profound analysis of reality."⁷⁸

What are the realities in Yugoslavia? What sort of conclusion ought one to draw if one proceeds from objective laws, from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, and makes a profound analysis of the realities in Yugoslavia?

Let us now look into this question.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRIVATE CAPITAL IN YUGOSLAV CITIES

One of Khrushchev's arguments to affirm that Yugoslavia is a socialist country is that private capital, private enterprise and capitalists do not exist in Yugoslavia.

Is that true? No, it is not.

The fact is private capital and private enterprise exist on a very big scale in Yugoslavia and are developing apace.

Judging by the record in all socialist countries, it is not strange to find different sectors, including a private capitalist sector, existing in the national

⁷⁵ N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, December 1962.

⁷⁶ Open Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to All Party Organizations, to All Communists of the Soviet Union, July 14, 1963.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, December 1962.

economy of a socialist country for a considerable period after the proletariat has taken political power. What matters is the kind of policy adopted by the government towards private capitalism—the policy of utilizing, restricting, transforming and eliminating it, or the policy of laissez-faire and fostering and encouraging it. This is an important criterion for determining whether a country is developing towards socialism or towards capitalism.

On this question the Tito clique is going in the opposite direction from socialism. The social changes Yugoslavia introduced in the early post-war period were in the first place not thoroughgoing. The policy the Tito clique has adopted since its open betrayal is not one of transforming and eliminating private capital and private enterprise but of fostering and expanding them.

Regulations issued by the Tito clique in 1953 stipulate that “citizens’ groups” have the right to “found enterprises” and “hire labor.” In the same year, it issued a decree stipulating that private individuals have the right to purchase fixed assets from state economic establishments.

In 1956 the Tito clique encouraged local administrations to foster private capital by its taxation and other policies.

In 1961 the Tito clique decreed that private individuals have the right to purchase foreign exchange.

In 1963 the Tito clique embodied the policy of developing private capitalism in its constitution. According to provisions of the constitution, private individuals in Yugoslavia may found enterprises and hire labor.

With the Tito clique’s help and encouragement, private enterprise and private capital have mushroomed in the cities in Yugoslavia.

According to the official *Statistical Pocket-Book of Yugoslavia*, 1963 published in Belgrade, there are over 115,000 privately owned craft establishments in Yugoslavia. But in fact the owners of many of these private enterprises are not “craftsmen” but typical private capitalists.

The Tito clique admits that although the law allows private owners to employ a maximum of five workers each, there are some who employ ten or twenty times as many and even some who employ “five to six hundred workers.”⁷⁹ And the annual turnover of some private enterprises is over 100 million dinars.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ M. Todorovic, “The Struggle on Two Fronts,” *Nasha Stvarnost*, March issue, 1954.

⁸⁰ *Vesnik u sredu*, December 27, 1961.

Politika disclosed on December 7, 1961 that in many cases these private entrepreneurs are actually “big entrepreneurs.” It says:

It is difficult to ascertain how wide the net of these private entrepreneurs spreads and how many workers they have. According to the law, they are entitled to keep five workers who are supposed to help them in their work. But to those who know the ins and outs of the matter, these five persons are actually contractors who in turn have their own ‘sub-contractors’... As a rule, these contractors no longer engage in labor but only give orders, make plans and conclude contracts, traveling by car from one enterprise to another.

From the profits made by these entrepreneurs, one can see that they are one hundred percent capitalists. *Svet* reported on December 8, 1961 that “the net income of some private handicraftsmen reaches one million dinars per month,” and the Belgrade *Vecernje novosti* said on December 20, 1961 that in Belgrade “last year 116 owners of private enterprises each received an income of more than 10 million dinars.” Some entrepreneurs “received an income of about 70 million dinars” in one year, which is nearly US \$100,000 according to the official rate of exchange.

In Yugoslav cities not only are there private industrial enterprises, private service establishments, private commerce, private housing estates and private transport business, there are also usurers, who are known as “private bankers.” These usurers operate openly and even advertise their business in the newspapers; one such advertisement runs as follows: “A loan of 300,000 dinars for three months offered. 400,000 dinars to be returned. Security necessary.”⁸¹

All these are indisputable facts.

We would like to ask those who are bent on reversing the verdict on the Tito clique: Unless it is your intention to deceive, how can you assert that Yugoslavia has no private capital, no private enterprise and no capitalists?

YUGOSLAV COUNTRYSIDE SWAMPED BY CAPITALISM

Let us now consider the situation in the Yugoslav countryside.

Does it no longer have capitalists, as Khrushchev asserts?

No, the facts are quite the reverse.

⁸¹ *Vesnik u sredu*, December 6, 1961.

The fact that Yugoslavia has been swamped by capitalism is even more striking in the countryside.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that individual economy, petty-producer economy, generates capitalism daily and hourly, and that only collectivization can lead agriculture on to the path of socialism.

Stalin pointed out:

Lenin says that so long as individual peasant economy, which engenders capitalists and capitalism, predominates in the country, the danger of a restoration of capitalism will exist. Clearly, so long as this danger exists there can be no serious talk of the victory of socialist construction in our country.⁸²

On this question the Tito clique pursues a line running counter to socialism.

In the initial post-war period a land reform took place in Yugoslavia and a number of peasants' working co-operatives were organized. But in the main the rich-peasant economy was left untouched.

In 1951 the Tito clique openly declared its abandonment of the road of agricultural collectivization and began to disband the peasants' working co-operatives. This was a serious step taken by the Tito clique in betraying the socialist cause. Such co-operatives decreased from over 6,900 in 1950 to a little more than 1,200 at the end of 1953, and to 147 in 1960. The Yugoslav countryside is submerged in a sea of individual economy.

The Tito clique declares that collectivization has not proved of value in Yugoslavia. It makes the vicious slander that "collectivization is the same as expropriation"⁸³ and is a path which "preserves serfdom and poverty in the countryside for the longest possible time."⁸⁴ It advocates the ridiculous idea that the development of agriculture should be "based on the free competition of economic forces."⁸⁵

⁸² Joseph Stalin, "Grain Procurements and the Prospects for the Development of Agriculture" in *Works*, Vol. XI, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, p. 8.

⁸³ Edvard Kardelj, Opening Address at the Ninth Plenum of the Fourth Federal Committee of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia, May 5, 1959.

⁸⁴ Vladimir Bakari, Speech at the Sixth Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

⁸⁵ Edvard Kardelj, "On Some Problems of Our Policy in the Villages," *Komunist*, Belgrade, No. 4, 1953.

While dissolving many of the peasants' working co-operatives, the Tito clique has promulgated one law and decree after another since 1953 to encourage the development of capitalism in the rural areas, granting freedom to buy, sell and rent land and to hire farm hands, abolishing the planned purchase of agricultural produce and replacing it with free trading in this sphere.

Under this policy, the forces of capitalism spread rapidly in the rural areas and the process of polarization quickened. This has been an important aspect of the Tito clique's work of restoring capitalism.

Polarization in the countryside is firstly revealed in the changes occurring in land ownership. Slavko Komar, formerly Yugoslav Secretary for Agriculture and Forestry, admitted that in 1959 poorer peasant households with less than 5 hectares of land each, which constitute 70 percent of all peasant households, owned only 43 percent of all privately owned land, whereas well-to-do peasant households with more than 8 hectares of land each, which form only 13 percent of all peasant households, owned 33 percent of all privately owned land. Komar also admitted that about 10 percent of the peasant households bought or sold land every year.⁸⁶ Most of the sellers were poorer families.

The concentration of land is actually much more serious than is apparent from the above data. As revealed in the July 19, 1963 issue of *Borba*, the organ of the Tito clique, in one district alone there were "thousands of peasant households with far more than the legal maximum of 10 hectares of land." In Bijeljina Commune, "it was found that five hundred peasant households owned estates of 10 to 30 hectares." These are not isolated cases.

Polarization in the rural areas also manifests itself in the great inequalities in the ownership of draught animals and farm implements. Of the 308,000 peasant households in the province of Vojvodina, which is a leading grain-producing area, 55 percent have no draught animals. Peasant households with less than 2 hectares of land each, which constitute 40.7 percent of all peasant households, have only 4.4 percent of all the ploughs in this region, or an average of one plough to 20 households. On the other hand,

⁸⁶ Slavko Komar, "Some Problems Concerning the Countryside and the Peasant Households," *Socializam*, No. 5, 1962.

the rich peasants own more than 1,300 tractors and a great deal of other farm machinery as well as large numbers of ploughs and animal-drawn carts.⁸⁷

Polarization likewise manifests itself in the growth of such forms of capitalist exploitation as the hiring of labor.

The February 7, 1958 issue of *Komunist* revealed that 52 percent of the peasant households in Serbia owning more than 8 hectares of land hired laborers in 1956.

In 1962 Slavko Komar said that the heads of some peasant households had in recent years “become powerful” and that “their income is derived not from their own labor but from unlawful trade, from the processing of both their own products and those of others, from illicit distilling of spirits, from the possession of more than the prescribed maximum of 10 hectares of farmland, which is obtained by purchasing, or more often by leasing land, fictitious partition of land among family members, seizure or concealment of public land, from the acquisition of tractors through speculation and from the exploitation of poor neighbors by cultivating their land for them.”⁸⁸

Borba stated on August 30, 1962 that “the so-called kindhearted producer... is a leaseholder of land, a hirer of labor and an experienced merchant... Such people are not producers, but entrepreneurs. Some never touch a hoe all the year round. They hire labor and only supervise the work in the field and they engage in trading.”

Usurers, too, are very active in the Yugoslav countryside. Interest rates often run to more than 100 percent per annum. In addition, there are people who, taking advantage of the plight of the unemployed, monopolize the labor market and practice exploitation in the process.

Deprived of land and other means of production, large numbers of poverty-stricken peasants can live only by selling their labor power. According to figures given in *Politika* of August 20, 1962, about 70 percent of the 1961 cash income of Yugoslav peasant households with less than 2 hectares of land came from selling their labor power. These peasants are fleeced right and left and lead a miserable life.

As facts show, the Yugoslav countryside is dominated by the exploiting class.

⁸⁷ The Yugoslav journal *Index*, No. 2. 1962.

⁸⁸ Slavko Komar, “Some Problems Concerning the Countryside and the Peasant Households,” *op. cit.*

In arguing that Yugoslavia is a socialist country, the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU states that the “socialist sector” in the rural areas of Yugoslavia has increased from 6 to 15 percent.

Unfortunately, even this pitiable percentage is not socialist.

By the socialist sector of 15 percent the leaders of the CPSU can only mean such organizations as the “agricultural farms” and “general agricultural co-operatives” promoted by the Tito clique. But in fact the “agricultural farms” are capitalist farms and the “general agricultural co-operatives” are capitalist economic organizations engaging mainly in commerce. They do not affect the private ownership of land; what is more, their main function is to foster the development of the rich-peasant economy.

Problems of Agriculture in Yugoslavia, a work published in Belgrade, states that “judging by how they are organized today and how they function,” the co-operatives “do not in the least signify socialist reconstruction of agriculture and of the countryside. They are working not so much for the creation of socialist strongholds as for the development and promotion of capitalist elements. There are cases in which these cooperatives are kulak associations.”

The Tito clique has given the “general agricultural cooperatives” the monopoly right to purchase agricultural products from the peasants. Taking advantage of this special privilege and of uncontrolled fluctuations in prices of farm produce, the so-called co-operatives speculate and through such commercial activities exploit the peasants in a big way. In 1958 Yugoslavia had a poor harvest. The co-operatives and other commercial organs took the opportunity to raise the selling prices of farm produce. The year 1959 brought a better harvest and the co-operatives broke their contracts with the peasants and reduced their purchases, not even hesitating to let the crops rot in the fields.

The “general agricultural co-operatives” and the “agricultural farms” hire and exploit a large number of long-term and temporary workers. According to data in the *Statistical Yearbook of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia of 1962*, long-term workers hired by the “co-operatives” alone totaled more than 100,000 in 1961. A large number of temporary workers were also employed. As disclosed by *Rad* on December 1, 1962, hired laborers “are very often subject to the crudest exploitation (the working day may be as long as 15 hours), and usually their personal income is extremely low.”

It is thus clear that these agricultural organizations of the so-called socialist sector are nothing but capitalist agricultural organizations.

Expropriation of poorer peasants and promotion of capitalist farms form the Tito clique's basic policy in the sphere of agriculture. Back in 1955, Tito said:

We do not abandon the idea that the day will come in Yugoslavia when small farms will be combined in one way or another... In America they have already done so. We must find a solution to this problem.

In order to take the capitalist path, in 1959 the Tito clique promulgated the Law on the Utilization of Cultivated Land, stipulating that the land of peasants working on their own, who cannot farm it according to requirements, is subject to the "compulsory management" of the "general agricultural cooperatives" and "agricultural farms." In effect, this means the expropriation of poorer peasants and the forcible annexation of their land to develop capitalist farms. This is the path of capitalist agriculture, pure and simple.

In speaking of the transition from small peasant economy to an economy of large-scale farming, Stalin said:

There you have two paths, the capitalist path and the socialist path: the path forward—to socialism, and the path backward—to capitalism.

Is there a third path? Stalin said, "The so-called third path is actually the second path, the path leading back to capitalism." "For what does it mean to return to individual farming and to restore the kulaks? It means restoring kulak bondage, restoring the exploitation of the peasantry by the kulaks and giving the kulaks power. But is it possible to restore the kulaks and at the same time to preserve the Soviet power? No, it is not possible. The restoration of the kulaks is bound to lead to the creation of a kulak power and to the liquidation of the Soviet power—hence, it is bound to lead to the formation of a bourgeois government. And the formation of a bourgeois government is bound to lead in its turn to the restoration of the landlords and capitalists, to the restoration of capitalism."⁸⁹

The path taken by Yugoslavia in agriculture during the past ten years and more is precisely the path of restoring capitalism.

⁸⁹ Joseph Stalin, "Speech Delivered at the First All-Union Congress of Collective-Farm Shock Brigaders" in *Problems of Leninism*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1976, pp. 655-656.

All these are indisputable facts.

We would like to ask those who are bent on reversing the verdict on the Tito clique: Unless it is your intention to deceive, how can you assert that there are no capitalists in Yugoslavia?

THE DEGENERATION OF SOCIALIST ECONOMY OWNED BY THE WHOLE PEOPLE INTO CAPITALIST ECONOMY

The restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia manifests itself not only in the fact that private capitalism is spreading freely both in the cities and in the countryside. Still more important, the “public” enterprises, which play a decisive role in the Yugoslav economy, have degenerated.

The Tito clique’s economy of “workers’ self-government” is state capitalism of a peculiar kind. It is not state capitalism under conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat but state capitalism under conditions in which the Tito clique has turned the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie. The means of production of the enterprises under “workers’ self-government” do not belong to one or more private capitalists but to the new type of bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie of Yugoslavia, which includes the bureaucrats and managers and which the Tito clique represents. Usurping the name of the state, depending on US imperialism and disguising itself under the cloak of socialism, this bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie has robbed the working people of the property originally belonging to them. In reality, “workers’ self-government” is a system of ruthless exploitation under the domination of bureaucrat-comprador capital.

Since 1950, the Tito clique has issued a series of decrees instituting “workers’ self-government” in all state-owned factories, mines and other enterprises in communications, transport, trade, agriculture, forestry and public utilities. The essence of “workers’ self-government” consists of handing over the enterprises to “working collectives,” with each enterprise operating independently, purchasing its own raw materials, deciding on the variety, output and prices of its products and marketing them, and determining its own wage scale and the division of part of its profits. Yugoslav decrees further stipulate that economic enterprises have the right to buy, sell or lease fixed assets.

In the enterprises under “workers’ self-government,” ownership is described by the Tito clique as “a higher form of socialist ownership.” They

assert that only with “workers’ self-government” can one “really build socialism.”

This is sheer deception.

Theoretically speaking, as anyone with a slight knowledge of Marxism knows, slogans like “workers’ self-government” and “factories to the workers” have never been Marxist slogans but slogans advanced by anarchist syndicalists, bourgeois socialists and old-line opportunists and revisionists.

The theory of “workers’ self-government” and “factories to the workers” runs counter to the fundamental Marxist theory of socialism. It was completely refuted by the classical Marxist writers long ago.

As Marx and Engels pointed out in the *Communist Manifesto*, “The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State...”⁹⁰

Engels wrote in *Anti-Dühring*, “The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production into state property.”⁹¹

Having seized political power, the proletariat must concentrate the means of production in the hands of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is a fundamental principle of socialism.

In the early period of Soviet power following the October Revolution when some people advocated handing the factories over to the producers so that they could “organize production” directly, Lenin sternly criticized this view, saying that in reality it meant opposition to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

He acutely pointed out:

Any direct or indirect legalization of the possession of their own production by the workers of individual factories or individual professions or of their right to weaken or impede the decrees of the state power is the greatest distortion of the basic principles of Soviet power and the complete renunciation of socialism.⁹²

It is thus clear that “workers’ self-government” has nothing to do with socialism.

⁹⁰ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party & Principles of Communism*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 55.

⁹¹ F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 308-309.

⁹² V. I. Lenin, “On the Democracy and Socialist Character of the Soviet Power.”

In fact, the “workers’ self-government” of the Tito clique does not provide self-government on the part of the workers; it is a hoax.

The enterprises under “workers’ self-government” are actually in the clutches of the new bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie represented by the Tito clique. It controls the enterprises’ property and personnel and takes away much the greater part of their income.

Through the banks the Tito clique controls the credit of the entire country and the investment funds and liquid capital of all enterprises and supervises their financial affairs.

The Tito clique plunders the income of these enterprises by various means, such as the collection of taxes and interest. According to the statistics of the “Report on the Work in 1961 by the Federal Executive Council of Yugoslavia,” it took away about three-quarters of the enterprises’ net income in this way.

The Tito clique seizes the fruits of the people’s labor which it appropriates chiefly for meeting the extravagant expenses of this clique of bureaucrats, for maintaining its reactionary rule, for strengthening the apparatus which suppresses the working people, and for paying tribute to the imperialists in the form of the servicing of foreign debts.

Moreover, the Tito clique controls these enterprises through their managers. The managers are nominally chosen by competition by the enterprises but are in fact appointed by the Tito clique. They are agents of the bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie in these enterprises.

In the enterprises under “workers’ self-government,” the relations between managers and workers are actually relations between employers and employees, between the exploiters and the exploited.

As matters stand, the managers can determine the production plans and the direction of development of these enterprises, dispose of the means of production, take the decisions on the distribution of the enterprises’ income, hire or fire workers and overrule the resolutions of the workers’ councils or management boards.

Abundant information published in the Yugoslav press proves that the workers’ council is merely formal, a kind of voting machine, and that all power in the enterprise is in the hands of the manager.

The fact that the manager of an enterprise controls its means of production and the distribution of its income enables him to appropriate the fruits of the workers’ labor by means of various privileges.

The Tito clique itself admits that in these enterprises there is a wide gap between managers and workers not only in wages but also in bonuses. In some enterprises, the bonuses of the managers and higher staff are forty times those of the workers. "In certain enterprises, the total amount of the bonus which a group of leaders received is equal to the wage fund of the entire collective."⁹³

Moreover, the managers of the enterprises use their privileges to make a lot of money by various subterfuges. Bribery, embezzlement and theft are still bigger sources of income for the managers.

The broad masses of the workers live in poverty. There is no guarantee of employment. Large numbers of workers lose their jobs with the closing down of enterprises. According to official statistics, in February 1963 the number of the unemployed reached 339,000, or about 10 percent of the number of the employed. In addition, every year many workers go abroad seeking work.

Politika admitted on September 25, 1961 that "there exists a great gap between some workers and office employees; the former look upon the latter as 'bureaucrats' who 'swallow up' their wages."

These facts show that in the Yugoslav enterprises under "workers' self-government," a new social group has come into being consisting of the few who appropriate the fruits of labor of the many. It is an important component of the new bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie in Yugoslavia.

By promoting "workers' self-government," the Tito clique has completely pushed the enterprises originally owned by the whole people off the path of socialist economy.

The main manifestations of this are the following:

First, the abandonment of unified economic planning by the state.

Second, the use of profits as the primary incentive in the operation of the enterprises. They may adopt a variety of methods to increase their income and profits. In other words, in the enterprises under "workers' self-government" the aim of production is not to meet the needs of society but to seek profits, just as in any capitalist enterprise.

Third, the pursuance of the policy of encouraging capitalist free competition. Tito has said to the managers of the enterprises, "Competition at

⁹³ Letter of the Central Committee of the LCY to Its Organizations and Leaderships at All Levels, February 17, 1958

home will be beneficial to our ordinary people, the consumers.” The Tito clique also openly declares that it allows “competition, the seeking of profits, speculation and the like” because “they play a positive role in promoting the initiative of the producers, their collective, the communes, etc..”⁹⁴

Fourth, the use of credit and the banks as important levers to promote capitalist free competition. In granting loans, the Tito regime’s credit and banking system invites tenders for investment. Whoever is capable of repaying the loan in the shortest period and paying the highest rate of interest will obtain the loan. In their words, this is “to use competition as the usual method of allocating investment credits.”⁹⁵

Fifth, relations among the enterprises are not socialist relations of mutual support and co-ordination under a unified government plan but capitalist relations of competition and rivalry in a free market.

All this has undermined the very foundation of socialist planned economy.

Lenin said:

Socialism... is inconceivable without planned state organization which subjects tens of millions of people to the strictest observance of a single standard in production and distribution.⁹⁶

He also said:

Without all-sided state accounting and control of production and distribution of goods, the power of the toilers, the freedom of the toilers, cannot be maintained, and... a return to the yoke of capitalism is inevitable.⁹⁷

Under the signboard of “workers’ self-government,” all the economic departments and enterprises in Yugoslavia are locked in fierce capitalist competition. It is quite common for the enterprises under “workers’ self-government” to engage in embezzlement, speculation and hoarding, to inflate prices, bribe, hide technical secrets, grab technical personnel and even to

⁹⁴ Vladimir Bakarić, Report to the Fourth Congress of the League of Communists of Croatia, April 7, 1959.

⁹⁵ Augustin Papić, “Investment Financing in Yugoslavia,” *Annals of Collective Economy*, Belgrade, April-November 1959.

⁹⁶ V. I. Lenin, “‘Left-Wing’ Childishness” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII.

⁹⁷ V. I. Lenin, “The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII.

attack one another in the press or over the radio in rivalry for markets and profits.

The fierce competition among Yugoslav enterprises goes on not only in the home market but also in foreign trade. The Yugoslav press says that it is not unusual for twenty or thirty agents of Yugoslav foreign trade establishments to visit the same market abroad, compete among themselves for business, and take away the others' customers or suppliers. "From selfish motives," these enterprises engaged in foreign trade seek to "make profits at any cost" and "is not choosy about their means."

A result of this fierce competition is chaos in the Yugoslav market. Prices vary considerably not only in different cities or regions but also in different shops in the same place, and even for the same kind of goods from the same producer. In order to maintain high prices, some enterprises do not hesitate to destroy large quantities of farm produce.

Another result of this fierce competition is the closing down of large numbers of enterprises in Yugoslavia. According to information provided by the *Official Bulletin of the FPRY*, five hundred to six hundred enterprises closed down annually in recent years.

All this shows that the "public" economy of Yugoslavia is governed not by the laws of socialist planned economy but by those of capitalist competition and anarchy of production. The Tito clique's enterprises under "workers' self-government" are not socialist but capitalist in nature.

We would like to ask those who are bent on reversing the verdict on the Tito clique: Unless it is your intention to deceive, how can you describe the state capitalist economy controlled by the bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie as a socialist economy?

A DEPENDENCY ON US IMPERIALISM

The process of the restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia is interwoven with the process in which the Tito clique has become subservient towards US imperialism and Yugoslavia has degenerated into a US imperialist dependency.

With its betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, the Tito clique embarked on the shameful course of selling out the sovereignty of the state and living off the alms of US imperialism.

According to incomplete statistics, from the conclusion of World War II to January 1963 the United States and other imperialist powers extended to

the Tito clique "aid" totaling some US \$5,460 million, of which more than 60 percent, or about \$3,500 million, was US "aid." The greatest part of this US aid was granted after 1950.

US aid has been the mainstay of Yugoslavia's finances and economy. Official statistics show that in 1961 the loans the Tito clique obtained from the United States and US-controlled international financial organizations totaled US\$346 million, or 47.4 percent of the federal budgetary income of Yugoslavia in that year. With the inclusion of aid from other Western countries, the money received by the Tito clique from Western countries in 1961 totaled US\$493 million, or 67.6 percent of the federal budgetary income in that year.

In order to obtain US aid, the Tito clique has concluded a series of traitorous treaties with the United States.

The notes exchanged between Yugoslavia and the United States in 1951 concerning the Agreement Relating to Mutual Defense Assistance stipulated that US Government officials have the "freedom..., without restriction," to observe and supervise the receipt and distribution in Yugoslavia of US military aid material and has "full access to communication and information facilities." The agreement also required Yugoslavia to provide the United States with strategic raw materials.

The Agreement Regarding Military Assistance signed between Yugoslavia and the United States in 1951 stipulated that Yugoslavia should "make the full contribution... to the development and maintenance of the defensive strength of the free world" and should be ready to provide troops for the United Nations. Under this agreement the military mission sent by the United States was to directly supervise the training of Yugoslav troops.

The Yugoslav-US Economic Cooperation Agreement of 1952 stipulated that Yugoslavia must use US aid for "furthering fundamental individual human rights, freedoms and democratic institutions," that is, for furthering capitalism.

In 1954 Yugoslavia concluded a Treaty of Alliance, Political Cooperation and Mutual Assistance with Greece and Turkey, both members of NATO. The treaty provided for military and diplomatic co-ordination among the three countries, thus making Yugoslavia a virtual member of the US-controlled military bloc.

Since 1954 Yugoslavia has concluded a series of agreements with the United States, selling out its sovereignty. More than fifty such agreements were signed in the period between 1957 and 1962.

Because of the conclusion of these treaties and agreements and because the Tito clique has made Yugoslavia dependent on US imperialism, the United States enjoys the following rights in Yugoslavia:

- (1) to control its military affairs;
- (2) to control its foreign affairs;
- (3) to interfere in its internal affairs;
- (4) to manipulate and supervise its finance;
- (5) to control its foreign trade;
- (6) to plunder its strategic resources; and
- (7) to collect military and economic intelligence.

The independence and sovereignty of Yugoslavia have thus been auctioned off by the Tito clique.

In addition to selling out Yugoslavia's sovereign rights in a series of unequal treaties with the United States, the Tito clique, in order to secure US aid, has taken one step after another in domestic and foreign policy to comply with Western monopoly capital's demand to penetrate Yugoslavia.

Starting from 1950 the Tito clique abolished the monopoly of foreign trade by the state.

The Act on Foreign Trade Activities promulgated in 1953 permitted enterprises to conduct foreign trade independently and to have direct transactions with Western monopoly capitalist enterprises.

In 1961 the Tito regime introduced reforms in the systems of foreign exchange and foreign trade. Their main content was the further relaxation of restrictions on import and export trade. Complete liberalization was effected in the import of major semi-processed materials and certain consumers goods, and restrictions on the import of other commodities were relaxed in varying degrees. Restrictions were removed on the supply of foreign exchange needed for so-called unrestricted imports.

Everybody knows that state monopoly of foreign trade is a basic principle of socialism.

Lenin said that the industrial proletariat "is absolutely not in a position to recover our industry and to make Russia an industrial country without the

protection of industry, which in no way refers to its protection by customs policy, but solely and exclusively refers to its protection by monopoly of foreign trade.”⁹⁸

Stalin said that “the monopoly of foreign trade is one of the unshakable foundations of the platform of the Soviet Government,” and that the abolition of the monopoly of foreign trade would mean “abandoning the industrialization of the country,” “flooding the USSR with goods from capitalist countries,” and “transforming our country from an independent country into a semi-colonial one.”⁹⁹

To abolish the state monopoly of foreign trade, as the Tito regime has done, is to throw the door wide open to imperialist monopoly capital.

What are the economic consequences of the fact that the Tito clique receives large amounts of US aid and keeps Yugoslavia’s door wide open to imperialism?

First, Yugoslavia has become a market for imperialist dumping.

Huge quantities of industrial goods and farm produce from the imperialist countries have flooded the Yugoslav market. In pursuit of profits the Yugoslav comprador capitalists, who make piles of money by serving foreign monopoly capital, keep on importing commodities even though they can be produced at home and even when stocks are huge. *Politika* admitted on July 25, 1961 that it “was everywhere evident” that Yugoslav industry “was suffering blows from the continuous and very complicated competition of foreign industry.”

Secondly, Yugoslavia has become an outlet for imperialist investment.

Many Yugoslav industrial enterprises have been built with “aid” from the United States and other imperialist countries. A great deal of foreign private monopoly capital has penetrated into Yugoslavia. According to Augustin Papić, the general manager of the Yugoslav Investment Bank, in the period between 1952 and 1956 “the participation of foreign funds reached 32.5 percent of the total value of economic investments.” US Secretary of State Dean Rusk said on February 5, 1962 that Yugoslavia’s source of capital was “largely in the West.”

⁹⁸ V. I. Lenin, “Re The Monopoly of Foreign Trade” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXIII.

⁹⁹ Joseph Stalin, “Interview with the First American Labor Delegation” in *Works*, Vol. X, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, pp. 115-116.

Thirdly, Yugoslavia has become a base from which imperialism extracts raw materials.

In accordance with the Agreement Regarding Military Assistance, the Tito clique has since 1951 continually supplied the United States with large quantities of strategic raw materials. According to the *Statistical Yearbook of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia* of 1961, about half of Yugoslavia's exports of important metals, such as magnesium, lead, zinc and antimony, have gone to the United States since 1957.

Fourthly, the industrial enterprises of Yugoslavia have become assembly shops for Western monopoly capitalist companies.

Many major Yugoslav industries produce under licence from Western countries and are dependent on imports of semi-processed materials, parts, spare parts and semi-manufactured products. The production of these industries is under the control of Western monopoly capital.

In fact, many of the industrial products sold as home products in Yugoslavia are assembled from imported ready-made parts and have Yugoslav trademarks attached. *Vesnik u sredu* of April 25, 1962 said that "some of our industrial enterprises are becoming a special type of commercial organization, which does not produce but assembles, only sticking its own trademark on the products of others."

In these circumstances, Yugoslavia has become an integral part of the world market of Western monopoly capital. In the financial and economic spheres it is tightly bound to the capitalist world market and has degenerated into a dependency of imperialism, and particularly of US imperialism.

When a socialist country sells out its independence and sovereign rights and becomes an imperialist appendage, the restoration of the capitalist system is the inevitable result.

The special road of building "socialism" by relying on U. S. aid advertised by the Tito clique is nothing but a road for turning a socialist system into a capitalist system to meet the needs of imperialism, a road of degeneration from an independent country into a semi-colony.

Khrushchev insists that this dependency of US imperialism is "building socialism." This is fantastic. A self-styled socialism having US aid as its trademark is a new variety to be added to the bogus brands of socialism, which were criticized by Marx, Engels and Lenin, and this is presumably a great contribution on the part of Tito and Khrushchev in "creatively developing the theory of Marxism-Leninism."

A COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY SPECIAL DETACHMENT OF US IMPERIALISM

Judging by the counter-revolutionary role played by the Tito clique in international relations and by its reactionary foreign policy, Yugoslavia is still farther from being a socialist country.

In the international arena the Tito clique is a special detachment of US imperialism for sabotaging the world revolution.

By setting the example of restoring capitalism in Yugoslavia, the Tito clique is helping US imperialism to push its policy of “peaceful evolution” inside the socialist countries.

Under the signboard of a socialist country, the Tito clique is frantically opposing and disrupting the socialist camp and serving as an active agent in the anti-Chinese campaign.

Under the cover of non-alignment and active coexistence, the Tito clique is trying to wreck the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America and is serving US neo-colonialism.

The Tito clique spares no effort to prettify US imperialism and benumb the people of the world in their struggle against the imperialist policies of war and aggression.

Under the pretext of opposing “Stalinism,” the Tito clique is peddling revisionist poison everywhere and opposing revolution by the people in all countries.

The Tito clique has invariably played the role of a lackey of US imperialism in the major international events of the past ten years and more.

1. The revolution in Greece. On July 10, 1949 Tito closed the border between Yugoslavia and Greece against the Greek people’s guerrillas. At the same time, he allowed the Greek fascist royalist troops to pass through Yugoslav territory in order to attack the guerrillas from the rear. In this way the Tito clique helped the US-British imperialists to strangle the Greek people’s revolution.

2. The Korean War. In a statement issued on September 6, 1950, Edvard Kardelj, who was then foreign minister, brazenly slandered the Korean people’s just war of resistance to aggression and defended US imperialism. On December 1, speaking at the UN Security Council, the representative of the Tito clique attacked China for its “active interference in the Korean War.” The Tito clique also voted in the United Nations for the embargo on China and Korea.

3. The Vietnamese people's war of liberation. On the eve of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China in April 1954, the Tito clique violently slandered the just struggle of the Vietnamese people, asserting that they were being used by Moscow and Beijing "as a card in their post-war policy of cold war."¹⁰⁰

They said of the Vietnamese people's great battle to liberate Dien Bien Phu that it was "not a gesture of goodwill."¹⁰¹

4. Subversion against Albania. The Tito clique has been carrying on subversive activities and armed provocations against socialist Albania for a long time. It has engineered four major cases of treason in 1944, 1948, 1956 and 1960. Its armed provocations on the Yugoslav-Albanian border numbered more than 470 from 1948 to 1958. In 1960 the Tito clique and the Greek reactionaries planned an armed attack on Albania in co-ordination with the US Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean.

5. The counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary. The Tito clique played a shameful role of an interventionist provocateur in the Hungarian counter-revolutionary rebellion in October 1956. After the outbreak of the rebellion, Tito published a letter supporting the counter-revolutionary measures of the traitor Nagy. On November 3 the Tito clique bade Nagy seek asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy in Hungary. In a speech on November 11, Tito characterized the counter-revolutionary rebellion as resistance by "progressives" and impudently questioned whether the "course of Yugoslavia" or the "course of Stalinism" would win.

6. The Middle Eastern events. In 1958 troops were sent by US imperialism to occupy Lebanon and by British imperialism to occupy Jordan. There arose a world-wide wave of protest demanding the immediate withdrawal of the US and British troops. At the emergency session of the UN General Assembly on the Middle Eastern situation, Koča Popović, State Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia, said that "it is not a question of whether we insist on condemning or approving the actions taken by the United States and Great Britain." He advocated intervention by the United Nations, an organization which is under the control of US imperialism.

7. The event in the Taiwan Straits. In the autumn of 1958, the Chinese People's Liberation Army shelled Quemoy in order to counter the US impe-

¹⁰⁰ *Borba*, April 23, 1954.

¹⁰¹ *Borba*, May 8, 1954.

rialist provocations in the Taiwan Straits and to punish the Chiang Kai-shek gang, which is a US imperialist lackey. The Tito clique maligned China's just struggle as "a danger to the whole world"¹⁰² and "harmful to peace."¹⁰³

8. The U-2 incident. In 1960 the United States sent a U-2 spy plane to intrude into the Soviet Union and sabotaged the four-power summit conference scheduled to be held in Paris. On May 17 Tito issued a statement attacking the correct stand then taken by the Soviet Government as creating "such large-scale disputes."

9. The Japanese people's patriotic struggle against the United States. In June 1960 the Japanese people waged a just and patriotic struggle against the United States, which was unprecedented in its scale. But the Tito clique defended US imperialism, saying that the US occupation of Japan "promoted the democratization of political life in Japan."¹⁰⁴ Subsequently, it attacked the statement of Inejiro Asanuma, the late President of the Japanese Socialist Party, that "US imperialism is the common enemy of the Japanese and Chinese peoples," accusing him of "standing for an extremist line."¹⁰⁵

10. The struggle of the Indonesian people. The Tito clique tried to sabotage the Indonesian people's struggle against imperialism. It engaged in base activities in an effort to prevent the establishment of a "Nasakom" cabinet in Indonesia, that is, a government of national unity comprising the nationalists, religious circles and the Communists.

11. The Congo event. In the summer of 1960, when US imperialism carried out armed aggression in the Congo under the flag of the United Nations, the Tito clique not only voted for US imperialism in the United Nations but, in accordance with the desire of US imperialism, sent air force personnel to the Congo to take a direct part in the bloody suppression of the Congolese people.

12. The Laotian question. When US imperialism stepped up its intervention in Laos in January 1961, the Tito clique spread the view that the United States "is really concerned for the peace and neutralization of Laos."¹⁰⁶ When US imperialism engineered political assassinations and armed conflicts in

¹⁰² *Slobodni Dom*, September 4, 1958.

¹⁰³ *Slovenski Porocevalec*, September 9, 1958.

¹⁰⁴ *Komunist*, Belgrade, June 2, 1960.

¹⁰⁵ *Foreign Political Bulletin*, February 1, 1962.

¹⁰⁶ *Borba*, January 13, 1961.

Laos in May 1963, the Tito clique attacked the Laotian patriotic forces for “putting all the blame on the United States.”¹⁰⁷

13. The US Alliance for Progress program. In August 1961 the United States forced various Latin American countries to sign the Alliance for Progress program, which was a new US imperialist instrument for the enslavement of the Latin American people. This program of aggression was strongly opposed by the Latin American people but was praised by the Tito clique as “meeting in a large measure the requirements of the Latin American countries.”¹⁰⁸

14. The Sino-Indian border conflict. Ever since the Indian reactionaries created tension on the Sino-Indian border in 1959, the Tito clique has consistently supported the expansionism, aggression and provocations of the Indian reactionaries against China. It openly spread the lie that “the demarcation of the boundary was already completed at the beginning of the present century and put into the shape of the well-known McMahon Line,”¹⁰⁹ and did its best to confuse right and wrong, making the slander that China “permits itself to revise its border with India willfully and by force”¹¹⁰ and “committed aggression” against India.¹¹¹

15. The Cuban revolution and the Caribbean crisis. The Tito clique has made numerous comments attacking Cuba, saying that Cuba “believes only in revolution”¹¹² and that the Cuban revolution is “not so much a model as an exception to the road of revolution.”¹¹³ During the Caribbean crisis in the autumn of 1962, the Tito clique defended US imperialist aggression, saying that “the difficulties started when the Cuban revolution trod on the pet corns of the US companies,”¹¹⁴ and that “if it is said that the United States was irritated by the establishment of rocket bases in Cuba, in its close neighborhood, that would be understandable.”¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁷ *Politika*, May 5, 1963.

¹⁰⁸ *Komunist*, Belgrade, August 17, 1961.

¹⁰⁹ *Rad*, September 12, 1959.

¹¹⁰ *Borba*, December 26, 1960.

¹¹¹ *Politika*, September 3, 1959.

¹¹² *The Rebellion of Cuba*, Belgrade, November 1962.

¹¹³ *Politika*, January 1, 1963.

¹¹⁴ *Komunist*, Belgrade, September 13, 1962.

¹¹⁵ *Politika*, November 13, 1962.

From all this, people cannot fail to see that for the past ten years and more the Tito clique has desperately opposed the socialist countries, tried to sabotage the national liberation movement, maligned the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of the people in all countries and actively served imperialism, and especially US imperialism.

Khrushchev has said repeatedly that there is “unanimity” and “accord” between the leadership of the CPSU and the Tito clique in their positions on international problems.¹¹⁶ Well, then, we would like to ask whether or not there is unanimity or accord between your activities and the counter-revolutionary crimes of the Tito clique. Please answer, if you have the courage.

THE DEGENERATION OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT INTO THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE BOURGEOISIE

In the final analysis, the fact that capitalism has swamped Yugoslavia in both town and country, the degeneration of an economy owned by the whole people into a state capitalist economy and the decline of Yugoslavia into a dependency of US imperialism are all due to the degeneration of the Party and state power in Yugoslavia.

Fighting heroically against the German and Italian fascist aggressors during World War II, the Communist Party and people of Yugoslavia overthrew the reactionary rule of imperialism and its lackey in Yugoslavia and established the people’s democratic state power under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Not long afterwards, the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist Party betrayed Marxism-Leninism and embarked on the path of revisionism, bringing about the gradual degeneration of the party and state power in Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslav Communist Party had a glorious tradition of revolutionary struggles. The betrayal of the Tito clique met first of all with strong resistance inside the Party. To suppress this resistance, the Tito clique used its power to expel and purge from the Party a great number of Communists loyal to Marxism-Leninism. In the period from 1948 to 1952 alone, more than 200,000 party members, or half the original membership of the Yugoslav Communist Party, were expelled. Taking action against the so-called Cominform elements, it arrested and slaughtered large numbers of Marxist-Leninists

¹¹⁶ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at a Mass Rally in Split, Yugoslavia, August 24, 1963.

and revolutionary cadres and people, the number of Communists and active revolutionaries arrested and imprisoned alone exceeding thirty thousand. At the same time, the Tito clique opened the door wide to counter-revolutionaries, bourgeois elements, all kinds of anti-socialist elements and careerists seeking position and wealth through their membership cards. In November 1952 the Tito clique declared that “the appellation party no longer fits” and changed the name, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, into the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. In violation of the will of all honest Communists in Yugoslavia, it changed the character of the Yugoslav Communist Party as the vanguard of the proletariat and made the LCY the virtual instrument for maintaining its dictatorial rule.

In the socialist countries, state power is under the leadership of communist political parties. With the degeneration of a communist into a bourgeois political party, state power inevitably degenerates from the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

The state power of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Yugoslavia was the fruit of the protracted and heroic struggle of the Yugoslav people. But as the Tito clique turned renegade, this state power changed its nature.

The Tito clique has declared, “The means of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., of the socialist state system, become increasingly unnecessary.”¹¹⁷

But is there no dictatorship in Yugoslavia any longer? Yes, there is. While the dictatorship of the proletariat is indeed no more, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie not only exists, but is a brutal fascist dictatorship at that.

The Tito regime has set up many fascist prisons and concentration camps, where tens of thousands of revolutionaries have been tortured to death by every kind of inhuman punishment. At the same time, the Tito regime has pardoned large numbers of counter-revolutionaries and traitors in the anti-fascist war. Replying to a United Press correspondent on January 7, 1951, Tito admitted that 11,000 political prisoners had been pardoned in Yugoslavia. On March 13, 1962 another 150,000 counter-revolutionaries living in exile abroad were pardoned. The dictatorship over these enemies of the people was indeed abolished and they have obtained “democracy.” Whatever fine-sounding phrases the Tito clique may use, its “democracy” is

¹¹⁷ Edvard Kardelj, “The New Constitution of Socialist Yugoslavia,” *Borba*, September 29, 1962.

only a democracy for the small number of old and new bourgeois elements; for the working people it is out-and-out dictatorship. The Tito clique has transformed the revolutionary state machinery, which was built up to suppress the small minority of exploiters, into a state machinery for suppressing the proletariat and the broad masses.

The degeneration of the state power in Yugoslavia occurred not through the overthrow of the original state power by violence and the establishment of a new state power, but through “peaceful evolution.” In appearance, the same people remain in power, but in essence these people no longer represent the interests of the workers, peasants and the working people but those of imperialism and the old and new bourgeoisie of Yugoslavia.

Utilizing state power and controlling the economic lifeline of the country, the Tito clique exploited the Yugoslav working people to the utmost extent and brought into being a bureaucrat-capitalist class. Being dependent on US imperialism, this class is strongly comprador in character and is also a comprador capitalist class. The state power controlled by the Tito clique is that of the dictatorship of the bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie.

The above facts show from various aspects that the policy pursued by the Tito regime is one of restoring and developing capitalism, namely, of reducing Yugoslavia to a semi-colony or a dependency.

The degeneration of the state power in Yugoslavia has led to the destruction of the socialist economic system and the restoration of a capitalist economic system. When a new bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie has gradually come into being with the re-establishment of the capitalist economic system in a new form, it demands the intensification of the bourgeois dictatorship and the development of a political system suited to the capitalist economic system so as to consolidate its ruling position.

This is how the process from the degeneration of the party and state power to the restoration of capitalism in the entire social and economic system has been realized step by step in Yugoslavia. The process of degeneration has gone on for fifteen years. This is the record of how a socialist state “peacefully evolves” into a capitalist state.

The Tito clique maintains its rule in Yugoslavia by relying on US imperialist support, the state machine of the dictatorship of the bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie, the labor aristocracy bought by it, and the rich peasants in the countryside. At the same time, it uses various cunning means to disguise its reactionary features and hoodwink the people. But its reactionary policies

are extremely unpopular. The degeneration of the socialist state into a capitalist state, the degeneration of an independent country into a semi-colony or a dependency of imperialism, runs counter to the basic interests of the Yugoslav people, and cannot but be opposed by all the honest Communists and the overwhelming majority of the people of Yugoslavia.

We are in deep sympathy with the people and Communists of Yugoslavia in their present predicament. Although the Tito clique can ride roughshod over the people for a time, we are confident that whatever high-handed measures and whatever tricks of deception it may resort to, no ruling group will come to a good end once it is against the people. The Tito clique is of course no exception. The deceived people will gradually wake up in the end. The people and Communists of Yugoslavia who have a glorious history will not submit to the renegade Tito clique for ever. The future of the Yugoslav people is bright.

THE PRINCIPLED STAND OF THE CPC ON THE QUESTION OF YUGOSLAVIA

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU asserts that for a time “the CPC leaders had no doubts as to the nature of the socialist system in Yugoslavia,” and that now the Chinese leaders have “changed their position on the Yugoslavian question so drastically.”

True, Yugoslavia was once a socialist state. For a time the country advanced along the path of socialism.

But soon after, owing to the Tito clique’s betrayal, the Yugoslav social system began to degenerate step by step.

In 1954, when Khrushchev proposed to improve relations with Yugoslavia, we agreed to treat it as a fraternal socialist country for the purpose of winning it back to the path of socialism and watching how the Tito clique would develop.

We did not entertain very much hope for the Tito clique even then. In its letter of June 10, 1954 to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Central Committee of the CPC pointed out that the fact should be taken into account that as the leaders of Yugoslavia had already gone quite far in their dealings with imperialism, they might reject our effort to win it over and refuse to return to the path of socialism; “but even though this should occur, it would not involve any political loss to the camp of peace, democracy and

socialism—on the contrary, it would further expose the hypocrisy of the Yugoslav leaders before the people of Yugoslavia and of the world.”

Unfortunately, our words have proved all too true! Indeed the Tito clique has flatly rejected our effort to win it over and gone farther and farther along the path of revisionism.

After it refused to sign the 1957 Declaration, the Tito clique put forward its out-and-out revisionist program in 1958 and set this banner of modern revisionism against the 1957 Declaration, which is the common program acknowledged by all communist and workers' parties. The process of restoring capitalism in Yugoslavia has been realized step by step. And internationally, the Tito clique is serving more and more energetically as a counter-revolutionary special detachment of US imperialism.

In these circumstances, the attitude every Marxist-Leninist party should take towards the Tito clique is no longer the one it should take towards a fraternal party or a fraternal country, nor should it be that of winning the Tito clique over, but it should be one of thoroughly exposing and firmly combating this gang of renegades. The 1960 Statement has given its clear conclusion on this point.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU has deliberately evaded the series of important events which occurred after the meeting of the fraternal parties in November 1957 and also the conclusions unanimously reached at the meeting of the fraternal parties in 1960, and tries to defend the erroneous stand of the leadership of the CPSU by quoting a sentence from the editorial on Yugoslavia in the *People's Daily* of September 12, 1957. This is futile.

The facts prove that our position with regard to the Tito clique conforms with reality, is a principled position, and is in accord with the common agreement of the meeting of the fraternal parties in 1960. On the other hand, the leaders of the CPSU have tried in a thousand and one ways to reverse the verdict on the Tito clique, which testifies to their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, their abandonment of the 1960 Statement, and their rendering of assistance to the US imperialists and their lackeys in deceiving the people of Yugoslavia and of the whole world.

HAS TITO “REMOVED HIS ERRORS?” OR DOES KHRUSHCHEV REGARD TITO AS HIS TEACHER?

Khrushchev says that the Yugoslav leaders have removed very much of what was considered erroneous. But the Titoites do not admit that they have committed any errors, much less removed them. The Titoites say that they have “no need” to correct any error¹¹⁸ and that “it would just be a waste of time”¹¹⁹ and “simply superfluous and ridiculous” to expect them to do so.¹²⁰

Let us look at the facts. Have the Titoites changed their revisionist program? No, they have not. Have they accepted the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement? No, they have not. Have they changed their revisionist domestic and foreign policies? Again, no.

The new constitution adopted by the Yugoslav Federal People’s Assembly in April 1963 most clearly shows that the Tito clique has not in the least changed its revisionist stand. The constitution is the legal embodiment of the out-and-out revisionist program of the Tito clique. Edvard Kardelj said in his report on the draft of the new constitution that it is the “legal-political and organizational embodiment” of the concepts of the program of the LCY.

Khrushchev is warmly fraternizing with the Tito clique not because it has corrected any of its errors but because he is following in Tito’s footsteps.

Consider the following facts:

1. Tito denounces Stalin in order to oppose Marxism-Leninism in its very fundamentals. Khrushchev completely negates Stalin for the same purpose.
2. Both Tito and Khrushchev repudiate the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism, both malign as dogmatists the Chinese and other Communists who firmly uphold Marxism-Leninism, and both describe their own revision of Marxism-Leninism as a “creative development” of Marxism-Leninism.
3. Both Tito and Khrushchev laud the chieftains of US imperialism. Tito says that Eisenhower “is a man who persistently

¹¹⁸ J. B. Tito, Speech at the Belgrade Railway Station, December 20, 1962.

¹¹⁹ J. B. Tito, Speech at the Seventh Congress of the LCY, April 1958.

¹²⁰ J. B. Tito, Speech at the Belgrade Railway Station, December 20, 1962.

defends peace,”¹²¹ and that Kennedy’s effort “will be helpful to the improvement of international relations and to the peaceful settlement of pressing world problems.”¹²² Khrushchev says that Eisenhower “has a sincere desire for peace,”¹²³ and that Kennedy “shows solicitude for the preservation of peace.”¹²⁴

4. Both Tito and Khrushchev play up the horrors of nuclear war in order to intimidate the people of the world into abandoning revolutionary struggle. Tito says that once a nuclear war breaks out, it will be the “annihilation of mankind.”¹²⁵ Likewise, Khrushchev says that once a nuclear war breaks out, “we will destroy our Noah’s Ark—the globe.”¹²⁶
5. Both Tito and Khrushchev preach that a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars can be brought into being while imperialism still exists.
6. The Tito clique proclaims that “active peaceful coexistence” is the cornerstone of Yugoslavia’s foreign policy,¹²⁷ while Khrushchev declares that peaceful coexistence is the “general line of the foreign policy” of the Soviet Union.¹²⁸
7. Both Tito and Khrushchev proclaim that the possibility of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism has increased. The Tito clique says that “mankind is irresistibly entering a long way into the era of socialism through different ways.”¹²⁹ Khrushchev says that the road of the October Revolution can be replaced by the “parliamentary road.”

¹²¹ J. B. Tito, Talk with a *New York Times* Commentator, February 28, 1958.

¹²² J. B. Tito, Message of Greetings to J. F. Kennedy, *Borba*, January 21, 1961.

¹²³ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, May 1960.

¹²⁴ N. S. Khrushchev, Letter to J. F. Kennedy, October 27, 1962.

¹²⁵ J. B. Tito, Report to the Session of the Federal People’s Assembly of Yugoslavia, April 19, 1958.

¹²⁶ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at a Meeting of the Austro-Soviet Society, July 2, 1960.

¹²⁷ Koča Popović, Report on Foreign Policy to the Session of the Federal People’s Assembly of Yugoslavia, *Borba*, February 27, 1957.

¹²⁸ N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the 20th Congress of the CPSU, February 1956.

¹²⁹ Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

8. Tito advocates the introduction of “political and economic integration”¹³⁰ of the world through “peaceful competition.” Khrushchev also advocates “all-round cooperation” with imperialism through “peaceful economic competition.”
9. The Tito clique sabotages the national liberation movement and national liberation wars in every way. Khrushchev opposes the national liberation movement and national liberation wars on the pretext that “any small ‘local war’ might spark off the conflagration of a world war.”¹³¹
10. The Tito clique has renounced the dictatorship of the proletariat. Under the slogan of “the state of the whole people,” Khrushchev also renounces the dictatorship of the proletariat.
11. The Tito clique denies that the Communist Party should be the vanguard of the working class. Likewise, Khrushchev says that the CPSU “has become a party of the entire people”¹³²
12. The Tito clique, flaunting the “non-bloc” label, is opposing the socialist camp. Khrushchev also says that “expressions like blocs etc., are temporary phenomena.”¹³³ They both want to liquidate the socialist camp.

From these facts one must conclude that, both in domestic and foreign policy, Khrushchev really regards Tito as his teacher and is sliding down the path of revisionism hard on Tito’s heels.

Khrushchev has abandoned Marxism-Leninism, scrapped the 1960 Statement and wallowed in the mire with the renegade Tito clique, in complete violation of the interests of the Soviet Union, the Soviet people and the people of the whole world. This will not be tolerated by the great Soviet people,

¹³⁰ J. B. Tito, Replies to Questions by *Washington Post* Correspondent Drew Pearson, *Borba*, August 12, 1962.

¹³¹ N. S. Khrushchev, Statement at the Press Conference in Vienna, July 8, 1960.

¹³² N. S. Khrushchev, “On the Program of the CPSU,” delivered at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, October 1961.

¹³³ N. S. Khrushchev, Interview with Foreign Correspondents at Brioni in Yugoslavia, August 28, 1963.

the overwhelming majority of the members of the CPSU and cadres at various levels, all of whom have a glorious revolutionary tradition.

The great Soviet people and the membership of the CPSU will never agree with Khrushchev's collusion with the Tito clique in opposition to the fraternal parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism.

The great Soviet people and the membership of the CPSU will never agree with Khrushchev's collusion with the Tito clique and collaboration with imperialism in opposing socialist China, Albania and other fraternal countries and in disrupting the socialist camp.

The great Soviet people and the membership of the CPSU will never agree with Khrushchev's collusion with the Tito clique and collaboration with the reactionaries of all countries in opposition to the people of the world and to revolution.

The great Soviet people and the membership of the CPSU will never agree with Khrushchev's efforts to follow the example of the Yugoslav revisionists, change the nature of the party and the state and pave the way for the restoration of capitalism.

Khrushchev has caused dark clouds to overcast the Soviet Union, the first socialist country in the world. But this can only be an interlude in the history of the CPSU and of the Soviet Union. People who are deceived and hoodwinked for a time will gradually wake up in the end. History has confirmed, and will continue to confirm, that whoever wants to turn back the Soviet people in their advance is like the grasshopper in the fable which wanted to stop the chariot. He will never succeed in his aim.

BRIEF CONCLUSION

The restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia provides a new historical lesson to the international communist movement.

This lesson shows us that when the working class has seized power, struggle continues between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, struggle for victory continues between the two roads of capitalism and socialism, and there is a danger that capitalism may be restored. Yugoslavia presents a typical example of the restoration of capitalism.

It shows us that not only is it possible for a working-class party to fall under the control of a labor aristocracy, degenerate into a bourgeois party and become a flunkey of imperialism before it seizes power, but even after it seizes power it is possible for a working-class party to fall under the control

of new bourgeois elements, degenerate into a bourgeois party and become a flunkey of imperialism. The League of Communists of Yugoslavia typifies such degeneration.

It shows us that the restoration of capitalism in a socialist country can be achieved not necessarily through a counterrevolutionary *coup d'état* or armed imperialist invasion and that it can also be achieved through the degradation of the leading group in that country. The easiest way to capture a fortress is from within. Yugoslavia provides a typical case in point.

It shows us that revisionism is the product of imperialist policy. Old-line revisionism arose as a result of the imperialist policy of buying over and fostering a labor aristocracy. Modern revisionism has arisen in the same way. Sparing no cost, imperialism has now extended the scope of its operations and is buying over leading groups in socialist countries and pursues through them its desired policy of "peaceful evolution." US imperialism regards Yugoslavia as the "bellwether" because it has set an example in this respect.

The restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia will make all Marxist-Leninists see better and enable people to realize more keenly the necessity and urgency of combating modern revisionism.

So long as imperialism exists, there is apparently no grounds for saying that the danger of the restoration of capitalism in the socialist countries has been eliminated.

The leaders of the CPSU proclaim that they have already eliminated the danger of the restoration of capitalism and are building communism. If this were true, it would of course be heartening. But we see that in fact they are imitating Yugoslavia in every way and have taken a most dangerous road. This deeply worries and pains us.

Out of our warm love for the great Soviet Union and the great CPSU, we would like sincerely to appeal to the leaders of the CPSU: Comrades and friends! Do not follow the Yugoslav road. Turn back at once. Or it will be too late!

Apologists of Neo-Colonialism?

COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
CPSU (IV)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE *PEOPLE'S DAILY* AND THE *RED FLAG*

October 22, 1963

Source: *Red Flag* (*Hongqi*), No. 20, 1963, pp. 1-16.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, October 25, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 43, pp. 6-15.

A great revolutionary storm has spread through Asia, Africa and Latin America since World War II. Independence has been proclaimed in more than fifty Asian and African countries. China, Viet Nam, Korea and Cuba have taken the road of socialism. The face of Asia, Africa and Latin America has undergone a tremendous change.

While revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies suffered serious setbacks after World War I owing to suppression by the imperialists and their lackeys, the situation after World War II is fundamentally different. The imperialists are no longer able to extinguish the prairie fire of national liberation. Their old colonial system is fast disintegrating. Their rear has become a front of raging anti-imperialist struggles. Imperialist rule has been overthrown in some colonial and dependent countries, and in others it has suffered heavy blows and is tottering. This inevitably weakens and shakes the rule of imperialism in the metropolitan countries.

The victories of the people's revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America, together with the rise of the socialist camp, sound a triumphant paean to our day and age.

The storm of the people's revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America requires every political force in the world to take a stand. This mighty revolutionary storm makes the imperialists and colonialists tremble and the revolutionary people of the world rejoice. The imperialists and colonialists say, "Terrible, terrible!" The revolutionary people say, "Fine, fine!" The imperialists and colonialists say, "It is rebellion, which is forbidden." The revolutionary people say, "It is revolution, which is the people's right and an inexorable current of history."

An important line of demarcation between the Marxist-Leninists and the modern revisionists is the attitude taken towards this extremely sharp issue of contemporary world politics. The Marxist-Leninists firmly side with the oppressed nations and actively support the national liberation movement. The modern revisionists in fact side with the imperialists and colonialists and repudiate and oppose the national liberation movement in every possible way.

In their words, the leaders of the CPSU dare not completely discard the slogans of support for the national liberation movement, and at times, for the sake of their own interests, they even take certain measures which create the appearance of support. But if we probe to the essence and consider their views and policies over a number of years, we see clearly that their attitude towards the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America is a passive or scornful or negative one, and that they serve as apologists for neo-colonialism.

In the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU of July 14, 1963 and in a number of articles and statements, the comrades of the CPSU have worked hard at defending their wrong views and attacking the Chinese Communist Party on the question of the national liberation movement. But the sole outcome is to confirm the anti-Marxist-Leninist and anti-revolutionary stand of the leaders of the CPSU on the subject.

Let us now look at the theory and practice of the leaders of the CPSU on the question of the national liberation movement.

ABOLITION OF THE TASK OF COMBATING IMPERIALISM AND COLONIALISM

Victories of great historic significance have already been won by the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America. This no one can deny. But can anyone assert that the task of combating imperialism and colonialism and their agents has been completed by the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America?

Our answer is, no. This fighting task is far from completed.

However, the leaders of the CPSU frequently spread the view that colonialism has disappeared or is disappearing from the present-day world. They emphasize that “there are fifty million people on earth still groaning under

colonial rule,”¹³⁴ that the remnants of colonialism are to be found only in such places as Portuguese Angola and Mozambique in Africa, and that the abolition of colonial rule has already entered the “final phase.”¹³⁵

What are the facts?

Consider, first, the situation in Asia and Africa. There a whole group of countries have declared their independence. But many of these countries have not completely shaken off imperialist and colonial control and enslavement and remain objects of imperialist plunder and aggression as well as arenas of contention between the old and new colonialists. In some, the old colonialists have changed into neo-colonialists and retain their colonial rule through their trained agents. In others, the wolf has left by the front door, but the tiger has entered through the back door, the old colonialism being replaced by the new, more powerful and more dangerous U. S. colonialism. The peoples of Asia and Africa are seriously menaced by the tentacles of neo-colonialism, represented by U. S. imperialism.

Next, listen to the voice of the people of Latin America. The Second Havana Declaration says, “Latin America today is under a more ferocious imperialism, more powerful and ruthless than the Spanish colonial empire.”

It adds:

Since the end of the Second World War... North American investments exceed 10 billion dollars. Latin America moreover supplies cheap raw materials and pays high prices for manufactured articles.

It says further:

There flows from Latin America to the United States a constant torrent of money: some \$4,000 per minute, \$5 million per day, \$2 billion per year, \$10 billion each five years. For each thousand dollars which leaves us, one dead body remains. \$1,000 per death, that is the price of what is called imperialism.

The facts are clear. After World War II the imperialists have certainly not given up colonialism, but have merely adopted a new form, neo-colonialism. An important characteristic of such neo-colonialism is that the imperialists

¹³⁴ Speech of Mirzo Tursunzoda, Leader of the Soviet Delegation, at the Third Afro-Asian People’s Solidarity Conference, February 5, 1963.

¹³⁵ N. S. Khrushchev, “Report on the Program of the CPSU,” delivered at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, October 1961.

have been forced to change their old style of direct colonial rule in some areas and to adopt a new style of colonial rule and exploitation by relying on the agents they have selected and trained. The imperialists headed by the United States enslave or control the colonial countries and countries which have already declared their independence by organizing military blocs, setting up military bases, establishing “federations” or “communities,” and fostering puppet regimes. By means of economic “aid” or other forms, they retain these countries as markets for their goods, sources of raw material and outlets for their export of capital, plunder the riches and suck the blood of the people of these countries. Moreover, they use the United Nations as an important tool for interfering in the internal affairs of such countries and for subjecting them to military, economic and cultural aggression. When they are unable to continue their rule over these countries by “peaceful” means, they engineer military coups d’etat, carry out subversion or even resort to direct armed intervention and aggression.

The United States is most energetic and cunning in promoting neo-colonialism. With this weapon, the US imperialists are trying hard to grab the colonies and spheres of influence of other imperialists and to establish world domination.

This neo-colonialism is a more pernicious and sinister form of colonialism.

We would like to ask the leaders of the CPSU, under such circumstances how can it be said that the abolition of colonial rule has already entered the “final phase?”

In trying to bolster up such falsehoods, the leaders of the CPSU have the temerity to seek help from the 1960 Statement. They say, does not the 1960 Statement mention the vigorous process of disintegration of the colonial system? But this thesis about the rapid disintegration of old colonialism cannot possibly help their argument about the disappearance of colonialism. The Statement clearly points out that “the United States is the mainstay of colonialism today,” that “the imperialists, headed by the USA, make desperate efforts to preserve colonial exploitation of the peoples of the former colonies by new methods and in new forms” and that they “try to retain their hold on the levers of economic control and political influence in Asian, African and Latin American countries.” In these phrases the Statement exposes just what the leadership of the CPSU is trying so hard to cover up.

The leaders of the CPSU have also created the theory that the national liberation movement has entered upon a “new stage” having economic tasks as its core. Their argument is that, whereas “formerly, the struggle was carried on mainly in the political sphere,” today the economic question has become the “central task” and “the basic link in the further development of the revolution.”¹³⁶

The national liberation movement has entered a new stage. But this is by no means the kind of “new stage” described by the leadership of the CPSU. In the new stage, the level of political consciousness of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples has risen higher than ever and the revolutionary movement is surging forward with unprecedented intensity. They urgently demand the thorough elimination of the forces of imperialism and its lackeys in their own countries and strive for complete political and economic independence. The primary and most urgent task facing these countries is still the further development of the struggle against imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys. This struggle is still being waged fiercely in the political, economic, military, cultural, ideological and other spheres. And the struggles in all these spheres still find their most concentrated expression in political struggle, which often unavoidably develops into armed struggle when the imperialists resort to direct or indirect armed suppression. It is important for the newly independent countries to develop their independent economy. But this task must never be separated from the struggle against imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys.

Like “the disappearance of colonialism,” this theory of a “new stage” advocated by the leaders of the CPSU is clearly intended to whitewash the aggression against and plunder of Asia, Africa and Latin America by neo-colonialism, as represented by the United States, to cover up the sharp contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations and to paralyze the revolutionary struggle of the people of these continents.

According to this theory of theirs, the fight against imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys is, of course, no longer necessary, for colonialism is disappearing and economic development has become the central task of the national liberation movement. Does it not follow that the national liberation movement can be done away with altogether? Therefore, the kind of “new stage” described by the leaders of the CPSU, in which econom-

¹³⁶ “To the Detriment of the Struggle of the Peoples,” *Pravda*, September 17, 1963.

ic tasks are in the center of the picture, is clearly nothing but one of no opposition to imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys, a stage in which the national liberation movement is no longer desired.

PRESCRIPTIONS FOR ABOLISHING THE REVOLUTION OF THE OPPRESSED NATIONS

In line with their erroneous theories the leaders of the CPSU have sedulously worked out a number of nostrums for all the ills of the oppressed nations. Let us examine them.

The first prescription is labelled peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition.

The leaders of the CPSU constantly attribute the great post-war victories of the national liberation movement won by the Asian, African and Latin American peoples to what they call “peaceful coexistence” and “peaceful competition.” The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU says:

In conditions of peaceful coexistence, new important victories have been scored in recent years in the class struggle of the proletariat and in the struggle of the peoples for national freedom.

The world revolutionary process is developing successfully.

They also say that the national liberation movement is developing under conditions of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems and of economic competition between the two opposing social systems¹³⁷ and that peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition “assist the unfolding of a process of liberation on the part of peoples fighting to free themselves from the economic domination of foreign monopolies,”¹³⁸ and can deliver “a crushing blow” to “the entire system of capitalist relationship.”¹³⁹

All socialist countries should practice the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. But peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition cannot replace the revolutionary struggles of

¹³⁷ “The General Line of the International Communist Movement and the Schismatic Platform of the Chinese Leaders,” editorial board article in *Kommunist*, Moscow, No. 14, 1963.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³⁹ B. N. Ponomaryov, “Some Problems of the Revolutionary Movement,” *World Marxist Review*, No. 12, 1962.

the people. The victory of the national revolution of all colonies and dependent countries must be won primarily through the revolutionary struggle of their own masses, which can never be replaced by that of any other countries.

The leaders of the CPSU hold that the victories of the national liberation revolution are not due primarily to the revolutionary struggles of the masses, and that the people cannot emancipate themselves, but must wait for the natural collapse of imperialism through peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition. In fact, this is equivalent to telling the oppressed nations to put up with imperialist plunder and enslavement for ever, and not to rise up in resistance and revolution.

The second prescription is labelled aid to backward countries.

The leaders of the CPSU boast of the role played by their economic aid to the newly independent countries. Comrade Khrushchev has said that such aid can enable these countries “to avoid the danger of a new enslavement,” and that “it stimulates their progress and contributes to the normal development and even acceleration of those internal processes which may take these countries onto the highway leading to socialism.”¹⁴⁰

It is necessary and important for the socialist countries to give the newly independent countries economic aid on the basis of internationalism. But in no case can it be said that their national independence and social progress are due solely to the economic aid they receive from the socialist countries and not mainly to the revolutionary struggles of their own people.

To speak plainly, the policy and the purpose of the leaders of the CPSU in their aid to newly independent countries in recent years are open to suspicion. They often take an attitude of great-power chauvinism and national egoism in matters concerning aid to newly independent countries, harm the economic and political interests of the receiving countries, and as a result discredit the socialist countries. As for their aid to India, here their ulterior motives are especially clear. India tops the list of newly independent countries to which the Soviet Union gives economic aid. This aid is obviously intended to encourage the Nehru government in its policies directed against communism, against the people and against socialist countries. Even the US

¹⁴⁰ N. S. Khrushchev, “Vital Questions of the Development of the Socialist World System,” *World Marxist Review*, No. 9, 1962.

imperialists have stated that such Soviet aid “is very much to our [US] interest.”¹⁴¹

In addition, the leaders of the CPSU openly propose cooperation with US imperialism in “giving aid to the backward countries.” Khrushchev said in a speech in the United States in September 1959:

Your and our economic successes will be hailed by the whole world, which expects our two Great Powers to help the peoples who are centuries behind in their economic development to get on their feet more quickly.

Look! The mainstay of modern colonialism [namely, US imperialism] will help the oppressed nations “to get on their feet more quickly!” It is indeed astonishing that the leaders of the CPSU are not only willing but even proud to be the partners of the neo-colonialists.

The third prescription is labelled disarmament. Khrushchev has said:

Disarmament means disarming the war forces, abolishing militarism, ruling out armed interference in the internal affairs of any country, and doing away completely and finally with all forms of colonialism.¹⁴²

He has also said:

Disarmament would create proper conditions for a tremendous increase in the scale of assistance to the newly established national states. If a mere 8-10 percent of the 120,000 million dollars spent for military purposes throughout the world were turned to the purpose, it would be possible to end hunger, disease and illiteracy in the distressed areas of the globe within twenty years.¹⁴³

We have always maintained that the struggle for general disarmament should be carried on in order to expose and oppose imperialist arms expansion and war preparations. But one cannot possibly say that colonialism will be eliminated through disarmament.

¹⁴¹ W. A. Harriman, Radio and Television Interview, December 9, 1962.

¹⁴² N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, July 10, 1962.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

Khrushchev here sounds like a preacher. Downtrodden people of the world, you are blessed! If only you are patient, if only you wait until the imperialists lay down their arms, freedom will descend upon you. Wait until the imperialists show mercy, and the poverty-stricken areas of the world will become an earthly paradise flowing with milk and honey!...

This is not just the fostering of illusions, it is opium for the people.

The fourth prescription is labelled elimination of colonialism through the United Nations.

Khrushchev maintains that if the United Nations takes measures to uproot the colonial system, “the peoples who are now suffering the humiliation arising out of foreign domination, would acquire a clear and immediate prospect of peaceful liberation from foreign oppression.”¹⁴⁴

In a speech at the United Nations General Assembly in September 1960, Khrushchev asked, “Who, if not the United Nations Organization, should champion the abolition of the colonial system of government?”

This is a strange question to ask. According to Khrushchev, the revolutionary people of Asia, Africa and Latin America should not and cannot themselves eliminate colonialism, but must look to the United Nations for help.

At the United Nations General Assembly, Khrushchev also said:

This is why we appeal to the reason and far-sightedness of the peoples of the Western countries, to their governments and their representatives at this high assembly of the United Nations. Let us agree on measures for the abolition of the colonial system of government and thereby accelerate that natural historical process.

It is apparent that what he really means by looking to the United Nations for help is looking to the imperialists for help. The facts show that the United Nations, which is still under the control of the imperialists, can only defend and strengthen the rule of colonialism but can never abolish it.

In a word, the nostrums of the leaders of the CPSU for the national liberation movement have been concocted to make people believe that the imperialists will give up colonialism and bestow freedom and liberation upon the oppressed nations and peoples and that therefore all revolutionary theories,

¹⁴⁴ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the UN General Assembly, September 23, 1960.

demands and struggles are outmoded and unnecessary and should and must be abandoned.

OPPOSITION TO WARS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION

Although they talk about supporting the movements and wars of national liberation, the leaders of the CPSU have been trying by every means to make the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America abandon their revolutionary struggle, because they themselves are sorely afraid of the revolutionary storm.

The leaders of the CPSU have the famous “theory” that “even a tiny spark can cause a world conflagration”¹⁴⁵ and that a world war must necessarily be a thermonuclear war, which means the annihilation of mankind. Therefore, Khrushchev roars that “‘local wars’ in our time are very dangerous,”¹⁴⁶ and that “we will work hard... to put out the sparks that may set off the flames of war.”¹⁴⁷ Here Khrushchev makes no distinction between just and unjust wars and betrays the Communist stand of supporting just wars.

The history of the eighteen years since World War II has shown that wars of national liberation are unavoidable so long as the imperialists and their lackeys try to maintain their brutal rule by bayonets and use force to suppress the revolution of oppressed nations. These large-scale and small-scale revolutionary wars against the imperialists and their lackeys, which have never ceased, have hit hard at the imperialist forces of war, strengthened the forces defending world peace and effectively prevented the imperialists from realizing their plan of launching a world war. Frankly speaking, Khrushchev’s clamor about the need to “put out” the sparks of revolution for the sake of peace is an attempt to oppose revolution in the name of safeguarding peace.

Proceeding from these wrong views and policies, the leaders of the CPSU not only demand that the oppressed nations should abandon their revolutionary struggle for liberation and “peacefully coexist” with the imperialists and colonialists, but even side with imperialism and use a variety of methods to extinguish the sparks of revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

¹⁴⁵ N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, October 1959.

¹⁴⁶ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Press Conference in Vienna, July 8, 1960.

¹⁴⁷ N. S. Khrushchev, Replies to Questions by Newsmen at the US National Press Club in Washington, September 16, 1959.

Take the example of the Algerian people's war of national liberation. The leadership of the CPSU not only withheld support for a long period but actually took the side of French imperialism. Khrushchev used to treat Algeria's national independence as an "internal affair" of France. Speaking on the Algerian question on—October 3, 1955, he said, "I had and have in view, first of all, that the US does not interfere in the internal affairs of other states." Receiving a correspondent of *Le Figaro* on March 27, 1958, he said, "We do not want France to grow weaker, we want her to become still greater."

To curry favor with the French imperialists, the leaders of the CPSU did not dare to recognize the provisional government of the Republic of Algeria for a long time; not until the victory of the Algerian people's war of resistance against French aggression was a foregone conclusion and France was compelled to agree to Algerian independence did they hurriedly recognize Algeria. This unseemly attitude brought shame on the socialist countries. Yet the leaders of the CPSU glory in their shame and assert that the victory the Algerian people paid for with their blood should also be credited to the policy of "peaceful coexistence."

Again, let us examine the part played by the leaders of the CPSU in the Congo question. Not only did they refuse to give active support to the Congolese people's armed struggle against colonialism, but they were anxious to "co-operate" with US imperialism in putting out the spark in the Congo.

On July 13, 1960 the Soviet Union joined with the United States in voting for the Security Council resolution on the dispatch of UN forces to the Congo; thus it helped the US imperialists use the flag of the United Nations in their armed intervention in the Congo. The Soviet Union also provided the UN forces with means of transportation. In a cable to Kasavubu and Lumumba on July 15, Khrushchev said that "the United Nations Security Council has done a useful thing." Thereafter, the Soviet press kept up a stream of praise for the United Nations for "helping the government of the Congolese Republic to defend the independence and sovereignty of the country,"¹⁴⁸ and expressed the hope that the United Nations would adopt "resolute measures."¹⁴⁹ In its statements of August 21 and September 10,

¹⁴⁸ *Izvestia*, July 21, 1960.

¹⁴⁹ *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, July 30, 1960.

the Soviet Government continued to praise the United Nations, which was suppressing the Congolese people.

In 1961 the leaders of the CPSU persuaded Gizenga to attend the Congolese parliament, which had been convened under the “protection” of UN troops, and to join the puppet government. The leadership of the CPSU falsely alleged that the convocation of the Congolese parliament was “an important event in the life of the young republic” and “a success of the national forces.”¹⁵⁰

Clearly these wrong policies of the leadership of the CPSU rendered U. S. imperialism a great service in its aggression against the Congo. Lumumba was murdered, Gizenga was imprisoned, many other patriots were persecuted, and the Congolese struggle for national independence suffered a setback. Does the leadership of the CPSU feel no responsibility for all this?

THE AREAS IN WHICH CONTEMPORARY WORLD CONTRADICTIONS ARE CONCENTRATED

It is only natural that the revolutionary people of Asia, Africa and Latin America have rejected the words and deeds of the leaders of the CPSU against the movements and wars of national liberation. But the leaders of the CPSU have failed to draw the appropriate lesson and change their wrong line and policies. Instead, angry at their humiliation, they have launched a series of slanderous attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and the other Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU accuses the Chinese Communist Party of putting forward a “new theory.” It says:

According to the new theory the main contradiction of our time is, you see, contradiction not between socialism and imperialism, but between the national-liberation movement and imperialism. The decisive force in the struggle against imperialism, the Chinese comrades hold, is not the world system of socialism, not struggle of the international working class, but again the national-liberation movement.

In the first place, this is a fabrication. In our letter of June 14, we pointed out that the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world are the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, the

¹⁵⁰ *Pravda*, July 18, 1961.

contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism, and the contradictions among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

We also pointed out: The contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp is a contradiction between two fundamentally different social systems, socialism and capitalism. It is undoubtedly very sharp. But Marxist-Leninists must not regard the contradictions in the world as consisting solely and simply of the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp.

Our view is crystal clear.

In our letter of June 14, we explained the revolutionary situation in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the significance and role of the national liberation movement. This is what we said:

1. The various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America; these are the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm centers of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism.
2. The national democratic revolutionary movement in these areas and the international socialist revolutionary movement are the two great historical currents of our time.
3. The national democratic revolution in these areas is an important component of the contemporary proletarian world revolution.
4. The anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America are pounding and undermining the foundations of the rule of imperialism and colonialism, old and new, and are now a mighty force in defense of world peace.
5. In a sense, therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population.
6. Therefore, the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America is definitely not merely

a matter of regional significance but is one of overall importance for the whole cause of proletarian world revolution.

These are Marxist-Leninist theses, conclusions drawn by scientific analysis from the realities of our time.

No one can deny that an extremely favorable revolutionary situation now exists in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Today the national liberation revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America are the most important forces dealing imperialism direct blows. The contradictions of the world are concentrated in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The center of world contradictions, of world political struggles, is not fixed but shifts with changes in the international struggles and the revolutionary situation. We believe that, with the development of the contradiction and struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in Western Europe and North America, the momentous day of battle will arrive in these homes of capitalism and heartlands of imperialism. When that day comes, Western Europe and North America will undoubtedly become the center of world political struggles, of world contradictions.

Lenin said in 1913, "...a new source of great world storms opened up in Asia... It is in this era of storms and their 'repercussion' on Europe that we are now living."¹⁵¹

Stalin said in 1925:

The colonial countries constitute the principal rear of imperialism. The revolutionization of this rear is bound to undermine imperialism not only in the sense that imperialism will be deprived of its rear, but also in the sense that the revolutionization of the East is bound to give a powerful impulse to the intensification of the revolutionary crisis in the West.¹⁵²

Is it possible that these statements of Lenin and Stalin are wrong? The theses they enunciated have long been elementary Marxist-Leninist knowledge. Obviously, now that the leaders of the CPSU are bent on belittling the national liberation movement, they are completely ignoring elementary Marxism-Leninism and the plain facts under their noses.

¹⁵¹ V. I. Lenin, "Asia is a New Source of World Revolutionary Storms" in *Prediction on the Revolutionary Storms in the East*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1970, p. 1.

¹⁵² Joseph Stalin, "The Revolutionary Movement in the East" in *Works*, Vol. VII, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, pp. 235-236.

DISTORTION OF THE LENINIST VIEW OF LEADERSHIP IN THE REVOLUTION

In its Open Letter of July 14, the Central Committee of the CPSU also attacks the standpoint of the Chinese Communist Party on the question of proletarian leadership in the national liberation movement. It says:

The Chinese comrades want to “correct” Lenin and prove that hegemony in the world struggle against imperialism should go not to the working class, but to the petit bourgeoisie or the national bourgeoisie, even to “certain patriotically minded kings, princes and aristocrats.”

This is a deliberate distortion of the views of the Chinese Communist Party.

In discussing the need for the proletariat to insist on leading the national liberation movement, the letter of the Central Committee of the CPC of June 14 says:

History has entrusted to the proletarian parties in these areas [Asia, Africa and Latin America] the glorious mission of holding high the banner of struggle against imperialism, against old and new colonialism and for national independence and people’s democracy, of standing in the forefront of the national democratic revolutionary movement and striving for a socialist future.

* * *

On the basis of the worker-peasant alliance the proletariat and its party must unite all the strata that can be united and organize a broad united front against imperialism and its lackeys. In order to consolidate and expand this united front it is necessary that the proletarian party should maintain its ideological, political and organizational independence and insist on the leadership of the revolution.

In discussing the need for establishing a broad anti-imperialist united front in the national liberation movement, the letter of the Central Committee of the CPC says:

The oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are faced with the urgent task of fighting imperialism and its lackeys.

* * *

In these areas, extremely broad sections of the population refuse to be slaves of imperialism. They include not only the workers, peasants, intellectuals and petit bourgeoisie, but also the patriotic national bourgeoisie and even certain kings, princes and aristocrats, who are patriotic.

Our views are perfectly clear. In the national liberation movement it is necessary both to insist on leadership by the proletariat and to establish a broad anti-imperialist united front. What is wrong with these views? Why should the leadership of the CPSU distort and attack these correct views?

It is not we, but the leaders of the CPSU, who have abandoned Lenin's views on proletarian leadership in the revolution.

The wrong line of the leaders of the CPSU completely abandons the task of fighting imperialism and colonialism and opposes wars of national liberation; this means it wants the proletariat and the communist parties of the oppressed nations and countries to roll up their patriotic banner of opposing imperialism and struggling for national independence and surrender it to others. In that case, how could one even talk about an anti-imperialist united front or of proletarian leadership?

Another idea often propagated by the leaders of the CPSU is that a country can build socialism under no matter what leadership, including even that of a reactionary nationalist like Nehru. This is still farther removed from the idea of proletarian leadership.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU misinterprets the proper relationship of mutual support which should exist between the socialist camp and the working class movement in the capitalist countries on the one hand and the national liberation movement on the other, asserting that the national liberation movement should be "led" by the socialist countries and the working-class movement in the metropolitan countries. It has the audacity to claim that this is "based" on Lenin's views on proletarian leadership. Obviously this is a gross distortion and revision of Lenin's thinking. It shows that the leaders of the CPSU want to impose their line of abolishing revolution on the revolutionary movement of the oppressed nations.

THE PATH OF NATIONALISM AND DEGENERATION

In their Open Letter of July 14, the leaders of the CPSU attempt to pin on the Chinese Communist Party the charge of “isolating the national liberation movement from the international working class and its creation, the socialist world system.” They also accuse us of “separating” the national liberation movement from the socialist system and the working-class movement in the Western capitalist countries and “counterposing” the former to the latter. There are other Communists, like the leaders of the French Communist Party, who loudly echo the leaders of the CPSU.

But what are the facts? Those who counterpose the national liberation movement to the socialist camp and the working-class movement in the Western capitalist countries are none other than the leaders of the CPSU and their followers, who do not support, and even oppose, the national liberation movement.

The Chinese Communist Party has consistently maintained that the revolutionary struggles of all peoples support each other. We always consider the national liberation movement from the viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, from the viewpoint of the proletarian world revolution as a whole. We believe the victorious development of the national liberation revolution is of tremendous significance for the socialist camp, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the cause of defending world peace.

But the leaders of the CPSU and their followers refuse to acknowledge this significance. They talk only about the support which the socialist camp gives the national liberation movement and ignore the support which the latter gives the former. They talk only about the role of the working-class movement in the Western capitalist countries in dealing blows at imperialism and belittle or ignore the role of the national liberation movement in the same connection. Their stand contradicts Marxism-Leninism and disregards the facts, and is therefore wrong.

The question of what attitude to take towards the relationship between the socialist countries and the revolution of the oppressed nations, and towards the relationship between the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the revolution of the oppressed nations, involves the important principle of whether Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism are to be upheld or abandoned.

According to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, every socialist country which has achieved victory in its revolution must actively support and assist the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations. The socialist countries must become base areas for supporting and developing the revolution of the oppressed nations and peoples throughout the world, form the closest alliance with them and carry the proletarian world revolution through to completion.

But the leaders of the CPSU virtually regard the victory of socialism in one country or several countries as the end of the proletarian world revolution. They want to subordinate the national liberation revolution to their general line of peaceful coexistence and to the national interests of their own country.

When in 1925 Stalin fought the liquidationists, represented by the Trotskyites and Zinovievites, he pointed out that one of the dangerous characteristics of liquidationism was:

Lack of confidence in the international proletarian revolution, lack of confidence in its victory; a skeptical attitude towards the national-liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries... failure to understand the elementary demand of internationalism, by virtue of which the victory of socialism in one country is not an end in itself, but a means of developing and supporting the revolution in other countries.¹⁵³

He added:

That is the path of nationalism and degeneration, the path of the complete liquidation of the proletariat's international policy, for people afflicted with this disease regard our country not as a part of the whole that is called the world revolutionary movement, but as the beginning and the end of that movement, believing that the interests of all other countries should be sacrificed to the interests of our country.¹⁵⁴

Stalin depicted the line of thinking of the liquidationists as follows:

Support the liberation movement in China? But why? Wouldn't that be dangerous? Wouldn't it bring us into conflict with oth-

¹⁵³ Joseph Stalin, "Questions and Answers" in *Works*, Vol. VII, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 169-70.

er countries? Wouldn't it be better if we established "spheres of influence" in China in conjunction with other "advanced" powers and snatched something from China for our own benefit? That would be both useful and safe... And so on and so forth.¹⁵⁵

He concluded:

Such is the new type of nationalist "frame of mind," which is trying to liquidate the foreign policy of the October Revolution and is cultivating the elements of degeneration.¹⁵⁶

The present leaders of the CPSU have gone farther than the old liquidationists. Priding themselves on their cleverness, they only take up what is "both useful and safe." Mortally afraid of being involved in conflict with the imperialist countries, they have set their minds on opposing the national liberation movement. They are intoxicated with the idea of the two "super-powers" establishing spheres of influence throughout the world. Stalin's criticism of the liquidationists is a fair description of the present leaders of the CPSU. Following in the footsteps of the liquidationists, they have liquidated the foreign policy of the October Revolution and taken the path of nationalism and degeneration.

Stalin warned:

It is obvious that the first country to be victorious can retain the role of standard-bearer of the world revolutionary movement only on the basis of consistent internationalism, only on the basis of the foreign policy of the October Revolution, and that the path of least resistance and of nationalism in foreign policy is the path of the isolation and decay of the first country to be victorious.¹⁵⁷

This warning by Stalin is of serious, practical significance for the present leaders of the CPSU.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 170.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 171.

AN EXAMPLE OF SOCIAL-CHAUVINISM

Similarly, according to Proletarian internationalism, the proletariat and the Communists of the oppressor nations must actively support both the right of the oppressed nations to national independence and their struggles for liberation. With the support of the oppressed nations, the proletariat of the oppressor nations will be better able to win its revolution.

Lenin hit the nail on the head when he said:

The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would actually be a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and America were not closely and completely united with the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of “colonial” slaves who are oppressed by capital.¹⁵⁸

However, some self-styled Marxist-Leninists have abandoned Marxism-Leninism on this very question of fundamental principle. The leaders of the French Communist Party are typical in this respect.

Over a long period of time, the leaders of the CPF have abandoned the struggle against US imperialism, refusing to put up a firm fight against US imperialist control over and restrictions on France in the political, economic and military fields and surrendering the banner of French national struggle against the United States to people like de Gaulle; on the other hand, they have been using various devices and excuses to defend the colonial interests of the French imperialists, have refused to support, and indeed opposed, the national liberation movements in the French colonies, and particularly opposed national revolutionary wars; they have sunk into the quagmire of chauvinism.

Lenin said, “Europeans often forget that colonial peoples are *also* nations, but to tolerate such ‘forgetfulness’ is to tolerate chauvinism.”¹⁵⁹ Yet the leadership of the French Communist Party, represented by Comrade Thorez, has not only tolerated this “forgetfulness,” but has openly regarded the peoples of the French colonies as “naturalized Frenchmen,”¹⁶⁰ refused to acknowledge their right to national independence in dissociation from France and pub-

¹⁵⁸ V. I. Lenin, “The Second Congress of the Communist International,” *op. cit.*

¹⁵⁹ V. I. Lenin, “A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII.

¹⁶⁰ Maurice Thorez, Speech in Algiers, February 1939.

licly supported the policy of “national assimilation” pursued by the French imperialists.

For the past ten years and more, the leaders of the French Communist Party have followed the colonial policy of the French imperialists and served as an appendage of French monopoly capital. In 1946, when the French monopoly capitalist rulers played a neo-colonialist trick by proposing to form a French Union, they followed suit and proclaimed that “we have always envisaged the French Union as a ‘free union of free peoples’”¹⁶¹ and that “the French Union will permit the regulation, on a new basis, of the relations between the people of France and the overseas peoples who have in the past been attached to France.”¹⁶² In 1958, when the French Union collapsed and the French government proposed the establishment of a French Community to preserve its colonial system, the leaders of the CPF again followed suit and proclaimed “we believe that the creation of a genuine community will be a positive event.”¹⁶³

Moreover, in opposing the demand of the people in the French colonies for national independence, the leaders of the CPF have even tried to intimidate them, saying that “any attempt to break away from the Union of France will only lead to the strengthening of imperialism; although independence may be won, it will be temporary, nominal and false.” They further openly declared:

The question is whether this already unavoidable independence will be with France, or without France and against France. The interest of our country requires that this independence should be with France.¹⁶⁴

On the question of Algeria, the chauvinist stand of the leaders of the CPF is all the more evident. They have recently tried to justify themselves by asserting that they had long “recognized the correct demand of the people of Algeria for freedom.” But what are the facts?

¹⁶¹ Léon Feix, Speech at the 15th Congress of the Communist Party of France, June 1959.

¹⁶² Maurice Thorez, Speech at the Opening Ceremony of the New Term at the Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France, October 10, 1955.

¹⁶³ Léon Feix, Speech at the 15th Congress of the Communist Party of France, June 1959.

¹⁶⁴ Raymond Barbé, “Black Africa in the Age of Guinea?,” *Démocratie Nouvelle* of the French Communist Party, No. 11, 1958.

For a long time the leaders of the CPF refused to recognize Algeria's right to national independence; they followed the French monopoly capitalists, crying that "Algeria is an inalienable part of France"¹⁶⁵ and that France "should be a great African power, now and in the future."¹⁶⁶ Thorez and others were most concerned about the fact that Algeria could provide France with "a million head of sheep" and large quantities of wheat yearly to solve her problem of "the shortage of meat" and "make up our deficit in grain."¹⁶⁷

Just see! What feverish chauvinism on the part of the leaders of the CPF! Do they show an iota of proletarian internationalism? Is there anything of the proletarian revolutionary in them? By taking this chauvinistic stand they have betrayed the fundamental interests of the international proletariat, the fundamental interests of the French proletariat and the true interests of the French nation.

AGAINST THE "THEORY OF RACISM" AND THE "THEORY OF THE YELLOW PERIL"

Having used up all their wonder-working weapons for opposing the national liberation movement, the leaders of the CPSU are now reduced to seeking help from racism, the most reactionary of all imperialist theories. They describe the correct stand of the CPC in resolutely supporting the national liberation movement as "creating racial and geographical barriers," "replacing the class approach with the racial approach," and "playing upon the national and even racial prejudices of the Asian and African peoples."

If Marxism-Leninism did not exist, perhaps such lies could deceive people. Unfortunately for the manufacturers of these lies, they live in the wrong age, for Marxism-Leninism has already found its way deep into people's hearts. As Stalin rightly pointed out, Leninism "broke down the wall between whites and blacks, between Europeans and Asiatics, between the 'civilized' and 'uncivilized' slaves of imperialism."¹⁶⁸ It is futile for the leaders of the CPSU to try and rebuild this wall of racism.

¹⁶⁵ Documents of the September 24, 1946 Session of the Constituent National Assembly of France, Appendix II, No. 1013.

¹⁶⁶ Florimond Bonte, Speech at the Constituent Assembly of France, 1944.

¹⁶⁷ Maurice Thorez, Report at the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of France, 1945.

¹⁶⁸ Joseph Stalin, *The Foundations of Leninism*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 63.

In the last analysis, the national question in the contemporary world is one of class struggle and anti-imperialist struggle. Today the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals, anti-imperialist and patriotic bourgeois elements and other patriotic and anti-imperialist enlightened people of all races—white, black, yellow or brown—have formed a broad united front against the imperialists, headed by the United States, and their lackeys. This united front is expanding and growing stronger. The question here is not whether to side with the white people or the coloured people, but whether to side with the oppressed peoples and nations or with the handful of imperialists and reactionaries.

According to the Marxist-Leninist class stand, oppressed nations must draw a clear line of demarcation between themselves and the imperialists and colonialists. To blur this line represents a chauvinist-view serving imperialism and colonialism.

Lenin said:

This is precisely why the central point in the Social-Democratic program must be the distinction between oppressing and oppressed nations, which is the *essence* of imperialism, which is *falsely* evaded by the social-chauvinists, and by Kautsky.¹⁶⁹

By slandering the unity of the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the anti-imperialist struggle as being “based on the geographical and racial principles,” the leaders of the CPSU have obviously placed themselves in the position of the social-chauvinists and of Kautsky.

When they peddle the “theory of racism,” describing the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America as one of the coloured against the white race, the leaders of the CPSU are clearly aiming at inciting racial hatred among the white people in Europe and North America, at diverting the people of the world from the struggle against imperialism and at turning the international working-class movement away from the struggle against modern revisionism.

The leaders of the CPSU have raised a hue and cry about the “Yellow Peril” and the “imminent menace of Genghis Khan.” This is really not worth refuting. We do not intend in this article to comment on the historical role of Genghis Khan or on the development of the Mongolian, Russian and

¹⁶⁹ V. I. Lenin, “The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

Chinese nations and the process of their formation into states. We would only remind the leaders of the CPSU of their need to review their history lessons before manufacturing such tales. Genghis Khan was a Khan of Mongolia, and in his day both China and Russia were subjected to Mongolian aggression. He invaded part of northwestern and northern China in 1215 and Russia in 1223. After his death, his successors subjugated Russia in 1240 and thirty-nine years later, in 1279, conquered the whole of China.

Lu Xun, the well-known Chinese writer, has a paragraph about Genghis Khan in an article he wrote in 1934. We include it here for your reference, as it may be useful to you.

He wrote that, as a young man of twenty,

I had been told that “our” Genghis Khan had conquered Europe and ushered in the most splendid period in “our” history. Not until I was twenty-five did I discover that this so-called most splendid period of “our” history was actually the time when the Mongolians conquered China and we became slaves. And not until last August, when browsing through three books on Mongolian history, looking for history stories, did I find out that the conquest of “Russia” by the Mongolians and their invasion of Hungary and Austria actually preceded their conquest of China, and that the Genghis Khan of that time was not yet our Khan. The Russians were enslaved before we were, and presumably it is they who ought to be able to say “When our Genghis Khan conquered China, he ushered in the most splendid period of our history.”¹⁷⁰

Anyone with a little knowledge of modern world history knows that the “theory of the Yellow Peril” about which the CPSU leadership has been making such a noise is a legacy of the German emperor William II. Half a century ago, William II stated, “I am a believer in the Yellow Peril.”

The German Emperor’s purpose in propagating the “theory of the Yellow Peril” was to carry the partition of China further, to invade Asia, to suppress revolution in Asia, to divert the attention of the European people from revolution and to use it as a smokescreen for his active preparations for the imperialist world war and for his attempt to gain world hegemony.

¹⁷⁰ Lu Xun, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. VI, p. 109.

When William II spread this “theory of the Yellow Peril,” the European bourgeoisie was in deep decline and extremely reactionary, and democratic revolutions were sweeping through China, Turkey and Persia and affecting India, around the time of the 1905 Russian Revolution. That was the period, too, when Lenin made his famous remark about “backward Europe and advanced Asia.”

William II was a bigwig in his day. But in reality he proved to be only a snowman in the sun. In a very short time this reactionary chieftain vanished from the scene, together with the reactionary theory he invented. The great Lenin and his brilliant teachings live on forever.

Fifty years have gone by; imperialism in Western Europe and North America has become still more moribund and reactionary, and its days are numbered. Meanwhile, the revolutionary storm raging over Asia, Africa and Latin America has grown many times stronger than in Lenin’s time. It is hardly credible that today there are still people who wish to step into the shoes of William II. This is indeed a mockery of history.

RESURRECTING THE OLD REVISIONISM IN A NEW GUISE

The policy of the leadership of the CPSU on the national-colonial question is identical with the bankrupt policy of the revisionists of the Second International. The only difference is that the latter served the imperialists’ old colonialism, while the modern revisionists serve the imperialists’ neo-colonialism.

The old revisionists sang to the tune of the old colonialists, and Khrushchev sings to the tune of the neocolonialists.

The heroes of the Second International, represented by Bernstein and Kautsky, were apologists for the old colonial rule of imperialism. They openly declared that colonial rule was progressive, that it “brought a high civilization” to the colonies and “developed the productive forces” there. They even asserted that the “abolition of the colonies would mean barbarism.”¹⁷¹

In this respect Khrushchev is somewhat different from the old revisionists. He is bold enough to denounce the old colonial system.

How is it that Khrushchev is so bold? Because the imperialists have changed their tune.

¹⁷¹ Eduard David, *Speech on the Colonial Question at the International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart*, Verlag Buchhandlung Vorwärts, Berlin, 1907, p. 30.

After World War II, under the twin blows of the socialist revolution and the national liberation revolution, the imperialists were forced to recognize that “if the West had attempted to perpetuate the status quo of colonialism, it would have made violent revolution inevitable and defeat inevitable.”¹⁷² The old colonialist forms of rule “on the contrary... are likely to prove ‘running sores’ which destroy both the economic and the moral vigor of a nation’s life.”¹⁷³ Thus it became necessary to change the form and practice neo-colonialism.

Thus, too, Khrushchev singing to the tune of the neo-colonialist, flaunts the “theory of the disappearance of colonialism” in order to cover up the new colonialism. What is more, he tries to induce the oppressed nations to embrace this new colonialism. He actively propagates the view that “peaceful coexistence” between the oppressed nations and civilized imperialism will make “the national economy grow rapidly” and bring about an “uplift of their productive forces,” enable the home market in the oppressed countries to “become incomparably greater” and “furnish more raw materials, and various products and goods required by the economy of the industrially developed countries”¹⁷⁴ and, at the same time will “considerably raise the living standard of the inhabitants in the highly developed capitalist countries.”¹⁷⁵

Nor has Khrushchev forgotten to collect certain worn-out weapons from the arsenal of the revisionists of the Second International.

Here are some examples.

The old revisionists opposed wars of national liberation and held that the national question “can be settled only through international agreements”¹⁷⁶ and “advance in all the arts of peace.” On this question, Khrushchev has taken over the line of the revisionists of the Second International; he advocates a “quiet burial of the colonial system.”¹⁷⁷

¹⁷² J. F. Dulles, *War or Peace*, the MacMillan Company, New York, 1957, p. 76.

¹⁷³ John Strachey, *The End of Empire*, London, 1959, p. 194.

¹⁷⁴ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the UN General Assembly, September 23, 1960.

¹⁷⁵ “Liquidation of Colonialism—Command of the Times,” *Kommunist*, Moscow, No. 2, 1961.

¹⁷⁶ “Resolution on the Territorial Question adopted by the International Socialist Conference in Berne, 1919” in *Material on the First and Second Internationals*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1926, p. 380.

¹⁷⁷ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the UN General Assembly, September 23, 1960.

The old revisionists attacked the revolutionary Marxists, hurling at them the slander that “Bolshevism is in essence a warlike type of socialism”¹⁷⁸ and that “the Communist International harbors the illusion that the liberation of the workers can be achieved by means of the bayonets of the victorious Red Army and that a new world war is necessary for the world revolution.” They also spread the story that this position had “created the greatest danger of a new world war.”¹⁷⁹ The language Khrushchev uses today to slander the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties is exactly the language used by the old revisionists in slandering the Bolsheviks. It is hard to find any difference.

It must be said that in serving the imperialists’ neo-colonialism, Khrushchev is not a whit inferior to the old revisionists in their service of the imperialists’ old colonialism.

Lenin showed how the policy of imperialism caused the international workers’ movement to split into two sections—the revolutionary and the opportunist. The revolutionary section sided with the oppressed nations and opposed the imperialists and colonialists. On the other hand, the opportunist section fed on crumbs from the spoils which the imperialists and colonialists squeezed out of the people of the colonies and semi-colonies. It sided with the imperialists and colonialists and opposed the revolution of the oppressed nations for liberation.

The same kind of division between revolutionaries and opportunists in the international working-class movement as that described by Lenin is now taking shape not only in the working-class movement in capitalist countries but also in socialist countries where the proletariat wields state power.

The experience of history shows that if the national liberation movement is to achieve complete victory it must form a solid alliance with the revolutionary working-class movement, draw a clear line of demarcation between itself and the revisionists who serve the imperialists and colonialists, and firmly eradicate their influence.

The experience of history shows that if the working-class movement of the capitalist countries in Western Europe and North America is to achieve

¹⁷⁸ Otto Bauer, “Speech on the Oriental Question at the International Socialist Congress in Marseille, 1925” in *Material on the First and Second Internationals*, *op. cit.*, p. 468.

¹⁷⁹ “Resolution on the Oriental Question, adopted by the International Socialist Congress in Marseille, 1925” in *Material on the First and Second Internationals*, *op. cit.*, p. 474.

complete victory, it must form a close alliance with the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America, draw a clear line of demarcation between itself and the revisionists, and firmly eradicate their influence.

The revisionists are agents of imperialism who have hidden themselves among the ranks of the international working-class movement. Lenin said, "...the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism."¹⁸⁰ Thus it is clear that the present fight against imperialism and old and new colonialism must be linked closely with the fight against the apologists of neo-colonialism.

However hard the imperialists disguise their intentions and bestir themselves, however hard their apologists whitewash and help neo-colonialism, imperialism and colonialism cannot escape their doom. The victory of the national liberation revolution is irresistible. Sooner or later the apologists of neo-colonialism will go bankrupt.

Workers of the world and the oppressed nations, unite!

¹⁸⁰ V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 130.

Two Different Lines on the Question of War and Peace

COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
CPSU (V)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE *PEOPLE'S DAILY* AND THE *RED FLAG*

November 19, 1963

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 22, 1963, pp. 1-18.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, November 22, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 47,
pp. 6-16.

The whole world is discussing the question of war and peace.

The criminal system of imperialism has brought upon the people of the world numerous wars, including two disastrous world wars. Wars launched by imperialism have caused the people heavy suffering, but have also educated them.

Since World War II, people everywhere have been vigorously demanding world peace. More and more people have come to understand that to defend world peace, it is imperative to wage struggles against the imperialist policies of aggression and war.

Marxist-Leninists throughout the world are duty bound to treasure the peace sentiments of the people and to stand in the forefront of the struggle for world peace. They are duty bound to struggle against the imperialists' policies of aggression and war, to expose their deceptions and defeat their plans for war. They are duty bound to educate the people, raise their political consciousness and guide the struggle for world peace in the proper direction.

In contrast to the Marxist-Leninists, the modern revisionists help the imperialists to deceive the people, divert the people's attention, weaken and undermine their struggle against imperialism and cover up the imperialists' plans for a new world war, thus meeting the needs of imperialist policy.

The Marxist-Leninist line on the question of war and peace is diametrically opposed to the revisionist line.

The Marxist-Leninist line is the correct line conducive to the winning of world peace. It is the line consistently upheld by all Marxist-Leninist parties, including the Communist Party of China, and by all Marxist-Leninists.

The revisionist line is a wrong line which serves to increase the danger of a new war. It is the line gradually developed by the leaders of the CPSU since its 20th Congress.

On the question of war and peace many lies slandering the Chinese Communists have been fabricated in the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU and in numerous statements by the leaders of the CPSU, but these cannot conceal the essence of the differences.

In what follows we shall analyse the main differences between the Marxist-Leninist and the modern revisionist lines on the question of war and peace.

THE LESSONS OF HISTORY

Ever since capitalism evolved into imperialism, the question of war and peace has been a vital one in the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism.

Imperialism is the source of wars in modern times. The imperialists alternately use a deceptive policy of peace and a policy of war. They often cover their crimes of aggression and their preparations for a new war with lies about peace.

Lenin and Stalin tirelessly called upon the people of all countries to combat the peace frauds of the imperialists.

Lenin said that the imperialist governments “pay lip service to peace and justice, but in fact wage annexationist and predatory wars.”¹⁸¹

Stalin said that the imperialists “have only one aim in resorting to pacifism: to dupe the masses with high-sounding phrases about peace in order to prepare for a new war.”¹⁸² He also said:

Many think that imperialist pacifism is an instrument of peace. That is absolutely wrong. Imperialist pacifism is an instrument for the preparation of war and for disguising this preparation by hypocritical talk of peace. With-

¹⁸¹ V. I. Lenin, “Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI.

¹⁸² Joseph Stalin, “Concerning the International Situation” in *Works*, Vol. VI, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, p. 297.

out this pacifism and its instrument, the League of Nations, preparation for war in the conditions of today would be impossible.¹⁸³

In contrast to Lenin and Stalin, the revisionists of the Second International, who were renegades from the working class, helped the imperialists to deceive the people and became their accomplices in unleashing the two World Wars.

Before World War I, the revisionists represented by Bernstein and Kautsky endeavored by hypocritical talk about peace to paralyze the revolutionary fighting will of people and cover up the imperialist plans for a world war.

As World War I was breaking out, the old revisionists speedily shed their peace masks, sided with their respective imperialist governments, supported the imperialist war for the redivision of the world, voted for military appropriations in parliament, and incited the working class of their own countries to plunge into the war and slaughter their class brothers in other countries the hypocritical slogan of “defending the motherland.”

When the imperialists needed an armistice in their own interests, the revisionists typified by Kautsky tried to poison people’s minds and to oppose revolution by such glib talk as “nothing would make me happier than a conciliatory peace based on the principle, ‘Live and let live.’”¹⁸⁴

After World War I, the renegade Kautsky and his successors became still more brazen trumpeters of the imperialists’ peace frauds.

The revisionists of the Second International spread a pack of lies on the question of war and peace.

1. They prettified imperialism and turned the minds of the people away from their struggles. Kautsky said,

The danger to world peace from imperialism is only slight. The greater danger appears to come from the national strivings in the East and from the various dictatorships.¹⁸⁵

Thus people were asked to believe that the source of war was not imperialism but the oppressed nations of the East and the Soviet state, the great bulwark of peace.

¹⁸³ Joseph Stalin, “Results of the July Plenum of the CC, CPSU(B)” in *Works*, Vol. XI, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

¹⁸⁴ Karl Kautsky, *National Problems*, Russ. ed., Petrograd, 1918, p. 88.

¹⁸⁵ Karl Kautsky, *The Question of Defense and Social-Democracy*, Ger. ed., Berlin, 1928, p. 37.

2. They helped the imperialists cover up the danger of a new war and blunted the fighting will of the people. Kautsky said in 1928, "If today you keep on talking loudly about the dangers of imperialist war, you are relying on a traditional formula and not on present-day considerations."¹⁸⁶ Old revisionists of his brand described those believing in the inevitability of imperialist wars as "committed to a fatalistic conception of history."¹⁸⁷

3. They intimidated the people with the notion that war would destroy mankind. Kautsky said,

The next war will not only bring want and misery, but will basically put an end to civilization and, at least in Europe, will leave behind nothing but smoking ruins and putrefying corpses.¹⁸⁸

These old revisionists said,

The last war brought the entire world to the brink of the precipice; the next one would destroy it completely. The mere preparation for a new war would ruin the world.¹⁸⁹

4. They made no distinction between just and unjust wars and forbade revolution. Kautsky said in 1914:

In present-day conditions, there is no such thing as a war which is not a misfortune for nations in general and for the proletariat in particular. What we discussed was the means by which we could prevent a threatening war, and not which wars are useful and which harmful.¹⁹⁰

He also said:

The yearning for perpetual peace increasingly inspires the majority of cultured nations. It temporarily pushes the essentially great problem of our times into the background.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 28.

¹⁸⁷ Hugo Haase, "Speech on the Question of Imperialism at the Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party in Chemnitz, 1912" in the *Handbook of the Congress of the Social-Democratic Party in 1910-1913*, Vol. II, p. 234.

¹⁸⁸ Karl Kautsky, "Preface to *War and Democracy*," Ger. ed., Berlin, 1932, p. xii.

¹⁸⁹ "Resolution on the League of Nations, adopted by the International Socialist Conference in Berne, 1919" in *Material on the First and Second Internationals*, *op. cit.*, p. 378.

¹⁹⁰ Karl Kautsky, "Social Democracy in War," *Die Neue Zeit*, October 2, 1914.

¹⁹¹ Karl Kautsky, "Preface to *War and Democracy*," *op. cit.*, p. xii.

5. They propagated the theory that weapons decide everything and they opposed revolutionary armed struggle. Kautsky said:

As has been often stated, one of the reasons why the coming revolutionary struggles will more rarely be fought out by military means lies in the colossal superiority in armaments of the armies of modern states over the arms which are at the disposal of “civilians” and which usually render any resistance on the part of the latter hopeless from the very outset.¹⁹²

6. They spread the absurd theory that world peace can be safeguarded and equality of nations achieved through disarmament. Bernstein said:

Peace on earth and goodwill to all men! We should not pause or rest and must attend to the unhindered advance of society towards prosperity in the interests of all, towards equality of rights among nations through international agreement and disarmament.¹⁹³

7. They spread the fallacy that the money saved from disarmament can be used to assist backward countries. Kautsky said:

The lighter the burden of military expenditures in Western Europe, the greater the means available for building railways in China, Persia, Turkey, South America etc., and these public works are a far more effective means of promoting industrial development than the building of dreadnoughts.¹⁹⁴

8. They submitted schemes for the “peace strategy” of the imperialists. Kautsky said:

The nations of civilized Europe (and likewise the Americans) can maintain peace in the Near and Far East more effectively through their economic and intellectual resources than through ironclads and planes.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹² Karl Kautsky, “A Catechism of Social-Democracy,” *Die Neue Zeit*, December 13, 1893.

¹⁹³ Eduard Bernstein, Speech on the Question of Disarmament at the Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party in Chemnitz, 1912, published in the *Handbook of the Congress of the Social-Democratic Party in 1910-1913*, Ger. ed., Munich, Vol. II, p. 9.

¹⁹⁴ Karl Kautsky, “Once More on Disarmament,” *Die Neue Zeit*, September 6, 1912.

¹⁹⁵ Karl Kautsky, *The Question of Defense and Social-Democracy*, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

9. They extolled the League of Nations which was controlled by the imperialists. Kautsky said:

The mere existence of the League of Nations is itself already a great achievement for the cause of peace. It represents a lever for the preservation of peace such as no other institution can offer.¹⁹⁶

10. They spread the illusion that reliance could be placed on US imperialism to defend world peace. Kautsky said:

Today the United States is the strongest power in the world and will make the League of Nations irresistible as soon as it works inside it or with it to prevent war.¹⁹⁷

Lenin ruthlessly exposed the ugly features of Kautsky and his ilk. He pointed out that the pacifist phrases of the revisionists of the Second International were only “a *solace* to the people, a means which makes it easier for the governments to bring about the docility of the people in further imperialist slaughter!”¹⁹⁸

Stalin pointed out:

And the most important thing in all this is that Social-Democracy is the main channel of imperialist pacifism within the working class—consequently, it is capitalism’s main support among the working class in preparing for new wars and intervention.¹⁹⁹

Even a cursory comparison of Comrade Khrushchev’s statements on the question of war and peace with those of Bernstein, Kautsky and others shows that there is nothing new in his views, which are a mere reproduction of the revisionism of the Second International.

On the question of war and peace, which has a bearing on the destiny of mankind, Khrushchev is following in the footsteps of Bernstein and Kautsky. As history shows, this is a road extremely dangerous to world peace.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 25.

¹⁹⁷ Karl Kautsky, *Socialists and War*, Ger. ed., Prague, 1937, p. 639.

¹⁹⁸ V. I. Lenin, “To the Workers Who Support the Struggle Against the War and Against the Socialists Who Have Sided With Their Governments” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII.

¹⁹⁹ Joseph Stalin, “Results of the July Plenum of the CC, CPSU(B),” *op. cit.*, p. 210.

In order effectively to defend world peace and prevent a new world war, Marxist-Leninists and peace-loving people all over the world must reject and oppose Khrushchev's erroneous line.

THE GREATEST FRAUD

There is no bigger lie than the designation of the archenemy of world peace as a peace-loving angel.

Since World War II, US imperialism, stepping into the shoes of the German, Italian and Japanese fascists, has been endeavoring to set up a vast world empire such as has never been known before. The "global strategy" of US imperialism has been to grab and dominate the intermediate zone lying between the United States and the socialist camp, put down the revolutions of the oppressed peoples and nations, proceed to destroy the socialist countries, and thus to dominate the whole world.

In the eighteen years since the end of World War II, in order to realize its ambition of world domination, US imperialism has been carrying on aggressive wars or counter-revolutionary armed interventions in various parts of the world and has been actively preparing for a new world war.

It is obvious that imperialism remains the source of modern wars and that US imperialism is the main force of aggression and war in the contemporary world. This has been clearly affirmed in both the 1957 Declaration the 1960 Statement.

Yet the leaders of the CPSU hold that the chief representatives of US imperialism love peace. They say that a "reasonable" group has emerged capable of soberly assessing the situation. And Eisenhower and Kennedy are representatives of this "reasonable" group.

Khrushchev praised Eisenhower as one who "enjoys the absolute confidence of his people," who "has a sincere desire for peace" and who "also worries about ensuring peace just as we do."

Now Khrushchev praises Kennedy as even better qualified to shoulder the responsibility of preserving world peace than was Eisenhower. He showed "solicitude for the preservation of peace,"²⁰⁰ and it is reasonable to expect

²⁰⁰ N. S. Khrushchev, Letter to J. F. Kennedy, October 27, 1962.

him to “create reliable conditions for a peaceful life and creative labor on earth.”²⁰¹

Khrushchev works as hard as the revisionists of the Second International at telling lies about imperialism and prettifying it.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU asks those who do not believe in these lies: “Do they really think that all bourgeois governments lack reason in everything they do?” Obviously, the leaders of the CPSU ignore the ABC of Marxism-Leninism. In a class society there is no reason that can transcend class. The proletariat has proletarian reason and the bourgeoisie bourgeois reason. Reason connotes that one must be good at formulating policies in the fundamental interests of one’s own class and at taking actions according to one’s basic class stand. The reason of Kennedy and his like lies in acting according to the fundamental interests of US monopoly capital, and it is imperialist reason.

At a time when the international balance of class forces is becoming increasingly unfavorable to imperialism and the US imperialist policies of aggression and war are meeting with constant setbacks, the US imperialists have to disguise themselves more frequently under the cloak of peace.

It is true that Kennedy is rather clever at spinning words about peace and employing peace tactics. But as with his war policy, Kennedy’s deceptive peace policy serves the “global strategy” of US imperialism.

Kennedy’s “strategy of peace” aims at unifying the whole world into the “world community of free nations” rooted in US S. imperialist “law and justice.”

The main points of Kennedy’s “strategy of peace” are:

- To promote US neo-colonialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America by peaceful means;
- To penetrate and dominate other imperialist and capitalist countries by peaceful means;
- To encourage by peaceful means the socialist countries to take the Yugoslav road of “peaceful evolution”;
- To weaken and undermine by peaceful means the struggle of the people of the world against imperialism.

²⁰¹ New Year Message of Greetings from N. S. Khrushchev and L. I. Brezhnev to J. F. Kennedy, *Izvestia*, January 3, 1963.

In his recent speech at the United Nations General Assembly, Kennedy arrogantly announced the following conditions for peace between the United States and the Soviet Union:

1. The German Democratic Republic must be incorporated into West Germany.
2. Socialist Cuba must not be allowed to exist.
3. The socialist countries in Eastern Europe must be given “free choice,” by which he means that capitalism must be restored in these countries.
4. The socialist countries must not support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations. To attain their aims by “peaceful means” wherever possible has been a customary tactic of imperialists and colonialists.

Reactionary classes always rely on two tactics to maintain their rule and to carry out foreign aggrandizement. One is the tactic of priest-like deception, the other that of butcher-like suppression. Imperialism always employs its deceptive policy of peace and its policy of war to reinforce each other, and they are complementary. The reason of Kennedy, who is the representative of US monopoly capital, can express itself only in a more cunning use of these two tactics.

Violence is always the main tactic of reactionary ruling classes. Priest-like deception plays only a supplementary role. Imperialists always rely on positions of strength to carve out their spheres of influence. Kennedy has made this point very clear. He said, “In the end, the only way to maintain the peace is to be prepared in the final extreme to fight for our country—and to mean it.”²⁰² Since Kennedy took office, he has followed the “strategy of flexible response,” which requires the speedy building of “versatile military forces” and the strengthening of “all-round power” so that the United States will be able to fight any kind of war it pleases, whether a general war or a limited war, whether a nuclear war or a conventional war, and whether a large war or a small war. This mad plan of Kennedy’s has pushed US arms expansion and war preparations to an unprecedented peak. Let us look at the following facts published by official US sources:

²⁰² J. F. Kennedy, Speech at the Eighth Annual Veteran’s Day Ceremony, November 11, 1961.

1. The military expenditures of the US Government have increased from 46,700 million dollars in the fiscal year 1960 to an estimated 60,000 million dollars in the fiscal year 1964, the highest total ever in peacetime and greater than during the Korean War.

2. Kennedy recently declared that in the past two years and more there has been a 100 percent increase in the number of nuclear weapons of the US strategic alert forces and a 45 percent increase in the number of combat-ready army divisions, the procurement of airlift aircraft has been increased by 175 percent and there has been an increase by nearly five times in the “special guerrilla and counter-insurgency forces.”²⁰³

3. The US Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff has mapped out plans for nuclear war against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Robert S. McNamara, the US Secretary of Defense, declared at the beginning of this year:

We have provided, throughout the period under consideration, a capability to destroy virtually all of the “soft” [above-ground] and “semi-hard” [semi-protected] military targets in the Soviet Union and a large number of their fully hardened missile sites, with an additional capability in the form of a protected force to be employed or held in reserve for use against urban and industrial areas.²⁰⁴

The United States has strengthened its network of nuclear missile bases directed against the socialist camp and has greatly strengthened the disposition of its missile-equipped nuclear submarines abroad.

At the same time, the troops of the NATO bloc under US command have pushed eastward this year and approached the borders of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia.

4. The Kennedy Administration has reinforced its Military dispositions in Asia, Latin America and Africa and made great efforts to expand the “special forces” of its land, sea and air services in order to cope with the people’s revolutionary movement in those areas. The United States has turned southern Viet Nam into a proving ground for “special warfare” and increased its troops there to more than 16,000.

²⁰³ J. F. Kennedy, Speech at a Democratic Party Fund-Raising Dinner, October 30, 1963.

²⁰⁴ R. S. McNamara, Statement Before the Armed Services Committee of the US House of Representatives, January 30, 1963.

5. It has strengthened its war commands. It has set up a “US Strike Command” which controls a combined land and air force maintaining high combat readiness in peacetime, so that it can be readily sent to any place in the world to provoke wars. It has also set up national military command centers both above and below ground, and organized an Emergency Airborne Command Post operating from aircraft and an Emergency Sea Command Post operating from warships.

These facts demonstrate that the US imperialists are the wildest militarists of modern times, the wildest plotters of a new world war, and the most ferocious enemy of world peace.

It is thus clear that the U. S. imperialists have not become beautiful angels in spite of Khrushchev’s bible reading and psalm-singing; they have not turned into compassionate Buddhas in spite of Khrushchev’s prayers and incense-burning. However hard Khrushchev tries to serve the US imperialists, they show not the slightest appreciation. They continue to expose their own peace camouflage by fresh and numerous activities of aggression and war, and thus they continue to slap Khrushchev in the face and reveal the bankruptcy of his ridiculous theories prettifying imperialism. The lot of the willing apologists of US imperialism is indeed a sorry one.

THE QUESTION OF THE POSSIBILITY OF PREVENTING A NEW WORLD WAR

It is a fact that the imperialists headed by the United States are actively preparing a new world war and that the danger of such a war does exist. We should make this fact clear to the people.

But can a new world war be prevented?

The views of the Chinese Communists on this question have always been quite explicit.

After the conclusion of World War II, Comrade Mao Zedong scientifically analysed the post-war international situation and advanced the view that a new world war can be prevented.

Back in 1946, in his well-known talk with the American correspondent Anna Louise Strong, he said:

But the fact that the US reactionaries are now trumpeting so loudly about a US-Soviet war and creating a foul atmosphere, so soon after the end of World War II, compels us to take a look at

their real aims. It turns out that under the cover of anti-Soviet slogans they are frantically attacking the workers and democratic circles in the United States and turning all the countries which are the targets of US external expansion into US dependencies. I think the American people and the peoples of all countries menaced by US aggression should unite and struggle against the attacks of the US reactionaries and their running dogs in these countries. Only by victory in this struggle can a third world war be avoided; otherwise it is unavoidable.²⁰⁵

Comrade Mao Zedong's remarks were directed against a pessimistic appraisal of the international situation at the time. The imperialists headed by the United States, together with the reactionaries in various countries, were daily intensifying their anti-Soviet, anti-Communist and anti-popular activities and trumpeting that "war between the United States and the Soviet Union is inevitable" and that "the outbreak of a third world war is inevitable." The Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries gave this great publicity in order to intimidate the Chinese people. Frightened by such blackmail, some comrades became faint-hearted in the face of the armed attack launched by the Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries with US imperialist support and dared not firmly oppose the counter-revolutionary war with a revolutionary war. Comrade Mao Zedong held different views. He pointed out that a new world war could be prevented provided resolute and effective struggles were waged against world reaction. His scientific proposition was confirmed by the great victory of the Chinese Revolution.

The victory of the Chinese Revolution brought about a tremendous change in the international balance of class forces. Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out in June 1950:

The menace of war by the imperialist camp still exists, the possibility of a third world war still exists. But the forces thwarting the danger of war and preventing a third world war are rapidly developing, and the political consciousness of the broad masses of the people of the world is rising. A new world war can be prevented provided the communist parties of the world keep on

²⁰⁵ Mao Zedong, "Talk With the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 90.

uniting and strengthening all the forces of peace and democracy that can be united.²⁰⁶

In November 1957, at the meeting of fraternal parties, Comrade Mao Zedong made a detailed analysis of the changes in International relations since the end of World War II and showed that the international situation had reached a new turning point. He vividly depicted the situation with a metaphor from a classical Chinese novel—“The east wind prevails over the west wind.” He said:

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 the forces of imperialism.²⁰⁷

He arrived at this conclusion by an analysis of international class relations. He explicitly placed on the side of “the East wind” the socialist camp, the international working class, the communist parties, the oppressed people and nations and the peace-loving people and countries, while confining “the West wind” to the war forces of imperialism and reaction. The political meaning of this metaphor is very lucid and definite. The fact that the leaders of the CPSU and their followers are twisting is metaphor into a geographical or ethnical or meteorological concept only shows that they want to squeeze themselves into the ranks of the “West” in order to please the imperialists and to stir up chauvinism in Europe and North America.

Comrade Mao Zedong’s main aim in stating that “the East wind prevails over the West wind” was to point to the growing possibility that a new world war could be prevented and that the socialist countries would be able to carry on their construction in a peaceful environment. These propositions of Comrade Mao Zedong have been and are the consistent views of the Communist Party of China.

²⁰⁶ Mao Zedong, “Fight for a Fundamental Turn for the Better in the Nation’s Financial and Economic Situation” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. V, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 12.

²⁰⁷ Mao Zedong, “Interview with a Xinhua News Agency Correspondent (Excerpts)” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. VIII, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, p. 133.

It is thus clear that the leaders of the CPSU are deliberately concocting a lie in alleging that the Chinese Communist Party does “not believe in the possibility of preventing a new world war.”²⁰⁸

Again, it is clear that the thesis on the possibility of preventing a third world war was advanced by Marxist-Leninists long ago; it was not first put forward at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, nor is it Khrushchev’s “creation.”

Is it then true that Khrushchev has created nothing at all? No. He has created something. Unfortunately, these “creations” are by no means Marxist-Leninist, but revisionist.

First, Khrushchev has willfully interpreted the possibility of preventing a new world war as the only possibility, holding that there is no danger of a new world war.

Marxist-Leninists hold that while pointing to the possibility of preventing a new world war, we must also call attention to the possibility that imperialism may unleash a world war. Only by pointing to both possibilities, pursuing correct policies and preparing for both eventualities can we effectively mobilize the masses to wage struggles in defense of world peace. Only thus will the socialist countries and people and other peace-loving countries and people not be caught unawares and utterly unprepared should imperialism force a world war on the people of the world.

However, Khrushchev and others are against exposing the danger of a new war which the imperialists are plotting. According to them, imperialism has actually become peace-loving. This is helping the imperialists to lull the masses and sap their fighting will so that they will lose their vigilance against the danger of the new war the imperialists are plotting.

Second, Khrushchev has willfully interpreted the possibility of preventing a new world war as the possibility of preventing all wars, holding that the Leninist axiom that war is inevitable so long as imperialism exists is outmoded.

The possibility of preventing a new world war is one thing; the possibility of preventing all wars, including revolutionary wars, is another. And it is completely wrong to confuse the two.

²⁰⁸ See “Open Letter of the CC of the CPSU to all Party Organizations, to all Communists of the Soviet Union,” p. 489 of this volume.

There is soil for wars so long as imperialism and the system of exploitation of man by man exist. This is an objective law discovered by Lenin after abundant scientific study.

Stalin said in 1952 after indicating the possibility of preventing a new world war, “To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism.”²⁰⁹

Lenin and Stalin are right and Khrushchev is wrong.

History shows that while the imperialists have succeeded in launching two world wars, they have waged numerous wars of other kinds. Since World War II, by their policies of aggression and war the imperialists headed by the United States have brought about ceaseless local wars and armed conflicts of every description in many places, and especially in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is clear that national liberation wars are inevitable when the imperialists, and the US imperialists in particular, send their troops or use their lackeys to carry out sanguinary suppression of the oppressed nations and countries fighting for or upholding national independence.

Lenin said:

To deny all possibility of national wars under imperialism is wrong in theory, obviously mistaken historically, and in practice is tantamount to European chauvinism.²¹⁰

It is equally clear that revolutionary civil wars are inevitable when the bourgeois reactionaries suppress the people in their own countries by force of arms.

Lenin said:

Civil wars are also wars. Whoever recognizes the class struggle cannot fail to recognize civil wars, which in every class society are the natural, and under certain conditions, inevitable continuation, development and intensification of the class struggle. All the great revolutions prove this. To repudiate civil war, or to forget about it, would mean sinking into extreme opportunism and renouncing the socialist revolution.²¹¹

²⁰⁹ J. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR with Mao Zedong's Commentaries*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2022, p. 41.

²¹⁰ V. I. Lenin, “The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution,” *op. cit.*, p. 60.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*

Nearly all the great revolutions in history were made through revolutionary wars. The American War of Independence and Civil War are cases in point. The French Revolution is another example. The Russian Revolution and the Chinese Revolution are of course examples too. The revolutions in Viet Nam, Cuba, Algeria, etc. are also well-known examples.

In summing up the lessons of the Paris Commune in his speech commemorating the seventh anniversary of the founding of the First International in 1871, Marx mentioned the conditions for the elimination of class domination and class oppression. He said:

Before such a change can be consummated, a dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary, and its first premise is an army of the proletariat. The working class must win the right to its emancipation on the battlefield.²¹²

In accordance with Marxist-Leninist theory, Comrade Mao Zedong advanced in 1938 the famous thesis that “political power grows out of the barrel of a gun,” when discussing the lessons of the Russian and Chinese revolutions. This thesis, too, has now become a target of attack by the leaders of the CPSU. They say it is evidence of China’s being “warlike.”

Respected friends, slanders like yours were refuted by Comrade Mao Zedong as far back as twenty-five years ago:

According to the Marxist theory of the state, the army is the chief component of state power. Whoever wants to seize and retain state power must have a strong army. Some people ridicule us as advocates of the “omnipotence of war.” Yes, we are advocates of the omnipotence of revolutionary war; that is good, not bad, it is Marxist.²¹³

What is wrong with Comrade Mao Zedong’s remark? Only those who reject all the historical experience gained in the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions over the last few hundred years would reject this view of his.

With their guns, the Chinese people have created a socialist political power. All except imperialists and their lackeys can readily understand that this

²¹² K. Marx, F. Engels, “Record of Marx’s Speech on the Seventh Anniversary of the Internationale” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXII, Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, pp. 634.

²¹³ Mao Zedong, “Problems of War and Strategy” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. II, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, pp. 206.

is a fine thing and that it is an important factor in safeguarding world peace and preventing a third world war.

Marxist-Leninists never conceal their views. We wholeheartedly support every people's revolutionary war. As Lenin said of such revolutionary war, "Of all the wars known in history it is the only lawful, rightful, just, and truly great war."²¹⁴ If we are accused of being warlike simply because of this, it only goes to prove that we genuinely side with the oppressed peoples and nations and are true Marxist-Leninists.

The imperialists and revisionists always denounced the Bolsheviks and revolutionary leaders like Lenin and Stalin as being "warlike." The very fact that today we are likewise abused by imperialists and revisionists shows that we have been holding aloft the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism.

Khrushchev and others vigorously propagate the view that all wars can be prevented and "a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars" can be brought into being while imperialism still exists. This is nothing but Kautsky's theory of "ultra-imperialism" which has long been bankrupt. Their purpose is all too clear, it is to make the people believe that permanent peace can be realized under imperialism and thereby to abolish revolution and national liberation wars and revolutionary civil wars against imperialism and its lackeys, and in fact to help the imperialists in their preparations for a new war.

NUCLEAR FETISHISM AND NUCLEAR BLACKMAIL ARE THE THEORETICAL BASIS AND GUIDING POLICY OF MODERN REVISIONISM

The heart of the theory of the leaders of the CPSU on war and peace is their thesis that the emergence of nuclear weapons has changed everything and has changed the laws of class struggle.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU says, "The nuclear rocket weapons that were created in the middle of our century changed the old notions about war." In what way were they changed?

The leaders of the CPSU hold that with the appearance of nuclear weapons there is no longer any difference between just and unjust wars. They say, "the atomic bomb does not adhere to the class principle" and that "the atomic bomb does not distinguish between the imperialists and working people,

²¹⁴ V. I. Lenin, "Revolutionary Days" in *Collected Works*, Vol. VIII.

it hits big areas and therefore millions of workers would be destroyed per one monopolist.”²¹⁵

They hold that with the appearance of nuclear weapons the oppressed peoples and nations must abandon revolution and refrain from waging just popular revolutionary wars and wars of national liberation, or else such wars would lead to the destruction of mankind. They say, “...any small ‘local war’ might spark off the conflagration of a world war” and “Today, any sort of war, though it may break out as an ordinary non-nuclear war, is likely to develop into a destructive nuclear-missile conflagration.”²¹⁶ Thus, “We will destroy our Noah’s Ark—the globe.”

The leaders of the CPSU hold that the socialist countries must not resist but must yield to imperialist nuclear blackmail and war threats. Khrushchev said:

There can be no doubt that a world nuclear war, if started by the imperialist maniacs, would inevitably result in the downfall of the capitalist system, a system breeding wars. But would the socialist countries and the cause of socialism all over the world benefit from a world nuclear disaster? Only people who deliberately shut their eyes to the facts can think so. As regards Marxist-Leninists, they cannot propose to establish a Communist civilization on the ruins of centers of world culture, on land laid waste and contaminated by nuclear fall-out. We need hardly add that in the case of many peoples, the question of socialism would be eliminated altogether because they would have disappeared bodily from our planet.²¹⁷

In short, according to the leaders of the CPSU, with the emergence of nuclear weapons, the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, and the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism have all disappeared. The world no longer has any class contradictions. They regard the contradictions in the contemporary world as

²¹⁵ See “Open Letter of the CC of the CPSU to all Party Organizations, to all Communists of the Soviet Union,” p. 492 of this volume.

²¹⁶ N. S. Khrushchev, Radio and Television Speech, June 15, 1961.

²¹⁷ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, January 16, 1963.

boiling down to a single contradiction, that is, their fictitious contradiction between the so-called common survival of imperialism and the oppressed classes and nations on the one hand and their total destruction on the other.

As far as they are concerned, Marxism-Leninism, the Declaration and the Statement, and socialism and communism have all been cast to the winds.

How frankly *Pravda* puts it! “What is the use of principles if one’s head is chopped off?”²¹⁸

This is tantamount to saying that the revolutionaries who died under the sabres of the reactionaries for the victory of the Russian revolutions, the October Revolution, the warriors who bravely gave up their lives in the Anti-Fascist War, the heroes who shed their blood in the struggle against imperialism and for national independence and the martyrs to the revolutionary cause through the ages were all fools. Why should they have given up their heads for adherence to principle?

This is the philosophy of out-and-out renegades. It is a shameless statement, to be found only in the confessions of renegades.

Guided by this theory of nuclear fetishism and nuclear blackmail, the leaders of the CPSU maintain that the way to defend world peace is not for all existing peace forces to unite and form the broadest united front against US imperialism and its lackeys but for the two nuclear powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, to co-operate in settling the world’s problems.

Khrushchev has said:

We [the USA and the USSR] are the strongest countries in the world and if we unite for peace there can be no war. Then if any madman wanted war, we would but have to shake our fingers to warn him off.²¹⁹

It is thus apparent to everybody how far the leaders of the CPSU have gone in regarding the enemy as their friend.

In order to cover up their error, the leaders of the CPSU have not hesitated to attack the correct line of the CPC by lies and slanders. They assert that by advocating support for the peoples’ wars of national liberation and

²¹⁸ “Left of Common Sense,” *Pravda*, August 16, 1963.

²¹⁹ N. S. Khrushchev, Interview with the US Correspondent C. L. Sulzberger on September 5, 1961, *Pravda*, September 10, 1961.

revolutionary civil wars, the Communist Party of China wants to provoke a nuclear world war.

This is a curious lie.

The Communist Party of China has always held that the socialist countries should actively support the peoples' revolutionary struggles, including wars of national liberation and revolutionary civil wars. To fail to do so would be to renounce their proletarian internationalist duty. At the same time, we hold that the oppressed peoples and nations can achieve liberation only by their own resolute revolutionary struggle and that no one else can do it for them.

We have always maintained that socialist countries must not use nuclear weapons to support the peoples' wars of national liberation and revolutionary civil wars and have no need to do so.

We have always maintained that the socialist countries must achieve and maintain nuclear superiority. Only this can prevent the imperialists from launching a nuclear war and help bring about the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

We consistently hold that in the hands of a socialist country, nuclear weapons must always be defensive weapons for resisting imperialist nuclear threats. A socialist country absolutely must not be the first to use nuclear weapons, nor should it in any circumstances play with them or engage in nuclear blackmail and nuclear gambling.

We are opposed both to the wrong practice on the part of the leaders of the CPSU of withholding support from the revolutionary struggles of the peoples and to their wrong approach to nuclear weapons. Instead of examining their own errors, they accuse us of hoping for a "head-on clash"²²⁰ between the Soviet Union and the United States and trying to push them into a nuclear war.

Our answer is: No, friends. You had better cut out your sensation-mongering calumny. The Chinese Communist Party is firmly opposed to a "head-on clash" between the Soviet Union and the United States, and not in words only. In deeds too it has worked hard to avert direct armed conflict between them. Examples of this are the Korean war against US aggression in which we fought side by side with the Korean comrades and our struggle against

²²⁰ "The General Line of the International Communist Movement and the Schismatic Platform of the Chinese Leaders," *op. cit.*

the United States in the Taiwan Straits. We ourselves preferred to shoulder the heavy sacrifices necessary and stood in the first line of defense of the socialist camp so that the Soviet Union might stay in the second line. Have the leaders of the CPSU any sense of proletarian morality when they concoct such lies?

In fact, it is not we but the leaders of the CPSU who have frequently boasted that they would use nuclear weapons to help the anti-imperialist struggle of one country or another.

As everyone knows, the oppressed peoples and nations have no nuclear weapons and they cannot use them to make revolutions, nor is there any need for them to do so. The leaders of the CPSU admit that there is often no clear battle line between the two sides in national liberation wars and civil wars, and therefore the use of nuclear weapons is out of the question. We should then like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: What need is there for a socialist country to support the peoples' revolutionary struggles with nuclear weapons?

We should also like to ask them: How would a socialist country use nuclear weapons to support the revolutionary struggle of an oppressed people or nation? Would it use nuclear weapons on an area where a war of national liberation or a revolutionary civil war was in progress, thereby subjecting both the revolutionary people and the imperialists to a nuclear strike? Or would it be the first to use nuclear weapons against an imperialist country which was waging a conventional war of aggression elsewhere? Obviously, in either case it is absolutely impermissible for a socialist country to use nuclear weapons.

The fact is that when the leaders of the CPSU brandish their nuclear weapons, it is not really to support the people's anti-imperialist struggles.

Sometimes, in order to gain cheap prestige, they just publish empty statements which they never intend to honor.

At other times, during the Caribbean crisis for instance, they engage in speculative, opportunistic and irresponsible nuclear gambling for ulterior motives.

As soon as their nuclear blackmail is seen through and is countered in kind, they retreat one step after another, switch from adventurism to capitulationism and lose all through their nuclear gambling.

We wish to point out that the great Soviet people and Red Army have been and remain a great force safeguarding world peace. But Khrushchev's

military ideas based on nuclear fetishism and nuclear blackmail are entirely wrong.

Khrushchev sees only nuclear weapons. According to him, "The present level of military technique being what it is, the Air Force and the Navy have lost their former importance. These arms are being replaced and not reduced."²²¹

Of course, those units and men having combat duties on the ground are even less significant. According to him, "In our time, a country's defensive capacity is not determined by the number of men under arms, of men in uniform... a country's defense potential depends on decisive measure on the fire-power and the means of delivery that country commands."²²²

As for the militia and the people, they are still more inconsequential. Khrushchev has made the well-known remark that for those now having modern weapons at their disposal, the militia is not an army but just human flesh.²²³

Khrushchev's whole set of military theories runs completely counter to Marxist-Leninist teachings on war and the army. To follow his wrong theories will necessarily involve disintegrating the army and disarming oneself morally.

Obviously, if any socialist country should accept Khrushchev's erroneous military strategy, it would inevitably place itself in a most dangerous position.

Khrushchev may confer on himself such titles as "a great peace champion," award himself a peace prize and pin heroes' medals on himself, but no matter how much he may praise himself, he will not be able to cover up his dangerous practice of recklessly playing with nuclear weapons or his fawning before imperialist nuclear blackmail.

FIGHT OR CAPITULATE?

World peace can be won only through struggle by the people of all countries and not by begging the imperialists for it. Peace can be effectively safeguarded only by relying on the masses of the people and waging a tit-for-tat

²²¹ N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, January 1960.

²²² Ibid.

²²³ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Meeting of Representatives of Fraternal Parties in Bucharest, June 24, 1960.

struggle against the imperialist policies of aggression and war. This is the correct policy.

Tit-for-tat struggle is an important conclusion drawn by the Chinese people from their prolonged struggle against imperialism and its lackeys.

Comrade Mao Zedong said:

Chiang Kai-shek always tries to wrest every ounce of power and every ounce of gain from the people. And we? Our policy is to give him tit-for-tat and to fight for every inch of land. We act after his fashion.²²⁴

He added:

He always tries to impose war on the people, one sword in his left hand and another in his right. We take up swords, too, following his example.²²⁵

Analyzing the domestic political situation in 1945, Comrade Mao Zedong said:

How to give “tit for tat” depends on the situation. Sometimes, not going to negotiations is tit-for-tat; and sometimes, going to negotiations is also tit-for-tat... If they start fighting, we fight back, fight to win peace. Peace will not come unless we strike hard blows at the reactionaries who dare to attack the Liberated Areas.²²⁶

He drew the following historical lesson from the failure of China’s Revolution of 1924-27:

Confronted by counter-revolutionary attacks against the people, Chen Duxiu did not adopt the policy of giving tit for tat and fighting for every inch of land; as a result, in 1927, within the space of a few months, the people lost all the rights they had won.²²⁷

²²⁴ Mao Zedong, “The Situation and Our Policy After the Victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*

²²⁶ Mao Zedong, “On the Chongqing Negotiations” in *ibid.*, p. 46.

²²⁷ Mao Zedong, “The Situation and Our Policy After the Victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan,” *op. cit.*, p. 6.

The Chinese Communists understand and adhere to the policy of giving tit for tat. We oppose both capitulationism and adventurism. This correct policy ensured the victory of the Chinese revolution and the Chinese people's subsequent great successes in their struggle against imperialism.

All revolutionary people approve and welcome this correct fighting policy put forward by the Chinese Communists. All imperialists and reactionaries fear and hate it.

The policy of giving tit for tat as put forward by the CPC is virulently attacked by the leaders of the CPSU. This only goes to show that they do not in the least want to oppose imperialism. Their sole purpose in attacking and smearing the policy of tit for tat is to cover up their wrong line of catering to the needs of imperialism and surrendering to it.

The leaders of the CPSU assert that a tit-for-tat struggle against imperialism will lead to international tension. How terrible!

According to their logic, the imperialists are allowed to commit aggression and make threats against others but the victims of imperialist aggression are not allowed to fight; the imperialists are allowed to oppress others but the oppressed are not allowed to resist. This is a naked attempt to absolve the imperialists of their crimes of aggression. This is a philosophy of the jungle, pure and simple.

International tension is the product of the imperialist policies of aggression and war. The peoples should of course wage a firm struggle against imperialist aggression and threats. Facts have shown that only through struggle can imperialism be compelled to retreat and a genuine relaxation of international tension be achieved. Constant retreat before the imperialists cannot lead to genuine relaxation but will only encourage their aggression.

We have always opposed the creation of international tension by imperialism and stood for the relaxation of such tension. But the imperialists are bent on committing aggression and creating tension everywhere, and that can only lead to the opposite of what they desire.

Comrade Mao Zedong said:

The US imperialists believe that they will always benefit from tense situations, but the fact is that tension created by the United States has led to the opposite of what they desire. It serves to

mobilize the people of the whole world against the US aggressors.²²⁸

Further, “If the US monopoly groups persist in *their* policies of aggression and war, the day is bound to come when the people of the world will hang them by the neck.”²²⁹

The Declaration of 1957 rightly says, “By this policy these anti-popular, aggressive imperialist forces are courting their own ruin, creating their own gravediggers.”

This is the dialectic of history. Those who revere the imperialists can hardly understand this truth.

The leaders of the CPSU assert that by advocating a tit-for-tat struggle the Chinese Communist Party has rejected negotiations. This again is nonsense.

We consistently maintain that those who refuse negotiations under all circumstances are definitely not Marxist-Leninists.

The Chinese Communists conducted negotiations with the Kuomintang many times during the revolutionary wars. They did not refuse to negotiate even on the eve of nation-wide liberation. Comrade Mao Zedong said in March 1949:

Whether the peace negotiations are over-all or local, we should be prepared for such an eventuality. We should not refuse to enter into negotiations because we are afraid of trouble and want to avoid complications, nor should we enter into negotiations with our minds in a haze. We should be firm in principle; we should also have all the flexibility permissible and necessary for carrying out our principles.²³⁰

Internationally, in struggling against imperialism and reaction, the Chinese Communists take the same correct attitude towards negotiations.

In October 1951, Comrade Mao Zedong had this to say about the Korean armistice negotiations:

²²⁸ Mao Zedong, “Excerpts from the Speech at the Supreme State Conference (2)” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. VIII, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*

²³⁰ Mao Zedong, “Report to the Second Plenary Session of the 7th CC of the CPC” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, *op. cit.*, p. 372.

We have long said that the Korean question should be settled by peaceful means. This still holds good now. So long as the US government is willing to settle the question on a just and reasonable basis, and will stop using every shameless means possible to wreck and obstruct the progress of the negotiations, as it has done in the past, success in the Korean armistice negotiation is possible; otherwise it is impossible.²³¹

Resolute struggle against the US imperialists has compelled them to accept the Korean armistice agreement in the course of negotiations. We took an active part in the 1954 Geneva Conference and contributed to the restoration of peace in Indo-China.

We are in favor of negotiations even with the United States, which has occupied our territory of Taiwan. The Sino-US ambassadorial talks have been going on for more than eight years now.

We took an active part in the 1961 Geneva Conference on the Laotian question and promoted the signing of the Geneva agreements respecting the independence and neutrality of Laos.

Do the Chinese Communists allow themselves alone to negotiate with imperialist countries while opposing negotiations by the leaders of the CPSU with the leaders of the imperialist countries?

No, of course not.

In fact, we have always actively supported all such negotiations by the Soviet Government with imperialist countries as are beneficial and not detrimental to the defense of world peace.

Comrade Mao Zedong said on May 14, 1960:

We support the holding of the summit conference whether or not this sort of conference yields achievements, or whether the achievements are big or small. But the winning of world peace should depend primarily on resolute struggle by the people of all countries.²³²

We favor negotiations with imperialist countries. But it is absolutely impermissible to pin hopes for world peace on negotiations, spread illusions

²³¹ Mao Zedong, "Great Victories in Three Mass Movements" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. V, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

²³² Mao Zedong, "Important Talks with Guests from Asia, Africa and Latin America (Excerpts)" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. VIII, *op. cit.*, p. 308.

about them and thereby paralyze the fighting will of the peoples, as Khrushchev has done.

Actually, Khrushchev's wrong approach to negotiations is itself harmful to negotiations. The more Khrushchev retreats before the imperialists and the more he begs, the more the appetite of the imperialists will grow. Khrushchev, who poses as the greatest devotee of negotiations in history, is always an unrequited lover and too often a laughing-stock. Countless historical facts have shown that the imperialists and reactionaries never care to save the face of the capitulationists.

THE ROAD IN DEFENSE OF PEACE AND THE ROAD LEADING TO WAR

To sum up, our difference with the leaders of the CPSU on the question of war and peace is one between two different lines—whether or not to oppose imperialism, whether or not to support revolutionary struggles, whether or not to mobilize the people of the world against the imperialist war plots and whether or not to adhere to Marxism-Leninism.

Like all other genuine revolutionary parties, the Communist Party of China has always been in the forefront of the struggle against imperialism and for world peace.

We hold that to defend world peace it is necessary constantly to expose imperialism and to arouse and organize the people into struggle against the imperialists headed by the United States, and it is necessary to place reliance on the growth of the strength of the socialist camp, on the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and working people of all countries, on the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations, on the struggles of all peace-loving peoples and countries and on the broad united front against US imperialism and its lackeys.

This line of ours is in keeping with the common line for all communist parties laid down in the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

With this line, it is possible ceaselessly to raise the political consciousness of the people and to expand the struggle for world peace in the right direction.

With this line, it is possible constantly to strengthen the forces for world peace with the socialist camp as their core and strike at and weaken the imperialist forces for war.

With this line, it is possible constantly to expand the peoples' revolutions and manacle imperialism.

With this line, it is possible to turn to account for all available factors, including the contradictions between US imperialism and the other imperialist powers, and to isolate US imperialism to the fullest extent.

With this line, it is possible to smash the nuclear blackmail practiced by US imperialism and defeat its plan for launching a new world war.

This is the line for the people of all countries to win both victory in revolution and world peace. It is the sure and effective road in defense of world peace.

But the line pursued by the leaders of the CPSU is diametrically opposed to our line, to the common line of all Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people.

The leaders of the CPSU direct the edge of their struggle not at the enemy of world peace but at the socialist camp, thus weakening and undermining the core of strength which defends world peace.

They use nuclear blackmail to intimidate the people of the socialist countries and forbid them to support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, thus helping US imperialism to isolate the socialist camp and suppress peoples' revolutions.

They use nuclear blackmail to intimidate the oppressed peoples and nations and to prohibit them from making revolution, and they collaborate with US imperialism in stamping out the "sparks" of revolution, thus enabling it freely to carry on its policies of aggression and war in the intermediate zone lying between the United States and the socialist camp.

They also intimidate the allies of the United States and forbid them to struggle against the control it has imposed on them, thus helping US imperialism to enslave these countries and consolidate its position.

By this line of action the leaders of the CPSU have altogether relinquished the struggle against the imperialist policies of aggression and war.

This line of action denies the united front against US imperialism and its lackeys and in defense of world peace.

It tries to impose the greatest isolation not on the arch-enemy of world peace but on the peace forces.

It means the liquidation of the fighting task of defending world peace.

This is a line that serves the "global strategy" of US imperialism.

It is not the road to world peace but the road leading to greater danger of war and to war itself.

Today the world is no longer what it was on the eve of World War II. There is the powerful socialist camp. The national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America is surging forward. The political consciousness of the people of the world has been very much raised. The strength of the revolutionary peoples has been very much enhanced. The people of the Soviet Union, of the socialist countries and of the whole world will never allow their own destiny to be manipulated by the imperialist forces for war and their trumpeters.

The aggression and war activities of the imperialists and reactionaries are teaching the people of the world gradually to raise their political consciousness. Social practice is the sole criterion of truth. We are confident that as a result of such teaching by the imperialists and reactionaries, many people now holding wrong views on the question of war and peace will change their minds: We have high hopes on this score.

We firmly believe that the Communists and the people of the world will surely smash the imperialist plan for launching a new world war and safeguard world peace provided they expose the imperialist frauds, see through the revisionist lies and shoulder the task of defending world peace.

Peaceful Coexistence—Two Diametrically Opposed Policies

COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU (VI)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE *PEOPLE'S DAILY* AND THE *RED FLAG*

December 12, 1963

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 23, 1963, pp. 1-20.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, December 20, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 51, pp. 6-18.

Since the 20th Congress of the CPSU Khrushchev and other comrades have talked more about the question of peaceful coexistence than about anything else.

Again and again the leaders of the CPSU claim that they have been faithful to Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence and have creatively developed it. They ascribe to their policy of "peaceful coexistence" all the credit for the victories won by the peoples of the world in prolonged revolutionary struggles.

They advertise the notion that imperialism, and US imperialism in particular, supports peaceful coexistence, and they wantonly malign the Chinese Communist Party and all Marxist-Leninist parties as being opponents of peaceful coexistence. The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU even slanders China as favoring "competition in unleashing war" with the imperialists.

They describe the words and deeds by which they have betrayed Marxism-Leninism, the proletarian world revolution and the revolutionary cause of the oppressed peoples and nations as being in conformity with Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence.

But can the words "peaceful coexistence" really serve as a talisman for the leaders of the CPSU in their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism? No, absolutely not.

We are now confronted with two diametrically opposed policies of peaceful coexistence.

One is Lenin and Stalin's policy of peaceful coexistence, which all Marxist-Leninists, including the Chinese Communists, stand for.

The other is the anti-Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence, the so-called general line of peaceful coexistence advocated by Khrushchev and others.

Let us now examine Lenin and Stalin's policy of peaceful coexistence and the stuff Khrushchev and others call the general line of peaceful coexistence.

LENIN AND STALIN'S POLICY OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

It was Lenin who advanced the idea that the socialist state should pursue a policy of peaceful coexistence towards countries with different social systems. This correct policy was long followed by the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin.

The question of peaceful coexistence between socialist and capitalist countries could not possibly have arisen prior to the October Revolution, since there was no socialist country in existence. Nevertheless, on the basis of his scientific analysis of imperialism, Lenin foresaw in 1915-16 that "socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously *in all* countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois for some time."²³³ In other words, within a certain period of time, socialist countries would exist side by side with capitalist or pre-capitalist countries. The very nature of the socialist system determines that socialist countries must pursue a foreign policy of peace. Lenin said, "Only the working class, when it wins power, can pursue a policy of peace not in words... but in deeds."²³⁴ These views of Lenin's can be said to constitute the theoretical basis of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

After the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin proclaimed to the world on many occasions that the foreign policy of the Soviet state was one of peace. But the imperialists were bent on strangling the newborn socialist republic in its cradle. They launched armed intervention against the Soviet state. Lenin rightly pointed out that confronted with this situation "unless we defended the socialist republic by force of arms, we could not exist."²³⁵

²³³ V. I. Lenin, "The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution," *op. cit.*, p. 60.

²³⁴ V. I. Lenin, "Draft Resolution on the Present Political Situation" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXV.

²³⁵ V. I. Lenin, "Report of the Central Committee—Eighth Congress of the RCP(B)" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX.

By 1920 the great Soviet people had defeated the imperialist armed intervention. A relative equilibrium of forces had come into being between the Soviet state and the imperialist countries. After trials of strength over several years, the Soviet state had stood its ground. It began to turn from war to peaceful construction. It was in these circumstances that Lenin advanced the idea of a policy of peaceful coexistence. In fact, from that time onwards the imperialists had no choice but to “coexist” with the Soviet state.

During Lenin’s lifetime, this equilibrium was always highly unstable and the socialist Soviet Republic was subject to stringent capitalist encirclement. Time and again Lenin pointed out that owing to the aggressive nature of imperialism there was no guarantee that socialism and capitalism would live in peace for long.

In the prevailing conditions, it was not yet possible for him to define at length the content of the policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. But the great Lenin laid down the correct foreign policy for the first state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and advanced the basic ideas of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

What were Lenin’s basic ideas on this policy?

First, Lenin pointed out that the socialist state existed in defiance of the imperialists’ will. Although it adhered to the foreign policy of peace, the imperialists had no desire to live in peace with it and would do everything possible and seize every opportunity to oppose or even destroy the socialist state.

Lenin said:

International imperialism... could not... live side by side with the Soviet Republic, both because of its objective position and because of the economic interests of the capitalist class which are embodied in it.²³⁶

Further,

The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of

²³⁶ V. I. Lenin, “Report on War and Peace—Seventh Congress of the RCP(B)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII.

frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.²³⁷

He therefore stressed time and again that the socialist state should maintain constant vigilance against imperialism.

The lesson all workers and peasants must master is that we must be on our guard and remember that we are surrounded by men, classes and governments openly expressing their extreme hatred for us. We must remember that we are always at a hair's breadth from all kinds of invasions.²³⁸

Secondly, Lenin pointed out that it was only through struggle that the Soviet state was able to live in peace with the imperialist countries. This was the result of repeated trials of strength between the imperialist countries and the Soviet state, which adopted a correct policy, relied on the support of the proletariat and oppressed nations of the world and utilized the contradictions among the imperialists.

Lenin said in November 1919:

That is the way it always is—when the enemy is beaten, he begins talking peace. We have told these gentlemen, the imperialists of Europe, time and again that we agree to make peace, but they continued to dream of enslaving Russia. Now they have realized that their dreams are not fated to come true.²³⁹

He pointed out in 1921:

The imperialist powers, with all their hatred of Soviet Russia and desire to throw themselves upon her, have had to reject this thought, because the decay of the capitalist world is increasingly advancing, its unity is becoming less and less, and the pressure of the forces of the oppressed colonial peoples, with a population of over 1000 million, is becoming stronger with each year, each month and even each week.²⁴⁰

²³⁷ V. I. Lenin, "Report of the Central Committee—Eighth Congress of the RCP(B)," op. cit.

²³⁸ V. I. Lenin, "Ninth All-Russia Congress of Soviets" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

²³⁹ V. I. Lenin, "On Party Work in the Countryside" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

²⁴⁰ V. I. Lenin, "Tenth Congress of the RCP(B)" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXII.

Thirdly, in carrying out the policy of peaceful coexistence, Lenin adopted different principles with regard to the different types of countries in the capitalist world.

He attached particular importance to establishing friendly relations with countries which the imperialists were bullying and oppressing. He pointed out that “the fundamental interests of all peoples suffering from the yoke of imperialism coincide”, and that the “world policy of imperialism is leading to the establishment of closer relations, alliance and friendship among all the oppressed nations.” He said that the peace policy of the Soviet state “will increasingly compel the establishment of closer ties between the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and a growing number of neighboring states.”²⁴¹

Lenin also said:

We now set as the main task for ourselves: to defeat the exploiters and win the waverers to our side—this task is a world-wide one. The waverers include a whole series of bourgeois states, which as bourgeois states hate us, but on the other hand, as oppressed states, prefer peace with us.²⁴²

As for the basis for peace with the imperialist countries, such as the United States, he said: “Let the US capitalists refrain from touching us.” “‘The obstacle to such a peace?’ From our side, there is none. From the side of the American (and all the other) capitalists, it is imperialism.”²⁴³

Fourthly, Lenin advanced the policy of peaceful coexistence as a policy to be pursued by the proletariat in power towards countries with different social systems. He never made it the sum total of a socialist country’s foreign policy. Time and again Lenin made it clear that the fundamental principle of this foreign policy was proletarian internationalism.

He said:

²⁴¹ V. I. Lenin, “Report on the Work of the Council of People’s Commissars—Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

²⁴² V. I. Lenin, “Report on the Work of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Council of People’s Commissars” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

²⁴³ V. I. Lenin, “In Reply to Questions Put by Karl Wiegand” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

Soviet Russia considers it her greatest pride to help the workers of the whole world in their difficult struggle for the overthrow of capitalism.²⁴⁴

In the Decree on Peace issued after the October Revolution, while proposing an immediate peace without annexation or indemnities to all the belligerent countries, Lenin called upon the class-conscious workers in the capitalist countries to help, by comprehensive, determined, and supremely vigorous action, “to bring to a successful conclusion the cause of peace, and at the same time the cause of the emancipation of the toiling and exploited masses of the population from all forms of slavery and all forms of exploitation.”²⁴⁵

The Draft Program of the Party which Lenin drew up for the Seventh Congress of the Russian Communist Party laid down explicitly that “support of the revolutionary movement of the socialist proletariat in the advanced countries” and “support of the democratic and revolutionary movement in all countries in general, and particularly in the colonies and dependent countries” constituted the important aspects of the Party’s international policy.²⁴⁶

Fifthly, Lenin consistently held that it was impossible for the oppressed classes and nations to coexist peacefully with the oppressor classes and nations.

In the *Theses on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International*, he pointed out:

The bourgeoisie, even the most educated and democratic, now no longer hesitates to resort to any fraud or crime, to massacre millions of workers and peasants in order to save the private ownership of the means of production.²⁴⁷

Lenin’s conclusions were:

²⁴⁴ V. I. Lenin, “To the Fourth Congress of the Communist International and to the Petrograd Soviet of Workers’ and Red Army Deputies” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXIII.

²⁴⁵ V. I. Lenin, “Report on Peace—Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI.

²⁴⁶ V. I. Lenin, “Rough Outline of the Draft Program—Seventh Congress of the RCP(B)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII.

²⁴⁷ V. I. Lenin, “Theses on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI.

The very thought of peacefully subordinating the capitalists to the will of the majority of the exploited, of the peaceful, reformist transition to Socialism is not only extreme philistine stupidity, but also downright deception of the workers, the embellishment of capitalist wage slavery, concealment of the truth.²⁴⁸

He repeatedly pointed to the hypocrisy of what the imperialists called the equality of nations. He said:

The League of Nations and the whole postwar policy of the Entente reveal this truth more clearly and distinctly than ever, they are everywhere intensifying the revolutionary struggle both of the proletariat in the advanced countries and of the masses of the working people in the colonial and dependent countries, and are hastening the collapse of the petit-bourgeois national illusion that nations can live together in peace and equality under capitalism.²⁴⁹

The above constitute Lenin's basic ideas on the policy of peaceful coexistence.

Stalin upheld Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence. In the thirty years during which he was the leader of the Soviet Union, he consistently pursued this policy.

It was only when the imperialists and reactionaries made armed provocations or launched aggressive wars against the Soviet Union that she had to wage the Great Patriotic War and to fight back in self-defense.

Stalin pointed out that "our relations with the capitalist countries are based on the assumption that the coexistence of two opposite systems is possible" and that "the maintenance of peaceful relations with the capitalist countries is an obligatory task for us."²⁵⁰

He also pointed out:

The peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism is quite possible provided there is a mutual desire to co-operate, readiness to carry out undertaken commitments, and observance of

²⁴⁸ Ibid.

²⁴⁹ V. I. Lenin, "Draft Theses on National and Colonial Questions for the Second Congress of the Communist International" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI.

²⁵⁰ Joseph Stalin, "The Fifteenth Congress of the CPSU(B)" in *Works*, Vol. X, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

the principle of equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states.²⁵¹

While upholding Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence, Stalin firmly opposed withholding support from other people's revolutions in order to curry favor with imperialism. He forcefully pointed out two opposite lines in foreign policy, "either one or the other" of which must be followed.

One line was that "we continue to pursue a revolutionary policy, rallying the proletarians and the oppressed of all countries around the working class of the USSR—in which case international capital will do everything it can to hinder our advance."

The other was that "we renounce our revolutionary policy and agree to make a number of fundamental concessions to international capital—in which case international capital no doubt, will not be averse to 'assisting' us in converting our socialist country into a 'good' bourgeois republic."

Stalin cited an example. "America demands that we renounce in principle the policy of supporting the emancipation movement of the working class in other countries, and says that if we made this concession everything would go smoothly... perhaps we should make this concession?"

And he answered in the negative: "we cannot agree to these or similar concessions without being false to ourselves."²⁵²

These remarks of Stalin are still of great practical significance. There are indeed two diametrically opposed foreign policies, two diametrically opposed policies of peaceful coexistence. It is an important task for all Marxist-Leninists to distinguish between them, uphold Lenin and Stalin's policy and firmly oppose the policy of betrayal, capitulation and withholding support from revolution as well as the policy which converts a socialist country into a "good" bourgeois republic—policies which Stalin denounced.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA UPHOLDS LENIN'S POLICY OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU alleges that the Chinese Communist Party "lacks faith in the possibility of peaceful coex-

²⁵¹ Joseph Stalin, "Answers to Four Questions from a Group of Editors of American Newspapers" in *Works*, Vol. XVI, Red Star Press, London, 1986, p. 407.

²⁵² Joseph Stalin, "The Work of the April Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission" in *Works*, Vol. XI, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

istence” and slanderously accuses it of opposing Lenin’s policy of peaceful coexistence.

Is this true? No. Of course not.

Anyone who respects facts can see clearly that the Chinese Communist Party and the Government of the People’s Republic of China have unwaveringly pursued Lenin’s policy of peaceful coexistence with great success.

Since World War II, a fundamental change has taken place in the international balance of class forces. Socialism has triumphed in a number of countries and the socialist camp has come into being. The national liberation movement is growing apace and there have emerged many nationalist states which have newly acquired political independence. The imperialist camp has been greatly weakened and the contradictions among the imperialist countries are becoming increasingly acute. This situation provides more favorable conditions for the socialist countries to carry out the policy of peaceful coexistence towards countries with different social systems.

In these new historical conditions, the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government have enriched Lenin’s policy of peaceful coexistence in the course of applying it.

On the eve of the birth of the People’s Republic of China, Comrade Mao Zedong said:

We proclaim to the whole world that what we oppose is exclusively the imperialist system and its plots against the Chinese people. We are willing to discuss with any foreign government the establishment of diplomatic relations on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual benefit and mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, provided it is willing to sever relations with the Chinese reactionaries, stops conspiring with them or helping them and adopts an attitude of genuine, and not hypocritical, friendship towards People’s China. The Chinese people wish to have friendly cooperation with the people of all countries and to resume and expand international trade in order to develop production and promote economic prosperity.²⁵³

²⁵³ Mao Zedong, “Address to the Preparatory Meeting of the New Political Consultative Conference” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, *op. cit.*, p. 410.

In accordance with these principles set forth by Comrade Mao Zedong, we laid down our foreign policy of peace in explicit terms first in the Common Program adopted by the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference in September 1949 and subsequently in the Constitution of the People's Republic of China adopted by the National People's Congress in September 1954.

In 1954 the Chinese Government initiated the celebrated Five Principles of peaceful coexistence. They are mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. Together with other Asian and African countries, we formulated the Ten Principles on the basis of the Five Principles at the Bandung Conference of 1955.

In 1956 Comrade Mao Zedong summed up our country's practical experience in international affairs and further explained the general principles of our foreign policy.

To achieve a lasting world peace, we must further develop our friendship and cooperation with the fraternal countries in the camp of socialism and strengthen our solidarity with all peace-loving countries. We must endeavor to establish normal diplomatic relations on the basis of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty and of equality and mutual benefit with all countries willing to live together with us in peace. We must give active support to the national independence and liberation movement in countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America as well as to the peace movement and to just struggles in all countries throughout the world.²⁵⁴

In 1957 he said:

To strengthen our unity with the Soviet Union, to strengthen our unity with all socialist countries—this is our fundamental policy, herein lies our basic interest. Then, there are the Asian and African countries, and all the peace-loving countries and peoples—we must strengthen and develop our unity with them... As for the imperialist countries, we should also unite with their peoples and strive to coexist in peace with these countries, do business with them and prevent any possible war, but under no

²⁵⁴ Mao Zedong, "Opening Address to the Eighth National Congress of the CPC."

circumstances should we harbor any unrealistic notions about them.²⁵⁵

In our foreign affairs over the past fourteen years, we have adopted different policies towards different types of countries and varied our policies according to the different conditions in countries of the same type.

1. We differentiate between socialist and capitalist countries. We persevere in the proletarian internationalist principle of mutual assistance with regard to socialist countries. We take the upholding and strengthening of the unity of all the countries in the socialist camp as the fundamental policy in our foreign relations.

2. We differentiate between the nationalist countries which have newly attained political independence and the imperialist countries.

Although fundamentally different from the socialist countries in their social and political systems, the nationalist countries stand in profound contradiction to imperialism. They have common interests with the socialist countries—opposition to imperialism, the safeguarding of national independence and the defense of world peace. Therefore, it is quite possible and feasible for the socialist countries to establish relations of peaceful coexistence and friendly cooperation with these countries. The establishment of such relations is of great significance for the strengthening of the unity of the anti-imperialist forces and for the advancement of the common struggle of the peoples against imperialism.

We have consistently adhered to the policy of consolidating and further developing peaceful coexistence and friendly cooperation with countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. At the same time, we have waged appropriate and necessary struggles against countries such as India, which have violated or wrecked the Five Principles.

3. We differentiate between the ordinary capitalist countries and the imperialist countries and also between different imperialist countries.

As the international balance of class forces grows increasingly favorable to socialism and as the imperialist forces become daily weaker and the contradictions among them daily sharper, it is possible for the socialist countries to compel one imperialist country or another to establish some sort of peaceful coexistence with them by relying on their own growing strength, the expan-

²⁵⁵ Mao Zedong, "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. V, *op. cit.*, pp. 404-405..

sion of the revolutionary forces of the peoples, the unity with the nationalist countries and the struggle of all the peace-loving people, and by utilizing the internal contradictions of imperialism.

While persevering in peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems, we unswervingly perform our proletarian internationalist duty. We actively support the national liberation movements of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the working-class movements of Western Europe, North America and Australasia, the people's revolutionary struggles, and the people's struggles against the imperialist policies of aggression and war and for world peace.

In all this we have but one objective in view, that is, with the socialist camp and the international proletariat as the nucleus, to unite all the forces that can be united in order to form a broad united front against US imperialism and its lackeys.

On the basis of the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence, the Chinese Government over the past ten years and more has established friendly relations with many countries having different social systems and promoted economic and cultural exchanges with them. China has concluded treaties of friendship, of peace and friendship or of friendship, mutual assistance and mutual non-aggression with the Yemen, Burma, Nepal, Afghanistan, Guinea, Cambodia, Indonesia and Ghana. She has successfully settled her boundary questions with Burma, Nepal, Pakistan, Afghanistan, etc., questions which were left over by history.

No one can obliterate the great achievements of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government in upholding Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence.

In manufacturing the lie that China opposes peaceful coexistence, the leaders of the CPSU are prompted by ulterior motives. To put it bluntly, their aim is to draw a veil over their own ugliness in betraying proletarian internationalism and colluding with imperialism.

THE GENERAL LINE OF "PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE" OF THE CPSU LEADERS

It is not we, but the leaders of the CPSU, who in fact violate Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence.

The leaders of the CPSU have lauded their concept of peaceful coexistence in superlative terms. What are their main views on the question of peaceful coexistence?

1. The leaders of the CPSU maintain that peaceful coexistence is the overriding and supreme principle for solving contemporary social problems. They assert that it is “the categorical imperative of modern times” and “the imperious demand of the epoch.”²⁵⁶ They say that “peaceful coexistence alone is the best and the sole acceptable way to solve the vitally important problems confronting society”²⁵⁷ and that the principle of peaceful coexistence should be made the “basic law of life of the whole of modern society.”²⁵⁸

2. They hold that imperialism has become willing to accept peaceful coexistence and is no longer the obstacle to it. They say that “not a few government and state leaders of Western countries are now also coming out for peace and peaceful coexistence,”²⁵⁹ and that they “understand more and more clearly the necessity of peaceful coexistence.”²⁶⁰ In particular they have loudly announced a US President’s “admission of the reasonableness and practicability of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems.”²⁶¹

3. They advocate “all-round cooperation” with imperialist countries, and especially with the United States. They say that the Soviet Union and the United States “will be able to find a basis for concerted actions and efforts for the good of all humanity”²⁶² and can “march hand in hand for the sake of

²⁵⁶ B. N. Ponomaryov, “Victorious Banner of the Communists of the World,” *Pravda*, November 18, 1962.

²⁵⁷ A. Rumyantsev, “Our Common Ideological Weapon,” *World Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1962.

²⁵⁸ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the UN General Assembly, September 23, 1960.

²⁵⁹ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Gadjah Mada University, Djokjakarta, Indonesia, February 21, 1960.

²⁶⁰ N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, January 1960.

²⁶¹ “On the Interview of the US President J. F. Kennedy,” editorial board article in *Izvestia*, December 4, 1961.

²⁶² Telegram of Greetings from N. S. Khrushchev and L. I. Brezhnev to J. F. Kennedy, December 30, 1961.

consolidating peace and establishing real international cooperation between all states.”²⁶³

4. They assert that peaceful coexistence is “the general line of foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp.”²⁶⁴

5. They also assert that “the principle of peaceful coexistence determines the general line of foreign policy of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties,”²⁶⁵ that it is “the basis of the strategy of communism” in the world today, and that all Communists “have made the struggle for peaceful coexistence the general principle of their policy.”²⁶⁶

6. They regard peaceful coexistence as the prerequisite for victory in the peoples’ revolutionary struggles. They hold that the victories won by the people of different countries have been achieved under “conditions of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.”²⁶⁷ They assert that “it was precisely in conditions of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems that the socialist revolution triumphed in Cuba, that the Algerian people gained national independence, that more than forty countries won national independence, that the fraternal parties grew in number and strength, and that the influence of the world communist movement increased.”²⁶⁸

7. They hold that peaceful coexistence is “the best way of helping the international revolutionary labor movement achieve its basic class aims.”²⁶⁹ They declare that under peaceful coexistence the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism in capitalist countries has grown. They believe, moreover, that the victory of socialism in economic competition “will mean delivering a crushing blow to the entire system of capitalist relationships.”²⁷⁰ They state that “when the Soviet people will enjoy the blessings of communism,

²⁶³ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the UN General Assembly, September 23, 1960.

²⁶⁴ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Reception Given by the Embassy of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea in the Soviet Union, July 5, 1961.

²⁶⁵ B. N. Ponomaryov, “Some Problems of the Revolutionary Movement,” *op. cit.*

²⁶⁶ “Peaceful Coexistence and Revolution,” *Kommunist*, Moscow, No. 2, 1962.

²⁶⁷ B. N. Ponomaryov, “A New Stage in the General Crisis of Capitalism,” *Pravda*, February 8, 1961.

²⁶⁸ See “Letter of the CC of the CPSU of March 30, 1963,” p. 460 of this volume.

²⁶⁹ See “Open Letter of the CC of the CPSU to all Party Organizations, to all Communists of the Soviet Union,” p. 508 of this volume.

²⁷⁰ B. N. Ponomaryov, “Some Problems of the Revolutionary Movement,” *op. cit.*

new hundreds of millions of people on earth will say: ‘We are for communism!’”²⁷¹ and that by then even capitalists may “go over to the Communist Party.”

Just consider. What do these views have in common with Lenin’s policy of peaceful coexistence?

Lenin’s policy of peaceful coexistence is one followed by a socialist country in its relations with countries having different social systems, whereas Khrushchev describes peaceful coexistence as the supreme principle governing the life of modern society.

Lenin’s policy of peaceful coexistence constitutes one aspect of the international policy of the proletariat in power, whereas Khrushchev stretches peaceful coexistence into the general line of foreign policy for the socialist countries and even further into the general line for all communist parties.

Lenin’s policy of peaceful coexistence was directed against the imperialist policies of aggression and war, whereas Khrushchev’s peaceful coexistence caters to imperialism and abets the imperialist policies of aggression and war.

Lenin’s policy of peaceful coexistence is based on the standpoint of international class struggle, whereas Khrushchev’s peaceful coexistence strives to replace international class struggle with international class collaboration.

Lenin’s policy of peaceful coexistence proceeds from the historical mission of the international proletariat and therefore requires the socialist countries to give firm support to the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed peoples and nations while pursuing this policy, whereas Khrushchev’s peaceful coexistence seeks to replace the proletarian world revolution with pacifism and thus renounces proletarian internationalism.

Khrushchev has changed the policy of peaceful coexistence into one of class capitulation. In the name of peaceful coexistence, he has renounced the revolutionary principles of the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960, robbed Marxism-Leninism of its revolutionary soul, and distorted and mutilated it beyond recognition.

This is a brazen betrayal of Marxism-Leninism!

²⁷¹ Program of the CPSU, adopted by the 22nd Congress of the CPSU.

THREE DIFFERENCES OF PRINCIPLE

On the question of peaceful coexistence the difference between the leaders of the CPSU, on the one hand, and ourselves and all Marxist-Leninist parties and indeed all Marxist-Leninists, on the other, is not whether socialist countries should pursue the policy of peaceful coexistence. It is an issue of principle concerning the correct attitude towards Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence. It manifests itself mainly in three questions.

The first question is: In order to attain peaceful coexistence, is it necessary to wage struggles against imperialism and bourgeois reaction? Is it possible through peaceful coexistence to abolish the antagonism and struggle between socialism and imperialism?

Marxist-Leninists consistently maintain that as far as the socialist countries are concerned, there is no obstacle to the practice of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. The obstacles always come from the imperialists and the bourgeois reactionaries.

The Five Principles of peaceful coexistence were advanced to combat the imperialist policies of aggression and war. Under these principles, it is impermissible in international relations to encroach upon the territory and sovereignty of other countries, interfere in their internal affairs, impair their interests and equal status or wage aggressive wars against them. But it is in the very nature of imperialism to commit aggression against other countries and nations and to desire to enslave them. As long as imperialism exists, its nature will never change. That is why intrinsically the imperialists are unwilling to accept the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence. Whenever possible, they try to disrupt and destroy the socialist countries and they commit aggression against other countries and nations and try to enslave them.

History shows that it is only owing to unfavorable objective causes that the imperialists dare not risk starting a war against the socialist countries, or are forced to agree to an armistice and to accept some sort of peaceful coexistence.

History also shows that there have always been sharp and complex struggles between the imperialist and socialist countries, which have sometimes culminated in direct military conflicts or wars. When hot wars are not in progress, the imperialists wage cold wars, which they have been ceaselessly waging ever since the end of World War II. In fact, the imperialist and the socialist countries have been in a state of cold-war coexistence. At the

same time as they actively expand their armaments and prepare for war, the imperialist countries use every means to oppose the socialist countries politically, economically and ideologically, and even make military provocations and war threats against them. The imperialists' cold war against the socialist countries and the latter's resistance to it are manifestations of the international class struggle.

The imperialists push on with their plans of aggression and war not only against the socialist countries but throughout the world. They try to suppress the revolutionary movements of the oppressed peoples and nations.

In these circumstances, the socialist countries, together with the people of all other countries, must resolutely combat the imperialist policies of aggression and war and wage a tit-for-tat struggle against imperialism. This class struggle inevitably goes on, now in an acute and now in a relaxed form.

But Khrushchev is impervious to these inexorable facts. He proclaims far and wide that imperialism has already admitted the necessity of peaceful coexistence, and he regards the anti-imperialist struggles of the socialist countries and of the people of the world as incompatible with the policy of peaceful coexistence.

In Khrushchev's opinion, a socialist country has to make one concession after another and keep on yielding to the imperialists and the bourgeois reactionaries even when they subject it to military threats and armed attack or make humiliating demands which violate its sovereignty and dignity.

By this logic, Khrushchev describes his incessant retreats, his bartering away of principles and docile acceptance of the US imperialists' humiliating demands during the Caribbean crisis as "a victory of peaceful coexistence."

By the same logic, Khrushchev describes China's adherence to correct principles on the Sino-Indian boundary question and her counter-attack against the military onslaught of the Indian reactionaries, an act of self-defense by China when the situation became intolerable, as "a violation of peaceful coexistence."

At times, Khrushchev also talks about struggle between the two different social systems. But how does he see this struggle?

He has said, "The inevitable struggle between the two systems must be made to take the form exclusively of a struggle of ideas..."²⁷²

²⁷² N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, January 1960.

Here the political struggle has disappeared!

He has also said:

The Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of states with differing socio-economic and political systems does not mean just an absence of war, a temporary state of unstable ceasefire. It presupposes the maintenance between these states of friendly economic and political relations, it envisages the establishment and development of various forms of peaceful international cooperation.²⁷³

Here, struggle has disappeared altogether!

Like a conjurer, Khrushchev plays one trick after another, first reducing major issues to minor ones, and then minor issues to naught. He denies the basic antagonism between the socialist and capitalist systems, he denies the fundamental contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps, and he denies the existence of international class struggle. And so he transforms peaceful coexistence between the two systems and the two camps into “all-round cooperation.”

The second question is: Can peaceful coexistence be made the general line of foreign policy for socialist countries?

We hold that the general line of foreign policy for socialist countries must embody the fundamental principle of their foreign policy and comprise the fundamental content of this policy.

What is this fundamental principle? It is proletarian internationalism.

Lenin said, “Alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all the oppressed peoples against any and all the imperialists—such is the external policy of the proletariat.”²⁷⁴ This principle of proletarian internationalism advanced by Lenin should be the guide for the foreign policy of socialist countries.

Since the formation of the socialist camp, every socialist country has had to deal with three kinds of relations in its foreign policy, namely, its relations with other socialist countries, with countries having different social systems, and with the oppressed peoples and nations.

²⁷³ N. S. Khrushchev, “Answers to the Questions of the Austrian Professor Hans Thirring,” *Pravda*, January 3, 1962.

²⁷⁴ V. I. Lenin, “The Foreign Policy of the Russian Revolution,” *op. cit.*

In our view, the following should therefore be the content of the general line of foreign policy for socialist countries: to develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance and cooperation among the countries of the socialist camp in accordance with the principle of proletarian internationalism; to strive for peaceful coexistence on the basis of the Five Principles with countries having different social systems and oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war; and to support and assist the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed peoples and nations. These three aspects are interrelated and not a single one can be omitted.

The leaders of the CPSU have one-sidedly reduced the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries to peaceful coexistence. We would like to ask: How should a socialist country handle its relations with other socialist countries? Should it merely maintain relations of peaceful coexistence with them?

Of course, socialist countries, too, must abide by the Five Principles in their mutual relations. It is absolutely impermissible for any one of them to undermine the territorial integrity of another fraternal country, to impair its independence and sovereignty, interfere in its internal affairs, carry on subversive activities inside it, or violate the principle of equality and mutual benefit in its relations with another fraternal country. But merely to carry out these principles is far from enough. The 1957 Declaration states:

These are vital principles... However, they do not exhaust the essence of relations between them. Fraternal mutual aid is part and parcel of these relations. This aid is a striking expression of socialist internationalism.

In making peaceful coexistence the general line of foreign policy, the leaders of the CPSU have in fact liquidated the proletarian internationalist relations of mutual assistance and cooperation among socialist countries and put the fraternal socialist countries on a par with the capitalist countries. This amounts to liquidating the socialist camp.

The leaders of the CPSU have one-sidedly reduced the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries to peaceful coexistence. We would like to ask: How should a socialist country handle its relations with the oppressed peoples and nations? Should the relationship between the proletariat in power and its class brothers who have not yet emancipated themselves or between

it and all oppressed peoples and nations be one of peaceful coexistence alone and not of mutual help?

After the October Revolution, Lenin repeatedly stressed that the land of socialism, which had established the dictatorship of the proletariat, was a base for promoting the proletarian world revolution. Stalin, too, said:

The revolution which has been victorious in one country must regard itself not as a self-sufficient entity, but as an aid, as a means *for* hastening the victory of the proletariat in all countries.²⁷⁵

He added that “it constitutes... a mighty base for its further development [*i.e.*, of the world revolution].”²⁷⁶

In their foreign policy, therefore, socialist countries can in no circumstances confine themselves to handling relations with countries having different social systems, but must also correctly handle the relations among themselves and their relations with the oppressed peoples and nations. They must make support of the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations their internationalist duty and an important component of their foreign policy.

In contrast with Lenin and Stalin, Khrushchev makes peaceful coexistence the general line of foreign policy for socialist countries and, in so doing, excludes from this policy the proletarian internationalist task of helping the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations. So far from being a “creative development” of the policy of peaceful coexistence, this is a betrayal of proletarian internationalism on the pretext of peaceful coexistence.

The third question is: Can the policy of peaceful coexistence of the socialist countries be the general line for all communist parties and for the international communist movement? Can it be substituted for the people’s revolution?

We maintain that peaceful coexistence connotes a relationship between countries with different social systems, between independent sovereign states. Only after victory in the revolution is it possible and necessary for the proletariat to pursue the policy of peaceful coexistence. As for oppressed peo-

²⁷⁵ Joseph Stalin, “The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists” in *Problems of Leninism*, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

ples and nations, their task is to strive for their own liberation and overthrow the rule of imperialism and its lackeys. They should not practice peaceful coexistence with the imperialists and their lackeys, nor is it possible for them to do so.

It is therefore wrong to apply peaceful coexistence to the relations between oppressed and oppressor classes and between oppressed and oppressor nations, or to stretch the socialist countries' policy of peaceful coexistence so as to make it the policy of the communist parties and the revolutionary people in the capitalist world, or to subordinate the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations to it.

We have always held that the correct application of Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence by the socialist countries helps to develop their power, to expose the imperialist policies of aggression and war and to unite all the anti-imperialist peoples and countries, and it therefore helps the people's struggles against imperialism and its lackeys. At the same time, by directly hitting and weakening the forces of aggression, war and reaction, the people's revolutionary struggles against imperialism and its lackeys help the cause of world peace and human progress, and therefore help the socialist countries' struggle for peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems. Thus, the correct application of Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence by the socialist countries is in harmony with the interests of the people's revolutionary struggles in all countries.

However, the socialist countries' struggle for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems and the people's revolution in various countries are two totally different things.

In its letter of June 14 replying to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Central Committee of the CPC states:

It is one thing to practice peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. It is absolutely impermissible and impossible for countries practicing peaceful coexistence to touch even a hair of each other's social system. The class struggle, the struggle for national liberation and the transition from capitalism to socialism in various countries are quite another thing. They are all bitter, life-and-death revolutionary struggles which aim at changing the social system. Peaceful coexistence cannot replace the revolutionary struggles of the people. The transition

from capitalism to socialism in any country can only be brought about through the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in that country.

In a class society it is completely wrong to regard peaceful coexistence as “the best and the sole acceptable way to solve the vitally important problems confronting society” and as the “basic law of life for the whole of modern society.” This is social pacifism which repudiates class struggle. It is an outrageous betrayal of Marxism-Leninism.

Back in 1946, Comrade Mao Zedong differentiated between the two problems and explicitly stated that compromise between the Soviet Union and the United States, Britain and France on certain issues “does not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in those countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions.”²⁷⁷

This is a correct Marxist-Leninist policy. Guided by this correct policy of Comrade Mao Zedong’s, the Chinese people firmly and determinedly carried the revolution through to the end and won the great victory of their revolution.

Acting against this Marxist-Leninist policy, the leaders of the CPSU equate one aspect of the policy to be pursued by the proletariat in power in its state relations with countries having different social systems with the general line of all the communist parties, and they try to substitute the former for the latter, demanding that communist parties and revolutionary peoples should all follow what they call the general line of peaceful coexistence. Not desiring revolution themselves, they forbid others to make it. Not opposing imperialism themselves, they forbid others to oppose it.

This the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU and Khrushchev’s recent remarks have strenuously denied. It has been asserted that it is “a monstrous slander to accuse the leaders of the CPSU of extending peaceful coexistence to relations between the oppressed and oppressor classes and between the oppressed and oppressor nations. They have even hypocritically stated that peaceful coexistence “cannot be extended to the class struggle against capital within the capitalist countries and to national liberation movements.”

²⁷⁷ Mao Zedong, “Some Points in Appraisal of the Present International Situation” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

But such prevarication is futile.

We should like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Since the policy of peaceful coexistence constitutes only one aspect of the foreign policy of socialist countries, why have you asserted until recently that it represents “the strategic line for the whole period of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale?”²⁷⁸ In requiring the communist parties of all the capitalist countries and of the oppressed nations to make peaceful coexistence their general line, are you not aiming at replacing the revolutionary line of the communist parties with your policy of “peaceful coexistence” and willfully applying that policy to the relations between oppressed and oppressor classes and between oppressed and oppressor nations?

We should also like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Since the peoples win victory in their revolutions by relying primarily on their own struggles, how can such victory be attributed to peaceful coexistence or described as its outcome? Do not such allegations of yours mean the subordination of the revolutionary struggles of the peoples to your policy of peaceful coexistence?

We should further like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Economic successes in socialist countries and the victories they score in economic competition with capitalist countries undoubtedly play an exemplary role and are an inspiration to oppressed peoples and nations. But how can it be said that socialism will triumph on a worldwide scale through peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition instead of through the revolutionary struggles of the peoples?

The leaders of the CPSU advertise reliance on peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition as being enough to “deliver a crushing blow to the entire system of capitalist relationships” and bring about world-wide peaceful transition to socialism. This is equivalent to saying that the oppressed peoples and nations have no need to wage struggles, make revolution and overthrow the reactionary rule of imperialism and colonialism and their lackeys, and that they should just wait quietly—until the production levels and living standards of the Soviet Union outstrip those of the most developed capitalist countries, when the oppressed and exploited slaves throughout the world would be able to enter communism together with their oppressors and exploiters. Is this not an attempt on the part of the leaders of the CPSU to

²⁷⁸ “For the Unity and Solidarity of the International Communist Movement,” editorial board article in *Pravda*, December 6, 1963.

substitute what they call peaceful coexistence for the revolutionary struggles of the peoples and to liquidate such struggles?

An analysis of these three questions makes it clear that our difference with the leaders of the CPSU is a major difference of principle. In essence it boils down to this. Our policy of peaceful coexistence is Leninist and is based on the principle of proletarian internationalism. It contributes to the cause of opposing imperialism and defending world peace and accords with the interests of the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations the world over: whereas the so-called general line of peaceful coexistence pursued by the leaders of the CPSU is anti-Leninist, it abandons the principle of proletarian internationalism, damages the cause of opposing imperialism and defending world peace, and runs counter to the interests of the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations.

THE CPSU LEADERS' GENERAL LINE OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE CATERS TO US IMPERIALISM

The general line of peaceful coexistence pursued by the leaders of the CPSU is firmly rejected by all Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary people but is warmly praised by the imperialists.

The spokesmen of Western monopoly capital make no secret of their appreciation of this general line of the leaders of the CPSU. They see in Khrushchev “the West’s best friend in Moscow”²⁷⁹ and say that “Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev acts like an American politician.”²⁸⁰ They say, “Comrade Khrushchev is considered, as far as the free world is concerned, the best Prime Minister the Russians have. He genuinely believes in peaceful coexistence.”²⁸¹ They declare that “this possibility of better Soviet-American relations has led to the feeling in US State Department circles that, within certain limits, the US should facilitate Khrushchev’s task.”²⁸²

The imperialists have always been hostile to the socialist countries’ policy of peaceful coexistence, exclaiming “the very phrase ‘coexistence’ is both weird and pre-sumptuous” and “let us relegate to the scrap heap the concept

²⁷⁹ “How Nice Must We Be to Nikita?” in the US magazine *Time*, March 9, 1962.

²⁸⁰ W. A. Harriman, Television Interview, August 18, 1963.

²⁸¹ “Kennedy Helps Khrushchev,” in the British magazine *Time and Tide*, April 18-24, 1963.

²⁸² Agence France Press dispatch from Washington, July 14, 1963, on US government officials’ comment on the Open Letter of the CPSU.

of a transitory and uneasy coexistence.”²⁸³ Why do they now show so much interest in Khrushchev’s general line of peaceful coexistence? Because the imperialists are clear on its usefulness to them.

The US imperialists have invariably adopted the dual tactics of war and peace in order to attain their strategic objectives of liquidating the people’s revolutions, eliminating the socialist camp and dominating the world. When they find the international situation growing unfavorable to them, they need to resort increasingly to peace tricks while continuing their arms expansion and war preparations.

In 1958 John Foster Dulles proposed that the United States should dedicate itself to “a noble strategy” of “peaceful triumph.”²⁸⁴

After assuming office, Kennedy continued and developed Dulles’ “strategy of peace” and talked a great deal about “peaceful coexistence.” He said, “... we need a much better weapon than the H-bomb... and that better weapon is peaceful cooperation.”²⁸⁵

Does this mean that the US imperialists genuinely accept peaceful coexistence, or, in the words of the leaders of the CPSU, admit “the reasonableness and practicability of peaceful coexistence?” Of course not.

A little serious study makes it easy to see the real meaning and purpose of “peaceful coexistence” as advocated by the US imperialists.

What is its real meaning and purpose?

1. In the name of peaceful coexistence, the US imperialists try to tie the hands of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and forbid them to support the revolutionary struggles of the people in the capitalist world.

Dulles said:

The Soviet Government could end the “cold war,” so far as it is concerned if it would free itself from the guiding direction of international communism and seek primarily the welfare of the Russian nation and people. Also the “cold war” would come

²⁸³ Former US Under-Secretary of State Douglas Dillon’s address on US foreign policy, April 20, 1960.

²⁸⁴ J. F. Dulles, Speech Before the California State Chamber of Commerce, December 4, 1958.

²⁸⁵ J. F. Kennedy Speech at the UN General Assembly, September 20, 1963.

to an end if international communism abandoned its global goals.²⁸⁶

Kennedy stated that if US-Soviet relations were to be improved, the Soviet Union would have to abandon the plan of “communizing the entire world” and “look only to its national interest and to providing a better life for its people under conditions of peace.”²⁸⁷

Dean Rusk has put the point even more bluntly. “There can be no assured and lasting peace until the communist leaders abandon their goal of a world revolution.” He has also said that there are “signs of restiveness among the Soviet leaders “about the burdens and risks of their commitments to the world communist movement.” And he has even asked the Soviet leaders to “go on from there, by putting aside the illusion of a world communist triumph.”²⁸⁸

The meaning of these words is only too clear. The US imperialists describe the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations in the capitalist world for their own emancipation as being the outcome of attempts by the socialist countries to “communize the entire world.” They say to the Soviet leaders: Do you wish to live in peace with the United States? Very well! But on condition that you must not support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations in the capitalist world and must see to it that they will not rise in revolution. According to the wishful thinking of the US imperialists, this will leave them free to stamp out the revolutionary movements in the capitalist world and to dominate and enslave its inhabitants, who comprise two-thirds of the world’s population.

2. In the name of peaceful coexistence, the US imperialists try to push ahead with their policy of “peaceful evolution” vis-à-vis the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and to restore capitalism there.

Dulles said, “The renunciation of force... implies, not the maintenance of the *status quo*, but peaceful change.”²⁸⁹ “It is not sufficient to be defen-

²⁸⁶ J. F. Dulles, Speech Before the US House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, January 28, 1959.

²⁸⁷ J. F. Kennedy, Interview with A. I. Adzhubei, Editor-in-Chief of *Izvestia*, November 25, 1961.

²⁸⁸ Dean Rusk, Address at the National Convention of the American Legion, September 10, 1963.

²⁸⁹ J. F. Dulles, Address to the Award Dinner of the New York State Bar Association, January 31, 1959.

sive. Freedom must be a positive force that will penetrate.”²⁹⁰ “We hope to encourage an evolution within the Soviet world.”²⁹¹

Eisenhower asserted that whatever the United States could do by peaceful means would be done, “in order that those people who are held in bondage by a tyrannical dictatorship might finally have the right to determine their own fates by their own free votes.”²⁹²

Kennedy said that the “task is to do all in our power to see that the changes taking place... in the Soviet empire on all continents... lead to more freedom for more men and to world peace.”²⁹³ He declared that he would “pursue a policy of patiently encouraging freedom and carefully pressuring tyranny” towards the socialist countries in Eastern Europe, so as to provide “free choice” for the people of those countries.²⁹⁴

The meaning of these words, too, is very clear. The US imperialists malign the socialist system as “dictatorial” and “tyrannical” and describe the restoration of capitalism as “free choice.” They say to the Soviet leaders: Do you wish to live in peace with the United States? Very well! But this does not mean we recognize the *status quo* in the socialist countries; on the contrary, capitalism must be restored there. In other words, the US imperialists will never reconcile themselves to the fact that one-third of the world’s population has taken the socialist road, and they will always attempt to destroy all the socialist countries.

Briefly, what the US imperialists call peaceful coexistence amounts to this: no people living under imperialist domination and enslavement may strive for liberation, all who have already emancipated themselves must again come under imperialist domination and enslavement, and the whole world must be incorporated into the American “world community of free nations.”

It is easy to see why the general line of peaceful coexistence of the leaders of the CPSU is exactly to the taste of US imperialism.

²⁹⁰ J. F. Dulles, Speech Before the California State Chamber of Commerce, December 4, 1958.

²⁹¹ J. F. Dulles, Testimony Before the US House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, January 28, 1959.

²⁹² D. D. Eisenhower, Speech at the Polish-American Congress at Chicago, September 30, 1960.

²⁹³ J. F. Kennedy, *The Strategy of Peace*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1960, p. 199.

²⁹⁴ J. F. Kennedy, Speech at the Polish-American Congress at Chicago, October 1, 1960.

On the pretext of peaceful coexistence, the leaders of the CPSU do their best to curry favor with US imperialism and serve its fraudulent peace policy by constantly proclaiming that the representatives of US imperialism “are concerned about peace.”

On the pretext of peaceful coexistence, the leaders of the CPSU apply the policy of peaceful coexistence to the relations between oppressed and oppressor classes and between oppressed and oppressor nations, and they oppose revolution and try to liquidate it; this exactly suits the US imperialists’ requirement that the socialist countries should not support people’s revolutions in the capitalist world.

On the pretext of peaceful coexistence, the leaders of the CPSU try to substitute international class collaboration for international class struggle and advocate “all-round cooperation” between socialism and imperialism, thus opening the door to imperialist penetration of the socialist countries; this exactly suits the needs of the US imperialist policy of “peaceful evolution.”

The imperialists have always been our best teachers by negative example. Let us here cite extracts from two speeches by Dulles after the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

He stated:

I had said... that there was evidence within the Soviet Union of forces toward greater liberalism...

...if these forces go on and continue to gather momentum within the Soviet Union, then we can think, and reasonably hope, I said within a decade or perhaps a generation, that we would have what is the great goal of our policy, that is, a Russia which is governed by people who are responsive to the wishes of the Russian people, who had given up their predatory world-wide ambitions to rule and who conform to the principles of civilized nations and such principles as are embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.²⁹⁵

He also stated:

The long-range prospect—indeed, I would say the long-range certainty—is that there will be an evolution of the present poli-

²⁹⁵ J. F. Dulles, Press Conference, May 15, 1956.

cies of the Soviet rulers so that they will become more nationalist and less internationalist.²⁹⁶

Apparently, Dulles' ghost has been haunting the betrayers of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and they have become so obsessed with the so-called general line of peaceful coexistence that they do not pause to consider how well their actions accord will, the desires of US imperialism.

SOVIET-US COLLABORATION IS THE HEART AND SOUL OF THE CPSU LEADERS' GENERAL LINE OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

While harping on peaceful coexistence in recent years, the leaders of the CPSU have in fact not only violated the principle of proletarian internationalism but even failed to conform to the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence in their attitude towards China and a number of other socialist countries. To put it plainly, their ceaseless advocacy of peaceful coexistence as the general line of their foreign policy amounts to a demand that all the socialist countries and the communist parties must submit to their long-cherished dream of Soviet-US collaboration.

The heart and soul of the general line of peaceful coexistence pursued by the leaders of the CPSU is Soviet-US collaboration for the domination of the world.

Just look at the extraordinary statements they have made:

The two greatest modern powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, have left far behind any other country in the world.²⁹⁷

Each of these two powers is leading a large group of nations—the Soviet Union leading the world socialist system and the United States the capitalist camp.²⁹⁸

We [the Soviet Union and the United States] are the strongest countries in the world and if we unite for peace there can be no

²⁹⁶ J. F. Dulles, Press Conference, October 28, 1958.

²⁹⁷ N. N. Yakovlev, "After 30 Years..." a pamphlet written for the 30th anniversary of Soviet-American diplomatic relations.

²⁹⁸ Ibid.

war. Then if any madman wanted war, we would but have to shake our fingers to warn him off.²⁹⁹

...if there is agreement between N. S. Khrushchev, the head of the Soviet Government, and John Kennedy, the President of the United States, there will be a solution of international problems on which mankind's destinies depend.³⁰⁰

We would like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Since the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement say clearly that US imperialism is the sworn enemy of the people of the world and the main force making for aggression and war, how can you “unite” with the main enemy of world peace to “safeguard peace?”

We would like to ask them: Can it be that more than a hundred countries and over three thousand million people have no right to decide their own destiny? Must they submit to the manipulations of the two “giants,” the two “greatest powers,” the Soviet Union and the United States? Isn't this arrogant nonsense of yours an expression of great-power chauvinism and power politics pure and simple?

We would also like to ask them: Do you really imagine that if only the Soviet Union and the United States reached agreement, if only the two “great men” reached agreement, the destiny of mankind would be decided and all international issues settled? You are wrong, hopelessly wrong. From time immemorial, things have never happened in this way, and they are much less likely to do so in the nineteen sixties. The world today is full of complex contradictions, the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism, and the contradictions among the imperialist countries and among the monopoly capitalist groups in the imperialist countries. Would these contradictions disappear once the Soviet Union and the United States reached agreement?

The only country the leaders of the CPSU look up to is the United States. In their pursuit of Soviet-US collaboration, they do not scruple about betraying the Soviet people's true allies, including their class brothers and all

²⁹⁹ N. S. Khrushchev, Interview with the US Correspondent C. L. Sulzberger, *op. cit.*

³⁰⁰ A. A. Gromyko, Speech at the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, December 13, 1962.

the oppressed peoples and nations still living under the imperialist-capitalist system.

The leaders of the CPSU are trying hard to wreck the socialist camp. They use every kind of lie and slander against the Chinese Communist Party and exert political and economic pressure on China. As for socialist Albania, nothing short of its destruction would satisfy them. Hand in hand with US imperialism, they brought pressure to bear upon revolutionary Cuba, making demands on it at the expense of its sovereignty and dignity.

The leaders of the CPSU are trying hard to sabotage the revolutionary struggles of the peoples against imperialism and its lackeys. They are acting as preachers of social reformism and are sapping the revolutionary fighting will of the proletariat and its political party in various countries. To cater to the needs of imperialism, they are undermining the national liberation movement and becoming more and more shameless apologists of US neo-colonialism.

What do the leaders of the CPSU get from US imperialism in return for all their strenuous efforts and for the high price they pay in pursuit of Soviet-US collaboration?

Since 1959, Khrushchev has become obsessed with summit meetings between the Soviet Union and the United States. He has had many fond dreams and spread many illusions about them. He has extolled Eisenhower as “a big man” who “understands big politics.”³⁰¹ He has enthusiastically praised Kennedy as one who “understands the great responsibility that lies with the governments of two such powerful states.”³⁰² The leaders of the CPSU made a big fuss about the so-called spirit of Camp David and proclaimed the Vienna meeting to be “an event of historic significance.” The Soviet press claimed that once the heads of the Soviet Union and the United States sat at the same table, history would arrive at a “new turning point” and that a handshake between the two “greats men” would usher in a “new era” in international relations.

But how does US imperialism treat the leaders of the CPSU? A little over a month after the Camp David talk, Eisenhower declared, “I wasn’t aware of any spirit of Camp David.” And seven months after the talks he sent a U-2

³⁰¹ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Luncheon Given in His Honor by the Mayor of New York, September 17, 1959.

³⁰² N. S. Khrushchev, Radio and Television Speech, June 15, 1961.

spy plane to intrude into the Soviet Union, thus wrecking the four-power summit conference. Not long after the Vienna meeting, Kennedy put forward the following insolent conditions for twenty years of peace between the Soviet Union and the United States: no support by the Soviet Union for any people's revolutionary struggles, and the restoration of capitalism in the socialist countries of Eastern Europe. A year or more after the Vienna meeting Kennedy ordered the piratical military blockade of Cuba and created the Caribbean crisis.

Searching high and low among the quick and the dead, where can one find the much vaunted "spirit of Camp David," "turning point in the history of mankind and "new era in international relations?"

After the signing of the tripartite treaty on the partial nuclear test ban, the leaders of the CPSU gave great publicity to the so-called spirit of Moscow. They spoke of the need to "strike while the iron is hot," asserted that "all the favorable conditions are there" for the Soviet Union and the United States to reach further agreements, and declared that it was bad to take the attitude that "time can wait" or "there is no hurry."³⁰³

What is the "spirit of Moscow?" Let us look at recent events.

To create more of an atmosphere of Soviet-US cooperation, the leaders of the CPSU held a rally in Moscow in celebration of the thirtieth anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. At the same time, they sent a cultural delegation to the United States for celebrations there. But what came of the enthusiasm of the leader of the CPSU? The entire staff of the US Embassy in the Soviet Union refused to attend the Moscow rally, and the US State Department issued a special memorandum asking the American public to boycott the Soviet cultural delegation, whom they denounced as "extremely dangerous and suspicious people."

While the leaders of the CPSU were advocating "Soviet-US cooperation," the United States sent the agent Barghoorn to carry on activities in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government very properly arrested this agent. But, after Kennedy made the threat that the success of the wheat deal between the United States and the Soviet Union "depends upon a reasonable atmosphere in both countries," which he said had been "badly damaged by the Barghoorn arrest," the Soviet Government hurriedly released this US agent without

³⁰³ "Time Cannot Wait," article by observer in *Izvestia*, August 21, 1963.

any trial, on the grounds of “the concern of the US high officials over F. C. Barghoorn’s fate,” over the fate of an agent who “the investigation confirmed... had been engaged in intelligence activities against the USSR.”

Are all these manifestations of the “spirit of Moscow?” If so, it is indeed very sad.

Moscow! Bright capital of the first socialist country and glorious name cherished by so many millions of people throughout the world since the Great October Revolution! Now this name is being used by the leaders of the CPSU to cover up their foul practice of collaboration with the US imperialists. What an unprecedented shame!

All too often have the leaders of the CPSU said fine things about the US imperialists and begged favors from them; all too often have they lost their temper with fraternal countries and parties and put pressure on them; all too many are the tricks and deceptions they have practiced on the revolutionary people in various countries—solely in order to beg for “friendship” and “trust” from US imperialism. But “while the drooping flowers pine for love, the heartless brook babbles on.” All that the leaders of the CPSU have received from the US Imperialists is humiliation, again humiliation, always humiliation!

A FEW WORDS OF ADVICE TO THE LEADERS OF THE CPSU

During the bitter days of resistance to armed imperialist intervention and amidst the raging fires of the Patriotic War, was there ever an occasion when the great Soviet people under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin bowed to difficulties? Did they ever kneel before the enemy? Today, the world situation is most favorable to revolution and socialism is stronger than ever, while imperialism has never been in such difficulties; yet how ignominiously has the first socialist country, the state founded by Lenin, been bullied by US imperialism and how grossly has the socialist camp been disgraced by the leaders of the CPSU! How is it possible for us, for any Marxist-Leninists or revolutionary people, not to feel distress?

Here we should like to offer sincere advice to the leaders of the CPSU.

The United States, the most ferocious imperialist country, has the mad strategic aim of conquering the world. It is frantically suppressing the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations and has openly declared its intention of bringing Eastern Europe back into the so-called world community of free nations. How can you imagine that the heaviest

blows of the US imperialists in pursuit of their aggressive plans for conquering the whole world will fall on others and not on the Soviet Union?

The United States is an imperialist country and the Soviet Union a socialist country. How can you expect “all-round cooperation” between two countries with entirely different social systems?

There is mutual deception and rivalry even between the United States and the other imperialist powers, and the United States will not be satisfied until it has trampled them underfoot. How then can you imagine that the imperialist United States will live in harmony with the socialist Soviet Union?

Leading comrades of the CPSU! Just think the matter over soberly. Can US imperialism be depended upon when a storm breaks in the world? No! The US imperialists are undependable, as are all imperialists and reactionaries. The only dependable allies of the Soviet Union are the fraternal countries of the socialist camp, the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties and all oppressed peoples and nations.

The laws of historical development operate independently of any individual's will. No one can possibly prevent the growth of the socialist camp and the revolutionary movement of the oppressed peoples and nations, let alone destroy them. He who betrays the people of the socialist camp and the world and dreams of dominating the globe by colluding with US imperialism is bound to end up badly. It is very mistaken and dangerous for the leaders of the CPSU to do so.

It is not yet too late for the leaders of the CPSU to rein in at the brink. It is high time for them to discard their general line of peaceful coexistence and return to Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence, to the road of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The Leaders of the CPSU Are the Greatest Splitters of Our Times

COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU (VII)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE *PEOPLE'S DAILY* AND THE *RED FLAG*
February 4, 1964

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, Nos. 2-3, 1964, pp. 6-32.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, February 7, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 6, pp. 5-21.

Never before has the unity of the international communist movement been so gravely threatened as it is today when we are witnessing a deluge of modern revisionist ideology. Both internationally and inside individual parties, fierce struggles are going on between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism. The international communist movement is confronted with an unprecedentedly serious danger of a split.

It is the urgent task of the Communists, the proletariat and the revolutionary people of the world to defend the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement.

The Communist Party of China has made consistent and unremitting efforts to defend and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement in accordance with Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. It has been and remains the unswerving position of the Chinese Communist Party to uphold principle, uphold unity, eliminate differences and strengthen the struggle against our common enemy.

Ever since they embarked on the path of revisionism, the leaders of the CPSU have tirelessly professed their devotion to the unity of the international communist movement. Of late, they have been particularly active in crying for "unity." This calls to mind what Engels said ninety years ago. "One must not allow oneself to be misled by the cry for 'unity.' Those who have this word most often on their lips are the ones who sow the most dissension..."

“...the biggest sectarians and the biggest brawlers and rogues at times shout loudest for unity.”³⁰⁴

While presenting themselves as champions of unity, the leaders of the CPSU are trying to pin the label of splittism on the Chinese Communist Party. In its Open Letter the Central Committee of the CPSU says:

The Chinese leaders are undermining the unity not only of the socialist camp but of the entire world communist movement, trampling on the principles of proletarian internationalism and grossly violating accepted standards of relations between fraternal parties.

And the subsequent articles published in the Soviet press have been condemning the Chinese Communists as “sectarians” and “splitters.”

But what are the facts? Who is undermining the unity of the socialist camp? Who is undermining the unity of the international communist movement? Who is trampling on the principles of proletarian internationalism? And who is grossly violating the accepted standards of relations between fraternal parties? In other words, who are the real, out-and-out splitters?

Only when these questions are properly answered can we find the way to defend and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement and overcome the danger of a split.

A REVIEW OF HISTORY

In order to gain a clear understanding of the nature of splittism in the present international communist movement and to struggle against it in the correct way, let us look back on the history of the international communist movement over the past century or so.

The struggle between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism and between the forces defending unity and those creating splits runs through the history of the development of the communist movement. This is the case both in individual countries and on the international plane. In this prolonged struggle, Marx, Engels and Lenin expounded the true essence of proletarian unity on a theoretical level and, by their deeds, set brilliant examples in combating opportunism, revisionism and splittism.

In 1847 Marx and Engels founded the earliest international working-class organization—the Communist League. In the *Communist Manifesto*, which

³⁰⁴ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Engels to August Bebel,” *op. cit.*, p. 54.

they wrote as the program of the League, Marx and Engels advanced the militant call, “Workers of All Countries, Unite!” and gave a systematic and profound exposition of scientific communism, thus laying the ideological basis for the unity of the international proletariat.

Throughout their lives Marx and Engels worked unremittingly for this principled unity of the international proletariat.

In 1864 they established the First International, the International Working Men’s Association, to unite the workers’ movements of all countries. Throughout the period of the First International they waged principled struggles against the Bakuninists, Proudhonists, Blanquists, Lassalleans, etc., the fiercest struggle being that against the Bakuninist splitters.

The Bakuninists attacked Marx’s theory from the very beginning. They charged Marx with wanting to make his “particular program and personal doctrine dominant in the International.” In fact, however, it was they who tried to impose the dogmas of their sect on the International and to replace the program of the International with Bakunin’s opportunist program. They resorted to one intrigue after another, lined up a “majority” by hook or by crook and engaged in sectarian and divisive activities.

To defend the genuine unity of the international proletariat, Marx and Engels took an uncompromising and principled stand against the open challenge of the Bakuninist splitters to the First International. In 1872 the Bakuninists who persisted in their splitting activities were expelled from the International at its Hague Congress, in which Marx personally participated.

Engels said that if the Marxists had adopted an unprincipled and conciliatory attitude towards the divisive activities of the Bakuninists at the Hague, it would have had grave consequences for the international working-class movement. He stated, “Then the International would indeed have gone to pieces—gone to pieces through ‘unity!’”³⁰⁵

Led by Marx and Engels, the First International fought against opportunism and splittism and laid the basis for the supremacy of Marxism in the international working-class movement.

With the announcement of the end of the First International in 1876 there began the successive establishment of mass socialist workers’ parties in many countries. Marx and Engels followed the establishment and devel-

³⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 56.

opment of these parties with close attention in the hope that they would be established and developed on the basis of scientific communism.

Marx and Engels devoted particular attention and concern to the German Social-Democratic Party which then occupied an important position in the working-class movement in Europe. On many occasions, they sharply criticized the German Party for its rotten spirit of compromise with opportunism in the pursuit of “unity.”

In 1875 they criticized the German Social-Democratic Party for its union with the Lassalleans at the expense of principle and for the resultant Gotha Program. Marx pointed out that this union was “bought too dearly” and that the Gotha Program was “a thoroughly objectionable program that demoralizes the Party.”³⁰⁶ Engels pointed out that it was a “bending of the knee to Lassalleanism on the part of the whole German socialist proletariat,” adding, “I am convinced that a union on *this* basis will not last a year.”³⁰⁷

In criticizing the Gotha Program, Marx put forward the well-known principle that for Marxists “there would be no haggling about principles.”³⁰⁸

Later Marx and Engels again sharply criticized the leaders of the German Party for tolerating the activities of the opportunists inside the Party. Marx said that these opportunists tried “to replace its materialistic basis... by modern mythology with its goddesses of Justice, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity”³⁰⁹ and that this was a “vulgarization of Party and theory.”³¹⁰ In their “Circular Letter” to the leaders of the German Party, Marx and Engels wrote:

For almost forty years we have stressed the class struggle as the immediate driving power of history, and in particular the class struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat as the great lever of the modern social revolution; it is, therefore, impossible for us to co-operate with people who wish to expunge this class struggle from the movement.³¹¹

³⁰⁶ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Marx to Wilhelm Bracke, May 5, 1875” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XLV, Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, p. 70.

³⁰⁷ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Engels to August Bebel, 18-28 March, 1875” in *ibid.*, p. 65.

³⁰⁸ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Marx to Wilhelm Bracke, May 5, 1875,” *op. cit.*, p. 70.

³⁰⁹ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Marx to Friedrich A. Sorge, October 19, 1877” in *ibid.*, p. 283.

³¹⁰ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Marx to Friedrich A. Sorge, September 19, 1879” in *ibid.*, p. 413.

³¹¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Marx and Engels to A. Bebel, W. Liebknecht, W. Bracke and Others (Circular Letter)” in *Selected Letters, op. cit.*, p. 69.

Founded under Engels' influence in 1889, the Second International existed in a period when capitalism was developing "peacefully." While Marxism became widespread and the *Communist Manifesto* became the common program of tens of millions of workers everywhere during this period, the socialist parties in many countries blindly worshipped bourgeois legality instead of utilizing it and became legalists, thus opening the floodgates for opportunism.

Hence, throughout the period of the Second International., the international working-class movement was divided into two main groups, the revolutionary Marxists and the pseudo-Marxian opportunists.

Engels waged irreconcilable struggles against the opportunists. He refuted with particular sharpness their fallacies on the peaceful evolution of capitalism into socialism. He said of those opportunists who posed as Marxists that Marx "would repeat to these gentlemen what Heine had said of his imitators: I sowed dragons but I reaped fleas."³¹²

After the death of Engels in 1895, these fleas came out for the open and systematic revision of Marxism and gradually took over the leadership of the Second International.

As the outstanding revolutionary in the international working-class movement after Engels, the great Lenin shouldered the heavy responsibility of defending Marxism and opposing the revisionism of the Second International.

When the revisionists of the Second International howled that Marxism was "incomplete" and "outmoded," Lenin solemnly declared. "We take our stand entirely on the Marxist theoretical position," because revolutionary theory "unites all socialists."³¹³

Above all, Lenin fought to create a Marxist party in Russia. In order to build a party of the new type, differing fundamentally from the opportunist parties of the Second International, he waged uncompromising struggles against the various anti-Marxist factions inside the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

Like other parties of the Second International, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party had a revolutionary as well as an opportunist group.

³¹² K. Marx, F. Engels, "Engels to Paul Lafargue, August 27, 1890" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XLIX, Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, p. 22.

³¹³ V. I. Lenin, "Our Program" in *Collected Works*, Vol. IV.

The Bolsheviks led by Lenin constituted the former and the Mensheviks the latter.

The Bolsheviks led by Lenin conducted prolonged theoretical and political struggles against the Mensheviks in order to safeguard the unity of the proletarian party and the purity of its ranks, and finally in 1912 expelled the Mensheviks for their persistence in opportunism and splitting activities.

All the opportunist factions abused Lenin in the most vicious language. They tried by every means to label him a splitter. Lining up with all the anti-Leninist factions and raising the banner of “non-factionalism,” Trotsky wantonly attacked the Bolshevik Party and Lenin, whom he called a “usurper” and “splitter.” Lenin replied that Trotsky, who paraded as “non-factional,” was “a representative of the ‘worst remnants of factionalism’”³¹⁴ and “the worst of splitters”³¹⁵

Lenin put it clearly: ‘Unity—a great cause and a great slogan! But the workers’ cause requires the *unity of the Marxists* and not the unity of the Marxists with the opponents and distorters of Marxism.’³¹⁶

Lenin’s struggle against the Mensheviks was of great international significance, for Menshevism was a Russian form and variant of the revisionism of the Second International and was supported by the revisionist leaders of the Second International.

While combating the Mensheviks, Lenin also waged a series of struggles against the revisionism of the Second International.

Before World War I, Lenin criticized the revisionists of the Second International on the theoretical and political plane and fought them face to face at the Stuttgart and Copenhagen Congresses.

When World War I broke out, the leaders of the Second International openly betrayed the proletariat. Serving the imperialists’ interests, they urged the proletarians of different countries to slaughter each other and thus brought about a most serious split in the international proletariat. As Rosa Luxemburg said, the revisionists turned the previous proud slogan of “Work-

³¹⁴ V. I. Lenin, “Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Outcries for Unity” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XX.

³¹⁵ V. I. Lenin, “The Break-Up of the ‘August’ Bloc” in *ibid.*

³¹⁶ V. I. Lenin, “Unity” in *ibid.*

ers of all countries, unite!” into the command on the battlefield, “Workers of all countries, slay one another!”³¹⁷

The Social-Democratic Party of Germany, Marx’s native land, was then the most powerful and influential party in the Second International. It was the first to side with the imperialists of its own country, and thus became the arch-criminal splitting the international working-class movement.

At this critical juncture, Lenin stepped forward to fight resolutely in defense of the unity of the international proletariat.

In his article “The Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War” circulated in August 1914, Lenin proclaimed the collapse of the Second International and sternly condemned most of its leaders, and in particular those of the German Social-Democratic Party, for their overt betrayal of socialism.

In view of the fact that the revisionists of the Second International had turned their secret alliance with the bourgeoisie into an open alliance and that they had made the split in the international working-class movement irrevocable, Lenin stated:

It is impossible to carry out the tasks of Socialism at the present time, it is impossible to achieve real international unity of the workers, without a determined rupture with opportunism and explaining to the masses the inevitability of its bankruptcy.³¹⁸

For this reason, Lenin staunchly supported the Marxists in breaking with the opportunists in many European countries and boldly called for the establishment of a third International to replace the bankrupt Second International so as to rebuild the revolutionary unity of the international proletariat.

The Third International was founded in March 1919. It inherited the positive achievements of the Second International and discarded its opportunist, social chauvinist, bourgeois and petit-bourgeois rubbish. Thus it enabled the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat to grow both in breadth and depth.

Lenin’s theory and practice carried Marxism to a new stage in its development—the stage of Leninism. On the basis of Marxism-Leninism, the unity

³¹⁷ Rosa Luxemburg, “Either/Or” in *Selected Political Writings*, Monthly Review Press, New York & London, 1970, p. 337.

³¹⁸ V. I. Lenin, “The War and Social-Democracy” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

of the international proletariat and the international communist movement was further strengthened and expanded.

EXPERIENCE AND LESSONS

What does the history of the development of the international communist movement demonstrate?

First, it demonstrates that like everything else, the international working-class movement tends to divide itself in two. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is inevitably reflected in the communist ranks. It is inevitable that opportunism of one kind or another should arise in the course of the development of the communist movement, that opportunists should engage in anti-Marxist-Leninist splitting activities and that Marxist-Leninists should wage struggles against opportunism and splittism. It is precisely through this struggle of opposites that Marxism-Leninism and the international working-class movement have developed. And it is also through this struggle that the international working-class movement has strengthened and consolidated its unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

Engels said:

The movement of the proletariat necessarily passes through different stages of development; at every stage part of the people get stuck and do not join in the further advance; and this alone explains why it is that actually the “solidarity of the proletariat” is everywhere being realized in different party groupings, which carry on life-and-death feuds with one another.³¹⁹

This is exactly what happened. The Communist League, the First International and the Second International, all of which were originally unified, divided in two in the course of their development and became two conflicting parts. Each time the international struggle against opportunism and splittism carried the international working-class movement forward to a new stage and enabled it to forge a firmer and broader unity on a new basis. The victory of the October Revolution and the founding of the Third International were the greatest achievements in the struggle against the Second International’s revisionism and splittism. Unity, struggle or even splits, and

³¹⁹ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Engels to August Bebel,” *op. cit.*, p. 57.

a new unity on a new basis—such is the dialectics of the development of the international working-class movement.

Secondly, the history of the international communist movement demonstrates that in every period the struggle between the defenders of unity and the creators of splits is in essence one between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism-revisionism, between the upholders of Marxism and the traitors to Marxism.

Both internationally and in individual countries, genuine proletarian unity is possible only on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

Both internationally and in individual countries, wherever opportunism and revisionism are rampant, a split becomes inevitable in the proletarian ranks. Every split in the communist movement is invariably caused by the opportunist-revisionist opposition to and betrayal of Marxism-Leninism.

What is splittism?

It means a split with Marxism-Leninism. Anyone who opposes and betrays Marxism-Leninism and undermines the basis of proletarian unity is a splitter.

It means a split with the revolutionary proletarian party. Anyone who persists in a revisionist line and turns a revolutionary proletarian party into a reformist bourgeois party is a splitter.

It means a split with the revolutionary proletariat and the broad masses of the working people. Anyone who follows a program and line running counter to the revolutionary will and fundamental interests of the proletariat and the working people is a splitter.

Lenin said, “Where the *majority* of the class-conscious workers have rallied around precise and definite decisions there is *unity* of opinion and action,”³²⁰ while opportunism “is, in fact, schism, in that it most unblushingly thwarts the will of the majority of the workers.”³²¹

By disrupting proletarian unity, splittism serves the bourgeoisie and meets its needs. It is the consistent policy of the bourgeoisie to create splits within the ranks of the proletariat. Its most sinister method of doing so is to buy over or cultivate agents within the proletarian ranks. And agents of the bourgeoisie are exactly what the opportunists and revisionists are. So far from seeking to unite the proletariat in the fight against the bourgeoisie, they want

³²⁰ V. I. Lenin, “Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Outcries for Unity,” *op. cit.*

³²¹ *Ibid.*

the proletariat to co-operate with it. This was what the revisionists of the Second International, such as Bernstein and Kautsky, did. At a time when the imperialists were most afraid that the proletariat of all countries would unite to turn the imperialist war into civil wars, they came forward to create a split in the international working-class movement and advocate cooperation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

The splitters in the communist ranks are those who, to meet the needs of the bourgeoisie, split with Marxism-Leninism, with the revolutionary proletarian party and with the revolutionary proletariat and the broad masses of the laboring people; and they remain splitters even when for a time they are in the majority or hold the leading posts.

In the days of the Second International, the revisionists represented by Bernstein and Kautsky were in the majority, and the Marxists represented by Lenin were in the minority. Yet obviously it was Bernstein, Kautsky and other opportunists who were the splitters, and not revolutionaries like Lenin.

In 1904 the Mensheviks were the splitters although they held leading positions which they had usurped in the central organs of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. Lenin pointed out at the time, "The leading centers (the Central Organ, the Central Committee, and the Council) *have broken with the Party,*"³²² and "the centers *have put themselves outside the Party.* There is no middle ground; one is either with the centers or with the Party."³²³

In brief, opportunism and revisionism are the political and ideological roots of splittism. And splittism is the organizational manifestation of opportunism and revisionism. It can also be said that opportunism and revisionism are splittism as well as sectarianism. The revisionists are the greatest and vilest splitters and sectarians in the communist movement.

Thirdly, the history of the international communist movement demonstrates that proletarian unity has been consolidated and has developed through struggle against opportunism, revisionism and splittism. The struggle for unity is inseparably connected with the struggle for principle.

The unity the proletariat requires is class unity, revolutionary unity, unity against the common enemy and for or the great goal of communism. The unity of the international proletariat has its theoretical and political basis in

³²² V. I. Lenin, "A Letter to the Zurich Group of Bolsheviks" in *Collected Works*, Vol. VIII.

³²³ *Ibid.*

Marxism-Leninism. Only when it has theoretical and political unity can the international proletariat have organizational cohesion and unity of action.

The genuine revolutionary unity of the proletariat can be attained only by upholding principle and upholding Marxism-Leninism. Unity bought by forsaking principles and by wallowing in the mire with opportunists ceases to be proletarian unity; instead, as Lenin said, it “means in practice unity of the proletariat with the national bourgeoisie and a *split* in the international proletariat, unity of lackeys and a split among the revolutionists.”³²⁴

He also pointed out that “as the bourgeoisie will not die until it is overthrown,” so the opportunist current bribed and supported by the bourgeoisie “will not die if it is not ‘killed’, *i.e.*, overthrown, deprived of every influence among the Socialist proletariat.” Hence, it is necessary to wage “a merciless struggle against the current of opportunism.”³²⁵

Faced with the challenge of the opportunist-revisionists who are openly splitting the international communist movement, the Marxist-Leninists must make no compromise in matters of principle, but must resolutely combat this splittism. This is an invaluable behest of Marx, Engels and Lenin, as well as the only correct way to safeguard the unity of the international communist movement.

THE GREATEST SPLITTERS OF OUR TIMES

The events of recent years show that the leaders of the CPSU headed by Khrushchev have become the chief representatives of modern revisionism as well as the greatest splitters in the international communist movement.

Between the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, the leaders of the CPSU developed a rounded system of revisionism. They put forward a revisionist line which contravenes the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, a line which consists of “peaceful coexistence,” “peaceful competition,” “peaceful transition,” “a state of the whole people” and “a party of the entire people.” They have tried to impose this revisionist line on all fraternal parties as a substitute for the common line of the international communist movement which was laid down at the meetings of fraternal parties in 1957 and 1960. And they have attacked anyone who perseveres in the Marxist-Leninist line and resists their revisionist line.

³²⁴ V. I. Lenin, “The Voice of an Honest French Socialist” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

³²⁵ *Ibid.*

The leaders of the CPSU have themselves undermined the basis of the unity of the international communist movement and created the present grave danger of a split by betraying Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and pushing their revisionist and divisive line.

Far from working to consolidate and expand the socialist camp, the leaders of the CPSU have endeavored to split and disintegrate it. They have thus made a mess of the splendid socialist camp.

They have violated the principles guiding relations among fraternal countries as laid down in the Declaration and the Statement, pursued a policy of great-power chauvinism and national egoism towards fraternal socialist countries and thus disrupted the unity of the socialist camp.

They have arbitrarily infringed the sovereignty of fraternal countries, interfered in their internal affairs, carried on subversive activities and striven in every way to control fraternal countries.

In the name of the "international division of labor," the leaders of the CPSU oppose the adoption by fraternal countries of the policy of building socialism by their own efforts and developing their economies on an independent basis, and attempt to turn them into economic appendages. They have tried to force those fraternal countries which are comparatively backward economically to abandon industrialization and become their sources of raw materials and markets for surplus products.

The leaders of the CPSU are quite unscrupulous in their pursuit of the policy of great-power chauvinism. They have constantly brought political, economic and even military pressure to bear on fraternal countries.

The leaders of the CPSU have openly called for the overthrow of the Party and government leaders of Albania, brashly severed all economic and diplomatic relations with her and tyrannically deprived her of her legitimate rights as a member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the Council of Economic Mutual Assistance.

The leaders of the CPSU have violated the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance, made a unilateral decision to withdraw 1,390 Soviet experts working in China, to tear up 343 contracts and supplementary contracts on the employment of experts and to cancel 257 projects of scientific and technical cooperation, and pursued a restrictive and discriminatory trade policy against China. They have provoked incidents on the Sino-Soviet border and carried on large-scale subversive activities in Sinkiang. On more than one occasion, Khrushchev went so far as to tell lead-

ing comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC that certain anti-party elements in the Chinese Communist Party were his “good friends.” He has praised Chinese anti-party elements for attacking the Chinese Party’s general line for socialist construction, the big leap forward and the people’s communes, describing their action as a “manly act.”

Such measures which gravely worsen state relations are rare even between capitalist countries. But again and again the leaders of the CPSU have adopted shocking and extreme measures of this kind against fraternal socialist countries. Yet they go on prating about being “faithful to proletarian internationalism.” We would like to ask, is there a shred of internationalism in all these deeds of yours?

The great-power chauvinism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU are equally glaring in their conduct vis-à-vis fraternal parties.

Since the 20th Congress of the CPSU its leaders have tried, on the pretext of “combating the personality cult,” to change the leadership of other fraternal parties to conform to their will. Right up to the present they have insisted on “combating the personality cult” as a precondition for the restoration of unity and as a “principle” which is “obligatory on every Communist Party.”³²⁶

Contrary to the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties laid down in the Declaration and the Statement, the leaders of the CPSU ignore the independent and equal status of fraternal parties, insist on establishing a kind of feudal patriarchal domination over the international communist movement and turn the relations between brother parties into those between a patriarchal father and his sons. Khrushchev has more than once described a fraternal party as a “silly boy” and called himself its “mother.”³²⁷ With his feudal psychology of self-exaltation, he has absolutely no sense of shame.

The leaders of the CPSU have completely ignored the principle of achieving unanimity through consultation among fraternal parties and habitually make dictatorial decisions and order others about. They have recklessly torn up joint agreements with fraternal parties, taken arbitrary decisions on

³²⁶ “For the Unity and Solidarity of the International Communist Movement,” *op. cit.*

³²⁷ See N. S. Khrushchev’s Interview with Gardner Cowles, Editor of the US magazine *Look*, April 20, 1962; report by N. S. Khrushchev to the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, December 12, 1962.

important matters of common concern to fraternal parties and forced *faits accomplis* on them.

The leaders of the CPSU have violated the principle that differences among fraternal parties should be settled through inter-party consultation; they first used their own party congress and then the congresses of other fraternal parties as rostrums for large-scale public attacks against those fraternal parties which firmly uphold Marxism-Leninism.

The leaders of the CPSU regard fraternal parties as pawns on their diplomatic chessboard. Khrushchev plays fast and loose, he blows hot and cold, he talks one way one day and another the next, and yet he insists on the fraternal parties dancing to his every tune without knowing whence or whither.

The leaders of the CPSU have stirred up trouble and created splits in many communist parties by encouraging the followers of their revisionist line in these parties to attack the leadership, or usurp leading positions, persecute Marxist-Leninists and even expel them from the Party. It is this divisive policy of the leaders of the CPSU that has given rise to organizational splits in the fraternal parties of many capitalist countries.

The leaders of the CPSU have turned the magazine *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, originally the common journal of fraternal parties, into an instrument for spreading revisionism, sectarianism and splittism and for making unscrupulous attacks on Marxist-Leninist fraternal parties in violation of the agreement reached at the meeting at which the magazine was founded.

In addition, they are imposing the revisionist line on the international democratic organizations, changing the correct line pursued by these organizations and trying to create splits in them.

The leaders of the CPSU have completely reversed enemies and comrades. They have directed the edge of struggle, which should be against US imperialism and its lackeys, against the Marxist-Leninist fraternal parties and countries.

The leaders of the CPSU are bent on seeking Soviet-US cooperation for the domination of the world, they regard US imperialism, the most ferocious enemy of the people of the world, as their most reliable friend, and they treat the fraternal parties and countries adhering to Marxism-Leninism as their enemy. They collude with US imperialism, the reactionaries of various countries, the renegade Tito clique and the Right-wing social democrats in a partnership against the socialist fraternal countries, the fraternal parties, the Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionary people of all countries.

When they snatch at a straw from Eisenhower or Kennedy or others like them, or think that things are going smoothly for them, the leaders of the CPSU are beside themselves with joy, hit out wildly at the fraternal parties and countries adhering to Marxism-Leninism, and endeavor to sacrifice fraternal parties and countries on the altar of their political dealings with US imperialism.

When their wrong policies come to grief and they find themselves in difficulties, the leaders of the CPSU become angrier and more red-faced than ever, again hit out wildly at the fraternal parties and countries adhering to Marxism-Leninism, and try to make others their scapegoats.

These facts show that the leaders of the CPSU have taken the road of complete betrayal of proletarian internationalism, in contravention of the interests of the Soviet people, the socialist camp and the international communist movement and those of all revolutionary people.

These facts clearly demonstrate that the leaders of the CPSU counterpose their revisionism to Marxism-Leninism, their great-power chauvinism and national egoism to proletarian internationalism and their sectarianism and splittism to the international unity of the proletariat. Thus, like all the opportunists and revisionists of the past, the leaders of the CPSU have turned into creators of splits in many fraternal parties, the socialist camp and the entire international communist movement.

The revisionism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU constitute a greater danger than those of any other opportunists and splitters, whether past or present. As everyone knows, this revisionism is occurring in the CPSU, the Party which was created by Lenin and which has enjoyed the highest prestige among all communist parties; it is occurring in the great Soviet Union, the first socialist country. For many years, Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people the world over have held the CPSU in high esteem and regarded the Soviet Union as the base of world revolution and the model of struggle. And the leaders of the CPSU have taken advantage of all this—of the prestige of the Party created by Lenin and of the first socialist country—to cover up the essence of their revisionism and splittism and deceive those who are still unaware of the truth. At the same time, these past masters in double-dealing are shouting “unity, unity,” while actually engaged in splitting. To a certain extent, their tricks do temporarily confuse people. Traditional confidence in the CPSU and ignorance of the facts have prevented

quite a few people from recognizing the revisionism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU sooner.

Because the leaders of the CPSU exercise state power in a large socialist country which exerts world-wide influence, their revisionist and divisive line has done far greater harm to the international communist movement and the proletarian cause of world revolution than that of any of the opportunists and splitters of the past.

It can be said that the leaders of the CPSU are the greatest of all revisionists as well as the greatest of all sectarians and splitters known to history.

It is already clear that the revisionism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU have greatly assisted the spread of the revisionist torrent internationally and rendered enormous service to imperialism and the reactionaries of all countries.

The revisionism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU are the product both of the lush growth of the bourgeois elements inside the Soviet Union, and of imperialist policy, and particularly of the US imperialist policies of nuclear blackmail and “peaceful evolution.” In turn, their revisionist and divisive theories and policies cater not only to the widespread capitalist forces at home but also to imperialism, and serve to paralyze the revolutionary will and to obstruct the revolutionary struggle of the people of the world.

Indeed, the leaders of the CPSU have already won warm praise and applause from imperialism and its lackeys.

The US imperialists praise Khrushchev especially for his splitting activities in the international communist movement. They say, “It seems clear that Khrushchev is sufficiently in earnest in his desire for a *détente* with the West that he is willing to risk a split in the Communist movement to achieve it.”³²⁸ “Nikita Khrushchev has destroyed, irrevocably, the unified bloc of Stalin’s day. That is perhaps Khrushchev’s greatest service—not to Communism, but to the Western world.”³²⁹ “We ought to be grateful for his mishandling of his relationship with the Chinese... We should be grateful for his introducing disarray into international Communism by a lot of quite bumptious and sudden initiatives.”³³⁰

³²⁸ “Openings for Diplomacy: Cracks in the Blocs,” *The Nation*, February 9, 1963.

³²⁹ “Moscow and Beijing: How Wide the Split?,” *Newsweek*, March 26, 1962.

³³⁰ “With Test-Ban Treaty—Has Khrushchev Changed His Ways?,” *US News and World Report*, September 30, 1963.

They firmly believe that Khrushchev is “the best Soviet Prime Minister the west can expect to treat with and... it must try for the time being to avoid any action that might further weaken his position.”³³¹ They say, “The Administration is now convinced that the US should offer Khrushchev maximum support in his dispute with Red China.”³³²

The Trotskyites, who have long been politically bankrupt, are among those applauding the leaders of the CPSU. The former actively support the latter on such fundamental issues as the attitude one should take towards Stalin, towards US imperialism and towards the Yugoslav revisionists. They say, “The situation created by the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU and still more by the Twenty-second Congress is eminently favorable for the revival of our movement in the workers states themselves.”³³³ “We have prepared for this for more than 25 years. Now we must move in, and move energetically.”³³⁴ “In relation to the Khrushchev tendency, we will give a critical support to its struggle for destalinisation against the more conservative tendencies.”³³⁵

Just consider! All the enemies of revolution support the leaders of the CPSU with alacrity. The reason is that they have found a common language with the leaders of the CPSU in their approach to Marxism-Leninism and world revolution, and that the revisionist and divisive line of the leaders of the CPSU meets the counter-revolutionary needs of US imperialism.

As Lenin said, the bourgeoisie understands that “the active people in the working class movement who adhere to the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie, than the bourgeoisie itself.”³³⁶ The imperialist

³³¹ “Communist Unity Seen in US as Thing of the Past,” the *London Times*, January 17, 1962.

³³² “The Periscope,” *Newsweek*, July 1, 1963.

³³³ “The International Situation and Our Tasks,” resolution adopted by the Reunification Congress of the Trotskyites’ so-called Fourth International in June 1963, *Fourth International*, No. 17, October-December 1963, p. 47.

³³⁴ “The New Stage of the Russian Revolution and the Crisis of Stalinism,” resolution adopted by a meeting of the National Committee of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers’ Party of the USA, April 13-15, 1956, *The 20th Congress (CPSU) and World Trotskyism*, New Park Publications Ltd., London, 1957, p. 36.

³³⁵ “The Repercussions of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU,” resolution adopted by the International Secretariat of the Trotskyites’ so-called Fourth International on December 5, 1961, *Fourth International*, No. 14, winter issue, 1961-1962, p. 25.

³³⁶ V. I. Lenin, “Report on the International Situation and the Fundamental Tasks of the Communist International—Second Congress of the Communist International” in *Col-*

lords and masters are gleefully letting the leaders of the CPSU clear the way for the destruction of the proletarian cause of world revolution.

Having brought on the serious danger of a split in the international communist movement, the leaders of the CPSU are trying to shift the blame, vilifying the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties as guilty of “splittism” and “sectarianism” and fabricating a host of charges against them.

Here we deem it necessary to take up some of their chief slanders and to refute them one by one.

REFUTATION OF THE CHARGE OF BEING ANTI-SOVIET

The leaders of the CPSU accuse all who resist and criticize their revisionism and splittism of being anti-Soviet. This is a terrifying charge. To oppose the first socialist country in the world and the Party founded by the great Lenin—what insolence!

But we advise the leaders of the CPSU not to indulge in histrionics. The anti-Soviet charge can never apply to us.

We also advise the leaders of the CPSU not to become self-intoxicated. The anti-Soviet charge can never silence Marxist-Leninists.

Together with all other Communists and revolutionary people the world over, we Chinese Communists have always cherished sincere respect and love for the great Soviet people, the Soviet state and the Soviet Communist Party. For it was the people of the Soviet Union who, under the leadership of Lenin's Party, lit the triumphant torch of the October Revolution, opened up the new era of world proletarian revolution and marched in the van along the road to communism in the years that followed. It was the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet state which, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, pursued a Marxist-Leninist domestic and foreign policy, scored unprecedented achievements in socialist construction, made the greatest contribution to victory in the war against fascism and gave internationalist support to the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and working people of all other countries.

Not long before his death, Stalin said:

Representatives of the fraternal parties, in their admiration for the daring and success of our Party, conferred upon it the title of

the “Shock Brigade” of the world revolutionary and labor movement. By this, they were expressing the hope that the successes of the “Shock Brigade” would help to ease the position of the peoples languishing under the yoke of capitalism. I think that our Party has justified these hopes.³³⁷

He was right in saying that the Soviet Party built by Lenin had justified the hopes of all Communists. The Soviet Party was worthy of the admiration and support it won from all the fraternal parties, including the Chinese Communist Party.

But, beginning with the 20th Congress, the leaders of the CPSU headed by Khrushchev have been launching violent attacks on Stalin and taking the road of revisionism. Is it possible to say that they have justified the hopes of all Communists? No, it is not.

In its *Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China points out that it is the common demand of the people in the countries of the socialist camp and of the international proletariat and working people that all communist parties in the socialist camp should:

- (1) adhere to the Marxist-Leninist line and pursue correct Marxist-Leninist domestic and foreign policies;
- (2) consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and the worker-peasant alliance led by the proletariat and carry the socialist revolution forward to the end on the economic, political and ideological fronts;
- (3) promote the initiative and creativeness of the broad masses, carry out socialist construction in a planned way, develop production, improve the people’s livelihood and strengthen national defense;
- (4) strengthen the unity of the socialist camp on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, and support other socialist countries on the basis of proletarian internationalism;
- (5) oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war, and defend world peace;

³³⁷ Joseph Stalin, “Speech at the Nineteenth Congress of the CPSU” in *Works*, Vol. XVI, *op. cit.*, pp. 425-426.

- (6) oppose the anti-Communist, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary policies of the reactionaries of all countries; and
- (7) help the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed classes and nations of the world.

It adds that all communist parties in the socialist camp “owe it to their own people and to the international proletariat and working people to fulfil these demands.”

But instead, the leaders of the CPSU have abandoned these demands, disappointed the hopes of the fraternal parties and pursued a revisionist and divisive line. This violates the interests not only of the international proletariat and working people but also of the CPSU, the Soviet state and the Soviet people themselves.

It is none other than the leaders of the CPSU headed by Khrushchev, who are anti-Soviet.

The leaders of the CPSU have completely negated Stalin and painted the first dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist system as dark and dreadful. What is this if not anti-Soviet?

The leaders of the CPSU have proclaimed the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat, altered the proletarian character of the CPSU and opened the floodgates for capitalist forces in the Soviet Union. What is this if not anti-Soviet?

The leaders of the CPSU seek US-Soviet cooperation and tirelessly fawn upon US imperialism, and have thus disgraced the great Soviet Union. What is this if not anti-Soviet?

The leaders of the CPSU pursue the policy of great-power chauvinism and treat fraternal socialist countries as dependencies and have thus damaged the prestige of the Soviet state. What is this if not anti-Soviet?

The leaders of the CPSU obstruct and oppose the revolutionary struggles of other peoples and act as apologists for imperialism and neo-colonialism, and have thus tarnished the glorious internationalist tradition of Lenin's Party. What is this if not anti-Soviet?

In short, the actions of the leaders of the CPSU have brought deep shame upon the great Soviet Union and the CPSU and seriously damaged the fundamental interests of the Soviet people. They are anti-Soviet actions through and through.

Naturally, in these circumstances, the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties and Marxist-Leninists are bound to subject the revisionist and divisive line of the leaders of the CPSU to serious criticism for the purpose of defending the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the international communist movement and upholding the principle of proletarian internationalism. We oppose only the revisionist and divisive errors of the leaders of the CPSU. And we do so for the sake of defending the CPSU founded by Lenin and safeguarding the fundamental interests of the Soviet Union, the first socialist country, and of the Soviet people. How can this be described as anti-Soviet?

Whether one defends or opposes the Soviet Union depends on whether or not one truly defends the line of Marxism-Leninism and the principle of proletarian internationalism and whether or not one truly defends the fundamental interests of the Soviet Party, the Soviet state and the Soviet people. To subject the leaders of the CPSU to serious criticism for their revisionism and splittism is to defend the Soviet Union. On the other hand, to pursue a revisionist and divisive line, as the leaders of the CPSU are doing, is actually to oppose the Soviet Union; and to copy this wrong line or submit to it is not genuinely to defend the Soviet Union but to help the leaders of the CPSU damage the fundamental interests of the Soviet people.

Here we may recall Lenin's attitude to the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party in the early years of the 20th century. The German Social-Democratic Party was then the biggest and most influential party in the Second International. But as soon as Lenin discovered opportunism among its leaders, he made it clear to the Russian Social-Democrats that they should not take "the least creditable features of German Social-Democracy as a model worthy of imitation."³³⁸ He further stated:

We must criticize the mistakes of the German leaders fearlessly and openly if we wish to be true to the spirit of Marx and help the Russian socialists to be equal to the present-day tasks of the workers' movement.³³⁹

³³⁸ V. I. Lenin, "The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XIII.

³³⁹ V. I. Lenin, "Preface to the Pamphlet by Voinov (A. V. Lunacharsky) on the Attitude of the Party Towards the Trade Unions," *op. cit.*

In the spirit of Lenin's behest, we would advise the leaders of the CPSU: If you do not correct your revisionist errors, we will continue to criticize you "fearlessly and openly" in the interests of the CPSU, the Soviet state and the Soviet people, and in the interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement and for the sake of their unity.

REFUTATION OF THE CHARGE OF SEIZING THE LEADERSHIP

The leaders of the CPSU ascribe our criticisms and our opposition to their revisionist and divisive line to a desire to "seize the leadership."

First, we would like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: You say we want to seize the leadership. From whom? Who now holds the leadership? In the international communist movement, is there such a thing as a leadership which lords it over all fraternal parties? And is this leadership in your hands?

Apparently, the leaders of the CPSU consider themselves the natural leaders who can lord it over all fraternal parties. According to their logic, their program, resolutions and statements are all infallible laws. Every remark and every word of Khrushchev's are imperial edicts, however wrong or absurd they may be. All fraternal parties must submissively hear and obey and are absolutely forbidden to criticize or oppose them. This is outright tyranny. It is the ideology of feudal autocrats, pure and simple.

However, we must tell the leaders of the CPSU that the international communist movement is not some feudal clique. Whether large or small, whether new or old, and whether in or out of power, all fraternal parties are independent and equal. No meeting of fraternal parties and no agreement unanimously adopted by them has ever stipulated that there are superior and subordinate parties, one party which leads and other parties which are led, a party which is a father and parties which are sons, or that the leaders of the CPSU are the supreme rulers over other fraternal parties.

The history of the international proletarian revolutionary movement shows that, owing to the uneven development of revolution, at a particular historical stage the proletariat and its party in one country or another marched in the van of the movement.

Marx and Engels pointed out that the trade union movement in Britain and the political struggle of the French working class were successively in the van of the international proletarian movement. After the defeat of the Paris

Commune, Engels said that “the German workers have for the moment been placed in the vanguard of the proletarian struggle.” He went on to say:

How long events will allow them to occupy this post of honor cannot be foretold... the main point, however, is to safeguard the true international spirit, which allows no patriotic chauvinism to arise, and which joyfully welcomes each new advance of the proletarian movement, no matter from which nation it comes.³⁴⁰

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the Russian working class, standing at the forefront of the international proletarian movement, won victory in the proletarian revolution for the first time in history.

Lenin said in 1919:

Hegemony in the revolutionary proletarian International has passed for the time being—but not for long, it goes without saying—to the Russians, just as at various periods of the nineteenth century it was in the hands of the English, then of the French, then of the Germans.³⁴¹

The “vanguard” referred to by Engels, or the “hegemony” referred to by Lenin, in no way means that any party which is in the van of the international working-class movement can order other fraternal parties about, or that other parties must obey it. When the Social-Democratic Party of Germany was in the forefront of the movement, Engels said that “it has no right to speak in the name of the European proletariat and especially no right to say something false.”³⁴² When the Russian Bolshevik Party was in the van, Lenin said, “...while foreseeing every stage of development in other countries we must decree nothing from Moscow.”³⁴³

Even the vanguard position referred to by Engels and Lenin does not remain unchanged for a long time but shifts according to changing conditions. This shift is decided not by the subjective wishes of any individual or

³⁴⁰ F. Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1956, pp. 33-34.

³⁴¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Third International and Its Place in History” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX.

³⁴² K. Marx, F. Engels, “Engels to August Bebel, 18-28 March, 1875,” *op. cit.*, p. 62.

³⁴³ V. I. Lenin, “Report on the Party Program—Eighth Congress of the RCP(B)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX.

party, but by the conditions shaped by history. If conditions change, other parties may come to the van of the movement. When a party which formerly held the position of vanguard takes the path of revisionism, it is bound to forfeit this position despite the fact that it has been the largest party and has exerted the greatest influence. The German Social-Democratic Party was a case in point.

At one period in the history of the international communist movement, the Communist International gave centralized leadership to the communist parties of the world. It played a great historic role in promoting the establishment and growth of communist parties in many countries. But when the communist parties matured and the situation of the international communist movement grew more complicated, centralized leadership on the part of the Communist International ceased to be either feasible or necessary. In 1943 the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International stated in a resolution proposing to dissolve the Comintern:

To the extent that the internal as well as the international situation of individual countries became more complicated, the solution of the problems of the labor movement of each country through the medium of some international center would meet with insuperable obstacles.

Events have shown that this resolution corresponded to reality and was correct.

In the present international communist movement, the question of who has the right to lead whom simply does not arise. Fraternal Parties should be independent and completely equal, and at the same time they should be united. On questions of common concern they should reach unanimity of views through consultation, and they should concert their actions in the struggle for the common goal. These principles guiding relations among fraternal parties are clearly stipulated in the Declaration of 1957, and the Statement of 1960.

It is a flagrant violation of these principles, as laid down in the Declaration and the Statement, for the leaders of the CPSU to consider themselves the leaders of the international communist movement and to treat all fraternal parties as their subordinates.

Because of their different historical backgrounds, the fraternal parties naturally find themselves in different situations. Those parties which have won

victory in their revolutions differ from those which have not yet done so, and those which won victory earlier differ from those which did so later.

But these differences only mean that the victorious parties, and in particular the parties which won victory earlier, have to bear a greater internationalist responsibility in supporting other fraternal parties, and they have absolutely no right to dominate other fraternal parties.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union was built by Lenin and Stalin. It was the first Party to win the victory of the proletarian revolution, realize the dictatorship of the proletariat and engage in socialist construction. It was only logical that the CPSU should carry forward the revolutionary tradition of Lenin and Stalin, shoulder greater responsibility in supporting other fraternal parties and countries and stand in the van of the international communist movement.

Taking these historical circumstances into account, the Chinese Communist Party expressed the sincere hope that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union would shoulder this glorious historic mission. At the 1957 Moscow Meeting of the fraternal parties, our delegation emphasized that the socialist camp should have the Soviet Union at its head. The reason was that, although they had committed some mistakes, the leaders of the CPSU did finally accept the Moscow Declaration which was unanimously adopted by the fraternal parties. Our proposal that the socialist camp should have the Soviet Union at its head was written into the Declaration.

We hold that the existence of the position of head does not contradict the principle of equality among fraternal parties. It does not mean that the CPSU has any right to control other parties; what it means is that the CPSU carries greater responsibility and duties on its shoulders.

However, the leaders of the CPSU have not been satisfied with this position of "head." Khrushchev complained of it on many occasions. He said, "What does 'at the head' give us materially? It gives us neither milk nor butter, neither potatoes nor vegetables nor flats. Perhaps it gives us something morally? Nothing at all!"³⁴⁴ Later he said, "What is the use of 'at the head' for us? To hell with it!"³⁴⁵

³⁴⁴ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Banquet Given in Honor of the Delegations of the Fraternal Parties of the Socialist Countries, February 4, 1960.

³⁴⁵ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Meeting of the Delegates of Twelve Fraternal Parties in Bucharest, June 24, 1960.

The leaders of the CPSU say they have no desire for the position of “head,” but in practice they demand the privilege of lording it over all fraternal parties. They do not require themselves to stand in the van of the international communist movement in pursuing the Marxist-Leninist line and fulfilling their proletarian internationalist duty, but they do require all fraternal parties to obey their baton and follow them along the path of revisionism and splittism.

By embarking on the path of revisionism and splittism, the leaders of the CPSU automatically forfeited the position of “head” in the international communist movement. If the word “head” is now to be applied to them, it can only mean that they are at the head of the revisionists and splitters.

The question confronting all Communists and the entire international communist movement today is not who is the leader over whom, but whether one should uphold Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism or submit to the revisionism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU. In spreading the slander that we want to seize the leadership, the leaders of the CPSU are in fact insisting that all fraternal parties, including our own, must bow to their revisionist and divisive leadership.

REFUTATION OF THE CHARGE OF FRUSTRATING THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY AND VIOLATING INTERNATIONAL DISCIPLINE

In their attacks on the Chinese Communist Party since 1960, the leaders of the CPSU have most frequently resorted to the charge that we “frustrate the will of the majority” and “violate international discipline.” Let us review our debate with them on this question.

At the Bucharest meeting in June 1960 the leaders of the CPSU made a surprise assault on the Chinese Communist Party by distributing their Letter of Information attacking it and tried to coerce it into submission by lining up a majority. Their attempt did not succeed. But after the meeting they advanced the argument that the minority must submit to the majority in relations among fraternal parties, and demanded that the CPC should respect the “views and will unanimously expressed” at the Bucharest meeting on the pretext that the delegates of scores of parties had opposed the views of the CPC.

This erroneous argument was refuted by the Central Committee of the CPC in its Letter of Reply, dated September 10, 1960, to the Letter of Information of the Central Committee of the CPSU. It pointed out:

Where the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism are concerned, the problem of exactly who is right and who is wrong cannot in every case be judged by who has the majority. After all, truth is truth. Error cannot be turned into truth because of a temporary majority, nor will truth be turned into error because of a temporary minority.

Yet in its letter of November 5, 1960, the Central Committee of the CPSU repeated the fallacy about the minority's submitting to the majority in the international communist movement. Quoting a passage from Lenin's article "The Duma 'Seven'," it accused the CPC, saying that "he who does not wish to respect the opinion of the majority of the fraternal parties is in essence coming out against the unity and solidarity of the international communist movement."

At the Moscow Meeting of the fraternal parties in 1960, the delegation of the CPC once more refuted this fallacy of the leaders of the CPSU. It declared that it is totally wrong to apply the principle of the minority's submitting to the majority to the relations among fraternal parties in actual present-day conditions in which centralized leadership such as that of the Comintern neither exists nor is desirable. Within a party the principle that the minority should submit to the majority and the lower party organization to the higher one should be observed. But it cannot be applied to relations among fraternal parties. In their mutual relations, each fraternal party maintains its independence and at the same time unites with all the others. Here, the relationship in which the minority should submit to the majority does not exist, and still less so the relationship in which a lower party organization should submit to a higher one. The only way to deal with problems of common concern to fraternal parties is to hold discussions and reach unanimous agreement in accordance with the principle of consultation.

The delegation of the CPC pointed out that by advancing the principle that the minority should submit to the majority in its letter, the Central Committee of the CPSU had obviously repudiated the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation. Our delegation asked:

On what supra-party constitution does the Central Committee of the CPSU base itself in advancing such an organizational principle? When and where did the communist and workers'

parties of all countries ever adopt such a supra-party constitution?

The delegation of the CPC then proceeded to expose the ruse of the Central Committee of the CPSU in deliberately omitting the word “Russian” from its citation of a passage dealing with the situation within the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party from Lenin’s article “The Duma ‘Seven,’” in order to extend the principle of the minority’s submitting to the majority, which is valid within a party, to the relations among fraternal parties.

The delegation of the CPC further stated:

Even within a party, where the principle of the minority’s submitting to the majority must be observed organizationally, it cannot be said that on questions of ideological understanding truth can always be told from error on the basis of which is the majority and which the minority opinion. It was in this very article, “The Duma ‘Seven,’” that Lenin severely denounced the despicable action of the seven liquidationists in the party fraction in the Duma who took advantage of a majority of one to suppress the Marxists who were in the minority. Lenin pointed out that although the seven liquidationists constituted the majority, they could not possibly represent the united will, united resolutions, united tactics of the majority of the advanced and conscious Russian workers who were organized in a Marxist way, and that therefore all shouts about unity were sheer hypocrisy. “The non-party seven want to eat up the six Marxists and demand that this be called ‘unity.’”³⁴⁶ He continued that it was precisely these six Marxists in the party fraction in the Duma who were acting in accordance with the will of the majority of the proletariat, and that unity could be preserved only if those seven delegates “renounce their policy of suppression.”³⁴⁷

The delegation of the CPC continued that Lenin’s words show:

That even within a party group the majority is not always correct, that on the contrary sometimes the majority have to “renounce the policy of suppression” if unity is to be preserved,

³⁴⁶ V. I. Lenin, “The Duma ‘Seven’” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX.

³⁴⁷ V. I. Lenin, “Material on the Conflict Within the Social-Democratic Duma Group” in *ibid.*

and this is particularly the case where relations among fraternal parties are concerned. The comrades of the Central Committee of the CPSU rashly quoted a passage from Lenin without having fully grasped its meaning. Moreover, they purposely deleted an important word. Even so, they failed in their aim!

We have quoted at length from a speech of the delegation of the CPC at the 1960 Moscow Meeting in order to show that the absurd charge of the leaders of the CPSU that we “frustrate the will of the majority” was completely refuted by us some time ago. It is precisely because the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties persistently opposed this fallacy that the principle of achieving unanimity through consultation among the fraternal parties was written into the Statement of 1960.

Yet even now the leaders of the CPSU keep on clamoring that “the minority should submit to the majority.” This can only mean that they wish to deny the independent and equal status of all fraternal parties and to abolish the principle of achieving unanimity through consultation. They are trying to force some fraternal parties to submit to their will on the pretext of a “majority,” and to use the sham preponderance thus obtained to attack fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties. Their very actions are sectarian and divisive and violate the Declaration and the Statement.

Today, if one speaks of an international discipline binding on all communist parties, it can only mean observance of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as laid down in the Declaration and the Statement. We have cited a great many facts to prove that these principles have been violated by the leaders of the CPSU themselves.

If the CPSU leaders insist on marking off the “majority” from the “minority,” then we would like to tell them quite frankly that we do not recognize their majority. The majority you bank on is a false one. The genuine majority is not on your side. Is it true that the members of fraternal parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism are a minority in the international communist movement? You and your followers are profoundly alienated from the masses, so how can the great mass of party members and people who disapprove of your wrong line be counted as part of your majority?

The fundamental question is: Who stands with the broad masses of the people? Who represents their basic interests? And who reflects their revolutionary will?

In 1916 Lenin said of the situation in the German Social-Democratic Party:

Liebknecht and Rühle are only 2 against 108. But these two represent millions of people, the exploited masses, the vast majority of the population, the future of mankind, the revolution which is growing and maturing with each day. The 108 represent only the grovelling spirit of a small handful of bourgeois lackeys among the proletariat.³⁴⁸

Today, more than ninety percent of the world's population desire revolution, including those who are not yet but will eventually become politically conscious. The real majority are the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties and Marxist-Leninists who represent the fundamental interests of the people, and not the handful of revisionists who have betrayed these interests.

REFUTATION OF THE CHARGE OF SUPPORTING THE ANTI-PARTY GROUPS OF FRATERNAL PARTIES

In its Open Letter, the leadership of the CPSU makes the slanderous charge that “the CPC leadership organizes and supports various anti-party groups *of* defectors, which oppose the communist parties of the United States, Brazil, Italy, Belgium, Australia and India.”

What are the facts?

The fact is, the splits that have occurred in certain communist parties in recent years have largely been due to the forcible application by the leaders of the CPSU of their revisionist and divisive line.

The leaders of certain communist parties have led the revolutionary movement of their own countries astray and brought serious losses to the revolutionary cause either because they accepted the revisionist line imposed on them by the leaders of the CPSU or because their own revisionist line was encouraged by the leaders of the CPSU. By following the leaders of the CPSU and banging the drum for them in the struggle between the two lines in the international communist movement, they adversely affect the unity of the movement. Inevitably this arouses widespread dissatisfaction inside their own parties and resistance and opposition from the Marxist-Leninists in them.

³⁴⁸ V. I. Lenin, “An Open Letter to Boris Souvarine” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII.

Aping the leaders of the CPSU, their followers practice a divisive policy inside their own parties. Violating the principle of democratic centralism, they forbid normal inner-party discussion of differences concerning the party line and of major problems confronting the international communist movement. Moreover, they illegitimately ostracize, attack and even expel Communists who adhere to principle. As a result the struggle between the two lines within the parties inevitably takes on a particularly acute form.

In essence, the struggle within these communist parties turns on whether to follow the Marxist-Leninist line or the revisionist line, and whether to make the Communist Party a genuine vanguard of the proletariat and a genuine revolutionary proletarian party or to convert it into a servant of the bourgeoisie and a variant of the Social-Democratic Party.

In the Open Letter, the leaders of the CPSU present a distorted picture of the struggles within the communist parties of the United States of America, Brazil, Italy, Belgium, Australia and India. They vilify in the most malicious language those Marxist-Leninists who have been attacked and ostracized by the revisionist groups in their own parties.

Is it possible for the leaders of the CPSU to conceal or alter the truth about the struggles within these communist parties by calling white black and black white? No. They certainly cannot!

Take for example the inner-party struggle in the Belgian Communist Party.

Differences have existed inside the Belgian Communist Party for a long time. The struggle within the Party has become increasingly acute as the original leading group has sunk deeper and deeper into the quagmire of revisionism and abandoned Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

During the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary, the revisionist group in the Belgian Communist Party went so far as to issue a statement condemning the Soviet Union for helping the Hungarian working people to put down the rebellion.

This revisionist group opposed the Congolese people's armed resistance to the bloody repression of the Belgian colonialists and supported the US imperialists' utilization of the United Nations to interfere in and suppress the movement for national independence in the Congo. It shamelessly prided

itself on being the first to appeal to the United Nations, “desiring the rapid and integral application of the UN decisions.”³⁴⁹

It praised the Tito clique’s revisionist program, saying that it “contains ideas which enrich Marxism-Leninism.”³⁵⁰

It denigrated the 1960 Statement, saying that its contents were all mixed up and that “in every twenty lines there is a phrase contradicting the general line of the Statement.”³⁵¹

During the great strike of the Belgian workers towards the end of 1960 and at the beginning of 1961, this revisionist group undermined the workers will to fight by denouncing their resistance to suppression by the police and gendarmes as “rash and irresponsible actions.”³⁵²

In the face of these betrayals of the interests of the Belgian working class and the international proletariat, it is only natural that Belgian Marxist-Leninists headed by Comrade Jacques Grippa earnestly struggled against this revisionist group. They have exposed and repudiated the errors of the revisionist group inside the Party and have firmly resisted and opposed its revisionist line.

Thus it is clear that the struggle inside the Belgian Communist Party is a struggle between the Marxist-Leninist and the revisionist line.

How has the revisionist group in the Belgian Communist Party handled this inner-party struggle? They have pursued a sectarian and divisive policy and used illegitimate means to attack and ostracize those Communists who have persevered in a principled Marxist-Leninist stand. At the 14th Congress of the Belgian Communist Party they refused to allow Jacques Grippa and other comrades to speak and, disregarding the widespread opposition of the membership, illegitimately declared them expelled from the Party.

It is in these circumstances that Belgian Marxist-Leninists headed by Comrade Jacques Grippa, upholding the revolutionary line, have firmly

³⁴⁹ Ernest Burnelle, Interview with a Correspondent of *l'Humanité* on the Congolese Question, *Le Drapeau Rouge* (organ of the Belgian Communist Party), July 26, 1960.

³⁵⁰ “The Belgian Communist Party and the Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia,” *Le Drapeau Rouge*, April 22, 1958.

³⁵¹ Jean Blume, Speech at the Federal Congress of Brussels, on December 3, 1961, cited by Jacques Grippa in “For the Marxist-Leninist Unity of the Party and for the Marxist-Leninist Unity of the International Communist Movement,” *Le Drapeau Rouge*, February 22, 1962.

³⁵² Jean Blume, “For a Complete and Quick Victory: Two Communist Proposals,” *Le Drapeau Rouge*, December 29, 1960.

combated the revisionist and divisive line pursued by the original leading group and fought to rebuild the Belgian Communist Party. Are not their actions absolutely correct and above reproach?

In openly supporting the revisionist group in the Belgian Party and encouraging it to attack and ostracize Belgian Marxist-Leninists, the leaders of the CPSU have simply exposed themselves as creators of splits in fraternal parties.

As for the Indian Communist Party, its situation is even graver.

On the basis of a wealth of facts, we pointed out in "A Mirror for Revisionists," published by the Editorial Department of the *People's Daily* on March 9, 1963, that the renegade clique headed by Dange had betrayed Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, betrayed the revolutionary cause of the Indian proletariat and people and embarked on the road of national chauvinism and class capitulationism. This clique has usurped the leadership of the Indian Communist Party and, conforming to the will of the big Indian capitalists and landlords, has been transforming the Party into a lackey of the Nehru government which represents their interests.

What has happened to the Indian Communist Party since then?

Now everybody can see that the Dange clique is still traveling on the road of betrayal. It is still advocating class collaboration and the realization of socialism in India through the Nehru government. It actively supported the Nehru government's huge budget providing for arms expansion and war preparation, and its measures for fleecing the people. In August 1963 it sabotaged the great strike of one million people in Bombay against the Nehru government's ruthless taxation policy. It tried to obstruct the holding of a mass rally in Calcutta demanding the release of the imprisoned Communists, in which one hundred thousand people participated. It is continuing its frenzied anti-China activities and supporting the Nehru government's expansionist policy. It is following the Nehru government's policy of hiring itself out to US imperialism.

As their renegade features are revealed, Dange and company meet increasing opposition and resistance from the broad rank and file of the Indian Communist Party. More and more Indian Communists have come to see clearly that Dange and company are the bane of the Indian Communist Party and the Indian nation. They are now struggling to rehabilitate the Party's glorious and militant revolutionary tradition. They are the genuine representatives and the hope of the Indian proletariat and the Indian people.

The leaders of the CPSU clamor about the Chinese Communist Party's support of "defectors" and "renegades," but it is they themselves who support such out-and-out defectors and renegades as Dange and company.

The leaders of the CPSU denounce Communists in many countries who dare to combat revisionism and splittism as "defectors," "renegades" and "anti-party elements." But what have these Communists done? Nothing except to adhere to Marxism-Leninism and insist on a revolutionary party and a revolutionary line. Do the leaders of the CPSU really think that their abuse can cow these Marxist-Leninists, make them abandon their struggle for the correct and against the wrong line, and prevent them from carrying it through to the end? This wishful thinking can never be transformed into reality.

Everywhere and at all times, true revolutionaries, true proletarian revolutionary fighters, true Marxist-Leninists (militant materialists), are dauntless people; they are not afraid of the abuse of the reactionaries and revisionists. For they know it is not such seemingly formidable giants as the reactionaries and revisionists, but "nobodies" like themselves who represent the future. All great men were once nobodies. Provided that they possess the truth and enjoy the support of the masses, those who are seemingly insignificant at first are sure to be victorious in the end. This was true of Lenin and of the Third International. On the other hand, the celebrities and the big battalions inevitably dwindle, decline and putrefy when they lose possession of the truth and therefore lose the support of the masses. This was the case with Bernstein, Kautsky and the Second International. Everything tends to change into its opposite in particular conditions.

Communists are makers of revolution. If they refuse to make revolutions, they cease to be Marxist-Leninists and become revisionists and such-like. As Marxist-Leninists, Communists by their very nature should adhere to their revolutionary stand and oppose revisionism. Similarly, a Marxist-Leninist party should as a matter of course give firm support to revolutionaries and to Communists who oppose revisionism.

The Chinese Communist Party has never concealed its position. We support all revolutionary comrades who adhere to Marxism-Leninism. In the international communist movement, we have contacts with revisionists; why then can we not have contacts with Marxist-Leninists? The leaders of the CPSU describe our support for Marxist-Leninists in other countries as a

divisive act. In our opinion, it is simply a proletarian internationalist obligation which it is our duty to discharge.

Fearing no difficulty or tyranny, upholding truth and daring to struggle, Marxist-Leninists in all countries have demonstrated the great revolutionary spirit of communist fighters. Among such heroic fighters are the Belgian Communists represented by Jacques Grippa and other comrades, the Brazilian Communists represented by João Amazonas, Mauricio Grabois and other comrades, the Australian Communists represented by E. F. Hill and other comrades, the Ceylonese Communists represented by Premalal Kumarasiri, Nagalingam Sanmugathan and other comrades, and the many Marxist-Leninists both inside and outside the Indian, Italian, French, US and other communist parties. They have made important contributions to the common world proletarian cause by upholding the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, by working persistently to build revolutionary vanguard parties of the proletariat armed with Marxist-Leninist principles, and by persevering in the revolutionary line that conforms with the fundamental interests of the proletariat and other working people of their own countries. They deserve the respect, sympathy and support of all people fighting for the victory of communism throughout the world.

In short, whatever the country or place, where one finds oppression, there one finds resistance; where one finds revisionists, there one finds Marxist-Leninists fighting them, and where one finds expulsion of Marxist-Leninists from the party and other divisive measures, there outstanding Marxist-Leninists and strong revolutionary parties inevitably emerge. Changes contrary to the expectations of the modern revisionists are taking place. The revisionists are producing their own opposites and will eventually be buried by them. This is an inexorable law.

THE PRESENT PUBLIC DEBATE

In the last analysis, the present great debate in the international communist movement centers on whether to adhere to Marxism-Leninism or to revisionism, whether to adhere to proletarian internationalism or to great-power chauvinism and whether to desire unity or a split. This dispute over fundamental principles began long ago, following the 20th Congress of the CPSU. It went on in private talks between fraternal parties for a considerable time until it came into the open a little more than two years ago.

As everybody knows, the leaders of the CPSU first provoked and insisted on the open polemics in the international communist movement.

At their 22nd Congress in October 1961, they made public attacks on the Albanian Party of Labour. In his address at that Congress, Comrade Zhou Enlai, the head of the Chinese Communist Party delegation, took exception to this action by the leaders of the CPSU, pointing out that it could not be regarded as representing a serious Marxist-Leninist attitude. What was the answer of the Soviet party leaders? They declared that they were “absolutely correct”³⁵³ and were taking “the only correct and genuinely Marxist-Leninist position of principle”³⁵⁴ in starting the open polemics.

Then, in January 1962, the Viet Nam Workers Party suggested that “mutual attacks on the radio and in the press should be stopped by the Parties.” This suggestion was supported by the Chinese Communist Party, the Albanian Party of Labour and other fraternal parties. But in effect the leaders of the CPSU refused to make a definite commitment to halt public polemics. Far from stopping their open attacks on the Albanian Party of Labour, they proceeded to engineer open attacks on the Chinese Communist Party too at the successive congresses of five fraternal parties in Europe in late 1962 and early 1963, and so launched another round of open polemics on an even wider scale. This gave us no choice but to make public replies to the attackers.

Although we had not yet answered all the attacks by fraternal parties, in its reply to the Central Committee of the CPSU in March 1963 the Central Committee of our Party stated that in order to create a favorable atmosphere for the scheduled talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties we would temporarily suspend public replies in the press from March 9, without prejudice to our rights. But on the eve of the talks the leaders of the CPSU took the further step of openly attacking the Chinese Communist Party by name in their party statements and resolutions.

On July 14, in the midst of the talks between the Chinese and Soviet party delegations in Moscow, the Central Committee of the CPSU published its Open Letter to Party Organizations and all Communists in the

³⁵³ N. S. Khrushchev, “Concluding Speech at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, October 27, 1961” in *Documents of the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, p. 334.

³⁵⁴ “The Banner of Our Epoch,” editorial board article in *Pravda*, February 21, 1962.

Soviet Union, in which it distorted the facts, confused right and wrong, and blatantly and demagogically attacked and abused the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao Zedong. Thus, the leaders of the CPSU took yet a further step and provoked open polemics on a still larger scale.

From July 15, 1963 onward, the leaders of the CPSU slandered and attacked China as their Enemy No. 1, using all the media at their disposal, such as government statements, speeches by leaders, meetings and articles, and setting in motion all their propaganda machinery, from the central and local press to the radio and television stations. Between July 15 and October 31 their twenty-six central newspapers and journals alone published 1,119 articles by editorial boards, editorials, commentaries, signed articles, readers' letters and cartoons, in which the Chinese Communist Party and its leaders, Mao Zedong, Liu Shaoqi, Zhou Enlai and other comrades, were assailed by name. Incomplete figures based on the study of the 15 organs of the Union Republics showed that at least 728 similar anti-Chinese articles and items appeared in the Soviet local press in the same period.

We have published the most important anti-Chinese material including the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU, which we printed in full twice and broadcast to the whole world in more than a dozen foreign languages in order to acquaint those interested in this open debate with the views of the leaders of the CPSU. We have not printed every one of the Soviet articles attacking China simply because they are so numerous and in most cases repeat each other, and because our press has limited space. Our publishing houses have collected all these articles and will print them in book form.

The Soviet side has already put out nearly two thousand anti-Chinese articles and other items. In accordance with the principle of equality among all fraternal parties, the Chinese side has the right to publish a commensurate number of replies.

As the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU touches upon many questions involving a series of fundamental theoretical issues in Marxism-Leninism as well as many major events of the past seven or eight years in the international communist movement, the Editorial Departments of our *Renmin Ribao* and *Hongqi*, after careful study, started the series of comments that began on September 6, 1963. Up to now, we have published only seven comments on this Open Letter, including the present one.

We have not yet concluded our comments. As for the vast number of anti-Chinese articles published by the central or local press of the Soviet Union, we have not even begun to reply to them.

In his answers to newspapermen on October 25, 1963, Khrushchev called for a cessation of the public debate. Subsequently, however, the Soviet press continued to publish articles attacking China.

Recently, the leaders of the CPSU again proposed a halt to the public debate, which they said had “done enormous harm to the communist movement.” Yet in the past they said that public polemics were “in the interests of the whole world communist movement”³⁵⁵ and “the only correct and genuinely Marxist-Leninist position of principle.”³⁵⁶ We would like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: What sort of games are you playing, saying one thing at one time and another thing at another?

We would also like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Is it in accord with the principle of equality among fraternal parties for you to ask us to be silent after publishing less than ten articles in reply to your two thousand articles and other items attacking China, and when we have not yet even completed our reply to your Open Letter? Is it in accord with the principles of democratic discussion for you to become impatient and intolerant and to refuse to listen when we have said only a little while you have talked so much and for so long?

Again, we would like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Was it not an outright threat and intimidation when you brazenly declared in the Soviet government statement of September 21, 1963 that if the Chinese continued the polemics, “they must clearly realize that the most resolute rebuff from the CPSU and the Soviet people awaits them on this road?” Do you really believe that other people are bound docilely to obey your orders and tremble at your roar? To be frank, ever since September 21 you have been eagerly waiting to see what “the most resolute rebuff” would be.

Comrades and friends! You are mistaken, completely mistaken.

Now that the public debate is on, it must proceed according to rule. If you think you have said enough, you should allow the other side ample chance to reply. If you think you still have a lot to say, please say it all. But when you do

³⁵⁵ “Toward New Victories of Communism,” editorial board article in *Kommunist*, No. 16, 1961.

³⁵⁶ “The Banner of Our Epoch,” *op. cit.*

so, let the other side have his full say as well. In a word, there should be equal rights. Have not you, too, said that fraternal parties are equal? Why then do you insist that you may start public polemics whenever you want to attack fraternal parties and at the same time deprive the parties so attacked of their right to make public replies whenever you choose to stop the polemics?

The leaders of the CPSU unscrupulously provoked, extended and insisted on the open polemics, but now they have begun to clamor for their cessation. What is behind all this?

Apparently, things have not developed according to the expectations of the launchers of these polemics. The public debate, which the leaders of the CPSU at first thought would be to their advantage, is developing in a way contrary to their wishes. Truth is not on the side of the leaders of the CPSU, and therefore in their attacks on others they can only depend on lies, slanders, distortion of the facts and confusion of right and wrong. When argument develops and it becomes necessary to produce facts and reason things out, they find the ground slipping from under their feet and take fright.

Lenin once said that for revisionists “there is nothing more disagreeable, undesirable unacceptable than the elucidation of the prevailing theoretical, programmatic, tactical and organizational differences.”³⁵⁷

This is precisely the situation in which the leaders of the CPSU now find themselves.

The stand of the Chinese Communist Party on public polemics is known to all. From the very beginning, we have held that differences among fraternal parties should be resolved through private consultations. The public polemics were neither provoked nor desired by us.

However, since the public debate is already on and since the leaders of the CPSU have said that to conduct it is to “act in Lenin’s manner,”³⁵⁸ it must be conducted on the basis of democratic discussion by adducing facts and by reasoning until everything is thrashed out.

More important still, since the leaders of the CPSU have openly betrayed Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and torn up the Declaration and the Statement, they cannot expect us to refrain from defending Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism and the revolutionary prin-

³⁵⁷ V. I. Lenin, “Once More About the International Socialist Bureau and the Liquidators” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XX.

³⁵⁸ “The Historic Congress of the Leninist Party,” *Pravda* editorial, November 4, 1961.

ciples of the Declaration and the Statement. Since the debate concerns major issues of principle in the international communist movement, they must be thoroughly thrashed out. This, too, represents a serious Marxist-Leninist attitude.

The essence of the matter is that the existing differences in the international communist movement are between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism and between proletarian internationalism and great-power chauvinism. These major differences of principle cannot be solved in a fundamental way by a cessation of the public debate. On the contrary, only through public debate, setting forth the facts and reasoning things out will it be possible to clarify matters, distinguish right from wrong and safeguard and strengthen the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Marxism-Leninism is a science, and science fears no debate. Anything which fears debate is no science. The present great debate in the international communist movement is impelling Communists, revolutionists and revolutionary people in all countries to use their brains and ponder over problems concerning the revolution in their own countries and the world revolution in accordance with the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism. Through this great debate, people will be able to distinguish between right and wrong and between real and sham Marxism-Leninism. Through this great debate, all the revolutionary forces in the world will be mobilized, and all Marxist-Leninists will be tempered ideologically and politically and will be able to integrate Marxism-Leninism with concrete practice in their own countries in a more mature way. Thus, Marxism-Leninism will undoubtedly be further enriched, developed and raised to new heights.

THE WAY TO DEFEND AND STRENGTHEN UNITY

The revisionism and great-power chauvinism of the leaders of the CPSU are an unprecedented menace to the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. By taking a revisionist and great-power chauvinist position, the leaders of the CPSU are standing for a split. So long as they maintain such a position, they are in fact working for sham unity and a real split no matter how volubly they may talk of "unity" and abuse others as "splitters" and "sectarians."

The Chinese Communist Party, other Marxist-Leninist parties and all Marxist-Leninists persevere in Marxism-Leninism and proletarian interna-

tionalism. This position is the only correct one for defending and strengthening the genuine unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism constitute the basis of that unity. Only on this basis can the unity of fraternal parties and countries be built. Such unity will be out of the question if one departs from this basis. To fight for Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism is to work for the unity of the international communist movement. Persevering in principle and upholding unity are inextricably bound together.

If the leaders of the CPSU genuinely want unity and are not just pretending, they should loyally abide by the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and by the Marxist-Leninist teachings concerning classes and class struggle, the state and revolution, and especially proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is absolutely impermissible for them to substitute class collaboration or class capitulation for class struggle, and social reformism or social pacifism for proletarian revolution, or abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat no matter under what pretext.

If the leaders of the CPSU genuinely want unity and are not just pretending, they should strictly abide by the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. It is absolutely impermissible for them to substitute their own party program for the common program, which was unanimously agreed upon by the fraternal parties.

If the leaders of the CPSU genuinely want unity and are not just pretending, they should draw a sharp line of demarcation between enemies and comrades and should unite with all socialist countries, all fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties, the proletariat of the whole world, all oppressed people and nations and all peace-loving countries and people in order to oppose US imperialism, the arch-enemy of the people of the world, and its lackeys. It is absolutely impermissible for them to treat enemies as friends and friends as enemies, and to ally themselves with the US imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries and the renegade Tito clique against fraternal countries and parties and all revolutionary people in the vain pursuit of world domination through US-Soviet collaboration.

If the leaders of the CPSU genuinely want unity and are not just pretending, they should be faithful to proletarian internationalism and strictly abide by the principles guiding relations among fraternal countries and parties, as laid down in the Declaration and the Statement. It is absolutely impermissi-

ble for them to replace these principles with policies of great-power chauvinism and national egoism. In other words, they should:

- Observe the principle of solidarity and never line up a number of fraternal parties to attack other fraternal parties and engage in sectarian and divisive activities;
- Adhere to the principle of mutual support and mutual assistance and never try to control others in the name of assistance or, on the pretext of the “international division of labor,” impair the sovereignty and interests of fraternal countries and oppose their building socialism through self-reliance;
- Observe the principle of independence and equality and never place themselves above other fraternal parties or impose their own party’s program, line and resolutions on others; never interfere in the internal affairs of fraternal parties and carry out subversive activities under the pretext of “combating the personality cult”; and never treat fraternal parties as their property and fraternal countries as their dependencies;
- Follow the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation and never force through their own party’s wrong line in the name of the so-called majority or use the Congresses of their own party or of other parties and such forms as resolutions, statements and leaders’ speeches for public and explicit attacks on other fraternal parties, and certainly never extend ideological differences to state relations.

In short, if the leaders of the CPSU genuinely desire the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, they must make a clean break with their line of revisionism, great-power chauvinism and splittism. The unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement can be safeguarded and strengthened only by remaining loyal to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and by opposing modern revisionism and modern dogmatism, great-power chauvinism and other forms of bourgeois nationalism, and sectarianism and splittism, and by doing so not merely in words but in deeds. This is the sole way to defend and strengthen unity.

Taken as a whole, the present world situation is most favorable. The international communist movement has already gained brilliant victories, bringing about a fundamental change in the international balance of class forces. At present the international communist movement is being assailed by an adverse current of revisionism and splittism; this phenomenon is not inconsistent with the law of historical development. Even though it creates temporary difficulties for the international communist movement and some fraternal parties, it is a good thing that the revisionists have revealed their true features and that a struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism has ensued.

Without any doubt, Marxism-Leninism will continue to demonstrate its youthful vitality and will sweep the whole world; the international communist movement will grow stronger and more united on the basis of Marxism-Leninism; and the cause of the international proletariat and the world people's revolution will win still more brilliant victories. Modern revisionism will undoubtedly go bankrupt.

We would like to advise the leaders of the CPSU to think matters over calmly: what will your clinging to revisionism and splittism lead to? Once again, we would like to make a sincere appeal to the leaders of the CPSU: We hope you will be able to return to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, to the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement and to the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties and countries as laid down in these documents, so that the differences will be eliminated and the unity of the international communist movement and the socialist camp and unity between China and the Soviet Union will be strengthened on these principled bases.

Despite our serious differences with the leaders of the CPSU, we have full confidence in the vast membership of the CPSU and in the Soviet people, who grew up under the guidance of Lenin and Stalin. As always, the Communists and the people of China will unswervingly safeguard the unity between China and the Soviet Union, and consolidate and develop the deep-rooted friendship between our two peoples.

Communists of the world, unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism!

Letter of the CC of the CPC of February 20, 1964

February 20, 1964

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 9, 1964, pp. 7-8.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, May 8, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 19, pp. 10-11.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

We have learnt from a number of quarters that the Central Committee of the CPSU recently sent to fraternal parties a letter which is directed against the Communist Party of China. This letter distorts the facts of the current public polemics in the international communist movement, manufactures lies slandering the Chinese Communist Party and instigates a so-called “struggle against the great-power and Trotskyite views and the factional and disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders.” This letter has not, however, been sent to the Chinese Communist Party, from which it has been kept a secret.

It must be noted in all seriousness that, while crying for a halt to public polemics under the presence of desiring unity, the leaders of the CPSU are engineering a new campaign against the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties behind the back of the Chinese Communist Party and are unscrupulously engaging in sectarian, factional and divisive activities. Throughout the recent years the leaders of the CPSU have been wearing one face in public and another in private, and saying one thing and doing another. Your vicious two-faced tactics are a gross violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties laid down in the 1960 Statement as well as of proletarian internationalism.

You have launched the present campaign against the Chinese Communist Party on the new pretext that the CPC has not yet replied to your letter of November 29, 1963. But we would like to ask: Why were you free for a long time to act willfully and refuse to accept the advice of fraternal parties against bringing inter-party differences into the open before the enemy and their proposal for a halt to public polemics, whereas the CPC must regard

the letter from the leaders of the CPSU as God's will and give an immediate and affirmative reply or else be charged with the major crime of insubordination? Why are you privileged to publish thousands of lengthy articles and other items attacking us, whereas we may not make any reply to set the facts straight and distinguish truth from falsehood? A journey has to be made step by step, and problems have to be solved one by one. Your letter will be answered in due course. Your self-important and domineering attitude in maintaining that you can attack whenever you please and that we must stop as soon as you cry halt has fully exposed your inveterate habit of great-power chauvinism and posing as the "father party."

The present grave act of the leaders of the CPSU to create a split has once again brought to light the intrigue you have been carrying on in behalf of a sham unity and a real split.

The Communist Party of China has been consistent in its stand of firmly defending the purity of Marxism-Leninism, upholding the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, and on these foundations safeguarding the unity of the international communist movement, the unity of the socialist camp and the unity of the Chinese and Soviet Parties and our two peoples. This stand of ours will never change. We obey the truth and the truth only and will never trade in principles.

The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party delegated Comrade Peng Zhen, member of the Political Bureau and the Secretariat, to convey our views orally to Comrade Chervonenko, the Soviet Ambassador to China, on the afternoon of February 18.

We would like in all seriousness to repeat our request that the Central Committee of the CPSU send us a copy of the letter directed against the CPC, which it has recently addressed to fraternal parties. We shall make our reply after studying this letter,

With fraternal greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China**

Letter of the CC of the CPC of February 27, 1964

February 27, 1964

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 9, 1964, pp. 9-10.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, May 8, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 19, pp. 11-12.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has received your letter of February 22, 1964. The characteristic feature of this letter is the prodigality of the abuse—such as “unseemly,” “a clumsy attempt to lay one’s own fault at somebody else’s door,” “rude” and “ridiculous”—with which you try to evade the questions of substance which we raised in our letter of February 20, 1964. This is really a poor performance.

You accuse us of behaving like “the real culprit crying ‘stop thief.’” In fact, it is you who are playing the trick of “the real culprit crying ‘stop thief’” to divert attention and steal away because you have been caught red-handed in sectarian, factional and divisive activities and confronted with irrefutable evidence. But however much you may quibble and sophisticate, you cannot deny the following facts. First, you have actually sent a letter behind our backs to fraternal parties, a letter which is specifically directed against the Chinese Communist Party.

Second, you are actually planning behind our backs to take “collective measures” from which the Chinese Communist Party will be excluded, and to go a step further in splitting the international communist movement.

In our letter of February 20, we point out that you “are unscrupulously engaging in sectarian, factional and divisive activities,” that you adopt “vicious two-faced tactics,” and that you have the “inveterate habit of great-power chauvinism and posing as the ‘father party.’” Your most recent letter proves that these criticisms completely fit the facts and are entirely correct.

Have you not repeatedly professed a desire to improve relations and uphold unity? If you really have such a desire, you ought to admit that right

is right and wrong is wrong. One had better be honest. This is the only way to bring about a real settlement of problems. There is no other alternative.

You begin your letter with the assertion that you have the “right not to answer at all” the letter of the Central Committee of the CPC to the Central Committee of the CPSU, whereas we have repeatedly made it clear that we will answer your letter of November 29, 1963 in due course. We have advised you against impatience because we have not yet completed our reply to your numerous attacks. Whereupon you have flown into a rage as if we had committed a monstrous crime. Please think the matter over calmly: can this be described as treating fraternal parties as equals?

Far from examining your own errors and publicly acknowledging and correcting them in all seriousness according to Lenin’s teachings, you deny facts, call white black and turn on us by slanderously accusing us of factional activities. You even produced the Belishova case of June 1960 as an important piece of evidence against us. But you have lifted a rock only to crush your own toes. Our exchange of views with the responsible comrades of a fraternal party on the international communist movement was above-board, entirely normal and beyond reproach. On the other hand, your intrigues on the question of Belishova cannot stand the light of day. You made Belishova your tool for subverting the leadership of a fraternal party and country and for disrupting the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. The Albanian comrades have exposed your intrigues and handled the Belishova case in the proper way.

It is the leaders of the CPSU themselves who have been conducting “the most genuine behind-the-scenes factional activity against a fraternal party.” As early as January 1960, that is, five months before the Belishova case, you delegated Comrade Mikoyan to meet the leading comrades of Albania in an effort to engineer activities against the Chinese Communist Party. Instances of such behind-the-scenes factional activity on your part were cited by Comrade Kapo, head of the Albanian delegation, in Comrade Khrushchev’s presence on June 24, 1960, at the Bucharest meeting of representatives of the fraternal parties of the socialist countries.

Yet acting like “knights for a day,” you state in your letter that you will “publish documents” and “openly state our views.” Moreover, you declared on September 21, 1963 that you would give us a “most resolute rebuff.” Have you not played enough of such tricks? Have you not divulged enough information? Were these to be enumerated, we could cite a wealth of facts

beginning from the 20th Congress of the CPSU. You are well aware of this and we do not need to waste our ink. Now you are again making an empty threat, and, to be blunt, this can only frighten people with weak nerves. In our opinion, all your bluster simply reminds one of a paper tiger. It is like a pewter-pointed spear. Please produce all the magic weapons in your treasure box for our enlightenment—the “most resolute rebuff,” the “open statement of our views,” “collective measures” against the CPC, documents and materials, and what not.

If you do not fear the truth and the masses and if, instead of treating them as rabble, you have faith in the political consciousness and discernment of the members of the CPSU and the Soviet people, we propose that our two Parties reach an agreement, by which each side will, on an equal basis, publish in its own press the documents, articles and other material both sides have published or will publish in criticism of each other.

You accuse us of committing a blunder by “demanding”³⁵⁹ instead of “requesting” that you send us a copy of your letter of February 12. In Chinese usage, these two words do not imply as big a difference as you describe. But since you take it so seriously and even make it an excuse for refusing to give us the letter of February 12, which is directed against the CPC, well then, we are now complying with your wish and *request* that you send us a copy of the letter which you gave the other fraternal parties on February 12. It is our earnest hope that you will do so.

With fraternal greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China**

³⁵⁹ Following the Chinese usage, this word was translated into “request” and not “demand” in the English version of the February 20 letter of the Central Committee of the CPC to the Central Committee of the CPSU.—*Trans.*

Letter of the CC of the CPC of February 29, 1964

February 29, 1964

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 9, 1964, pp. 11-19.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, May 8, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 19, pp. 12-18.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

This letter from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China is in reply to the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated November 29, 1963.

The Chinese Communist Party has always regarded the safeguarding and cementing of the unity of the international communist movement as its sacred duty.

The unity of the Communists of all countries is not that of a club, it is the revolutionary unity of people guided by a common theory and fighting for a common ideal. The unity of the international communist movement can only be based on the revolutionary teachings of Marx and Lenin. Without this basis there can be no proletarian internationalist unity.

The differences between us and the leaders of the CPSU involve a number of major problems of principle concerning Marxist-Leninist theory and the whole international communist movement. These problems of principle must be solved if our differences are to be eliminated and the unity of the Chinese and Soviet Parties is to be strengthened.

The views we have expressed in our reply of June 14, 1963 to the letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU, that is, our proposal concerning the general line of the international communist movement, and in our articles about the international communist movement published both before and after that reply, are in full accord with Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

In this letter we would like to state our views on a number of questions raised in your letter.

1. THE QUESTION OF THE SINO-SOVIET BOUNDARY

The Government of the People's Republic of China has consistently held that the question of the boundary between China and the Soviet Union, which is a legacy from the past, can be settled through negotiation between the two governments. It has also held that, pending such a settlement, the *status quo* on the border should be maintained. This is what we have done over the past ten years or more. Had the Soviet Government taken the same attitude, both sides could have lived in amity along the border and preserved tranquility there.

With the stepping up of anti-Chinese activities by the leaders of the CPSU in recent years, the Soviet side has made frequent breaches of the *status quo* on the border, occupied Chinese territory and provoked border incidents. Still more serious, the Soviet side has flagrantly carried out large-scale subversive activities in Chinese frontier areas, trying to sow discord among China's nationalities by means of the press and wireless, inciting China's minority nationalities to break away from their motherland, and inveigling and coercing tens of thousands of Chinese citizens into going to the Soviet Union. Not only do all these acts violate the principles guiding relations between socialist countries, they are absolutely impermissible even in the relations between countries in general.

Among all our neighbors it is only the leaders of the CPSU and the reactionary nationalists of India who have deliberately created border disputes with China. The Chinese Government has satisfactorily settled complicated boundary questions, which were legacies from the past, both with all its fraternal socialist neighbors except the Soviet Union, and with its nationalist neighbors such as Burma, Nepal, Pakistan and Afghanistan, with the exception of India.

The delegations of our two governments started boundary negotiations in Beijing on February 25, 1964. Although the old treaties relating to the Sino-Russian boundary are unequal treaties, the Chinese Government is nevertheless willing to respect them and take them as the basis for a reasonable settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question. Guided by proletarian internationalism and the principles governing relations between socialist countries, the Chinese Government will conduct friendly negotiations with the Soviet Government in the spirit of consultation on an equal footing and mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. If the Soviet side

takes the same attitude as the Chinese Government, the settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question, we believe, ought not to be difficult, and the Sino-Soviet boundary will truly become one of lasting friendship.

2. THE QUESTION OF AID

We have always had a proper appreciation of the friendly Soviet aid which began under Stalin's leadership. We have always considered that the Soviet people's friendly aid has played a beneficial role in helping China to lay the preliminary foundations for her socialist industrialization. For this the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people have expressed their gratitude on numerous occasions.

In recent years the leaders of the CPSU have habitually played the benefactor and frequently boasted of their "disinterested assistance." When commemorating the fourteenth anniversary of the signing of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance in February this year, *Pravda*, *Izvestia* and other Soviet propaganda media again beat the drum to the same tune. We have not yet made a systematic reply in the press, but we must point out that, so far from being gratis, Soviet aid to China was rendered mainly in the form of trade and that it was certainly not a one-way affair. China has paid and is paying the Soviet Union in goods, gold or convertible foreign exchange for all Soviet-supplied complete sets of equipment and other goods, including those made available on credit plus interest. It is necessary to add that the prices of many of the goods we imported from the Soviet Union were much higher than those on the world market.

While China has received aid from the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union on its part has also received corresponding aid from China. No one can say that China's aid to the Soviet Union has been insignificant and not worthy of mention. Here are some examples:

Up to the end of 1962 China had furnished the Soviet Union with 2,100 million new rubles' worth of grain, edible oils and other foodstuffs. Among the most important items were 5,760,000 tons of soya beans, 2,940,000 tons of rice, 1,090,000 tons of edible oils and 900,000 tons of meat.

Over the same period, China furnished the Soviet Union with more than 1,400 million new rubles' worth of mineral products and metals. Among the most important items were: 100,000 tons of lithium concentrates, 34,000 tons of beryllium concentrates, 51,000 tons of borax, 270,000 tons of wolfram concentrates, 32.9 tons of piezoelectric quartz, 7,730 tons of mercu-

ry, 39 tons of tantalum-niobium concentrates, 37,000 tons of molybdenum concentrates and 180,000 tons of tin. Many of these mineral products are raw materials which are indispensable for the development of the most advanced branches of science and for the manufacture of rockets and nuclear weapons.

As for the Soviet loans to China, it must be pointed out that China used them mostly for the purchase of war matériel from the Soviet Union, the greater part of which was used up in the war to resist US aggression and aid Korea. In the war against US aggression the Korean people carried by far the heaviest burden and sustained by far the greatest losses. The Chinese people, too, made great sacrifices and incurred vast military expenses. The Chinese Communist Party has always considered that this was the Chinese people's bounden internationalist duty and that it is nothing to boast of. For many years we have been paying the principal and interest on these Soviet loans, which account for a considerable part of our yearly exports to the Soviet Union. Thus even the war *matériel* supplied to China in the war to resist US aggression and aid Korea has not been given gratis.

3. THE QUESTION OF THE SOVIET EXPERTS

The Soviet experts working in China were invariably made welcome, respected and trusted by the Chinese Government and people. The overwhelming majority of them were hard-working and helpful to China's socialist construction. We have always highly appreciated their conscientious work, and still miss them to this day.

You will remember that when the leaders of the CPSU unilaterally decided to recall all the Soviet experts in China, we solemnly affirmed our desire to have them continue their work in China and expressed the hope that the leaders of the CPSU would reconsider and change their decision.

But in spite of our objections you turned your backs on the principles guiding international relations and unscrupulously withdrew the 1,390 Soviet experts working in China, tore up 343 contracts and supplementary contracts concerning experts, and scrapped 257 projects of scientific and technical cooperation, all within the short span of a month.

You were well aware that the Soviet experts were posted in over 250 enterprises and establishments in the economic field and the fields of national defense, culture, education and scientific research, and that they were undertaking important tasks involving technical design, the construction of proj-

ects, the installation of equipment, trial production and scientific research. As a result of your peremptory orders to the Soviet experts to discontinue their work and return to the Soviet Union, many of our country's important designing and scientific research projects had to stop halfway, some of the construction projects in progress had to be suspended, and some of the factories and mines which were conducting trial production could not go into production according to schedule. Your perfidious action disrupted China's original national economic plan and inflicted enormous losses upon China's socialist construction.

You were going completely against communist ethics when you took advantage of China's serious natural disasters to adopt these grave measures.

Your action fully demonstrates that you violate the principle of mutual assistance between socialist countries and use the sending of experts as an instrument for exerting political pressure on fraternal countries, butting into their internal affairs and impeding and sabotaging their socialist construction.

Now you have again suggested sending experts to China. To be frank, the Chinese people cannot trust you. They have just healed the wounds caused by your withdrawal of experts. These events are still fresh in their memory. With the leaders of the CPSU pursuing an anti-Chinese policy, the Chinese people are unwilling to be duped.

In our opinion, all the countries in the socialist camp should handle the question of sending experts in accordance with the principles of genuine equality, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, mutual assistance and internationalism. It is absolutely impermissible for any country unilaterally to annul or scrap any agreement or contract concerning the sending of experts. Any country which violates such an agreement or contract should, in accordance with international practice, compensate the other side for the losses thus inflicted. Only thus can there be an interchange of experts on a basis of equality and mutual benefit between China and the Soviet Union and among countries in the socialist camp.

We would like to say in passing that, basing ourselves on the internationalist principle of mutual assistance among countries in the socialist camp, we are very much concerned about the present economic situation in the Soviet Union. If you should feel the need for the help of Chinese experts in certain fields, we would be glad to send them.

4. THE QUESTION OF SINO-SOVIET TRADE

Nobody is in a better position than you to know the real cause for the curtailment of Sino-Soviet trade over the last few years. This curtailment was precisely the result of your extending the differences from the field of ideology to that of state relations.

Your sudden withdrawal of all the Soviet experts working in China upset the schedules of construction and the production arrangements of many of our factories, mines and other enterprises and establishments, and had a direct impact on our need for the import of complete sets of equipment. Such being the case, did you expect us to keep on buying them just for display?

Moreover, in pursuance of your policy of further imposing restrictions on and discriminating against China in the economic and commercial fields, since 1960 you have deliberately placed obstacles in the way of economic and trade negotiations between our two countries and held up or refused supplies of important goods which China needs. You have insisted on providing large amounts of goods which we do not really need or which we do not need at all, while holding back or supplying very few of the goods which we need badly. For several years you have used the trade between our two countries as an instrument for bringing political pressure to bear on China. How could this avoid cutting down the volume of Sino-Soviet trade?

From 1959 to 1961, our country suffered extraordinary natural disasters for three years in succession and could not supply you with as large quantities of agricultural produce and processed products as before. This was the result of factors beyond human control. It is utterly unreasonable for you to attack China on this account and blame her for this reduction in trade.

Indeed, but for China's efforts the volume of Sino-Soviet trade would have decreased even more. Take this year for example. China has already put forward a list of 220 million new rubles' worth of imports from the Soviet Union and 420 million new rubles' worth of exports to the Soviet Union. But you have been procrastinating unreasonably, continuing to hold back goods we need while trying to force on us goods we do not need. You say in your letter, "In the course of the next few years the US could increase its export to China of goods in which you are interested..." But your deeds do not agree with your words.

You constantly accuse us of “going it alone” and claim that you stand for extensive economic ties and division of labor among the socialist countries. But what is your actual record in this respect?

You infringe the independence and sovereignty of fraternal countries and oppose their efforts to develop their economy on an independent basis in accordance with their own needs and potentialities.

You bully those fraternal countries whose economies are less advanced and oppose their policy of industrialization and try to force them to remain agricultural countries forever and serve as your sources of raw materials and as outlets for your goods.

You bully fraternal countries which are industrially more developed and insist that they stop manufacturing their traditional products and become accessory factories serving your industries.

Moreover, you have introduced the jungle law of the capitalist world into relations between socialist countries. You openly follow the example of the Common Market which was organized by monopoly capitalist groups.

All these actions of yours are wrong.

In the economic, scientific, technical and cultural spheres, we stand for relations of cooperation of a new type, based on genuine equality and mutual benefit, between China and the Soviet Union and among all the socialist countries.

We hold that it is necessary to transform the present Council of Mutual Economic Assistance of socialist countries to accord with the principle of proletarian internationalism and turn this organization, which is now solely controlled by the leaders of the CPSU, into one based on genuine equality and mutual benefit, which the fraternal countries of the socialist camp may join of their own free will. It is hoped that you will favorably respond to our suggestion.

5. THE QUESTION OF STOPPING PUBLIC POLEMICS

The public polemics were provoked by you. We maintained that differences in the international communist movement should be settled through inter-party discussions. But you insisted on bringing them into the open. Beginning with the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, you imposed public polemics on the entire international communist movement in violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as laid down in the 1960 Statement, and you asserted that to do so was to “act in Lenin’s manner.”

What you did was a bad thing. You created difficulties for fraternal parties and rendered a service to the imperialists and reactionaries. Now, with the extensive unfolding of the public debate, the truth is becoming clearer and clearer and Marxism-Leninism is making more and more progress. What was a bad thing is becoming a good thing.

In the course of this great debate, the Communists, proletarians, working people, revolutionary intellectuals, and other people who have an interest in opposing imperialism and reaction have become more discerning and increasingly awakened politically, and their revolutionary enthusiasm and theoretical level have been greatly enhanced. The effect of the public debate is the opposite of what you intended. It leads more and more people away from the bad influence of the baton and makes them think over problems independently. Thus, as with the other debates in the history of the international communist movement, the present debate is undoubtedly the prelude to a new revolutionary upsurge.

When you wanted to start public polemics against the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties, you said that such polemics represented “the only correct and genuinely Marxist-Leninist position of principle” and were “in the interests of the whole world communist movement.” Yet now that the public polemics have more and more clearly exposed your revisionist features and placed you in an increasingly disadvantageous position, you declare that they “are doing great harm to the communist movement” and that it would be “most wise” and “in the interests of the solidarity of the world communist movement” to stop them. What truth or principle is to be found in you when you say one thing one day and another the next? Which of your statements do you expect others to believe? And which do you expect others to obey?

As to the proposal for stopping the public polemics, you seem to have forgotten that it was put forward by the Workers’ Party of Viet Nam as early as January 1962. Similar proposals were put forward by the communist parties of Indonesia and of New Zealand. They all won our immediate approval. But you turned a deaf ear to them and, far from stopping the public polemics, you kept extending them. Why must others accept your proposal the instant it is made?

You also seem to have forgotten that in our letter to you of March 9, 1963 we said, “On the suspension of public polemics, it is necessary that our two Parties and the fraternal parties concerned should have some discussion and reach an agreement that is fair and acceptable to all.” You ignored our

proposal. On July 20, 1963 when the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties were drawing to a close, we proposed to write into the communique: “our two Parties and the fraternal parties concerned should make joint efforts to seek a reasonable basis for achieving a fair agreement on the cessation of public polemics, which is acceptable to all.” Once again you turned down our proposal.

In your letter you state that “it would be correct not to concentrate attention on the problems on which there are differences between us but to let them wait until the heat of passion has cooled, to let time do its work.” Again, you seem to have forgotten that as far back as October 10, 1960 we pointed out in our written statement at the drafting committee of the twenty-six fraternal parties that “as to the questions on which unanimity cannot be achieved for the time being, it would be better to leave them open than to reach a forced solution” and that “time will help us eliminate the differences.” You then categorically rejected our proposal. In your letter of November 5, 1960 to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, which you circulated during the 1960 meeting of the fraternal parties, you declared, “To wait for the ‘verdict of history’ would be a grave error fraught with serious consequences for the entire communist movement...” But now you suddenly make a turn of 180 degrees on this question and say that we should let the differences wait. What are you up to? To put it plainly, you are merely resorting to this trick to deprive us of the right to reply, after you yourselves have heaped so much abuse on the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

While the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties were in progress in Moscow, despite our repeated sincere advice you published your Open Letter to Party Organizations and all Communists in the Soviet Union on July 14, 1963 in order to curry favor with US imperialism and to reach an agreement with it on the monopoly of nuclear weapons. You then launched an anti-Chinese campaign on an unprecedented scale. According to incomplete statistics, between July 15 and the end of October 1963 the Soviet press carried nearly two thousand anti-Chinese articles and other items.

Meanwhile, under your influence the leaders of the fraternal parties of socialist countries—the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party and the Mongolian People’s Revolutionary Party—

have also published a great number of articles and other items against China.

You say in your letter that “the differences and sharp polemics are doing great harm to the communist movement.” If you really think so, don’t you find you ought to reproach yourselves, to ask yourselves why you again and again insisted on attacking and slandering the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties in a big way?

You also say in your letter that the difficulties of other fraternal parties should be taken into account. We have always given full consideration to the difficulties of other fraternal parties. It was for this very reason that we repeatedly advised the leaders of the CPSU against bringing the controversy into the open. But following the leaders of the CPSU, the leaders of the communist and workers’ parties of many capitalist countries, for example, the parties of France, Italy, Belgium, Spain, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Austria, West Germany, Greece, Portugal, Britain, the United States of America, Canada, Chile, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Peru, Colombia, Paraguay, Uruguay, Australia, Ceylon, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Turkey, Iran, Jordan and Algeria—as well as the Dange clique, who are renegades from the Indian proletariat—published many articles attacking the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties, and some adopted resolutions, issued statements or open letters to party members, or even unscrupulously attacked or expelled comrades adhering to the Marxist-Leninist stand. Did they ever take their own difficulties into account when they were doing all this? Did you ever take their difficulties into account when you were supporting them in all this?

These fraternal parties have attacked us in numerous articles and other items, but we have all along exercised great restraint. We have replied to none of them except to a part of the attacks of the leaders of the communist parties of France, Italy and the USA. We have merely reserved our right of reply. How was it possible for us to create difficulties for them when we have never disturbed them? If they have difficulties, these are of their own making.

Even after your letter of November 29, 1963 you and your followers did not stop your anti-Chinese propaganda. You attacked us by name in the *Pravda* articles, “Why Mislead?” and “The Soviet-Chinese Treaty—Fourteen Years,” in the *Izvestia* article “An Important Document,” in “The World in a Week” in the magazine *Za Rubezhom*, and in many other articles and items. In addition, you have recently published books against China, such as

Talks on Political Subjects, Our Leninist Party, A Treaty that Purifies the Atmosphere..., *The Leninist Teaching of the Party and the Contemporary Communist Movement* and *The General Crisis of Capitalism and Foreign Policy*, in which you make comprehensive and concentrated attacks on the Chinese Communist Party. You have also distributed pamphlets attacking China through your embassies abroad and your delegates to international mass organizations. As for the articles and other items your followers have published in the meantime, we shall not dwell on them here.

Moreover, since November 29, 1963 you have raised acute controversial questions and provoked debates at the Warsaw meeting of the World Peace Council, the Prague meeting of the Executive Bureau of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Berlin meeting of the Bureau of the Women's International Democratic Federation, the Budapest meeting of the Executive Committee of the International Union of Students, and at a number of other international meetings. At these meetings, while we, together with the delegates from other countries, were actively promoting the struggle of the people of the world for peace, supporting the national liberation movement and calling for a united front against US imperialism, you on your part extolled US imperialism and created splits by insisting on adopting resolutions in support of the tripartite treaty by which you allied yourselves with the United States against China.

All this provides ample proof that you say one thing and do another and that your cry for an end to public polemics is utterly false and demagogic.

While you have published so many articles and other items against China, we have so far printed only seven articles in reply to your Open Letter. We have not yet completed our reply to the important questions you raised in the Open Letter, and have not even started to reply to the questions you raised in your other anti-Chinese articles. In all our articles we have adduced facts and used reasoned arguments. How can it be said that they are "shaking the friendship and unity of the peoples of the socialist community and weakening the anti-imperialist front?" Do not these phrases neatly fit your own voluminous and unreasonable material and your countless lies and slanders?

You have used every conceivable term of abuse in attacking the Chinese Communist Party and called us a host of names such as "dogmatists," "left adventurists," "pseudo-revolutionaries," "newly-baked Trotskyites," "nationalists," "racists," "great-power chauvinists," "sectarians," "splitters," and peo-

ple “falling into the company of the forces of imperialist reaction,” “having an itch for war” and “assuming the role of right-flank man in the line-up of the American ‘maniacs’, West German revanchists and French extremists.” In short, according to you the Chinese Communists are undoubtedly one hundred percent arch-reactionaries. If so, we would like to ask: How can such fine fellows as you, who call yourselves one hundred percent Marxist-Leninists, talk of unity with those bad fellows whom you consider more hateful than the enemy? How are you going to wind up the whole affair? Do you propose to come forward with a public statement admitting that all your attacks on the Chinese Communist Party are lies and slanders and removing all the labels you have stuck on it? Or will you insist that we accept your verdict, give up the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism and kowtow to your revisionist line?

It is now perfectly clear that our differences with you involve the questions of whether or not to adhere to the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and whether or not to adhere to the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement, as well as a whole series of important questions of principle, such as the following:

Are the US imperialists the sworn enemies of the people of the world, or are they sensible emissaries of peace? Are they overlords who determine the destiny of mankind?

What is the reliable way to prevent the imperialists from unleashing a world war and to safeguard world peace?

To defend world peace and serve the interests of revolution, should we unite the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals, the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolutionaries among the national bourgeoisie, and all other forces of the world that can be united, and form the broadest possible united front in a common struggle against US imperialism and its lackeys? Or should we pin all our hopes on US-Soviet collaboration?

When the Indian reactionaries attack socialist China, should proletarian internationalism be observed and the Indian reactionaries’ provocations be denounced, or should they be helped with arms to fight the brothers of the Soviet people?

Are the Titoites renegades or comrades? Are they a special detachment of US imperialism or not? Is Yugoslavia a socialist country or not?

Is the socialist camp needed or not? On what principles is the unity of the socialist camp to be strengthened?

Should we actively support all the oppressed peoples and nations in their revolutionary and class struggles for emancipation, or should we forbid and oppose their revolutions?

Was Stalin a great Marxist-Leninist, or was he a murderer, a bandit and a gambler?

Should a socialist country maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat, or should it use the so-called state of the whole people and the so-called party of the entire people to pave the way for the restoration of capitalism?

These questions admit of no equivocation but must be thoroughly straightened out. How can issues of such magnitude be evaded? If they were, there would be no distinction between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism and dogmatism, between Marxism-Leninism and Trotskyism, between the Communist and the social democratic parties, or between communism and capitalism.

You frequently threaten others with a “most resolute rebuff.” In fact, people have had plenty of experience of your tactics, whether hard or soft, bitter or sweet. It was you who exerted military, economic and political pressure on Albania, severed diplomatic relations tore up agreements and broke off trade relations with her. It was you too who scrapped contracts with China, withdrew experts, discontinued aid and carried out subversive activities against her. The Chinese Communist Party and all other parties adhering to Marxism-Leninism will never be misled by honeyed words or bow under pressure or barter away principles. If you are indeed ready to deliver a “most resolute rebuff” worthy of the term, “openly state our views,” “publish documents and material,” take “collective measures” or what not, well then, please do whatever you intend to do.

Despite the fact that the differences have grown to their present serious proportions, the Chinese Communist Party is willing to do its best for the restoration and strengthening of unity. In your letter of November 29 you merely cry for a halt to the public polemics without putting forward any concrete measures for solving the problem. We now propose to you the following concrete measures for the solution to the problem, and we hope you will consider them and give us an answer.

(1) For the cessation of the public polemics it is necessary for the Chinese and Soviet Parties and other fraternal parties concerned to hold various bilateral and multilateral talks

in order to find through consultation a fair and reasonable formula acceptable to all and to conclude a common agreement.

(2) The Chinese Communist Party consistently advocates and actively supports the convening of a meeting of representatives of all communist and workers' parties. Prior to the meeting adequate preparations should be made, and difficulties and obstacles should be overcome. Together with the other fraternal parties, we will do everything possible to ensure that this meeting will be a meeting of unity on the basis of the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism.

(3) The resumption of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties is a necessary preparatory step for making the meeting of the fraternal parties a success. We propose that the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties be resumed in Beijing, from October 10 to 25, 1964.

(4) In order to make further preparations for the meeting of representatives of all fraternal parties, we propose that the Sino-Soviet talks be followed by a meeting of representatives of seventeen fraternal parties, namely, the parties of Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and Viet Nam, and the parties of Indonesia, Japan, Italy and France.

UNITE UNDER THE BANNER OF MARXISM-LENINISM!

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China**

The Proletarian Revolution and Khrushchev's Revisionism

COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
CPSU (VIII)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE *PEOPLE'S DAILY* AND THE *RED FLAG*

March 31, 1964

Source: *Red Flag* (*Hongqi*), No. 6, 1964, pp. 2-27.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, April 3, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 14, pp. 5-22.

The present article will discuss the familiar question of “peaceful transition.” It has become familiar and has attracted everybody’s attention because Khrushchev raised it at the 20th Congress of the CPSU and rounded it into a complete system in the form of a program at the 22nd Congress, where he pitted his revisionist views against the Marxist-Leninist views. The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU of July 14, 1963 once again struck up this old tune.

In the history of the international communist movement the betrayal of Marxism and of the proletariat by the revisionists has always manifested itself most sharply in their opposition to violent revolution and to the dictatorship of the proletariat and in their advocacy of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. This is likewise the case with Khrushchev’s revisionism. On this question, Khrushchev is a disciple of Browder and Tito as well as of Bernstein and Kautsky.

Since the days of World War II, we have witnessed the emergence of Browderite revisionism, Titoite revisionism and the theory of structural reform. These varieties of revisionism are local phenomena in the international communist movement. But Khrushchev’s revisionism, which has emerged and gained ascendancy in the leadership of the CPSU, constitutes a major question of overall significance for the international communist movement with a vital bearing on the success or failure of the entire revolutionary cause of the international proletariat.

For this reason, in the present article we are replying to the revisionists in more explicit terms than before.

A DISCIPLE OF BERNSTEIN AND KAUTSKY

Beginning with the 20th Congress of the CPSU, Khrushchev put forward the road of “peaceful transition,” i.e., “transition to socialism by the parliamentary road,”³⁶⁰ which is diametrically opposed to the road of the October Revolution.

Let us examine the “parliamentary road” peddled by Khrushchev and his like.

Khrushchev holds that the proletariat can win a stable majority in parliament under the bourgeois dictatorship and under bourgeois electoral laws. He says that in the capitalist countries “the working class, by rallying around itself the toiling peasantry, the intelligentsia, all patriotic forces, and resolutely repulsing the opportunist elements who are incapable of giving up the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, is in a position to defeat the reactionary forces opposed to the popular interest, to capture a stable majority in parliament.”³⁶¹

Khrushchev maintains that if the proletariat can win a majority in parliament, this in itself will amount to the seizure of state power and the smashing of the bourgeois state machinery. He says that, for the working class, “to win a majority in parliament and transform it into an organ of the people’s power, given a powerful revolutionary movement in the country, means smashing the military-bureaucratic machine of the bourgeoisie and setting up a new, proletarian people’s state in parliamentary form.”³⁶²

Khrushchev holds that if the proletariat can win a stable majority in parliament, this in itself will enable it to realize the socialist transformation of society. He says that the winning of a stable parliamentary majority “could create for the working class of a number of capitalist and former colonial countries the conditions needed to secure fundamental social changes.”³⁶³ Also,

³⁶⁰ N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU, February 1956.

³⁶¹ Ibid.

³⁶² N. S. Khrushchev, “For New Victories for the World Communist Movement” (a speech delivered at a meeting of the party organizations in the Higher Party School, the Academy of Social Sciences and the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, CC of the CPSU, on January 6, 1961), *World Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1961, p. 22.

³⁶³ N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the 20th Congress of the CPSU, February 1956.

The present situation offers the working class in a number of capitalist countries a real opportunity to unite the overwhelming majority of the people under its leadership and to secure the transfer of the basic means of production into the hands of the people.³⁶⁴

The Program of the CPSU maintains that “the working class of many countries can, even before capitalism is overthrown, compel the bourgeoisie to carry out measures that transcend ordinary reforms.”³⁶⁵ The Program even states that under the bourgeois dictatorship it is possible for a situation to emerge in certain countries, in which “it will be preferable for the bourgeoisie... to agree to the basic means of production being purchased from it.”³⁶⁶

The stuff Khrushchev is touting is nothing original but is simply a reproduction of the revisionism of the Second International, a revival of Bernsteinism and Kautskyism.

The main distinguishing marks of Bernstein's betrayal of Marxism were his advocacy of the legal parliamentary road and his opposition to violent revolution, the smashing of the old state machinery and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Bernstein held that capitalism could “grow into socialism” peacefully. He said that the political system of modern bourgeois society “should not be destroyed but should only be further developed,”³⁶⁷ and that “we are now bringing about by voting, demonstrations and similar means of pressure reforms which would have required bloody revolution a hundred years ago.”³⁶⁸

He held that the legal parliamentary road was the only way to bring about socialism. He said that if the working class has “universal and equal suffrage, the social principle which is the basic condition for emancipation is attained.”³⁶⁹

³⁶⁴ Ibid.

³⁶⁵ “Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union” in *Documents of 22nd Congress of the CPSU*, op. cit., p. 482.

³⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 486.

³⁶⁷ Eduard Bernstein, *The Prerequisites for Socialism and the Tasks of the Social-Democratic Party*, Ger. ed., Berlin, 1923, p. 11.

³⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 197.

³⁶⁹ Eduard Bernstein, *What Is Socialism?*, Ger. ed., Berlin, 1922, p. 28.

He asserted that “the day will come when it [the working class] will have become numerically so strong and will be so important for the whole of society that so to speak the palace of the rulers will no longer be able to withstand its pressure and will collapse semi-spontaneously.”³⁷⁰

Lenin said:

The Bernsteinians accepted and accept Marxism minus its directly revolutionary aspect. They do not regard the parliamentary struggle as one of the weapons particularly suitable for definite historical periods, but as the main and almost the sole form of struggle making “force,” “seizure,” “dictatorship,” unnecessary.³⁷¹

Herr Kautsky was a fitting successor to Bernstein. Like Bernstein, he actively publicized the parliamentary road and opposed violent revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. He said that under the bourgeois democratic system there is “no more room for armed struggle for the settlement of class conflicts”³⁷² and that “it would be ridiculous... to preach a violent political overthrow.”³⁷³ He attacked Lenin and the Bolshevik Party by comparing to “an impatient midwife who uses violence to make a pregnant woman give birth in the fifth month instead of the ninth.”³⁷⁴

Kautsky was hopelessly afflicted with parliamentary cretinism. He made the well-known statement:

The aim of our political struggle remains, as hitherto, the conquest of state power by winning a majority in parliament and by converting parliament into the master of the government.³⁷⁵

He also said:

The parliamentary republic—with a monarchy at the top in the English model, or without—is to my mind the base out of which

³⁷⁰ Eduard Bernstein, *The Political Mass Strike and the Political Situation of the Social-Democratic Party in Germany*, Ger. ed., Berlin, 1905, p. 37.

³⁷¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Victory of the Cadets and the Tasks of the Workers’ Party” in *Collected Works*, Vol. X.

³⁷² Karl Kautsky, *The Materialist Interpretation of History*, Ger. ed., Berlin, 1927, pp. 431-432.

³⁷³ Karl Kautsky, *Social Democracy Versus Communism*, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

³⁷⁴ Karl Kautsky, *The Proletarian Revolution and Its Program*, Ger. ed., Berlin, 1922, p. 90.

³⁷⁵ Karl Kautsky, “New Tactics,” *Die Neue Zeit*, No. 46, 1912.

proletarian dictatorship and socialist society grow. This republic is the “state of the future” toward which we must strive.³⁷⁶

Lenin severely criticized these absurd statements of Kautsky's.

In denouncing Kautsky, Lenin declared:

Only scoundrels or simpletons can think that the proletariat must win the majority in elections carried out *under the yoke of the bourgeoisie*, under *the yoke of wage-slavery*, and that it should win power afterwards. This is the height of folly or hypocrisy; it is substituting voting, under the old system and with the old power, for class struggle and revolution.³⁷⁷

Lenin made the pointed comment that Kautsky's parliamentary road “is nothing, but the purest and the most vulgar opportunism: repudiating revolution in deeds, while accepting it in words.”³⁷⁸ He said:

By so “interpreting” the concept “revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat” as to expunge the revolutionary violence of the oppressed class against its oppressors, Kautsky beat the world record in the liberal distortion of Marx.³⁷⁹

Here, we have quoted Khrushchev as well as Bernstein and Kautsky and Lenin's criticism of these two worthies at some length in order to show that Khrushchev's revisionism is modern Bernsteinism and Kautskyism, pure and simple. As with Bernstein and Kautsky, Khrushchev's betrayal of Marxism is most sharply manifested in his opposition to revolutionary violence, in what he does “to expunge revolutionary violence.” In this respect, Kautsky and Bernstein have now clearly lost their title to Khrushchev who has set a new world record. Khrushchev, the worthy disciple of Bernstein and Kautsky, has excelled his masters.

³⁷⁶ Karl Kautsky, Letter to Franz Mehring, July 15, 1893.

³⁷⁷ V. I. Lenin, “Greetings To Italian, French and German Communists” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

³⁷⁸ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

³⁷⁹ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 15.

VIOLENT REVOLUTION IS A UNIVERSAL LAW OF PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

The entire history of the working-class movement tells us that the acknowledgement or non-acknowledgement of violent revolution as a universal law of proletarian revolution, of the necessity of smashing the old state machine, and of the necessity of replacing the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat has always been the watershed between Marxism and all brands of opportunism and revisionism between proletarian revolutionaries and all renegades from the proletariat.

According to the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the key question in every revolution is that of state power. And the key question in the proletarian revolution is that of the seizure of state power and the smashing of the bourgeois state machine by violence, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the replacement of the bourgeois state by the proletarian state.

Marxism has always proclaimed the inevitability of violent revolution. It points out that violent revolution is the midwife to socialist society, the only road to the replacement of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat, and a universal law of proletarian revolution.

Marxism teaches us that the state itself is a form of violence. The main components of the state machine are the army and the police. History shows that all ruling classes depend upon violence to maintain their rule.

The proletariat would, of course, prefer to gain power by peaceful means. But abundant historical evidence indicates that the reactionary classes never give up power voluntarily and that they are always the first to use violence to repress the revolutionary mass movement and to provoke civil war, thus placing armed struggle on the agenda.

Lenin has spoken of "civil war, without which not a single great revolution in history has yet been able to get along, and without which not a single serious Marxist has conceived of the transition from capitalism to socialism."³⁸⁰

The great revolutions in history referred to by Lenin include the bourgeois revolution. The bourgeois revolution is one in which one exploiting class overthrows another, and yet it cannot be made without a civil war. Still

³⁸⁰ V. I. Lenin, "Prophetic Words" in *Marx, Engels, Marxism, op. cit.*, p. 445.

more is this the case with the proletarian revolution, which is a revolution to abolish all exploiting classes and systems.

Regarding the fact that violent revolution is a universal law of proletarian revolution, Lenin repeatedly pointed out that “between capitalism and socialism there lies a long period of ‘birth pains’—that violence is always the midwife of the old society”³⁸¹, that the bourgeois state “cannot be superseded by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) through the process of ‘withering away,’ but, as a general rule, only through a violent revolution,”³⁸² and that “the necessity of systematically imbuing the masses with this and precisely this view of violent revolution lies at the root of *all* the teachings of Marx and Engels.”³⁸³

Stalin, too, said that a violent revolution of the proletariat, the dictatorship of the proletariat, is “an inevitable and indispensable condition” for the advance towards socialism in all countries ruled by capital.³⁸⁴

Can a radical transformation of the bourgeois order be achieved without violent revolution, without the dictatorship of the proletariat? Stalin answered:

Obviously not. To think that such a revolution can be carried out peacefully, within the framework of bourgeois democracy, which is adapted to the rule of the bourgeoisie, means that one has either gone out of one's mind and lost normal human understanding, or has grossly and openly repudiated the proletarian revolution.³⁸⁵

Basing himself on the Marxist-Leninist theory of violent revolution and the new experience of the proletarian revolution and the people's democratic revolution led by the proletariat, Comrade Mao Zedong advanced the celebrated dictum that “political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.”

Comrade Mao Zedong said:

³⁸¹ V. I. Lenin, “Fear of the Collapse of the Old and the Fight for the New” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI.

³⁸² V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.

³⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

³⁸⁴ Joseph Stalin, “Reply to the Discussion on the Report on “The Social-Democratic Deviation in our Party”” in *Works*, Vol. VIII, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

³⁸⁵ Joseph Stalin, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism & Concerning Questions of Leninism*, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 45.

Revolutions and revolutionary wars are inevitable in class society and... in their absence no leap in social development can be accomplished, the reactionary ruling classes cannot be overthrown and the people cannot win political power.³⁸⁶

He stated:

The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries.³⁸⁷

He stated further:

Experience in the class struggle in the era of imperialism teaches us that it is only by the power of the gun that the working class and the laboring masses can defeat the armed bourgeoisie and landlords; in this sense we may say that only with guns can the whole world be transformed.³⁸⁸

To sum up, violent revolution is a universal law of proletarian revolution. This is a fundamental tenet of Marxism-Leninism. It is on this most important question that Khrushchev betrays Marxism-Leninism.

OUR STRUGGLE AGAINST KHRUSHCHEV'S REVISIONISM

When Khrushchev first put forward the “parliamentary road” at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the Chinese Communist Party considered it a gross error, a violation of the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism, and absolutely unacceptable.

As Khrushchev's revisionism was still in its incipient stage and the leaders of the CPSU had not as yet provoked open polemics, we refrained for a time from publicly exposing or criticizing Khrushchev's error of the “parliamentary road.” But, as against his erroneous proposition, we stated the Marxist-Leninist view in a positive form in our documents and articles. At the same time we waged the appropriate and necessary struggle against it at inter-party talks and meetings among the fraternal parties.

³⁸⁶ Mao Zedong, “On Contradiction” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. I, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021, p. 314.

³⁸⁷ Mao Zedong, “Problems of War and Strategy,” *op. cit.*, p. 201.

³⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 206.

Summing up the experience of the Chinese revolution, we clearly stated in the political report of our Central Committee to the Eighth National Congress of our Party in September 1956:

While our Party was working for peaceful change, it did not allow itself to be put off its guard or to give up the people's arms...

Unlike the reactionaries, the people are not warlike... But when the people were compelled to take up arms, they were completely justified in doing so. To have opposed the people's taking up arms and to have asked them to submit to the attacking enemy would have been to follow an opportunist line. Here, the question of following a revolutionary line or an opportunist line became the major issue of whether our six hundred million people should or should not capture political power when conditions were ripe. Our Party followed the revolutionary line and today we have the People's Republic of China.

On this question, the Marxist-Leninist view of the Eighth National Congress of the CPC is opposed to the revisionist view of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

In December 1956 we explained the road of the October Revolution in a positive way in the article "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," thus in fact criticizing the so-called parliamentary road which Khrushchev set against the road of the October Revolution.

In many private talks with the leaders of the CPSU, the leading comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC made serious criticisms of Khrushchev's erroneous views. We hoped in all sincerity that he would correct his mistakes.

At the time of the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties in 1957, the delegation of the CPC engaged in a sharp debate with the delegation of the CPSU on the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism.

In the first draft for the Declaration which it proposed during the preparations for the Moscow meeting, the Central Committee of the CPSU referred only to the possibility of peaceful transition and said nothing about the possibility of non-peaceful transition; it referred only to the parliamentary road and said nothing about other means of struggle, and at the same time pinned

hopes for the winning of state power through the parliamentary road on "the concerted actions of Communists and socialists." Naturally the Central Committee of the CPC could not agree to these wrong views, which depart from Marxism-Leninism, being written into the programmatic document of all the communist and workers' parties.

After the delegation of the CPC made its criticisms, the Central Committee of the CPSU produced a second draft for the Declaration. Although phrases about the possibility of non-peaceful transition were added, the formulation of the question of peaceful transition in this draft still reflected the revisionist views put forward by Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

The delegation of the CPC expressed its disagreement with these erroneous views in clear terms. On November 10, 1957 it systematically explained its own views on the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism to the Central Committee of the CPSU, to which it also presented a written outline.

The main points made in our written outline are summarized below.

It is advantageous from the point of view of tactics to refer to the desire for peaceful transition, but it would be inappropriate to over-emphasize the possibility of peaceful transition. It is necessary to be prepared at all times to repulse counter-revolutionary attacks and, at the critical juncture of the revolution when the working class is seizing state power, to overthrow the bourgeoisie by armed force if it uses armed force to suppress the people's revolution (generally speaking, it is inevitable that the bourgeoisie will do so).

The parliamentary form of struggle must be fully utilized, but its role is limited. What is most important is to proceed with the hard work of accumulating revolutionary strength; peaceful transition should not be interpreted in such a way as solely to mean transition through a parliamentary majority. The main question is that of the state machinery, namely, the smashing of the old state machinery (chiefly the armed forces) and the establishment of the new slate machinery (chiefly the armed forces).

The social democratic parties are not parties of socialism; with the exception of certain Left wings, they are a variant of bourgeois political parties. On the question of socialist revolution, our position is fundamen-

tally different from that of the social democratic parties. This distinction must not be obscured.

These views of ours are in full accord with Marxism-Leninism.

The comrades of the delegation of the Central Committee of the CPSU were unable to argue against them, but they repeatedly asked us to make allowances for their internal needs, expressing the hope that the formulation of this question in the draft Declaration might show some connection with its formulation by the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

We had refuted the wrong views of the leadership of the CPSU and put forward a written outline of our own views. For this reason and for the sake of the common struggle against the enemy, the delegation of the CPC decided to meet the repeated wishes of the comrades of the CPSU and agreed to take the draft of the Central Committee of the CPSU on this question as the basis, while suggesting amendments in only a few places.

We hoped that through this debate the comrades of the CPSU would awaken to their errors and correct them. But contrary to our hopes, the leaders of the CPSU did not do so.

At the meeting of fraternal parties in 1960, the delegation of the CPC again engaged in repeated sharp debates with the delegation of the CPSU on the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism, and thoroughly exposed and criticized Khrushchev's revisionist views. During the meeting, the Chinese and the Soviet sides each adhered to its own position, and no agreement could be reached. In view of the general wish of fraternal parties that a common document should be hammered out at the meeting, the delegation of the CPC finally made a concession on this question again and agreed to the verbatim transcription of the relevant passages in the 1957 Declaration into the 1960 Statement, again out of consideration for the needs of the leaders of the CPSU. At the same time, during this meeting we distributed the Outline of Views on the Question of Peaceful Transition put forward by the Chinese Communist Party on November 10, 1957, and made it clear that we were giving consideration to the leadership of the CPSU on this issue for the last time, and would not do so again.

If comrades now make the criticism that we were wrong in giving this consideration to the leaders of the CPSU, we are quite ready to accept this criticism.

As the formulation of the question of peaceful transition in the Declaration and the Statement was based on the drafts of the CPSU and in some

places retained the formulation by its 20th Congress, there are serious weaknesses and errors in the overall presentation, even though a certain amount of patching up was done. While indicating that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily, the formulation in the two documents also asserts that state power can be won in a number of capitalist countries without civil war; while stating that extra-parliamentary mass struggle should be waged to smash the resistance of the reactionary forces, it also asserts that a stable majority can be secured in parliament and that parliament can thus be transformed into an instrument serving the working people; and while referring to non-peaceful transition, it fails to stress violent revolution as a universal law. The leadership of the CPSU has taken advantage of these weaknesses and errors in the Declaration and the Statement and used them as an excuse for peddling Khrushchev's revisionism.

It must be solemnly declared that the Chinese Communist Party has all along maintained its differing views on the formulation of the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism in the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960. We have never concealed our views. We hold that in the interest of the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat and in order to prevent the revisionists from misusing these programmatic documents of the fraternal parties, it is necessary to amend the formulation of the question in the Declaration and the Statement through joint consultation of communist and workers' parties so as to conform to the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism.

In order to help readers acquaint themselves with the full views of the Chinese Communist Party on this question, we are re-publishing the complete text of the Outline of Views on the Question of Peaceful Transition put forward by the delegation of the CPC to the Central Committee of the CPSU on November 10, 1957, as an appendix to this article.³⁸⁹

In the last eight years the struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties and of the world's Marxist-Leninists against Khrushchev's revisionism has made great progress. More and more people have come to recognize the true features of Khrushchev's revisionism. Nevertheless, the leaders of the CPSU are still resorting to subterfuge and quibbles, and trying in every possible way to peddle their nonsense.

³⁸⁹ See Appendix 1, pp. 433-435.

Therefore, it is still necessary for us to refute the fallacy of “peaceful transition.”

SOPHISTRY CANNOT ALTER HISTORY

The leaders of the CPSU openly distort the works of Marx and Lenin and distort history too to cover up their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and justify their revisionist line.

They argue: Did not Marx “admit such a possibility [peaceful transition] for England and America?”³⁹⁰ In fact, this argument is taken from the renegade Kautsky who used the self-same method to distort Marx's views and oppose the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is true that in the 1870s Marx said that in countries like the United States and Britain “the workers can reach their goal by peaceful means.” But at the same time he stressed that this possibility was an exception. He said that “even if this be so, we must also recognize that in the majority of countries on the continent force must serve as the lever of our revolution.”³⁹¹ What is more, he pointed out:

The English bourgeoisie has always shown its readiness to accept the decision of the majority, so long as it has the monopoly of the suffrage. But believe me, at the moment when it finds itself in the minority on questions which it considers vitally important, we will have a new slave-holders' war here.³⁹²

Lenin said in his criticism of the renegade Kautsky:

The argument that Marx in the 'seventies granted the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism in England and America is the argument of a sophist, or, to put it bluntly, of a swindler who juggles with quotations and references. First, Marx regarded this possibility as an exception even then. Secondly, in those days monopoly capitalism, *i.e.*, imperialism, did not yet exist. Thirdly, in England and America there was no military then—as

³⁹⁰ *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, First Edition, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1960, p. 614.

³⁹¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, “On the Hague Congress” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII, Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, p. 255.

³⁹² K. Marx, F. Engels, “Record of Marx's Interview with *The World Correspondent*” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXII, Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, p. 606.

there is now—serving as the chief apparatus of the bourgeois state machine.³⁹³

Lenin said that, by virtue of its fundamental economic traits, imperialism is distinguished “by a minimum attachment for peace and freedom, and by a maximum and universal development of militarism.” “To ‘fail to notice’ this” in the discussion of the question of peaceful or violent change is “to stoop to the position of a common or garden variety lackey of the bourgeoisie.”³⁹⁴

Today, the leaders of the CPSU have struck up Kautsky's old tune. What is this if not stooping to the position of a common or garden lackey of the bourgeoisie?

Again, the leaders of the CPSU argue: Did not Lenin “admit in principle the possibility of a peaceful revolution?”³⁹⁵ This is even worse sophistry.

For a time after the February Revolution of 1917 Lenin envisaged a situation in which “in Russia, by way of an exception, this revolution can be a peaceful revolution.”³⁹⁶ He called this “an exception” because of the special circumstances then obtaining: “The *essence* of the matter was that the arms were in the hands of the people, and that no coercion from without was exercised in regard to the people.”³⁹⁷ In July 1917 the counter-revolutionary bourgeois government suppressed the masses by force of arms, drenching the streets of Petrograd with the blood of workers and soldiers. After this incident Lenin declared that “all hopes for a peaceful development of the Russian Revolution have definitely vanished.”³⁹⁸ In October 1917 Lenin and the Bolshevik Party resolutely led the workers and soldiers in an armed uprising and seized state power. Lenin pointed out in January 1918 that “the class struggle... has turned into a civil war.”³⁹⁹ The Soviet state had to wage another three and half years of revolutionary war and to make heavy sacrific-

³⁹³ V. I. Lenin, “The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky” (article) in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVIII.

³⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁹⁵ A. Beliakov, F. Burlatsky, “Lenin's Theory of Socialist Revolution and the Present Day,” *Kommunist*, Moscow, No. 13, 1960.

³⁹⁶ V. I. Lenin, “Speech on the Attitude Towards The Provisional Government—First All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXV.

³⁹⁷ V. I. Lenin, “On Slogans” in *ibid.*

³⁹⁸ V. I. Lenin, “The Political Situation” in *ibid.*

³⁹⁹ V. I. Lenin, “People from Another World” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI.

es before it smashed both the domestic counter-revolutionary rebellion and the foreign armed intervention. Only then was the victory of the revolution consolidated. In 1919 Lenin said that “revolutionary violence gained brilliant successes in the October Revolution.”⁴⁰⁰

Now the leaders of the CPSU have the impudence to say that the October Revolution was “the most bloodless of all revolutions”⁴⁰¹ and was “accomplished almost peacefully.”⁴⁰² Their assertions are totally contrary to the historical facts. How can they face the revolutionary martyrs who shed their blood and sacrificed their lives to create the world's first socialist state?

When we point out that world history has thus far produced no precedent for peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism, the leaders of the CPSU quibble, saying that “practical experience exists of the achievement of the socialist revolution in peaceful form.” And shutting their eyes to all the facts, they state, “In Hungary in 1919, the dictatorship of the proletariat was established by peaceful means.”⁴⁰³

Is this true? No, it is not. Let us see what Bela Kun, the leader of the Hungarian revolution, had to say.

The Communist Party of Hungary was founded in November 1918. The newborn Party immediately plunged into revolutionary struggle and proclaimed as the slogans of socialist revolution: “Disarm the bourgeoisie, arm the proletariat, establish Soviet power.”⁴⁰⁴ The Hungarian Communist Party worked actively in all fields for an armed uprising. It armed the workers, strove to win over the government troops and organize the demobilized soldiers, staged armed demonstrations, led the workers in expelling their bosses and occupying the factories, led the agricultural workers in seizing large estates, disarmed the reactionary army officers, troops and police, combined strikes with armed uprisings, and so forth.

⁴⁰⁰ V. I. Lenin, “Achievements and Difficulties of the Soviet Government,” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX.

⁴⁰¹ F. Konstantinov, “Lenin and Our Own Times,” *Kommunist*, Moscow, No. 5, 1960.

⁴⁰² A. I. Mikoyan, Speech at the 20th Congress in *The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, *op. cit.*, p. 313.

⁴⁰³ “Marxism-Leninism—the Basis of Unity of the Communist Movement,” editorial board article in *Kommunist*, Moscow, No. 15, 1963.

⁴⁰⁴ Bela Kun, *Lessons of the Proletarian Revolution in Hungary*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1960, p. 46.

In fact, the Hungarian revolution abounded in armed struggle of various forms and on various scales. Bela Kun wrote:

From the day of the founding of the Communist Party to the taking of power, armed clashes with the organs of bourgeois power occurred with increasing frequency. Starting with December 12, 1913 when the armed Budapest garrison came out into the streets in a demonstration against the War Minister of the Provisional Government... there was probably not a single day on which the press failed to report sanguinary clashes between the revolutionary workers and soldiers and armed units of the government forces, and in particular of the police. The Communists organized numerous uprisings not only in Budapest but in the provinces as well.⁴⁰⁵

The leaders of the CPSU are telling a glaring lie when they say that the Hungarian revolution was an example of peaceful transition.

It is alleged in the Soviet press that the Hungarian bourgeois government “voluntarily resigned,”⁴⁰⁶ and this is probably the only ground the leaders of the CPSU base themselves on. But what were the facts?

Karolyi, the head of the Hungarian bourgeois government at the time, was quite explicit on this point. He declared:

I signed a proclamation concerning my own resignation and the transfer of power to the proletariat, which in reality had already taken over and proclaimed power earlier... *I did not hand over power to the proletariat, as it had already won it earlier, thanks to its planned creation of a Socialist army.*

For this reason, Bela Kun pointed out that to say the bourgeoisie voluntarily handed political power over to the proletariat was a deceptive “legend.”⁴⁰⁷

The Hungarian Revolution of 1919 was defeated. In examining the chief lessons of its defeat, Lenin said that one fatal error committed by the young Hungarian Communist Party was that it was not firm enough in exercising dictatorship over the enemy but wavered at the critical moment. Moreover,

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 57.

⁴⁰⁶ “How the World Revolutionary Process Is Developing,” *Sovietskaya Rossia*, August 1, 1963.

⁴⁰⁷ Bela Kun, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

the Hungarian Party failed to take correct measures to meet the peasants' demand for the solution of the land problem and therefore divorced itself from the peasantry. Another important reason for the defeat of the Revolution was the amalgamation of the Communist Party and the opportunist Social Democratic Party.

It is a sheer distortion of history when the leaders of the CPSU allege that the Hungarian Revolution of 1918-1919 is a model of "peaceful transition."

Furthermore, they allege that the working class of Czechoslovakia won "power by the peaceful road."⁴⁰⁸ This is another absurd distortion of history.

The people's democratic power in Czechoslovakia was established in the course of the anti-fascist war; it was not taken from the bourgeoisie "peacefully." During World War II, the Communist Party led the people in guerrilla warfare and armed uprisings against the fascists, it destroyed the German fascist troops and their servile regime in Czechoslovakia with the assistance of the Soviet Army and established a national front coalition government. This government was in essence a people's democratic dictatorship under the leadership of the proletariat, i.e., a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In February 1948 the reactionaries inside Czechoslovakia, backed by US imperialism, plotted a counter-revolutionary coup d'état to overthrow the people's government by an armed rebellion. But the government led by the Communist Party immediately deployed its armed forces and organized armed mass demonstrations, thus shattering the bourgeois plot for a counter-revolutionary comeback. These facts clearly testify that the February event was not a "peaceful" seizure of political power by the working class from the bourgeoisie but a suppression of a counter-revolutionary bourgeois coup d'état by the working class through its own state apparatus, and mainly through its own armed forces.

In summarizing the February event Gottwald said:

Even before the February event we said: one of the basic changes compared with what existed before the war is precisely that the state apparatus already serves new classes and not the previous

⁴⁰⁸ L. I. Brezhnev, Speech at the 12th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, *Pravda*, December 4, 1962.

ruling classes. The February event showed that the state apparatus, in this sense, played an outstanding role.⁴⁰⁹

How can the above instances be regarded as precedents for peaceful transition?

Lenin said:

Kautsky had to resort to all these subterfuges, sophistries and fraudulent falsifications only in order to *dissociate* himself from *violent* revolution, and to conceal his renunciation of it, his desertion to the *liberal* labor policy, i.e., to the bourgeoisie.

And he added, "That is where the trouble lies."⁴¹⁰

Why has Khrushchev so shamelessly distorted the works of Marx and Lenin, fabricated history and resorted to subterfuges? Again, that is where the trouble lies.

LIES CANNOT COVER UP REALITY

The principal argument used by the leaders of the CPSU to justify their anti-revolutionary line of "peaceful transition" is that historical conditions have changed.

With regard to the appraisal of the changes in historical conditions since World War II and the conclusions to be drawn from them, Marxist-Leninists hold entirely different views from those of Khrushchev.

Marxist-Leninists hold that historical conditions have changed fundamentally since the War. The change is mainly manifested in the great increase in the forces of proletarian socialism and the great weakening of the forces of imperialism. Since the War, the mighty socialist camp and a whole series of new and independent nationalist states have emerged, and there have occurred a continuous succession of armed revolutionary struggles, a new upsurge in the mass movements in capitalist countries and the great expansion of the ranks of the international communist movement. The international proletarian socialist revolutionary movement and the national democratic revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America have become the two major historical trends of our time.

⁴⁰⁹ Klement Gottwald, Speech at the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, November 17, 1948.

⁴¹⁰ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

In the early post-war period, Comrade Mao Zedong repeatedly pointed out that the world balance of forces was favorable to us and not to the enemy, and that this new situation “has opened up still wider possibilities for the emancipation of the working class and the oppressed peoples of the world and has opened up still more realistic paths towards it.”⁴¹¹

He also indicated,

Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again... till their doom, that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law. When we say “imperialism is ferocious,” we mean that its nature will never change, that the imperialists will never lay down their butcher knives, that they will never become Buddhas, till their doom.⁴¹²

Marxist-Leninists base themselves on the fact that the changes in post-war conditions have become increasingly favorable for revolution and on the law that imperialism and reaction will never change their nature. Therefore they draw the conclusion that revolution must be promoted, and they hold that full use must be made of this very favorable situation and that in the light of the specific conditions in different countries the development of revolutionary struggles must be actively promoted and preparations must be made to seize victory in the revolution.

On the other hand, using the pretext of these very changes in post-war conditions, Khrushchev draws the conclusion that revolution must be opposed and repudiated, and he holds that as a result of the changes in the world balance of forces imperialism and reaction have changed their nature, the law of class struggle has changed, and the common road of the October Revolution and the Marxist-Leninist theory of proletarian revolution have become outmoded.

Khrushchev and his like are spreading an Arabian Nights tale. They maintain:

⁴¹¹ Mao Zedong, “Revolutionary Forces of the World Unite, Fight Against Imperialist Aggression” in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IV, *op. cit.*, p. 284.

⁴¹² Mao Zedong, “Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle” in *ibid.*, p. 432.

Now favorable international and internal conditions are taking shape for the working class of a number of capitalist countries to accomplish the socialist revolution in peaceful form.⁴¹³

They say:

In the period between the first and second world wars, the reactionary bourgeoisie in many European countries, incessantly developing and perfecting its police-bureaucratic machine, savagely repressed the mass movements of the working people and left no possibility for the achievement of the socialist revolution by the peaceful road.

But according to them the situation has now changed.⁴¹⁴

They say that “basic shifts in favor of socialism in the relationship of forces in the international arena” now create the possibility of “paralyzing the intervention of international reaction in the affairs of countries carrying out revolution,”⁴¹⁵ and that “this lessens the possibilities for the unleashing of civil war by the bourgeoisie.”⁴¹⁶

But the lies of Khrushchev and his like cannot cover up realities.

Two outstanding facts since World War II are that the imperialists and the reactionaries are everywhere, reinforcing their apparatus of violence for cruelly suppressing the masses and that imperialism headed by the United States is conducting counter-revolutionary armed intervention in all parts of the world.

Today the United States of America has become more militarized than ever and has increased its troops to over 2,700,000 men, or eleven times the 1934 total and nine times the 1939 total. It has so many police and secret service organizations that even some of the big US capitalists have had to admit that it tops the world in this respect, having far surpassed Hitlerite Germany.

Britain's standing army increased from over 250,000 men in 1934 to over 420,000 in 1963, and its police force from 67,000 in 1934 to 87,000 in 1963.

⁴¹³ A. Butenko, “War and Revolution,” *Kommunist*, Moscow, No. 4, 1961.

⁴¹⁴ *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, *op. cit.*, p. 616.

⁴¹⁵ A. Beliakov, F. Burlatsky, “Lenin's Theory of Socialist Revolution and the Present Day,” *op. cit.*

⁴¹⁶ A. Butenko, “War and Revolution,” *op. cit.*

France's standing army increased from 650,000 in 1934 to over 740,000 in 1963, and its police and security forces from 80,000 in 1934 to 120,000 in 1963.

Other imperialist countries and even the ordinary run of capitalist countries are no exceptions to this large-scale strengthening of the armed forces and police.

Khrushchev is zealously using the slogan of general and complete disarmament to immobilize the people. He has been chanting it for many years now. But in actual fact there is not even a shadow of general and complete disarmament. Everywhere in the imperialist camp headed by the United States one finds a general and complete arms drive and an expansion and strengthening of the apparatus of violent suppression.

Why are the bourgeoisie so frenziedly reinforcing their armed forces and police in peacetime? Can it be that their purpose is not to suppress the mass movements of the working people but rather to guarantee that they can win state power by peaceful means? Haven't the ruling bourgeoisie committed enough atrocities in the nineteen years since the War in employing soldiers and policemen to suppress striking workers and people struggling for their democratic rights?

In the past nineteen years, US imperialism has organized military blocs and concluded military treaties with more than forty countries. It has set up over 2,200 military bases and installations in all parts of the capitalist world. Its armed forces stationed abroad exceed 1,000,000. Its "Strike Command" directs a mobile land and air force, ready at all times to be sent anywhere to suppress the people's revolution.

In the past nineteen years, the US and other imperialists have not only given every support to the reactionaries of various countries and helped them to suppress the peoples' revolutionary movements; they have also directly planned and executed numerous counter-revolutionary armed aggressions and interventions, i.e., they have exported counter-revolution. US imperialism, for instance, helped Chiang Kai-shek fight the civil war in China, sent its own troops to Greece and commanded the attack on the Greek people's liberated areas, unleashed the war of aggression in Korea, landed troops in Lebanon to threaten the revolution in Iraq, aided and abetted the Laotian reactionaries in extending civil war, organized and directed a so-called United Nations force to suppress the national independence movement in the Congo, and conducted counter-revolutionary invasions of Cuba. It is still

fighting to suppress the liberation struggle of the people of South Viet Nam. Recently it has used armed force to suppress the just struggle of the Panamanian people in defense of their sovereignty and participated in the armed intervention in Cyprus.

Not only does US imperialism take determined action to suppress and intervene in all people's revolutions and national liberation movements, but it also tries to get rid of bourgeois regimes which show some nationalist colouration. During these nineteen years, the US Government has engineered numerous counter-revolutionary military coups d'état in a number of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It has even used violence to remove puppets of its own fostering, such as Ngô Đình Diệm, once they have ceased to suit its purposes—"kill the donkey as soon as you take it from the millstone," as the saying goes.⁴¹⁷

Facts have demonstrated that nowadays in order to make revolutions and achieve liberation all oppressed peoples and nations not only have to cope with violent suppression by the domestic reactionary ruling classes, but must prepare themselves fully against armed intervention by imperialism, and especially US imperialism. Without such preparation and without steadfastly rebuffing counter-revolutionary violence by revolutionary violence whenever necessary, revolution, let alone victory, is out of the question.

Without strengthening their armed forces, without preparing to meet imperialist armed aggression and intervention and without adhering to the policy of waging struggles against imperialism, countries which have won independence will not be able to safeguard their national independence and still less to ensure the advance of the revolutionary cause.

We would like to ask the leaders of the CPSU: Since you talk so glibly about the new features of the postwar situation, why have you chosen to omit the most important and conspicuous one, namely, that the US and other imperialists are suppressing revolution everywhere? You never weary of talking about peaceful transition, but why have you never had a single word to say about how to deal with the bloated apparatus of forcible suppression built up by the imperialists and reactionaries? You brazenly cover up the bloody realities of the cruel suppression of the national liberation and popular revolutionary movements by imperialism and reaction and spread the illusion that the oppressed nations and peoples can achieve victory by

⁴¹⁷ Meaning to get rid of something when it ceases to be useful —*Ed.*

peaceful means. Isn't it obvious that you are trying to lull the vigilance of the people, pacify the angry masses with empty promises about the bright future and oppose their revolution, thus in fact acting as accomplices of imperialism and the reactionaries of all countries?

On this question, it is useful to let John Foster Dulles, the late US Secretary of State, be our "teacher by negative example."

Dulles said in a speech on June 21, 1956 that all socialist countries had hitherto been established "through the use of violence." He then said that "the Soviet rulers now say that they will renounce the use of violence" and that "we welcome and shall encourage these developments."⁴¹⁸

As a faithful champion of the capitalist system, Dulles was of course perfectly aware of the essential role of force in class struggle. While welcoming Khrushchev's renunciation of violent revolution, he laid great stress on the bourgeoisie's need to strengthen its counter-revolutionary violence in order to maintain its rule. He said in another speech that "of all the tasks of government the most basic is to protect its citizens [read "reactionary ruling classes"] against violence... So in every civilized community the members contribute toward the maintenance of a police force as an arm of law and order."⁴¹⁹

Here Dulles was telling the truth. The political foundation of the rule of imperialism and all reaction is nothing other than—"a police force." So long as this foundation is unimpaired, nothing else is of any importance and their rule will not be shaken. The more the leaders of the CPSU cover up the fact that the bourgeoisie relies on violence for its rule and spread the fairy tale of peaceful transition, which was so welcome to Dulles, the more they reveal their true colours as cronies of the imperialists in opposing revolution.

REFUTATION OF THE "PARLIAMENTARY ROAD"

The idea of the "parliamentary road" which was publicized by the revisionists of the Second International was thoroughly refuted by Lenin and discredited long ago. But in Khrushchev's eyes, the parliamentary road seems suddenly to have acquired validity after World War II.

Is this true? Of course not.

⁴¹⁸ J. F. Dulles, Address at the 41st Annual Convention of Kiwanis International, June 21, 1956.

⁴¹⁹ J. F. Dulles, Speech at the Annual Luncheon of the Associated Press on April 22, 1957, *New York Times*, April 23, 1957.

Events since World War II have demonstrated yet again that the chief component of the bourgeois stale machine is armed force and not parliament. Parliament is only an ornament and a screen for bourgeois rule. To adopt or discard the parliamentary system, to grant parliament greater or less power, to adopt one kind of electoral law or another—the choice between these alternatives is always dictated by the needs and interests of bourgeois rule. So long as the bourgeoisie controls the military-bureaucratic apparatus, either the acquisition of a “stable majority in parliament” by the proletariat through elections is impossible, or this “stable majority” is undependable. To realize socialism through the “parliamentary road” is utterly impossible and is mere deceptive talk.

About half the communist parties in the capitalist countries are still illegal. Since these parties have no legal status, the winning of a parliamentary majority is, of course, out of the question.

For example, the Communist Party of Spain lives under White terror and has no opportunity to run in elections. It is pathetic and tragic that Spanish Communist leaders like Ibarruri should follow Khrushchev in advocating “peaceful transition” in Spain.

With all the unfair restrictions imposed by bourgeois electoral laws in those capitalist countries where communist parties are legal and can take part in elections, it is very difficult for them to win a majority of the votes under bourgeois rule. And even if they get a majority of the votes, the bourgeoisie can prevent them from obtaining a majority of the seats in parliament by revising the electoral laws or by other means.

For example, since World War II, the French monopoly capitalists have twice revised the electoral law, in each case bringing about a sharp fall in the parliamentary seats held by the Communist Party of France. In the parliamentary election in 1946, the CPF gained 182 seats. But in the election of 1951, the revision of the electoral law by the monopoly capitalists resulted in a sharp reduction in the number of CPF seats to 103, that is, there was a loss of 79 seats. In the 1956 election, the CPF gained 150 seats. But before the parliamentary election in 1958, the monopoly capitalists again revised the electoral law with the result that the number of seats held by the CPF fell very drastically to 10, that is, it lost 140 seats.

Even if in certain circumstances a Communist Party should win a majority of the seats in parliament or participate in the government as a result of an electoral victory, it would not change the bourgeois nature of parliament or

government, still less would it mean the smashing of the old and the establishment of a new state machine. It is absolutely impossible to bring about a fundamental social change by relying on bourgeois parliaments or governments. With the state machine under its control the reactionary bourgeoisie can nullify elections, dissolve parliament, expel Communists from the government, outlaw the Communist Party and resort to brute force to suppress the masses and the progressive forces.

For instance, in 1946 the Communist Party of Chile supported the bourgeois Radical Party in winning an electoral victory, and a coalition government was formed with the participation of Communists. At the time, the leaders of the Chilean Communist Party went so far as to describe this bourgeois-controlled government as a "people's democratic government." But in less than a year the bourgeoisie compelled them to quit the government, carried out mass arrests of Communists and in 1948 outlawed the Communist Party.

When a workers' party degenerates and becomes a hireling of the bourgeoisie, the latter may permit it to have a majority in parliament and to form a government. This is the case with the bourgeois social-democratic parties in certain countries. But this sort of thing only serves to safeguard and consolidate the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; it does not, and cannot, in the least alter the position of the proletariat as an oppressed and exploited class. Such facts only add testimony to the bankruptcy of the parliamentary road.

Events since World War II have also shown that if Communist leaders believe in the parliamentary road and fall victim to the incurable disease of "parliamentary cretinism," they will not only get nowhere but will inevitably sink into the quagmire of revisionism and ruin the revolutionary cause of the proletariat.

There has always been a fundamental difference between Marxist-Leninists on the one hand and opportunists and revisionists on the other on the proper attitude to adopt towards bourgeois parliaments.

Marxist-Leninists have always held that under certain conditions the proletarian party should take part in parliamentary struggle and utilize the platform of parliament for exposing the reactionary nature of the bourgeoisie, educating the masses and helping to accumulate revolutionary strength. It is wrong to refuse to utilize this legal form of struggle when necessary. But the proletarian party must never substitute parliamentary struggle for proletarian revolution or entertain the illusion that the transition to socialism can be

achieved through the parliamentary road. It must at all times concentrate on mass struggles.

Lenin said:

The party of the revolutionary proletariat must take part in bourgeois parliamentarism in order to enlighten the masses, which can be done during elections and in the struggle between parties in parliament. But to limit the class struggle to the parliamentary struggle, or to regard the latter as the highest and decisive form, to which all the other forms of struggle are subordinate, means actually deserting to the side of the bourgeoisie and going against the proletariat.⁴²⁰

He denounced the revisionists of the Second International for chasing the shadow of parliamentarism and for abandoning the revolutionary task of seizing state power. They converted the proletarian party into an electoral party, a parliamentary party, an appendage of the bourgeoisie and an instrument for preserving the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. In advocating the parliamentary road, Khrushchev and his followers can only meet with the same fate as that of the revisionists of the Second International.

REFUTATION OF “OPPOSITION TO LEFT OPPORTUNISM”

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU fabricates a tissue of lies in its treatment of the question of proletarian revolution. It asserts that the Chinese Communist Party favors “advancing the slogan of immediate proletarian revolution” even in the absence of a revolutionary situation, that it stands for abandoning “the struggle for the democratic rights and vital interests of the working people in capitalist countries,”⁴²¹ that it makes armed struggle “absolute,”⁴²² and so on. They frequently pin such labels as “Left opportunism,” “Left adventurism” and “Trotskyism” on the Chinese Communist Party.

The truth is that the leaders of the CPSU are making this hullabaloo in order to cover up their revisionist line which opposes and repudiates revolu-

⁴²⁰ V. I. Lenin, “The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX.

⁴²¹ See “Open Letter of the CC of the CPSU to all Party Organizations, to all Communists of the Soviet Union,” p. 507 of this volume.

⁴²² “Marxism-Leninism—the Basis of Unity of the Communist Movement,” *op. cit.*

tion. What they are attacking as “Left opportunism” is in fact nothing but the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line.

We have always maintained that a revolution cannot be made at will and is impossible unless a revolutionary situation objectively exists. But the outbreak and the victory of revolution depend not only on the existence of a revolutionary situation but also on the preparations and efforts made by the subjective revolutionary forces.

It is “Left” adventurism if the party of the proletariat does not accurately appraise both the objective conditions and subjective forces making for revolution and if it rashly launches a revolution before the conditions are ripe. But it is Right opportunism, or revisionism, if the proletarian party makes no active preparations for revolution before the conditions are ripe, or dare not lead a revolution and seize state power when a revolutionary situation exists and the conditions are ripe.

Until the time arrives for seizing state power, the fundamental and most important task for the proletarian party is to concentrate on the painstaking work of accumulating revolutionary strength. The active leadership given in day-to-day struggle must have as its central aim the building up of revolutionary strength and the preparations for seizing victory in the revolution when the conditions are ripe. The proletarian party should use the various forms of day-to-day struggle to raise the political consciousness of the proletariat and the masses of the people, to train its own class forces, to temper its fighting capacity and to prepare for revolution ideologically, politically, organizationally and militarily. It is only in this way that it will not miss the opportunity of seizing victory when the conditions for revolution are ripe. Otherwise, the proletarian party will simply let the opportunity of making revolution slip by even when a revolutionary situation objectively exists.

While tirelessly stressing that no revolution should be made in the absence of a revolutionary situation, the leaders of the CPSU avoid the question of how the party of the proletariat should conduct day-to-day revolutionary struggle and accumulate revolutionary strength before there is a revolutionary situation. In reality, they are renouncing the task of building up revolutionary strength and preparing for revolution on the pretext of the absence of a revolutionary situation.

Lenin once gave an excellent description of the renegade Kautsky's attitude towards the question of a revolutionary situation. He said of Kautsky that if the revolutionary crisis has arrived, “then he too is prepared to become

a revolutionary! But then, let us observe, every blackguard... would proclaim himself a revolutionary! If it has not, then Kautsky will turn his back on revolution!" As Lenin pointed out, Kautsky was like a typical philistine, and the difference between a revolutionary Marxist and a philistine is that the Marxist has the courage to "prepare the proletariat and all the toiling and exploited masses for it [revolution]." ⁴²³ People can judge for themselves whether or not Khrushchev and his followers resemble the Kautsky type of philistine denounced by Lenin.

We have always held that the proletarian parties in the capitalist countries must actively lead the working class and the working people in struggles to oppose monopoly capital, to defend democratic rights, to improve living conditions, to oppose imperialist arms expansion and war preparations, to defend world peace and to give vigorous support to the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations.

In the capitalist countries which are subject to bullying, control, intervention and aggression by US imperialism, the proletarian parties should raise the national banner of opposition to US imperialism and direct the edge of the mass struggle mainly against US imperialism as well as against monopoly capital and other reactionary forces at home which are betraying the national interests. They should unite all the forces that can be united and form a united front against US imperialism and its lackeys.

In recent years the working class and the working people in many capitalist countries have been waging broad mass struggles which not only hit monopoly capital and other reactionary forces at home, but render powerful support to the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples and to the countries of the socialist camp. We have always fully appreciated this contribution.

While actively leading immediate struggles, Communists should link them with the struggle for long-range and general interests, educate the masses in a proletarian revolutionary spirit, ceaselessly raise their political consciousness and accumulate revolutionary strength in order to seize victory in revolution when the time is opportune. Our view is in full accord with Marxism-Leninism.

In opposition to the views of Marxist-Leninists, the leaders of the CPSU spread the notion that "in the highly developed capitalist countries, demo-

⁴²³ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

cratic and socialist tasks are so closely intertwined that there, least of all, is it possible to draw any sort of lines of demarcation.”⁴²⁴ This is to substitute immediate for long-range struggles and reformism for proletarian revolution.

Lenin said that “no reform can be durable, genuine and serious if it is not supported by the revolutionary methods of struggle of the masses.” A workers’ party that “does not combine this struggle for reforms with the revolutionary methods of the workers’ movement may be transformed into a sect, and may become torn away from the masses, and... this is the most serious threat to the success of genuine revolutionary socialism.”⁴²⁵

He said that “every democratic demand... is, for the class-conscious workers, *subordinated* to the higher interests of socialism.”⁴²⁶ Further, in *The State and Revolution* Lenin quoted Engels as follows. The forgetfulness of the great main standpoint in the momentary interests of the day, the struggling and striving for the success of the moment without consideration for the later consequences, the sacrifice of the future of the movement for its present was opportunism, and dangerous opportunism at that.

It was precisely on this ground that Lenin criticized Kautsky for “praising reformism and submission to the imperialist bourgeoisie, and blaming and renouncing revolution.”⁴²⁷ He said that “the proletariat fights for the revolutionary overthrow of the imperialist bourgeoisie,” while Kautsky “fights for the reformist ‘improvement’ of imperialism, for adaptation to it, while *submitting* to it.”⁴²⁸

Lenin’s criticism of Kautsky is an apt portrayal of the present leaders of the CPSU.

We have always held that in order to lead the working class and the masses of the people in revolution, the party of the proletariat must master all forms of struggle and be able to combine different forms, swiftly substituting one form for another as the conditions of struggle change. It will be invincible in all circumstances only if it masters all forms of struggle, such as peaceful and

⁴²⁴ A. Beliakov, F. Burlatsky, “Lenin’s Theory of Socialist Revolution and the Present Day,” *op. cit.*

⁴²⁵ V. I. Lenin, “Letter to the Secretary of the Socialist Propaganda League” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

⁴²⁶ V. I. Lenin, “A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism,” *op. cit.*

⁴²⁷ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

⁴²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

armed, open and secret, legal and illegal, parliamentary and mass struggle, as well as both domestic and international struggle.

The victory of the Chinese revolution was precisely the result of the skillful and thorough mastery of all forms of struggle—in keeping with the specific characteristics of the Chinese revolution—by the Communists of China who learned from the historical experience of international proletarian struggle. Armed struggle was the chief form in the Chinese revolution, but the revolution could not have been victorious without the use of other forms of struggle.

In the course of the Chinese revolution the Chinese Communist Party fought on two fronts. It fought both the Right deviation of legalism and the “Left” illegalist deviation, and properly combined legal with illegal struggle. In the country as a whole, it correctly combined struggle in the revolutionary base areas with struggle in the Kuomintang areas, while in the Kuomintang areas it correctly combined open and secret work, made full use of legal opportunities and kept strictly to party rules governing secret work. The Chinese revolution has brought forth a complexity and variety of forms of struggle suited to its own specific conditions.

From its long practical experience, the Chinese Communist Party is fully aware that it is wrong to reject legal struggle, to restrict the Party's work within narrow confines and thereby to alienate itself from the masses. But one should never tolerate the legalism peddled by the revisionists. The revisionists reject armed struggle and all other illegal struggle, engage only in legal struggle and activity and confine the Party's activities and mass struggles within the framework allowed by the ruling classes.

They debase and even discard the Party's basic program, renounce revolution and adapt themselves solely to reactionary systems of law.

As Lenin rightly pointed out in his criticism, revisionists such as Kautsky were degraded and dulled by bourgeois legality. “For a mess of pottage given to the organizations that are recognized by the present police law, the proletarian right of revolution was sold.”⁴²⁹

While the leaders of the CPSU and their followers talk about the use of all forms of struggle, in reality they stand for legalism and discard the objective of the proletarian revolution on the pretext of changing forms of struggle. This is again substituting Kautskyism for Leninism.

⁴²⁹ V. I. Lenin, “The Collapse of the Second International” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

The leaders of the CPSU often make use of Lenin's great work, "Left-Wing' Communism, an Infantile Disorder," to justify their erroneous line and have made it a "basis" for their attacks on the Chinese Communist Party.

This is of course futile. Like all his other works, this book of Lenin's can only serve as a weapon for Marxist-Leninists in the fight against various kinds of opportunism and can never serve as an instrument of revisionist apologetics.

When Lenin criticized the "Left-wing" infantile disorder and asked the party of the proletariat to be skillful in applying revolutionary tactics and to do better in preparing for revolutions, he had already broken with the revisionists of the Second International and had founded the Third International.

Indeed, in "Left-Wing' Communism" he stated that the main enemy of the international working-class movement at the time was Kautsky's type of opportunism. He repeatedly stressed that unless a break was made with revisionism there could be no talk of how to master revolutionary tactics.

Those comrades whom Lenin criticized for their "Left-wing" infantile disorder all wanted revolution, while the latter-day revisionist Khrushchev is against it, has therefore to be included in the same category as Kautsky and has no right whatsoever to speak on the question of combating the "Left-wing" infantile disorder.

It is most absurd for the leadership of the CPSU to pin the label of "Trotskyism" on the Chinese Communist Party. In fact, it is Khrushchev himself who has succeeded to the mantle of Trotskyism and who stands with the Trotskyites of today.

Trotskyism manifests itself in different ways on different questions and often wears the mask of "ultra-Leftism," but its essence is opposition to revolution, repudiation of revolution.

As far as the fundamental fact of their opposition to the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat is concerned, Trotskyism and the revisionism of the Second International are virtually the same. This is why Stalin repeatedly said that Trotskyism is a variety of Menshevism, is Kautskyism and social democracy, and is the advanced detachment of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

In its essence, the present-day revisionism of Khrushchev also opposes and repudiates revolution. Therefore, the only logical conclusion is that

Khrushchev's revisionism is not only cut from the same cloth as Kautskyism, but also converges with Trotskyism to oppose revolution. Khrushchev had better pin the label of Trotskyism on himself.

TWO DIFFERENT LINES, TWO DIFFERENT RESULTS

History is the most telling witness. Rich experience has been gained since World War II both in the international communist movement and in the peoples' revolutionary struggles. There has been successful as well as unsuccessful experience. Communists and the revolutionary people of all countries need to draw the right conclusions from this historical experience.

The countries in Eastern Europe, Asia and Latin America which have succeeded in making a socialist revolution since the War have done so by following the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line and the road of the October Revolution. Now, in addition to the experience of the October Revolution, there is the experience of the revolutions of China, the socialist countries in Eastern Europe, Korea, Viet Nam and Cuba. The victorious revolutions in these countries have enriched and developed Marxism-Leninism and the experience of the October Revolution.

From China to Cuba, all these revolutions without exception were won by armed struggle and by fighting against armed imperialist aggression and intervention.

The Chinese people were victorious in their revolution after waging revolutionary wars for twenty-two years, including the three years of the People's Liberation War, in which they thoroughly defeated the Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries who were backed up to the hilt by US imperialism.

The Korean people carried on fifteen years of revolutionary armed struggle against Japanese imperialism beginning in the 1930s, built up and expanded their revolutionary armed forces, and finally achieved victory with the help of the Soviet Army. After the founding of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, it took another three years of war against US imperialist armed aggression before the victory of their revolution could be consolidated.

The Vietnamese people seized state power by the armed uprising of August 1945. Immediately afterwards, they had to begin fighting a war of national liberation lasting eight years against French imperialism and to defeat the US imperialist military intervention, and only then did they triumph in northern Viet Nam. The people of southern Viet Nam are still waging a heroic struggle against US imperialist armed aggression.

The Cuban people started their armed uprising in 1953, and later it took more than two years of people's revolutionary war before they overthrew the rule of US imperialism and its Cuban puppet, Batista. After their victorious revolution, the Cuban people smashed armed invasions by US imperialist mercenaries and safeguarded the fruits of revolution.

The other socialist countries too were all established through armed struggle.

What are the main lessons of the successful proletarian revolutions in the countries extending from China to Cuba after World War II?

1. Violent revolution is a universal law of proletarian revolution. To realize the transition to socialism, the proletariat must wage armed struggle, smash the old state machine and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

2. The peasants are the most dependable allies of the proletariat. The proletariat must closely rely on the peasants, establish a broad united front based on the worker-peasant alliance, and insist upon proletarian leadership in the revolution.

3. US imperialism is the archenemy of people's revolution in all countries. The proletariat must hold high the national banner of opposition to US imperialism and have the courage to fight with firm resolve against the US imperialists and their lackeys in its own country.

4. The revolution of the oppressed nations is an indispensable ally of the proletarian revolution. The workers of all countries must unite, and they must unite with all the oppressed nations and all the forces opposed to imperialism and its lackeys to form a broad international united front.

5. To make a revolution, it is essential to have a revolutionary party. The triumph of the proletarian revolution and the triumph of the dictatorship of the proletariat are impossible without a revolutionary proletarian party established in accordance with the revolutionary theory and style of Marxism-Leninism, a party which is irreconcilable towards revisionism and opportunism and which takes a revolutionary attitude towards the reactionary ruling classes and their state power.

To insist on revolutionary armed struggle is of primary importance not only to the proletarian revolution but also to the national democratic revolution of the oppressed nations. The victory of the Algerian national liberation war has set a good example in this respect.

The whole history of the proletarian parties since the War has shown that those parties which have followed the line of revolution, adopted the correct

strategy and tactics and actively led the masses in revolutionary struggle are able to lead the revolutionary cause forward step by step to victory and grow vigorously in strength.

Conversely, all those parties which have adopted a non-revolutionary opportunist line and accepted Khrushchev's line of "peaceful transition" are doing serious damage to the revolutionary cause and turning themselves into lifeless and reformist parties, or becoming completely degenerate and serving as tools of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. There is no lack of such instances.

The comrades of the Communist Party of Iraq were once full of revolutionary ardour. But acceptance of Khrushchev's revisionist line was forced on them by outside pressure, and they lost their vigilance against counter-revolution. In the armed counter-revolutionary coup d'état, leading comrades heroically sacrificed their lives, thousands of Iraqi Communists and revolutionaries were massacred in cold blood, the powerful Iraqi Communist Party was dispersed, and the revolutionary cause of Iraq suffered a grave setback. This is a tragic lesson in the annals of proletarian revolution, a lesson written in blood.

The leaders of the Algerian Communist Party danced to the baton of Khrushchev and of the leadership of the French Communist Party and completely accepted the revisionist line against armed struggle. But the Algerian people refused to listen to this rubbish. They courageously fought for national independence against imperialism, waged a war of national liberation for over seven years and finally compelled the French Government to recognize Algeria's independence. But the Algerian Communist Party, which followed the revisionist line of the leadership of the CPSU, forfeited the confidence of the Algerian people and its position in Algerian political life.

During the Cuban revolution, some leaders of the Popular Socialist Party refused to pursue the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line, the correct line of revolutionary armed struggle, but, following Khrushchev's revisionist line, advocated "peaceful transition" and opposed violent revolution. In these circumstances, Marxist-Leninists outside and inside the Cuban Party, represented by Comrade Fidel Castro, rightly bypassed those leaders who opposed violent revolution, joined hands and made revolution with the revolutionary Cuban people, and finally won a victory of great historic significance.

Certain leaders of the Communist Party of France of whom Thorez is representative have long been pursuing a revisionist line, have publicized the

“parliamentary road” in response to Khrushchev’s baton, and have actually reduced the Communist Party to the level of a social democratic party. They have ceased to give active support to the revolutionary aspirations of the people and rolled up the national banner of opposition to US imperialism. The result of their pursuit of this revisionist line is that the Communist Party, which once had great influence among the people, has become increasingly isolated from the masses and has deteriorated more and more.

Certain leaders of the Indian Communist Party, typified by Dange, have long pursued a revisionist line, hauled down the banner of revolution and failed to lead the masses in national and democratic revolutionary struggles. The Dange clique has slid farther and farther down the path of revisionism and degenerated into national chauvinists, into tools of the reactionary policies of India’s big landlords and big bourgeoisie, and into renegades from the proletariat.

The record shows that the two fundamentally different lines lead to two fundamentally different results. All these lessons merit close study.

FROM BROWDER AND TITO TO KHRUSHCHEV

Khrushchev’s revisionism has deep historical and social roots and bears the imprint of the times. As Lenin said, “opportunism is no accident, no sin, no slip, no betrayal on the part of individual persons, but the social product of a whole historical epoch.”⁴³⁰

While making great progress since World War II, the international communist movement has produced its antithesis within its own ranks—an adverse current of revisionism which is opposed to socialism, Marxism-Leninism and proletarian revolution. This adverse current was chiefly represented first by Browder, later by Tito and now by Khrushchev. Khrushchev’s revisionism is nothing but the continuation and development of Browderism and Titoism.

Browder began to reveal his revisionism around 1935. He worshipped bourgeois democracy, abandoned making the necessary criticisms of the bourgeois government and regarded the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie as

⁴³⁰ Ibid.

a fine thing for Communists, his slogan being “Communism Is Twentieth Century Americanism.”⁴³¹

With the formation of the international and domestic anti-fascist united fronts during World War II, he became obsessed with bourgeois “democracy,” “progress” and “reason,” prostrated himself before the bourgeoisie and degenerated into an out-and-out capitulationist.

Browder propagated a whole set of revisionist views which embellished the bourgeoisie and opposed and negated revolution.

He declared that the Teheran Declaration of the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain ushered in an epoch of “long-term confidence and collaboration” between capitalism and socialism and was capable of guaranteeing “a stable peace for generations.”⁴³²

He spread the notion that the international agreements of the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain represented “the most vital interests of every nation and every people in the world without exception”⁴³³ and that the perspective of inner chaos “is incompatible with the perspective of international order.” Therefore, it was necessary to oppose “an explosion of class conflict” within the country and “to minimize, and to place definite limits upon” internal class struggle.⁴³⁴

He spread the view that a new war would be “a real catastrophic smash-up of a large part of the world” and “may throw... most of the world back into barbarism for 50 or 100 years,” and that the “emphasis upon agreement that transcends all class divisions”⁴³⁵ was necessary in order to wipe out the disaster of war.

He advocated relying “entirely upon democratic persuasion and conviction”⁴³⁶ to realize socialism, and declared that after World War II certain

⁴³¹ Cited in William Z. Foster, *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, International Publishers, New York, 1944, pp. 23; 27.

⁴³² Earl Browder, *Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace*, International Publishers, New York, 1944, pp. 23; 27.

⁴³³ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

⁴³⁴ Earl Browder, *Teheran and America*, Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1944, pp. 17;28.

⁴³⁵ Earl Browder, *Communists and National Unity*, Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1944, pp. 9-10.

⁴³⁶ Earl Browder, *The Road to Victory*, Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1941, p. 22.

countries “have gained the conditions in which a peaceful transition to socialism has become possible.”⁴³⁷

He negated the independent role of the proletarian parties, saying that “the practical political aims they [the Communists] hold will for a long time be in agreement on all essential points with the aims of a much larger body of non-Communists.”⁴³⁸

Guided by these ideas, he dissolved the Communist Party of the USA.

For a time, Browder's revisionism led the revolutionary cause of the American proletariat to the brink of the precipice, and it contaminated the proletarian parties of other countries with the poison of liquidationism.

Browder's revisionist line was opposed by many American Communists headed by Comrade William Z. Foster and was rejected and repudiated by many fraternal parties. However, the revisionist trend represented by Browderism was not thoroughly criticized and liquidated by the international communist movement as a whole.

In the new circumstances after the War, the revisionist trend developed anew among the Communist ranks in certain countries.

In the capitalist countries, the growth of the revisionist trend first manifested itself in the fact that the leaders of certain communist parties abandoned the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line and embraced the line of “peaceful transition.” This line is clearly typified in Togliatti's theory of structural reform, which advocates the proletariat's attainment of the leadership of the state through the legal channels of bourgeois democracy and the socialist transformation of the national economy through such nationalization and planning as serve monopoly capital. According to this line, it is possible to establish new socialist relations of production and make the transition to socialism without smashing the bourgeois state machine. In practice, this amounts to making communism degenerate into social-democracy.

In the socialist countries, the revisionist trend first appeared in Yugoslavia. Capitulation to US imperialism is an important characteristic of Titoite revisionism. The Tito clique has sold themselves body and soul to US imperialism; they have not only restored capitalism in Yugoslavia but have become an imperialist instrument for undermining the socialist camp and the inter-

⁴³⁷ Earl Browder, *World Communism and US Foreign Policy*, New York, 1948, p. 19.

⁴³⁸ Earl Browder, *Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace*, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

national communist movement and are playing the role of a special detachment of US imperialism for sabotaging world revolution.

In their efforts to serve US imperialism and to oppose and abolish proletarian revolution, the Tito clique has outspokenly asserted that violent revolution has become “increasingly superfluous as a means of resolving social contradictions”⁴³⁹ and that the “evolutionary process of development toward socialism” through a bourgeois parliament “is not only possible but has already become a real fact.”⁴⁴⁰ They virtually equate capitalism with socialism, asserting that the present-day world “as a whole has deeply ‘plunged’ into socialism, become socialist.”⁴⁴¹ They also say that “now the question—socialism or capitalism—is already solved on a world scale.”⁴⁴²

Browderite revisionism, the theory of structural reform and Titoite revisionism—these have been the chief manifestations of the revisionist trend since World War II.

Between the 20th and the 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, Khrushchev's revisionist line of “peaceful transition,” “peaceful coexistence” and “peaceful competition” became a complete system. He has been hawking this stuff everywhere as his “new creation.” Yet it is nothing new but is merely a rehashed and meretricious combination of Browderite revisionism, the theory of structural reform and Titoite revisionism. In international relations, Khrushchev's revisionism practices capitulation to US imperialism; in the imperialist and capitalist countries it practices capitulation to the reactionary ruling classes; in the socialist countries it encourages the development of capitalist forces.

If Bernstein, Kautsky and the other revisionists of the Second International ran in a single line and belonged to the same family around the time of World War I, then the same is true of Browder, Tito and Khrushchev after World War II.

Browder has made this point clear. He wrote in 1960, “Khrushchev now adopted the ‘heresy’ for which I was kicked out of the Communist Party in 1945.” And he added that Khrushchev's new policy “is almost word for word

⁴³⁹ Ilija Kosanović, *Historical Materialism*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1958, p. 352.

⁴⁴⁰ Edvard Kardelj, “Socialist Democracy in Yugoslav Practice,” a lecture delivered before activists of the Norwegian Labour Party in Oslo on October 8, 1954.

⁴⁴¹ Mialko Todorović, “On the Declaration Concerning Relations Between the LCY and the CPSU,” *Komunist*, Belgrade, Nos. 7-8, 1956.

⁴⁴² Mirko Perović, *Politička Ekonomija*, 2nd ed., Belgrade, 1958, p. 466.

the same line I advocated fifteen years ago. So my crime has become—at least for the moment—the new orthodoxy.”⁴⁴³

Khrushchev himself has admitted that he and the Tito clique “belong to one and the same idea and are guided by the same theory.”⁴⁴⁴

In the nature of the case, Khrushchev's revisionism is even more pernicious than the revisionism of Bernstein, Kautsky, Browder and Tito. Why? Because the US is the first socialist state, a large country in the socialist camp and the native land of Leninism. The CPSU is a large party created by Lenin and in the international communist movement it enjoys a prestige shaped by history. Khrushchev is exploiting his position as the leader of the CPSU and of the Soviet Union to push through his revisionist line.

He describes his revisionist line as a “Leninist” line and utilizes the prestige of the great Lenin and of the great Bolshevik Party to confuse and deceive people.

Exploiting the inherited prestige of the CPSU and the position of a large party and a large country, he has been waving his baton and employing all kinds of political, economic and diplomatic measures to force others to accept his revisionist line.

In line with the imperialist policy of buying over the labor aristocracy, he is buying over certain bourgeoisified Communists in the international communist movement who have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and inducing them to acclaim and serve the anti-revolutionary line of the leaders of the CPSU.

That is why all other revisionists, whether past or present, are dwarfed by Khrushchev.

As the Declaration of 1957 points out, the social source of modern revisionism is surrender to external imperialist pressure and acceptance of domestic bourgeois influence.

Like the old-line revisionists, the modern revisionists answer to the description given by Lenin: “objectively, they are a political detachment of the bourgeoisie... they are transmitters of its influence, its agents in the labor movement.”⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴³ Earl Browder, “How Stalin Ruined the American Communist Party,” *Harper's Magazine*, March 1960.

⁴⁴⁴ N. S. Khrushchev, Interview with Foreign Correspondents at Brioni in Yugoslavia, August 28, 1963.

⁴⁴⁵ V. I. Lenin, “The Collapse of the Second International,” *op. cit.*

The economic basis of the emergence of modern revisionism, like that of old-line revisionism, is in the words of Lenin “an insignificant section of the ‘top’ of the labor movement.”⁴⁴⁶

Modern revisionism is the product of the policies of imperialism and of international monopoly capital which are both headed by the United States. Terrified by the policy of nuclear blackmail and corrupted by the policy of buying over, the modern revisionists are serving as the pawns of US imperialism and its servile followers in opposing revolution.

The revisionist Khrushchev is also scared out of his wits by the hysterical war cries of the US imperialists, and he thinks that this “Noah’s ark,” the earth, is threatened with destruction at any moment and he has completely lost confidence in the future of mankind. Proceeding from national egoism, he fears that revolutions by the oppressed classes and nations might create trouble for him and implicate him. Therefore, he tries to oppose every revolution by all means and, as in the case of the Congo, does not scruple about taking joint action with US imperialism in stamping out a people’s revolution. He thinks that by so doing he can avoid risks and at the same time conspire with US imperialism to divide the world into spheres of influence, thus killing two birds with one stone. All this only goes to show that Khrushchev is the greatest capitulationist in history. The enforcement of Khrushchev’s pernicious policy will inevitably result in inestimable damage to the great Soviet Union itself.

Why has Khrushchev’s revisionism emerged in the Soviet Union, a socialist state with a history of several decades? Actually, this is not so strange. For in every socialist country the question of who wins over whom—socialism or capitalism—can only be gradually settled over a very long historical period. So long as there are capitalist forces and there are classes in society, there is soil for the growth of revisionism.

Khrushchev asserts that in the Soviet Union classes have been abolished, the danger of capitalist restoration is ruled out and the building of communism is under way. All these assertions are lies.

In fact, as a result of Khrushchev’s revisionist rule, of the open declaration that the Soviet state has changed its nature and is no longer a dictatorship of the proletariat, and of the execution of a whole series of erroneous domes-

⁴⁴⁶ V. I. Lenin, “Opportunism, and the Collapse of the Second International” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI.

tic and foreign policies, the capitalist forces in Soviet society have become a deluge sweeping over all fields of life in the US, including the political, economic, cultural and ideological fields. The social source of Khrushchev's revisionism lies precisely in the capitalist forces, which are ceaselessly spreading in the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev's revisionism represents and serves these capitalist forces. Therefore, it will never bring communism to the Soviet people; on the contrary, it is seriously jeopardizing the fruits of socialism and is opening the floodgates for the restoration of capitalism. This is the very road of "peaceful evolution" craved by US imperialism.

The whole history of the dictatorship of the proletariat tells us that peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism is impossible. However, there is already the Yugoslav precedent for the "peaceful evolution" of socialism back into capitalism. Now Khrushchev's revisionism is leading the Soviet Union along this road.

This is the gravest lesson in the history of the dictatorship of the proletariat. All Marxist-Leninists, all revolutionaries and the generations to come must under no circumstances forget this great lesson.

OUR HOPES

Only eight years have elapsed since the 20th Congress of the CPSU. In this extremely short period of history, Khrushchev's revisionism has inflicted very great and grave damage on the Soviet Union and the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat.

Now is the time—now it is high time—to repudiate and liquidate Khrushchev's revisionism!

Here, we would give the leading comrades of the CPSU a piece of advice: Since so many opportunists and revisionists have been thrown on to the rubbish heap of history, why must you obdurately follow their example?

Here, too, we express the hope that those leading comrades of other fraternal parties who have committed revisionist errors will think this over: What have they gained by following the revisionist line of the leaders of the CPSU? We understand that, excepting those who have fallen deep into the revisionist quagmire, quite a number of comrades have been confused and deceived, or compelled to follow the wrong path. We believe that all those who are proletarian revolutionaries will eventually choose the revolutionary line and

reject the anti-revolutionary line, will eventually choose Marxism-Leninism and reject revisionism. We entertain very great hopes in this regard.

Revisionism can never stop the wheel of history, the wheel of revolution. Revisionist leaders who do not make revolution themselves can never prevent the genuine Marxists and the revolutionary people from rising in revolution. In *the Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* Lenin wrote that when Kautsky became a renegade, the German Marxist Liebknecht could only express his appeal to the working class in this way “to push aside such ‘leaders,’ to free themselves from their stultifying and debasing propaganda, to rise in revolt *in spite of* them, *without* them, and march over their heads *towards revolution!*”⁴⁴⁷

When the Second International's brand of revisionism prevailed in many parties in Europe, Lenin attached great significance to the views of the French Communist Paul Golay.

Golay said:

Our adversaries talked loudly of the bankruptcy of Socialism. That is going a bit too fast. Still, who would dare to assert that they are entirely wrong? What is dying at present is not Socialism at all, but one variety of socialism, a sugary socialism without the spirit of idealism and without passion, with the ways of a paunchy official and of a substantial paterfamilias, a socialism without boldness or fierce enthusiasm, a devotee of statistics with its nose buried in friendly agreements with capitalism, a socialism which is preoccupied solely with reforms and which has sold its birthright for a mess of pottage, a socialism which in the eyes of the bourgeoisie is a throttle on the popular impatience and an automatic brake on proletarian audacity.⁴⁴⁸

What a superb description! Lenin called it the honest voice of a French Communist. People now ask: Is not modern revisionism precisely the “variety of socialism” which is dying? They will soon hear the resounding ring of the honest voices of innumerable Communists inside the parties dominated by revisionism.

⁴⁴⁷ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

⁴⁴⁸ Cited in V. I. Lenin, “The Voice of an Honest French Socialist,” *op. cit.*

“A thousand sails pass by the shipwreck; ten thousand saplings shoot up beyond the withered tree.”⁴⁴⁹ Bogus socialism is dying, whereas scientific socialism is bursting with youthful vigor and is advancing in bigger strides than ever. Revolutionary socialism with its vitality will overcome all difficulties and obstacles and advance step by step towards victory until it has won the whole world.

Let us wind up this article with the concluding words of the *Communist Manifesto*:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

WORKING MEN OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁴⁹ A quote from a poem of Liu Yuxi (772-842), a poet of the Tang dynasty —Ed.

⁴⁵⁰ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party & Principles of Communism*, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

Letter of the CC of the CPC of May 7, 1964

May 7, 1964

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 9, 1964, pp. 2-6.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, May 8, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 19, pp. 7-10.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has received the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated March 7, 1964.

In your letter you talk glibly about your desire for “the speediest possible settlement of existing differences” and “the cessation of the public polemics between communist parties” and about your willingness to do your utmost “to help strengthen the unity of the communist movement.” But the facts show the complete falsity of your fine words. Both before and since the delivery of your letter, you have never ceased your attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties. At every single meeting of the international democratic organizations in the last few months, you have energetically preached and pushed your wrong line and conducted activities against China. Already in the middle of February this year, that is, three weeks before your letter of March 7, you made an anti-Chinese report and adopted an anti-Chinese decision at the Plenum of your Central Committee, at which six thousand people were present, declaring that you would “publicly explain” the “mistakes” of the CPC and “come out openly and strongly” against it.

All this clearly reveals that in writing the letter of March 7 you were simply playing a two-faced game. Under the guise of “deep concern for the settlement of the differences and for the unity of the international communist movement,” you were diligently preparing a new onslaught against the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties and hatching a big plot for openly splitting the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

We have given you repeated explanations of our consistent stand on public polemics. Since you have ignored our repeated advice, obdurately provoked and extended the public polemics and made massive public attacks upon us and other fraternal parties, we and the other fraternal parties are of course entitled to make public replies according to the principle of equality among fraternal parties. It is our right to reply as much as you attack us.

Our press has not yet finished replying to your Open Letter of July 14, 1963. We have not yet started—to say nothing of completing—our reply to the more than two thousand anti-Chinese articles and other items which you published after your Open Letter and to the great number of resolutions, statements and articles in which scores of fraternal parties have attacked us. How can we be asked to give up our right of public reply when you have issued such a mass of resolutions, statements, articles, books and pamphlets attacking the Chinese Communist Party without ever publicly revoking them?

On many public occasions, including international meetings, you have violated the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement by spreading and pushing your general line of “peaceful transition,” “peaceful competition” and “peaceful coexistence,” and have set your minds on uniting with US imperialism, the common enemy of the people of the whole world, to oppose the national liberation movement, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and to undermine the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. You have tried to impose your erroneous line on fraternal parties and on the international democratic organizations. How can you expect us and all other Marxist-Leninists to keep silent about these foul deeds of yours and about such important questions of principle affecting the future of the world revolution and the destiny of mankind? And how can you expect us to refrain from exposing and publicly opposing your revisionist and divisive errors and from publicly stating our position and views?

You said earlier that in starting the public polemics at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU you were “acting in Lenin’s manner,” yet you say now in your letter that to refrain from public polemics is “the behest of V. I. Lenin.” Which of your two statements is correct? If you really want a cessation of the public polemics, does that not mean your 22nd Congress was wrong? And are you ready to admit your mistake?

The anti-Chinese report and decision of the February Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU published on April 3, 1964 and the ensuing events make it all the more clear that your call for a cessation of the public polemics was intended solely to gag us so that you could have a free rein to push ahead with your revisionist and divisive line.

Regarding the question of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and a meeting of representatives of all fraternal parties, the proposal we made in our letter of February 29, 1964 was as follows: The talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties should be resumed in October so as to make preparations for a meeting of representatives of all fraternal parties; in order to make further preparations for the meeting of representatives of all fraternal parties, the two Party talks should be followed by a meeting of representatives of seventeen fraternal parties, the meeting of representatives of all fraternal parties should be convened after the completion of preparations, so that it will be a meeting of unity on the basis of the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism.

In your letter of March 7, 1964 you disagree with this reasonable proposal of ours and charge us with deliberate stalling. You want the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties to be held in May, the preparatory meeting of representatives of fraternal parties in June-July and the international meeting of all fraternal parties in autumn this year.

At first glance you are most eager and enthusiastic. But it is not for the purpose of eliminating differences and strengthening unity that you have put forward this pressing timetable. On the contrary, more and more facts testify that it is a step in your plot to accelerate an open split in the international communist movement.

On February 12 this year you sent a letter directed against the Communist Party of China to fraternal parties and behind our backs. Your letter of February 22, 1964 to us divulged that in that anti-Chinese letter you had called for a "rebuff" to us and threatened to "take collective measures." At the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU on February 14-15 this year you decided to "come out openly and strongly against the incorrect views and dangerous actions of the leadership of the CPC." This means that you have pushed the cartridge into the chamber and are ready to press the trigger. In such circumstances, is it not utterly hypocritical of you to suggest that Sino-Soviet talks be held in May this year for "the speediest possible settlement of existing differences?"

We would like to ask the comrades of the CPSU: Why were you in such a great hurry? Was it not your intention, upon our rejection of your proposal for holding the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties in May 1964, to use it as a pretext for brazenly and unilaterally calling an international meeting and effecting an open split?

The consistent stand of the Chinese Communist Party is to uphold unity and oppose a split. We have worked unswervingly for the elimination of differences and the restoration of unity. At the same time, we are fully aware that our difference with you is a grave one involving a whole series of fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. It began with the 20th Congress of the CPSU and was aggravated at the 22nd Congress and later. It is obviously impossible for such long-accumulated differences of principle to be solved overnight. Time and patience are needed.

When in our letter of February 29, 1964 we proposed that the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties should be resumed in October this year, our chief consideration was to have seven months for doing a number of things by way of preparation. For instance, we would have to receive a copy of the letter of February 12, 1964 which you sent to fraternal parties and acquaint ourselves with its contents; we would like to see the magic weapons you threatened to use, such as “openly stating our views,” “publishing documents and material,” giving “the most resolute rebuff” and applying “collective measures”; and we would have to answer your attacks and react to your new magic weapons. All this would take time.

It is regrettable that to date you have still groundlessly refused to give us a copy of your letter of February 12, 1964 to fraternal parties in spite of our repeated requests. It must be understood that this is a letter attacking us, and since you have given it to many fraternal parties, why do you particularly deny it to us? We have the right to ask you to send us a copy. Now we again request you to send us the letter. If you go on refusing, our request will stand for ten thousand years.

As for your magic weapons, at least you have produced a few beginning with April 3 this year. It seems that you have now warmed up and have a lot more to say. But we still do not know what other magic weapons you have and what your “most resolute rebuff” and “collective measures” really are.

In these circumstances, how can the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and the international meeting of fraternal parties be successful? What will there be to say except for quarrels ending up in a fruitless adjournment,

or a final open split with each side going its own way? Can it be that you are resolved to have an open split?

Comrades! We are against a split. Before all your vaunted magic weapons are produced, before each side's case and intentions are made clear, and before full preparations are completed, the holding of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and of an international meeting of fraternal parties can only lead to a split, and to this we cannot agree.

Judging by present circumstances, not only is it impossible to hold the two-Party talks in May, but it will also be too early to hold them in October. We consider it more appropriate to postpone them till sometime in the first half of next year, say May. And if either the Chinese or the Soviet Party then considers that the time is still not ripe, they can be further postponed.

The timing of the preparatory meeting for the meeting of representatives of all communist and workers' parties will depend on the results of the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties. The composition of the preparatory meeting can be decided through consultation among fraternal parties, but we still consider it appropriate for the preparatory meeting to consist of the seventeen fraternal parties proposed in our letter of February 29, 1964, namely, the Parties of Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and Viet Nam, and the parties of Indonesia, Japan, Italy and France.

In principle we are not against increasing the number of participants in the preparatory meeting. But we cannot agree with the proposal, put forward in your letter, that it should be increased from seventeen to twenty-six fraternal parties. For the situation now is vastly different from that in 1960. There are two parties in some of the countries mentioned in your list. In Australia, for instance, there is a party represented by E. F. Hill and another by L. L. Sharkey. The former is a Marxist-Leninist and the latter a revisionist party. A similar situation obtains in Brazil. Obviously you and we differ as to which of these Parties should attend the meeting. In another case, that of India, the Dange clique has degenerated into pawns of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords and into renegades from communism. How can the Dange clique of renegades be allowed to participate in a meeting of fraternal parties? In our opinion, if the membership of the preparatory meeting is to be increased, the first consideration should be given to those fraternal parties

which uphold Marxism-Leninism and which are waging heroic revolutionary struggles.

As for the meeting of representatives of all communist and workers' parties, we hold that it must be a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and that it should definitely not become a meeting for a split. Therefore, ample preparations have to be made and it should not be called in a hurry. This is our consistent attitude and it is also the attitude of many other fraternal parties, including some which have ideological differences with us. In the past you, too, approved of this attitude. In your letter to us of November 29, 1963, you agreed that conditions should be created so that the meeting "will lead not to a split in the world communist movement but to the genuine unity and solidarity of all the fraternal parties and all the forces of peace and socialism." If you do not want an immediate open split, you should not be in too much of a hurry to call the international meeting in the coming autumn. We advise you to think this over calmly: it would be better to hold the international meeting of fraternal parties later rather than earlier, or even not to hold it, in these circumstances.

There is now no international organization like the Third International nor any body like the permanent bodies of the Third International which were entitled to call international meetings. In these circumstances, it would be wrong and impermissible for one or more parties to make a unilateral decision to call a meeting of representatives of all communist and workers' parties in violation of the principles of consultation and the attainment of unity among the fraternal parties. To do so would be illegitimate and entirely wrong and would lead to grave consequences. This is clear to you, to us and to all the other communist and workers' parties. If, in arrogant disregard of the advice of our Party and of many other fraternal parties, the Central Committee of the CPSU should cling to its own course, hurriedly convene such a meeting by calling together those parties that support its wrong, revisionist and divisive line, and treat it as a meeting of representatives of all the communist and workers' parties of the world, you would then be strongly condemned by the working class, the revolutionary people and all genuine Marxist-Leninist parties throughout the world, you would cast to the four winds the banner of unity which you profess to uphold, and would have to bear the responsibility for a split. Do you want to do this? Do you want to put yourselves in such an inextricable predicament? We are saying this in all

sincerity and clearly pointing to where interests or dangers lie, so do not say that you have not been forewarned.

We maintain that a series of preparatory steps are necessary in order to make the international meeting of fraternal parties a success, and that these should include the holding of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and of bilateral or multilateral talks among fraternal parties, the convening of a preparatory meeting by fraternal parties and the reaching of unanimous agreement at this meeting. Judging by present circumstances, it may require perhaps four or five years, or even longer, to complete these preparations.

Our views are based on deep concern for the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. We hope that they will receive your serious and earnest consideration.

Furthermore, we would like to ask you to reconsider the proposal we made in our letter of February 27 this year, namely, that our two Parties reach an agreement, by which each side will, on an equal basis, publish in its own press the documents, articles and other material which both sides have published or will publish in criticism of each other. Although you rejected this proposal in your letter of March 7, 1964, you failed to give any really tenable reason. You have one-sidedly published many statements vilifying the Chinese Communist Party, and yet you prevent the members of the CPSU and the Soviet people from reading our replies and becoming acquainted with our actual position and views; this is indeed a deliberate attempt to inflame hostility between the Chinese and Soviet peoples. If you have real faith in the members of the CPSU and the Soviet people as well as in yourselves, you will find no reason whatever not to reach an agreement with us on this question.

The documents of the February Plenum of your Central Committee and the *Pravda* editorial of April 3, 1964 divulged information from the letters exchanged between the Central Committees of the Chinese and Soviet Parties since November 1963 and distorted the facts, in an attempt to delude the members of the CPSU, the Soviet people, and people everywhere else unfamiliar with the true state of affairs. In order to clarify matters and give the true picture, the Central Committee of the CPC deems it necessary to publish in full all the letters exchanged between the Chinese and Soviet Parties since November 1963. These comprise: the letters of the Central Committee of the CPSU dated November 29, 1963, and February 22 and March 7, 1964, and the letters of the Central Committee of the CPC dated Feb-

ruary 20, 27 and 29 and May 7, 1964. We hope that you will be able to do likewise and will publish the full text of this exchange of letters between our two Parties in your own press.

With fraternal greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China**

On Khrushchev's Phony Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World

COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
CPSU (IX)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE *PEOPLE'S DAILY* AND THE *RED FLAG*

July 14, 1964

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 13, 1964.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, July 17, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 29, pp. 7-28.

The theories of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are the quintessence of Marxism-Leninism. The questions of whether revolution should be upheld or opposed and whether the dictatorship of the proletariat should be upheld or opposed have always been the focus of struggle between Marxism-Leninism and all brands of revisionism and are now the focus of struggle between Marxist-Leninists the world over and the revisionist Khrushchev clique.

At the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, the revisionist Khrushchev clique developed their revisionism into a complete system not only by rounding off their anti-revolutionary theories of “peaceful coexistence” and “peaceful transition” but also by declaring that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary in the Soviet Union and advancing the absurd theories of the “state of the whole people” and the “party of the entire people.”

The Program put forward by the revisionist Khrushchev clique at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU is a program of phony communism, a revisionist program against proletarian revolution and for the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian party.

The revisionist Khrushchev clique abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat behind the camouflage of the “state of the whole people,” change the proletarian character of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union behind the camouflage of the “party of the entire people” and pave the way for the restoration of capitalism behind that of “full-scale communist construction.”

In its Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement dated June 14, 1963, the Central Committee of the

Communist Party of China pointed out that it is most absurd in theory and extremely harmful in practice to substitute the “state of the whole people” for the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the “party of the entire people” for the vanguard party of the proletariat. This substitution is a great historical retrogression which makes any transition to communism impossible and helps only to restore capitalism.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the press of the Soviet Union resort to sophistry in self-justification and charge that our criticisms of the “state of the whole people” and the “party of the entire people” are allegations “far removed from Marxism,” betray “isolation from the life of the Soviet people” and are a demand that they “return to the past.”

Well, let us ascertain who is actually far removed from Marxism-Leninism, what Soviet life is actually like and who actually wants the Soviet Union to return to the past.

SOCIALIST SOCIETY AND THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

What is the correct conception of socialist society? Do classes and class struggle exist throughout the stage of socialism? Should the dictatorship of the proletariat be maintained and the socialist revolution be carried through to the end? Or should the dictatorship of the proletariat be abolished so as to pave the way for capitalist restoration? These questions must be answered correctly according to the basic theory of Marxism-Leninism and the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The replacement of capitalist society by socialist society is a great leap in the historical development of human society. Socialist society covers the important historical period of transition from class to classless society. It is by going through socialist society that mankind will enter communist society.

The socialist system is incomparably superior to the capitalist system. In socialist society, the dictatorship of the proletariat replaces bourgeois dictatorship and the public ownership of the means of production replaces private ownership. The proletariat, from being an oppressed and exploited class, turns into a ruling class and a fundamental change takes place in the social position of the working people. Exercising dictatorship over a few exploiters only, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat practices the broadest democracy among the masses of the working people, a democracy that is impossible in capitalist society. The nationalization of industry and collectiv-

ization of agriculture open wide vistas for the vigorous development of the social productive forces, ensuring a rate of growth incomparably greater than that in any older society.

However, one cannot but see that socialist society is a society born out of capitalist society and is only the first phase of communist society. It is not yet a fully mature communist society in the economic and other fields. It is inevitably stamped with the birthmarks of capitalist society. When defining socialist society Marx said:

What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has *developed* on its own foundations, but, on the contrary, just as it *emerges* from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it emerges.⁴⁵¹

Lenin also pointed out that in socialist society, which is the first phase of communism, “Communism *cannot* as yet be fully ripe economically and entirely free from traditions or traces of capitalism.”⁴⁵²

In socialist society, the differences between workers and peasants, between town and country, and between manual and mental laborers still remain, bourgeois rights are not yet completely abolished, it is *not possible* “at once to eliminate the other injustice, which consists in the distribution of articles of consumption ‘according to the amount of labor performed’ (and not according to needs),”⁴⁵³ and therefore differences in wealth still exist.

The disappearance of these differences, phenomena and bourgeois rights can only be gradual and long drawn-out. As Marx said, only after these differences have vanished and bourgeois rights have completely disappeared will it be possible to realize full communism with its principle, “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.”

Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the Soviet Union, China and other socialist countries all teach us that socialist society covers a very, very long historical stage. Throughout this stage, the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat goes on and the question of “who will win”

⁴⁵¹ K. Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Program*, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

⁴⁵² V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

⁴⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

between the roads of capitalism and socialism remains, as does the danger of restoration of capitalism.

In its Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement dated June 14, 1963, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China states:

For a very long historical period after the proletariat takes power, class struggle continues as an objective law independent of man's will, differing only in form from what it was before the taking of power.

After the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out a number of times that:

- a. The overthrown exploiters always try in a thousand and one ways to recover the "paradise" they have been deprived of.
- b. New elements of capitalism are constantly and spontaneously generated in the petit-bourgeois atmosphere.
- c. Political degenerates and new bourgeois elements may emerge in the ranks of the working class and among government functionaries as a result of bourgeois influence and the pervasive, corrupting influence of the petit bourgeoisie.
- d. The external conditions for the continuance of class struggle within a socialist society are encirclement by international capitalism, the imperialists' threat of armed intervention and their subversive activities to accomplish peaceful disintegration.

Life has confirmed these conclusions of Lenin's.

In socialist society, the overthrown bourgeoisie and other reactionary classes remain strong for quite a long time, and indeed in certain respects are quite powerful. They have a thousand and one links with the international bourgeoisie. They are not reconciled to their defeat and stubbornly continue to engage in trials of strength with the proletariat. They conduct open and hidden struggles against the proletariat in every field.

Constantly parading such signboards as support for socialism, the Soviet system, the Communist Party and Marxism-Leninism, they work to undermine socialism and restore capitalism. Politically, they persist for a long time as a force antagonistic to the proletariat and constantly attempt to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat. They sneak into the government organs,

public organizations, economic departments and cultural and educational institutions so as to resist or usurp the leadership of the proletariat.

Economically, they employ every means to damage socialist ownership by the whole people and socialist collective ownership and to develop the forces of capitalism. In the ideological, cultural and educational fields, they counterpose the bourgeois world outlook to the proletarian world outlook and try to corrupt the proletariat and other working people with bourgeois ideology.

The collectivization of agriculture turns individual into collective farmers and provides favorable conditions for the thorough remolding of the peasants. However, until collective ownership advances to ownership by the whole people and until the remnants of private economy disappear completely, the peasants inevitably retain some of the inherent characteristics of small producers. In these circumstances spontaneous capitalist tendencies are inevitable, the soil for the growth of new rich peasants still exists and polarization among the peasants may still occur.

The activities of the bourgeoisie as described above, its corrupting effects in the political, economic, ideological and cultural and educational fields, the existence of spontaneous capitalist tendencies among urban and rural small producers, and the influence of the remaining bourgeois rights and the force of habit of the old society all constantly breed political degenerates in the ranks of the working class and party and government organizations, new bourgeois elements and embezzlers and grafters in state enterprises owned by the whole people and new bourgeois intellectuals in the cultural and educational institutions and intellectual circles.

These new bourgeois elements and these political degenerates attack socialism in collusion with the old bourgeois elements and elements of other exploiting classes which have been overthrown but not eradicated. The political degenerates entrenched in the leading organs are particularly dangerous, for they support and shield the bourgeois elements in organs at lower levels.

As long as imperialism exists, the proletariat in the socialist countries will have to struggle both against the bourgeoisie at home and against international imperialism. Imperialism will seize every opportunity and try to undertake armed intervention against the socialist countries or to bring about their peaceful disintegration. It will do its utmost to destroy the socialist countries

or to make them degenerate into capitalist countries. The international class struggle will inevitably find its reflection within the socialist countries.

Lenin said:

The transition from capitalism to Communism represents an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this *hope* is converted into *attempts* at restoration.⁴⁵⁴

He also pointed out:

The abolition of classes requires a long, difficult and stubborn *class struggle*, which *after* the overthrow of the power of capital, *after* the destruction of the bourgeois state, *after* the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, *does not disappear* (as the vulgar representatives of the old Socialism and the old Social-Democracy imagine), but merely changes its forms and in many respects becomes more fierce.⁴⁵⁵

Throughout the stage of socialism the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the political, economic, ideological and cultural and educational fields cannot be stopped. It is a protracted, repeated, tortuous and complex struggle. Like the waves of the sea it sometimes rises high and sometimes subsides, is now fairly calm and now very turbulent. It is a struggle that decides the fate of a socialist society. Whether a socialist society will advance to communism or revert to capitalism depends upon the outcome of this protracted struggle.

The class struggle in socialist society is inevitably reflected in the Communist Party. The bourgeoisie and international imperialism both understand that in order to make a socialist country degenerate into a capitalist country, it is first necessary to make the Communist Party degenerate into a revisionist party.

The old and new bourgeois elements, the old and new rich peasants and the degenerate elements of all sorts constitute the social basis of revisionism, and they use every possible means to find agents within the Communist Party. The existence of bourgeois influence is the internal source of revisionism and surrender to imperialist pressure the external source.

⁴⁵⁴ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

⁴⁵⁵ V. I. Lenin, "Greetings to the Hungarian Workers" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX.

Throughout the stage of socialism, there is inevitable struggle between Marxism-Leninism and various kinds of opportunism—mainly revisionism—in the communist parties of socialist countries. The characteristic of this revisionism is that, denying the existence of classes and class struggle, it sides with the bourgeoisie in attacking the proletariat and turns the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

In the light of the experience of the international working-class movement and in accordance with the objective law of class struggle, the founders of Marxism pointed out that the transition from capitalism, from class to classless society, must depend on the dictatorship of the proletariat and that there is no other road.

Marx said that “the class struggle necessarily leads to the *dictatorship of the proletariat*.”⁴⁵⁶ He also said:

Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*.⁴⁵⁷

The development of socialist society is a process of uninterrupted revolution. In explaining revolutionary socialism Marx said:

This socialism is the *declaration of the permanence of the revolution*, the *class dictatorship* of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the *abolition of class distinctions generally*, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations.⁴⁵⁸

In his struggle against the opportunism of the Second International, Lenin creatively expounded and developed Marx's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He pointed out:

⁴⁵⁶ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Marx to Joseph Weydemeyer” in *Selected Letters*, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

⁴⁵⁷ K. Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Program*, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

⁴⁵⁸ K. Marx, F. Engels, “The Class Struggles in France (1848-1850)” in *Selected Works in Two Volumes*, Vol. I, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1955, p. 223.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is not the end of class struggle but its continuation in new forms. The dictatorship of the proletariat is class struggle waged by a proletariat which has been victorious and has taken political power in its hands against a bourgeoisie that has been defeated but not destroyed, a bourgeoisie that has not vanished, not ceased to offer resistance, but that has intensified its resistance.⁴⁵⁹

He also said:

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle—bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative—against the forces and traditions of the old society.⁴⁶⁰

In his celebrated work *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People* and in other works, Comrade Mao Zedong, basing himself on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, gives a comprehensive and systematic analysis of classes and class struggle in socialist society, and creatively develops the Marxist-Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Comrade Mao Zedong examines the objective laws of socialist society from the viewpoint of materialist dialectics. He points out that the universal law of the unity and struggle of opposites operating both in the natural world and in human society is applicable to socialist society, too.

In socialist society, class contradictions still remain and class struggle does not die out after the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production. The struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism runs through the entire stage of socialism. To ensure the success of socialist construction and to prevent the restoration of capitalism, it is necessary to carry the socialist revolution through to the end on the political, economic, ideological and cultural fronts. The complete victory of socialism cannot be brought about in one or two generations; to resolve this question thoroughly requires five to ten generations or even longer.

Comrade Mao Zedong stresses the fact that two types of social contradictions exist in socialist society, namely, contradictions among the people

⁴⁵⁹ V. I. Lenin, "Foreword to 'Deception of the People with Slogans on Freedom and Equality'" in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX.

⁴⁶⁰ V. I. Lenin, "*Left-Wing*" *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

and contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, and that the former are very numerous. Only by distinguishing between the two types of contradictions, which are different in nature, and by adopting different measures to handle them correctly is it possible to unite the people, who constitute more than 90 percent of the population, defeat their enemies, who constitute only a few percent, and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the basic guarantee for the consolidation and development of socialism, for the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie and of socialism in the struggle between the two roads.

Only by emancipating all mankind can the proletariat ultimately emancipate itself. The historical task of the dictatorship of the proletariat has two aspects, one internal and the other international.

The internal task consists mainly of completely abolishing all the exploiting classes, developing socialist economy to the maximum, enhancing the communist consciousness of the masses, abolishing the differences between ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, between workers and peasants, between town and country and between mental and manual laborers, eliminating any possibility of the re-emergence of classes and the restoration of capitalism and providing conditions for the realization of a communist society with its principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

The international task consists mainly of preventing attacks by international imperialism (including armed intervention and disintegration by peaceful means) and of giving support to the world revolution until the peoples of all countries finally abolish imperialism, capitalism and the system of exploitation.

Before the fulfilment of both tasks and before the advent of a full communist society, the dictatorship of the proletariat is absolutely necessary.

Judging from the actual situation today, the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat are still far from accomplished in any of the socialist countries. In all socialist countries without exception, there are classes and class struggle, the struggle between the socialist and the capitalist roads, the question of carrying the socialist revolution through to the end and the question of preventing the restoration of capitalism.

All the socialist countries still have a very long way to go before the differences between ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, between workers and peasants, between town and country and between

mental and manual laborers are eliminated, before all classes and class differences are eliminated and a communist society with its principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," is realized. Therefore, it is necessary for all the socialist countries to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In these circumstances, the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the revisionist Khrushchev clique is nothing but a betrayal of socialism and communism.

ANTAGONISTIC CLASSES AND CLASS STRUGGLE EXIST IN THE SOVIET UNION

In announcing the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, the revisionist Khrushchev clique base themselves mainly on the argument that antagonistic classes have been eliminated and that class struggle no longer exists.

But what is the actual situation in the Soviet Union? Are there really no antagonistic classes and no class struggle there?

Following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat was established in the Soviet Union, capitalist private ownership was destroyed and socialist ownership by the whole people and socialist collective ownership were established through the nationalization of industry and the collectivization of agriculture, and great achievements in socialist construction were scored during several decades. All this constituted an indelible victory of tremendous historic significance won by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin.

However, the old bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes which had been overthrown in the Soviet Union were not eradicated and survived after industry was nationalized and agriculture collectivized. The political and ideological influence of the bourgeoisie remained. Spontaneous capitalist tendencies continued to exist both in the city and in the countryside. New bourgeois elements and kulaks were still incessantly generated. Throughout the long intervening period, the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads have continued in the political, economic and ideological spheres.

As the Soviet Union was the first, and at the time the only, country to build socialism and had no foreign experience to go by, and as Stalin departed from

Marxist-Leninist dialectics in his understanding of the laws of class struggle in socialist society, he prematurely declared after agriculture was basically collectivized that there were “no longer antagonistic classes”⁴⁶¹ in the Soviet Union and that it was “free of class conflicts”⁴⁶², one-sidedly stressed the internal homogeneity of socialist society and overlooked its contradictions, failed to rely upon the working class and the masses in the struggle against the forces of capitalism and regarded the possibility of restoration of capitalism as associated only with armed attack by international imperialism. This was wrong both in theory and in practice.

Nevertheless, Stalin remained a great Marxist-Leninist. As long as he led the Soviet Party and State, he held fast to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist course, pursued a Marxist-Leninist line and ensured the Soviet Union's victorious advance along the road of socialism.

Ever since Khrushchev seized the leadership of the Soviet Party and State, he has pushed through a whole series of revisionist policies which have greatly hastened the growth of the forces of capitalism and again sharpened the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and the struggle between the roads of socialism and capitalism in the Soviet Union.

Scanning the reports in Soviet newspapers over the last few years, one finds numerous examples demonstrating not only the presence of many elements of the old exploiting classes in Soviet society, but also the generation of new bourgeois elements on a large scale and the acceleration of class polarization.

Let us first look at the activities of various bourgeois elements in the Soviet enterprises owned by the whole people.

Leading functionaries in some state-owned factories and their gangs abuse their positions and amass large fortunes by using the equipment and materials of the factories to set up “underground workshops” for private production, selling the products illicitly and dividing the spoils. Here are some examples.

In a Leningrad plant producing military items, the leading functionaries placed their own men in “all key posts” and “turned the state enterprise into

⁴⁶¹ Joseph Stalin, “On the Draft Constitution of the USSR” in *Problems of Leninism*, *op. cit.*, p. 808.

⁴⁶² Joseph Stalin, “Report on the Work of the Central Committee to the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU(B)” in *Works*, Vol. XIV, Red Star Press, London, 1978, p. 394.

a private one.” They illicitly engaged in the production of non-military goods and from the sale of fountain pens alone embezzled 1,200,000 old rubles in three years. Among these people was a man who “was a Nepman... in the 1920s” and had been a “lifelong thief.”⁴⁶³

In a silk-weaving mill in Uzbekistan, the manager ganged up with the chief engineer, the chief accountant, the chief of the supply and marketing section, heads of workshops and others, and they all became “newborn entrepreneurs.” They purchased more than ten tons of artificial and pure silk through various illegal channels in order to manufacture goods which “did not pass through the accounts.” They employed workers without going through the proper procedures and enforced “a twelve-hour working day.”⁴⁶⁴

The manager of a furniture factory in Kharkov set up an “illegal knit-wear workshop” and carried on secret operations inside the factory. This man “had several wives, several cars, several houses, 176 neckties, about a hundred shirts and dozens of suits.” He was also a big gambler at the horse-races.⁴⁶⁵

Such people do not operate all by themselves. They invariably work hand in glove with functionaries in the state departments in charge of supplies and in the commercial and other departments. They have their own men in the police and judicial departments who protect them and act as their agents. Even high-ranking officials in the state organs support and shield them. Here are a few examples.

The chief of the workshops affiliated with a Moscow psychoneurological dispensary and his gang set up an “underground enterprise,” and by bribery “obtained fifty-eight knitting machines” and a large amount of raw material. They entered into business relations with “fifty-two factories, handicraft co-operatives and collective farms” and made three million rubles in a few years. They bribed functionaries of the Department for Combating Theft of Socialist Property and Speculation, controllers, inspectors, instructors and others.⁴⁶⁶

The manager of a machinery plant in the Russian Federation, together with the deputy manager of a second machinery plant and other functionaries, or forty-three persons in all, stole more than nine hundred looms and

⁴⁶³ *Krasnaya Zvezda*, May 19, 1962.

⁴⁶⁴ *Pravda Vostoka*, October 8, 1963.

⁴⁶⁵ *Pravda Ukrainy*, May 18, 1962.

⁴⁶⁶ *Izvestia*, October 20, 1963, and *Izvestia* Sunday Supplement, No. 12, 1964.

sold them to factories in Central Asia, Kazakhstan, the Caucasus and other places, whose leading functionaries used them for illicit production.⁴⁶⁷

In the Kirghiz SSR, a gang of over forty embezzlers and grafters, having gained control of two factories, organized underground production and plundered more than thirty million rubles' worth of state property. The gang included the Chairman of the Planning Commission of the Republic, a Vice-Minister of Commerce, seven bureau chiefs and division chiefs of the Republic's Council of Ministers, National Economic Council and State Control Commission, as well as "a big kulak who had fled from exile."⁴⁶⁸

These examples show that the factories which have fallen into the clutches of such degenerates are socialist enterprises only in name, that in fact they have become capitalist enterprises by which these persons enrich themselves. The relationship of such persons to the workers has turned into one between exploiters and exploited, between oppressors and oppressed. Are not such degenerates who possess and make use of means of production to exploit the labor of others out-and-out bourgeois elements? Are not their accomplices in government organizations, who work hand in glove with them, participate in many types of exploitation, engage in embezzlement, accept bribes, and share the spoils, also out-and-out bourgeois elements?

Obviously all these people belong to a class that is antagonistic to the proletariat—they belong to the bourgeoisie. Their activities against socialism are definitely class struggle with the bourgeoisie attacking the proletariat.

Now let us look at the activities of various kulak elements on the collective farms.

Some leading collective-farm functionaries and their gangs steal and speculate at will, freely squander public money and fleece the collective farmers. Here are some examples.

The chairman of a collective farm in Uzbekistan "held the whole village in terror." All the important posts on this farm "were occupied by his in-laws and other relatives and friends." He squandered "over 132,000 rubles of the collective farm for his personal 'needs.'" He had a car, two motor-cycles and three wives, each with "a house of her own."⁴⁶⁹

⁴⁶⁷ *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, August 9, 1963.

⁴⁶⁸ *Sovietskaya Kirghizia*, January 9, 1962.

⁴⁶⁹ *Selskaya Zhizn*, June 26, 1962.

The chairman of a collective farm in the Kursk Region regarded the farm as his “hereditary estate.” He conspired with its accountant, cashier, chief warehouse-keeper, agronomist, general store-manager and others. Shielding each other, they “fleeced the collective farmers” and pocketed more than a hundred thousand rubles in a few years.⁴⁷⁰

The chairman of a collective farm in the Ukraine made over 50,000 rubles at its expense by forging purchase certificates and cash-account orders in collusion with its woman accountant, who had been praised for keeping “model accounts” and whose deeds had been displayed at the Moscow Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy.⁴⁷¹

The chairman of a collective farm in the Alma-Ata Region specialized in commercial speculation. He bought “fruit juice in the Ukraine or Uzbekistan, and sugar and alcohol from Djambul,” processed them and then sold the wine at very high prices in many localities. In this farm a winery was created with a capacity of over a million liters a year, its speculative commercial network spread throughout the Kazakhstan SSR, and commercial speculation became one of the farm’s main sources of income.⁴⁷²

The chairman of a collective farm in Byelorussia considered himself “a feudal princeling on the farm” and acted “personally” in all matters. He lived not on the farm but in the city or in his own splendid villa and was always busy with “various commercial machinations” and “illegal deals.” He bought cattle from the outside, represented them as the products of the collective farm and falsified output figures. And yet “not a few commendatory newspaper reports” had been published about him and he had been called a “model leader.”⁴⁷³

These examples show that collective farms under the control of such functionaries virtually become their private property. Such men turn socialist collective economic enterprises into economic enterprises of new kulaks. There are often people in their superior organizations who protect them. Their relationship to the collective farmers has likewise become that of oppressors to oppressed, of exploiters to exploited. Are not such neo-exploiters who ride on the backs of the collective farmers one-hundred-per-cent neo-kulaks?

⁴⁷⁰ *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta*, No. 35, 1963.

⁴⁷¹ *Selskaya Zhizn*, August 14, 1963.

⁴⁷² *Pravda*, January 14, 1962.

⁴⁷³ *Pravda*, February 6, 1961.

Obviously, they all belong to a class that is antagonistic to the proletariat and the laboring farmers, belong to the kulak or rural bourgeois class. Their anti-socialist activities are precisely class struggle with the bourgeoisie attacking the proletariat and the laboring farmers.

Apart from the bourgeois elements in state enterprises and collective farms, there are many others in both town and country in the Soviet Union.

Some of them set up private enterprises for private production and sale; others organize contractor teams and openly undertake construction jobs for state or co-operative enterprises; still others open private hotels. A "Soviet woman capitalist" in Leningrad hired workers to make nylon blouses for sale, and her "daily income amounted to over 700 new rubles."⁴⁷⁴ The owner of a workshop in the Kursk Region made felt boots for sale at speculative prices. He had in his possession 540 pairs of felt boots, eight kilograms of gold coins, 3,000 meters of high-grade textiles, 20 carpets, 1,200 kilograms of wool and many other valuables.⁴⁷⁵ A private entrepreneur in the Gomel Region "hired workers and artisans" and in the course of two years secured contracts for the construction and overhauling of furnaces in twelve factories at a high price.⁴⁷⁶ In the Orenburg Region there are "hundreds of private hotels and trans-shipment points," and "the money of the collective farms and the state is continuously streaming into the pockets of the hostelry owners."⁴⁷⁷

Some engage in commercial speculation, making tremendous profits through buying cheap and selling dear or bringing goods from far away. In Moscow there are a great many speculators engaged in the re-sale of agricultural produce. They "bring to Moscow tons of citrus fruit, apples and vegetables and re-sell them at speculative prices." "These profit-grabbers are provided with every facility, with market inns, storerooms and other services at their disposal."⁴⁷⁸ In the Krasnodar Territory, a speculator set up her own agency and "employed twelve salesmen and two stevedores." She transported "thousands of hogs, hundreds of quintals of stolen slag bricks, whole wagons

⁴⁷⁴ *Izvestia*, April 9, 1963.

⁴⁷⁵ *Sovietskaya Rossiya*, October 9, 1960.

⁴⁷⁶ *Izvestia*, October 18, 1960.

⁴⁷⁷ *Selskaya Zhizn*, July 17, 1963.

⁴⁷⁸ *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta*, No. 27, 1963.

of glass” and other building materials from the city to the villages. She reaped high profits out of each re-sale.⁴⁷⁹

Others specialize as brokers and middlemen. They have wide contacts and through them one can get anything, in return for a bribe. There was a broker in Leningrad who “though he is not the Minister of Trade, controls all the stocks,” and “though he holds no post on the railway, disposes of wagons.” He could obtain “things the stocks of which are strictly controlled, from outside the stocks.” “All the store-houses in Leningrad are at his service.” For delivering goods, he received huge “bonuses”—700,000 rubles from one timber combine in 1960 alone. In Leningrad, there is “a whole group” of such brokers.⁴⁸⁰

These private entrepreneurs and speculators are engaged in the most naked capitalist exploitation. Isn't it clear that they belong to the bourgeoisie, the class antagonistic to the proletariat?

Actually the Soviet press itself calls these people “Soviet capitalists,” “new-born entrepreneurs,” “private entrepreneurs,” “newly emerged kulaks,” “speculators,” “exploiters,” etc. Aren't the revisionist Khrushchev clique contradicting themselves when they assert that antagonistic classes do not exist in the Soviet Union?

The facts cited above are only a part of those published in the Soviet press. They are enough to shock people, but there are many more which have not been published, many bigger and more serious cases which are covered up and shielded. We have quoted the above data in order to answer the question whether there are antagonistic classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union. These data are readily available and even the revisionist Khrushchev clique is unable to deny them.

These data suffice to show that the unbridled activities of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat are widespread in the Soviet Union, in the city as well as the countryside, in industry as well as agriculture, in the sphere of production as well as the sphere of circulation, all the way from the economic departments to party and government organizations, and from the grass-roots to the higher leading bodies. These anti-socialist activities are nothing if not the sharp class struggle of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

⁴⁷⁹ *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, July 27 and August 17, 1963.

⁴⁸⁰ *Sovietskaya Rossiya*, January 27, 1961.

It is not strange that attacks on socialism should be made in a socialist country by old and new bourgeois elements. There is nothing terrifying about this so long as the leadership of the party and state remains a Marxist-Leninist one. But in the Soviet Union today, the gravity of the situation lies in the fact that the revisionist Khrushchev clique has usurped the leadership of the Soviet Party and State and that a privileged bourgeois stratum has emerged in Soviet society.

We shall deal with this problem in the following section.

THE SOVIET PRIVILEGED STRATUM AND THE REVISIONIST KHRUSHCHEV CLIQUE

The privileged stratum in contemporary Soviet society is composed of degenerate elements from among the leading cadres of party and government organizations, enterprises and farms as well as bourgeois intellectuals; it stands in opposition to the workers, the peasants and the overwhelming majority of the intellectuals and cadres of the Soviet Union.

Lenin pointed out soon after the October Revolution that bourgeois and petit-bourgeois ideologies and force of habit were encircling and influencing the proletariat from all directions and were corrupting certain of its sections. This circumstance led to the emergence from among the Soviet officials and functionaries both of bureaucrats alienated from the masses and of new bourgeois elements. Lenin also pointed out that although the high salaries paid to the bourgeois technical specialists staying on to work for the Soviet regime were necessary, they were having a corrupting influence on it.

Therefore, Lenin laid great stress on waging persistent struggles against the influence of bourgeois and petit-bourgeois ideologies, on arousing the broad masses to take part in government work, on ceaselessly exposing and purging bureaucrats and new bourgeois elements in the Soviet organs, and on creating conditions that would bar the existence and reproduction of the bourgeoisie. Lenin pointed out sharply that “without a systematic and determined struggle to improve the apparatus, we shall perish before the basis of socialism is created.”⁴⁸¹

At the same time, he laid great stress on adherence to the principle of the Paris Commune in wage policy, that is, all public servants were to be paid wages corresponding to those of the workers and only bourgeois specialists

⁴⁸¹ V. I. Lenin, “Plan of the Pamphlet *On the Food Tax*” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXII.

were to be paid high salaries. From the October Revolution to the period of Soviet economic rehabilitation, Lenin's directives were in the main observed; the leading personnel of the party and government organizations and enterprises and party members among the specialists received salaries roughly equivalent to the wages of workers.

At that time, the Communist Party and the government of the Soviet Union adopted a number of measures in the sphere of politics and ideology and in the system of distribution to prevent leading cadres in any department from abusing their powers or degenerating morally or politically.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union headed by Stalin adhered to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the road of socialism and waged a staunch struggle against the forces of capitalism. Stalin's struggles against the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and Bukharinites were in essence a reflection within the Party of the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and of the struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism. Victory in these struggles smashed the vain hopes of the bourgeoisie to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union.

It cannot be denied that before Stalin's death high salaries were already being paid to certain groups and that some cadres had already degenerated and become bourgeois elements. The Central Committee of the CPSU pointed out in its report to the 19th Party Congress in October 1952 that degeneration and corruption had appeared in certain party organizations.

The leaders of these organizations had turned them into small communities composed entirely of their own people, "setting their group interests higher than the interests of the Party and the State." Some executives of industrial enterprises "forget that the enterprises entrusted to their charge are state enterprises, and try to turn them into their own private domain."

"Instead of safeguarding the common husbandry of the collective farms," some party and Soviet functionaries and some cadres in agricultural departments "engage in filching collective-farm property." In the cultural, artistic and scientific fields too, works attacking and smearing the socialist system had appeared and a monopolistic "Arakcheyev regime" had emerged among the scientists.

Since Khrushchev usurped the leadership of the Soviet Party and State, there has been a fundamental change in the state of the class struggle in the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev has carried out a series of revisionist policies serving the interests of the bourgeoisie and rapidly swelling the forces of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

On the pretext of “combating the personality cult,” Khrushchev has defamed the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system and thus in fact paved the way for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. In completely negating Stalin, he has in fact negated Marxism-Leninism which was upheld by Stalin and opened the floodgates for the revisionist deluge.

Khrushchev has substituted “material incentive” for the socialist principle, “from each according to his ability, to each according to his work.” He has widened, and not narrowed, the gap between the incomes of a small minority and those of the workers, peasants and ordinary intellectuals. He has supported the degenerates in leading positions, encouraging them to become even more unscrupulous in abusing their powers and to appropriate the fruits of labor of the Soviet people. Thus he has accelerated the polarization of classes in Soviet society.

Khrushchev sabotages the socialist planned economy, applies the capitalist principle of profit, develops capitalist free competition and undermines socialist ownership by the whole people.

Khrushchev attacks the system of socialist agricultural planning, describing it as “bureaucratic” and “unnecessary.” Eager to learn from the big proprietors of American farms, he is encouraging capitalist management, fostering a kulak economy and undermining the socialist collective economy.

Khrushchev is peddling bourgeois ideology, bourgeois liberty, equality, fraternity and humanity, inculcating bourgeois idealism and metaphysics and the reactionary ideas of bourgeois individualism, humanism and pacifism among the Soviet people, and debasing socialist morality. The rotten bourgeois culture of the West is now fashionable in the Soviet Union, and socialist culture is ostracized and attacked.

Under the signboard of “peaceful coexistence,” Khrushchev has been colluding with US imperialism, wrecking the socialist camp and the international communist movement, opposing the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, practicing great-power chauvinism and national egoism and betraying proletarian internationalism. All this is being done for the protection of the vested interests of a handful of people, which he places above the fundamental interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the socialist camp and the whole world.

The line Khrushchev pursues is a revisionist line through and through. Guided by this line, not only have the old bourgeois elements run wild but new bourgeois elements have appeared in large numbers among the leading cadres of the Soviet Party and government, the chiefs of state enterprises and collective farms, and the higher intellectuals in the fields of culture, art, science and technology.

In the Soviet Union at present, not only have the new bourgeois elements increased in number as never before, but their social status has fundamentally changed. Before Khrushchev came to power, they did not occupy the ruling position in Soviet society. Their activities were restricted in many ways and they were subject to attack. But since Khrushchev took over, usurping the leadership of the Party and the State step by step, the new bourgeois elements have gradually risen to the ruling position in the party and government and in the economic, cultural and other departments, and formed a privileged stratum in Soviet society.

This privileged stratum is the principal component of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union today and the main social basis of the revisionist Khrushchev clique. The revisionist Khrushchev clique is the political representatives of the Soviet bourgeoisie, and particularly of its privileged stratum.

The revisionist Khrushchev clique has carried out one purge after another and replaced one group of cadres after another throughout the country, from the central to the local bodies, from leading party and government organizations to economic and cultural and educational departments, dismissing those they do not trust and placing their protégés in leading posts.

Take the Central Committee of the CPSU as an example. The statistics show that seventy percent of the members of the Central Committee of the CPSU who were elected at its 19th Congress in 1952 were purged in the course of the 20th and 22nd Congresses held respectively in 1956 and 1961. And nearly fifty percent of the members who were elected at the 20th Congress were purged at the time of the 22nd Congress.

Or take the local organizations. On the eve of the 22nd Congress, on the pretext of "renewing the cadres," the revisionist Khrushchev clique, according to incomplete statistics, removed from office forty-five percent of the members of the Party Central Committees of the Union Republics and of the Party Committees of the Territories and Regions, and forty percent of the Municipal and District Party Committees. In 1963, on the pretext of dividing the Party into "industrial" and "agricultural" party committees, they

further replaced more than half the members of the Central Committees of the Union Republics and of the Regional Party Committees.

Through this series of changes the Soviet privileged stratum has gained control of the Party, the government and other important organizations.

The members of this privileged stratum have converted the function of serving the masses into the privilege of dominating them. They are abusing their powers over the means of production and of livelihood for the private benefit of their small clique.

The members of this privileged stratum appropriate the fruits of the Soviet people's labor and pocket incomes that are dozens or even a hundred times those of the average Soviet worker and peasant. They not only secure high incomes in the form of high salaries, high awards, high royalties and a great variety of personal subsidies, but also use their privileged position to appropriate public property by graft and bribery. Completely divorced from the working people of the Soviet Union, they live the parasitical and decadent life of the bourgeoisie.

The members of this privileged stratum have become utterly degenerate ideologically, have completely departed from the revolutionary traditions of the Bolshevik Party and discarded the lofty ideals of the Soviet working class. They are opposed to Marxism-Leninism and socialism. They betray the revolution and forbid others to make revolution. Their sole concern is to consolidate their economic position and political rule. All their activities revolve around the private interests of their own privileged stratum.

People have seen how in Yugoslavia, although the Tito clique still displays the banner of "socialism," a bureaucratic bourgeoisie opposed to the Yugoslav people has gradually come into being since the Tito clique took the road of revisionism, transforming the Yugoslav state from a dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bureaucrat bourgeoisie and its socialist public economy into state capitalism. Now people see the Khrushchev clique taking the road already travelled by the Tito clique. Khrushchev looks to Belgrade as his Mecca, saying again and again that he will learn from the Tito clique's experience and declaring that he and the Tito clique "belong to one and the same idea and are guided by the same theory."⁴⁸² This is not at all surprising.

⁴⁸² N. S. Khrushchev, Interview with Foreign Correspondents at Brioni in Yugoslavia, August 28, 1963.

As a result of Khrushchev's revisionism, the first socialist country in the world built by the great Soviet people with their blood and sweat is now facing an unprecedented danger of capitalist restoration.

The Khrushchev clique is spreading the tale that "there are no longer antagonistic classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union" in order to cover up the facts about their own ruthless class struggle against the Soviet people.

The Soviet privileged stratum represented by the revisionist Khrushchev clique constitutes only a few percent of the Soviet population. Among the Soviet cadres its numbers are also small. It stands diametrically opposed to the Soviet people, who constitute more than 90 percent of the total population, and to the great majority of the Soviet cadres and Communists. The contradiction between the Soviet people and this privileged stratum is now the principal contradiction inside the Soviet Union, and it is an irreconcilable and antagonistic class contradiction.

The glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was built by Lenin, and the great Soviet people displayed epoch-making revolutionary initiative in the October Socialist Revolution, they showed their heroism and stamina in defeating the White Guards and the armed intervention by more than a dozen imperialist countries, they scored unprecedentedly brilliant achievements in the struggle for industrialization and agricultural collectivization, and they won a tremendous victory in the Patriotic War against the German fascists and saved all mankind. Even under the rule of the Khrushchev clique, the mass of the members of the CPSU and the Soviet people are carrying on the glorious revolutionary traditions nurtured by Lenin and Stalin, and they still uphold socialism and aspire to communism.

The broad masses of the Soviet workers, collective farmers and intellectuals are seething with discontent against the oppression and exploitation practiced by the privileged stratum. They have come to see ever more clearly the revisionist features of the Khrushchev clique which is betraying socialism and restoring capitalism.

Among the ranks of the Soviet cadres, there are many who still persist in the revolutionary stand of the proletariat, adhere to the road of socialism and firmly oppose Khrushchev's revisionism. The broad masses of the Soviet people, of Communists and cadres are using various means to resist and oppose the revisionist line of the Khrushchev clique, so that the revisionist Khrushchev clique cannot so easily bring about the restoration of capitalism.

The great Soviet people are fighting to defend the glorious traditions of the Great October Revolution, to preserve the great gains of socialism and to smash the plot for the restoration of capitalism.

REFUTATION OF THE SO-CALLED STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE

At the 22nd Congress of the CPSU Khrushchev openly raised the banner of opposition to the dictatorship of the proletariat, announcing the replacement of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the “state of the whole people.” It is written in the Program of the CPSU that the dictatorship of the proletariat “has ceased to be indispensable in the USSR” and that “the state, which arose as a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, has, in the new, contemporary stage, become a state of the entire people.”

Anyone with a little knowledge of Marxism-Leninism knows that the concept of the state is a class concept. Lenin pointed out that “the distinguishing feature of the state is the existence of a separate class of people in whose hands *power* is concentrated.”⁴⁸³ The state is a weapon of class struggle, a machine by means of which one class represses another. Every state is the dictatorship of a definite class. So long as the state exists, it cannot possibly stand above class or belong to the whole people.

The proletariat and its political party have never concealed their views; they say explicitly that the very aim of the proletarian socialist revolution is to overthrow bourgeois rule and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. After the victory of the socialist revolution, the proletariat and its party must strive unremittingly to fulfil the historical tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat and eliminate classes and class differences, so that the state will wither away. It is only the bourgeoisie and its parties which in their attempt to hoodwink the masses try by every means to cover up the class nature of state power and describe the state machinery under their control as being “of the whole people” and “above class.”

The fact that Khrushchev has announced the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and advanced the thesis of the “state of the whole people” demonstrates that he has replaced the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state by bourgeois falsehoods.

⁴⁸³ V. I. Lenin, “The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of it in Mr. Struve’s Book” in *Collected Works*, Vol. I.

When Marxist-Leninists criticized their fallacies, the revisionist Khrushchev clique hastily defended themselves and tried hard to invent a so-called theoretical basis for the “state of the whole people.” They now assert that the historical period of the dictatorship of the proletariat mentioned by Marx and Lenin refers only to the transition from capitalism to the first stage of communism and not to its higher stage. They further assert that “the dictatorship of the proletariat will cease to be necessary before the state withers away”⁴⁸⁴ and that after the end of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there is yet another stage, the “state of the whole people.”

These are out-and-out sophistries.

In his *Critique of the Gotha Program*, Marx advanced the well-known axiom that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the state of the period of transition from capitalism to communism. Lenin gave a clear explanation of this Marxist axiom.

He said:

In his *Critique of the Gotha Program* Marx wrote: “Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*.”

Up to now this axiom has never been disputed by Socialists, and yet it implies the recognition of the existence of the *state* right up to the time when victorious socialism has grown into complete communism.⁴⁸⁵

Lenin further said:

The essence of Marx's teaching on the state has been mastered only by those who understand that the dictatorship of a *single* class is necessary not only for the *proletariat* which has overthrown the bourgeoisie, but also for the entire *historical period* which separates capitalism from “classless society,” from Communism.⁴⁸⁶

⁴⁸⁴ “Program for the Building of Communism,” editorial board article in *Pravda*, August 18, 1961.

⁴⁸⁵ V. I. Lenin, “The Discussion On Self-Determination Summed Up” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXII.

⁴⁸⁶ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

It is perfectly clear that according to Marx and Lenin, the historical period throughout which the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat exists, is not merely the period of transition to the first stage of communism, as alleged by the revisionist Khrushchev clique, but the entire period of transition from capitalism to “complete communism,” to the time when all class differences will have been eliminated and “classless society” realized, that is to say, to the higher stage of communism.

It is equally clear that the state in the transition period referred to by Marx and Lenin is the dictatorship of the proletariat and nothing else. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the form of the state in the entire period of transition from capitalism to the higher stage of communism, and also the last form of the state in human history. The withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat will mean the withering away of the state. Lenin said:

Marx deduced from the whole history of Socialism and of the political struggle that the state was bound to disappear, and that the transitional form of its disappearance (the transition from state to non-state) would be the “proletariat organized as the ruling class.”⁴⁸⁷

Historically the dictatorship of the proletariat may take different forms from one country to another and from one period to another, but in essence it will remain the same. Lenin said:

The transition from capitalism to Communism certainly cannot but yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: *the dictatorship of the proletariat*.⁴⁸⁸

It can thus be seen that it is absolutely not the view of Marx and Lenin but an invention of the revisionist Khrushchev that the end of the dictatorship of the proletariat will precede the withering away of the state and will be followed by yet another stage, “the state of the whole people.”

In arguing for their anti-Marxist-Leninist views, the revisionist Khrushchev clique has taken great pains to find a sentence from Marx and distorting it by quoting it out of context. They have arbitrarily described the future *nature of the state* (*Staatswesen* in German) of communist society referred to

⁴⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 55.

⁴⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 35.

by Marx in his *Critique of the Gotha Program* as the “‘state of communist society’ [государственность коммунистического общества in Russian], which is no longer a dictatorship of the proletariat.”⁴⁸⁹ They gleefully announced that the Chinese would not dare to quote this from Marx. Apparently the revisionist Khrushchev clique thinks this is very helpful to them.

As it happens Lenin seems to have foreseen that revisionists would make use of this phrase to distort Marxism. In his *Marxism on the State*, Lenin gave an excellent explanation of it. He said, “the dictatorship of the proletariat is a ‘political transition period...’ But Marx goes on to speak of ‘the future nature of the state (государственность in Russian, *Staatswesen* in German) of communist society!’ Thus, there will be a state even in ‘communist society!’ Is there not a contradiction in this?” Lenin answered, “No.” He then tabulated the three stages in the process of development from the bourgeois state to the withering away of the state:

The first stage—in bourgeois society, the state is needed by the bourgeoisie—the bourgeois state.

The second stage—in the period of transition from capitalism to communism, the state is needed by the proletariat—the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The third stage—in communist society, the state is not necessary, it withers away.

He concluded: “Complete consistency and clarity!!”

In Lenin’s tabulation, only the bourgeois state, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the withering away of the state are to be found. By precisely this tabulation Lenin made it clear that when communism is reached the state withers away and becomes non-existent.

Ironically enough, the revisionist Khrushchev clique also quoted this very passage from Lenin’s *Marxism on the State* in the course of defending their error. And then they proceeded to make the following idiotic statement:

In our country the first two periods referred to by Lenin in the opinion quoted already belong to history. In the Soviet Union a

⁴⁸⁹ M. A. Suslov, Report at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU, February 1964, *New Times*, No. 15, 1964, p. 62.

state of the whole people—a *communist state system*, the state of the *first phase of communism*, has arisen and is developing.⁴⁹⁰

If the first two periods referred to by Lenin have already become a thing of the past in the Soviet Union, the state should be withering away, and where could a “state of the whole people” come from? If the state is not yet withering away, then it ought to be the dictatorship of the proletariat and under absolutely no circumstances a “state of the whole people.”

In arguing for their “state of the whole people,” the revisionist Khrushchev clique exert themselves to vilify the dictatorship of the proletariat as undemocratic. They assert that only by replacing the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the “state of the whole people” can democracy be further developed and turned into “genuine democracy for the whole people.” Khrushchev has pretentiously said that the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat exemplifies “a line of energetically developing democracy” and that “proletarian democracy is becoming socialist democracy of the whole people.”⁴⁹¹

These utterances can only show that their authors either are completely ignorant of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state or are maliciously distorting them.

Anyone with a little knowledge of Marxism-Leninism knows that the concept of democracy as a form of the state, like that of dictatorship, is a class one. There can only be class democracy, there cannot be “democracy for the whole people.”

Lenin said:

Democracy for the vast majority of the people, and suppression by force, i.e. exclusion from democracy, of the exploiters and oppressors of the people—this is the change democracy undergoes during the *transition* from capitalism to Communism.⁴⁹²

Dictatorship over the exploiting classes and democracy among the working people—these are the two aspects of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is only under the dictatorship of the proletariat that democracy for the

⁴⁹⁰ “From the Party of the Working Class to the Party of the Whole Soviet People,” editorial board article in *Partynaya Zhizn*, No. 8, 1964.

⁴⁹¹ N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, October 1961, and Report on the Program of the CPSU, delivered at the Congress.

⁴⁹² V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

masses of the working people can be developed and expanded to an unprecedented extent. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat there can be no genuine democracy for the working people.

Where there is bourgeois democracy there is no proletarian democracy, and where there is proletarian democracy there is no bourgeois democracy. The one excludes the other. This is inevitable and admits of no compromise. The more thoroughly bourgeois democracy is eliminated, the more will proletarian democracy flourish. In the eyes of the bourgeoisie, any country where this occurs is lacking in democracy. But actually this is the promotion of proletarian democracy and the elimination of bourgeois democracy. As proletarian democracy develops, bourgeois democracy is eliminated.

This fundamental Marxist-Leninist thesis is opposed by the revisionist Khrushchev clique. In fact, they hold that so long as enemies are subjected to dictatorship there is no democracy and that the only way to develop democracy is to abolish the dictatorship over enemies, stop suppressing them and institute "democracy for the whole people."

Their view is cast from the same mold as the renegade Kautsky's concept of "pure democracy."

In criticizing Kautsky Lenin said:

"Pure democracy" is not only an *ignorant* phrase, revealing a lack of understanding both of the class struggle and of the nature of the state, but also a thrice-empty phrase, since in communist society democracy will *wither away* in the process of changing and becoming a habit, but will never be "pure" democracy.⁴⁹³

He also pointed out:

The dialectics (course) of the development is as follows: from absolutism to bourgeois democracy; from bourgeois to proletarian democracy; from proletarian democracy to none.⁴⁹⁴

That is to say, in the higher stage of communism proletarian democracy will wither away along with the elimination of classes and the withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

To speak plainly, as with the "state of the whole people," the "democracy for the whole people" proclaimed by Khrushchev is a hoax. In thus retriev-

⁴⁹³ V. I. Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁴⁹⁴ V. I. Lenin, *Marxism on the State*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1958, p. 42.

ing the tattered garments of the bourgeoisie and the old-line revisionists, patching them up and adding a label of his own, Khrushchev's sole purpose is to deceive the Soviet people and the revolutionary people of the world and cover up his betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat and his opposition to socialism.

What is the essence of Khrushchev's "state of the whole people?"

Khrushchev has abolished the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and established a dictatorship of the revisionist clique headed by himself, that is, a dictatorship of the privileged stratum of the Soviet bourgeoisie. Actually his "state of the whole people" is not a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat but a state in which his small revisionist clique wields their dictatorship over the masses of the workers, the peasants and the revolutionary intellectuals.

Under the rule of the Khrushchev clique, there is no democracy for the Soviet working people, there is democracy only for the handful of people belonging to the revisionist Khrushchev clique, for the privileged stratum and for the bourgeois elements, old and new. Khrushchev's "democracy for the whole people" is nothing but out-and-out bourgeois democracy, i.e., a despotic dictatorship of the Khrushchev clique over the Soviet people.

In the Soviet Union today, anyone who persists in the proletarian stand, upholds Marxism-Leninism and has the courage to speak out, to resist or to fight is watched, followed, summoned, and even arrested, imprisoned or diagnosed as "mentally ill" and sent to "mental hospitals." Recently the Soviet press has declared that it is necessary to "fight" against those who show even the slightest dissatisfaction, and called for "relentless battle" against the "rotten jokers"⁴⁹⁵ who are so bold as to make sarcastic remarks about Khrushchev's agricultural policy. It is not particularly astonishing that the revisionist Khrushchev clique should have on more than one occasion bloodily suppressed striking workers and the masses who put up resistance.

The formula of abolishing the dictatorship of the proletariat while keeping a state of the whole people reveals the secret of the revisionist Khrushchev clique; that is, they are firmly opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat but will not give up state power till their doom. The revisionist Khrushchev clique knows the paramount importance of controlling state power. They need it to clear the way for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

⁴⁹⁵ *Izvestia*, March 10, 1964.

These are Khrushchev's real aims in raising the banners of the "state of the whole people" and "democracy for the whole people."

REFUTATION OF THE SO-CALLED PARTY OF THE ENTIRE PEOPLE

At the 22nd Congress of the CPSU Khrushchev openly raised another banner, the alteration of the proletarian character of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He announced the replacement of the party of the proletariat by a "party of the entire people." The program of the CPSU states:

As a result of the victory of socialism in the USSR and the consolidation of the unity of Soviet society, the Communist Party of the working class has become the vanguard of the Soviet people, a party of the entire people.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU says that the CPSU "has become a political organization of the entire people."

How absurd!

Elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism tells us that, like the state, a political party is an instrument of class struggle. Every political party has a class character. Party spirit is the concentrated expression of class character. There is no such thing as a non-class or supra-class political party and there never has been, nor is there such a thing as a "party of the entire people" that does not represent the interests of a particular class.

The party of the proletariat is built in accordance with the revolutionary theory and revolutionary style of Marxism-Leninism; it is the party formed by the advanced elements who are boundlessly faithful to the historical mission of the proletariat, it is the organized vanguard of the proletariat and the highest form of its organization. The party of the proletariat represents the interests of the proletariat and the concentration of its will.

Moreover, the party of the proletariat is the only party able to represent the interests of the people, who constitute over ninety percent of the total population. The reason is that the interests of the proletariat are identical with those of the working masses, that the proletarian party can approach problems in the light of the historical role of the proletariat and in terms of the present and future interests of the proletariat and the working masses and of the best interests of the overwhelming majority of the people, and that it can give correct leadership in accordance with Marxism-Leninism.

In addition to its members of working-class origin, the party of the proletariat has members of other class origins. But the latter do not join the party as representatives of other classes. From the very day they join the party they must abandon their former class stand and take the stand of the proletariat. Marx and Engels said:

If people of this kind join the proletarian movement, the first condition must be that they should not bring any remnants of bourgeois, petit-bourgeois, etc., prejudices with them but should wholeheartedly adopt the proletarian outlook.⁴⁹⁶

The basic principles concerning the proletarian party were long ago elucidated by Marxism-Leninism. But in the opinion of the revisionist Khrushchev clique these principles are “stereotyped formulas,” while their “party of the entire people” conforms to the “actual dialectics of the development of the Communist Party.”⁴⁹⁷

The revisionist Khrushchev clique has cudged their brains to think up arguments justifying their “party of the entire people.” They have argued during the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties in July 1963 and in the Soviet press that they have changed the Communist Party of the Soviet Union into a “party of the entire people” because:

- (1) The CPSU expresses the interests of the whole people.
- (2) The entire people have accepted the Marxist-Leninist world outlook of the working class, and the aim of the working class—the building of communism—has become the aim of the entire people.
- (3) The ranks of the CPSU consist of the best representatives of the workers, collective farmers and intellectuals. The CPSU unites in its own ranks representatives of over a hundred nationalities and peoples.
- (4) The democratic method used in the Party's activities is also in accord with its character as the Party of the entire people.

⁴⁹⁶ K. Marx, F. Engels, “Marx and Engels to A. Bebel, W. Liebknecht, W. Bracke and Others (Circular Letter),” *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁴⁹⁷ “From the Party of the Working Class to the Party of the Whole Soviet People,” *op. cit.*

It is obvious even at a glance that none of these arguments adduced by the revisionist Khrushchev clique shows a serious approach to a serious problem.

When Lenin was fighting the opportunist muddle-heads, he remarked:

Can people obviously incapable of taking serious problems seriously themselves be taken seriously? It is difficult to do so, comrades, very difficult! But the question which certain people cannot treat seriously is in itself so serious that it will do no harm to examine even patently frivolous replies to it.⁴⁹⁸

Today, too, it will do no harm to examine the patently frivolous replies given by the revisionist Khrushchev clique to so serious a question as that of the party of the proletariat.

According to the revisionist Khrushchev clique, the Communist Party should become a “party of the entire people” because it represents the interests of the entire people. Does it not then follow that from the very beginning it should have been a “party of the entire people” instead of a party of the proletariat?

According to the revisionist Khrushchev clique, the Communist Party should become a “party of the entire people” because “the entire people have accepted the Marxist-Leninist world outlook of the working class.” But how can it be said that everyone has accepted the Marxist-Leninist world outlook in Soviet society where sharp class polarization and class struggle are taking place?

Can it be said that the tens of thousands of old and new bourgeois elements in your country are all Marxist-Leninists? If Marxism-Leninism has really become the world outlook of the entire people, as you allege, does it not then follow that there is no difference in your society between Party and non-Party and no need whatsoever for the Party to exist? What difference does it make if there is a “party of the entire people” or not?

According to the revisionist Khrushchev clique, the Communist Party should become a “party of the entire people” because its membership consists of workers, peasants and intellectuals and all nationalities and peoples. Does this mean that before the idea of the “party of the entire people” was put forward at its 22nd Congress none of the members of the CPSU came from classes other than the working class? Does it mean that formerly the

⁴⁹⁸ V. I. Lenin, “Clarity First and Foremost!” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XX.

members of the Party all came from just one nationality, to the exclusion of other nationalities and peoples?

If the character of a party is determined by the social background of its membership, does it not then follow that the numerous political parties in the world whose members also come from various classes, nationalities and peoples are all “parties of the entire people?”

According to the revisionist Khrushchev clique, the Party should be a “party of the entire people” because the methods it uses in its activities are democratic. But from its outset, a Communist Party is built on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism and should always adopt the mass line and the democratic method of persuasion and education in working among the people. Does it not then follow that a Communist Party is a “party of the entire people” from the first day of its founding?

Briefly, none of the arguments listed by the revisionist Khrushchev clique hold water.

Besides making a great fuss about a “party of the entire people,” Khrushchev has also divided the Party into an “industrial party” and an “agricultural party” on the pretext of “building the party organs on the production principle.”⁴⁹⁹

The revisionist Khrushchev clique says that they have done so because of “the primacy of economics over politics under socialism”⁵⁰⁰ and because they want to place “the economic and production problems, which have been pushed to the forefront by the entire course of the communist construction, at the center of the activities of the party organizations” and make them “the cornerstone of all their work.”⁵⁰¹ Khrushchev said, “We say bluntly that the main thing in the work of the party organs is production.”⁵⁰² And what is more, they have foisted these views on Lenin, claiming that they are acting in accordance with his principles.

However, anyone at all acquainted with the history of the CPSU knows that, far from being Lenin's views, they are anti-Leninist views and that they

⁴⁹⁹ N. S. Khrushchev, Report at the Plenary Meeting of the CC of the CPSU, November 1962.

⁵⁰⁰ “Study, Know, Act,” editorial of *Economicheskaya Gazeta*, No. 50, 1962.

⁵⁰¹ “The Communist and Production,” editorial of *Kommunist*, Moscow, No. 2, 1963.

⁵⁰² N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Election Meeting of the Kalinin Constituency of Moscow, February 27, 1963.

were views held by Trotsky. On this question, too, Khrushchev is a worthy disciple of Trotsky.

In criticizing Trotsky and Bukharin, Lenin said:

Politics are the concentrated expression of economics... Politics cannot but have precedence over economics. To argue differently means forgetting the ABCs of Marxism.

He continued:

Without a proper political approach to the subject the given class cannot maintain its rule, and *consequently* cannot solve *its own production problems*.⁵⁰³

The facts are crystal clear; the real purpose of the revisionist Khrushchev clique in proposing a “party of the entire people” was completely to alter the proletarian character of the CPSU and transform the Marxist-Leninist Party into a revisionist party.

The great Communist Party of the Soviet Union is confronted with the grave danger of degenerating from a party of the proletariat into a party of the bourgeoisie and from a Marxist-Leninist into a revisionist party.

Lenin said:

A party that wants to exist cannot allow the slightest wavering on the question of its existence or any argument with those who may bury it.⁵⁰⁴

At present, the revisionist Khrushchev clique is again confronting the broad membership of the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union with precisely this serious question.

KHRUSHCHEV'S PHONY COMMUNISM

At the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, Khrushchev announced that the Soviet Union had already entered the period of the extensive building of communist society. He also declared that “we shall, in the main, have built a communist society within twenty years.”⁵⁰⁵ This is pure fraud.

⁵⁰³ V. I. Lenin, “Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXII.

⁵⁰⁴ V. I. Lenin, “How Vera Zasulich Demolishes Liquidationism” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX.

⁵⁰⁵ N. S. Khrushchev, Report on the Program of the CPSU, delivered at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU in October 1961.

How can there be talk of building communism when the revisionist Khrushchev clique is leading the Soviet Union onto the path of the restoration of capitalism and when the Soviet people are in grave danger of losing the fruits of socialism?

In putting up the signboard of “building communism” Khrushchev’s real aim is to conceal the true face of his revisionism. But it is not hard to expose this trick. Just as the eyeball of a fish cannot be allowed to pass as a pearl, so revisionism cannot be allowed to pass itself off as communism.

Scientific communism has a precise and definite meaning. According to Marxism-Leninism, communist society is a society in which classes and class differences are completely eliminated, the entire people have a high level of communist consciousness and morality as well as boundless enthusiasm for and initiative in labor, there is a great abundance of social products and the principle of “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” is applied, and in which the state has withered away.

Marx declared:

In the higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labor, and therefore also the antithesis between mental and physical labor, has vanished; after labor has become not only a means of life but life’s prime want; after the production forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!⁵⁰⁶

According to Marxist-Leninist theory, the purpose of upholding the dictatorship of the proletariat in the period of socialism is precisely to ensure that society develops in the direction of communism. Lenin said that “forward development, i.e., towards Communism, proceeds through the dictatorship of the proletariat, and cannot do otherwise.”⁵⁰⁷ Since the revisionist Khrushchev clique has abandoned the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, it is going backward and not forward to communism.

⁵⁰⁶ K. Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Program*, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁵⁰⁷ V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

Going forward to communism means moving towards the abolition of all classes and class differences. A communist society which preserves any classes at all, let alone exploiting classes, is inconceivable. Yet Khrushchev is fostering a new bourgeoisie, restoring and extending the system of exploitation and accelerating class polarization in the Soviet Union. A privileged bourgeois stratum opposed to the Soviet people now occupies the ruling position in the Party and government and in the economic, cultural and other departments. Can one find an iota of communism in all this?

Going forward to communism means moving towards a unitary system of the ownership of the means of production by the whole people. A communist society in which several kinds of ownership of the means of production coexist is inconceivable. Yet Khrushchev is creating a situation in which enterprises owned by the whole people are gradually degenerating into capitalist enterprises and farms under the system of collective ownership are gradually degenerating into units of a kulak economy. Again, can one find an iota of communism in all this?

Going forward to communism means moving towards a great abundance of social products and the realization of the principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." A communist society built on the enrichment of a handful of persons and the impoverishment of the masses is inconceivable. Under the socialist system the great Soviet people developed the social productive forces at unprecedented speed. But the evils of Khrushchev's revisionism are creating havoc in the Soviet socialist economy.

Constantly beset with innumerable contradictions, Khrushchev makes frequent changes in his economic policies and often goes back on his own words, thus throwing the Soviet national economy into a state of chaos. Khrushchev is truly an incorrigible wastrel. He has squandered the grain reserves built up under Stalin and brought great difficulties into the lives of the Soviet people. He has distorted and violated the socialist principle of distribution of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work," and enabled a handful of persons to appropriate the fruits of the labor of the broad masses of the Soviet people. These points alone are sufficient to prove that the road taken by Khrushchev leads away from communism.

Going forward to communism means moving towards enhancing the communist consciousness of the masses. A communist society with bourgeois ideas running rampant is inconceivable. Yet Khrushchev is zealously

reviving bourgeois ideology in the Soviet Union and serving as a missionary for the decadent American culture.

By propagating material incentive, he is turning all human relations into money relations and encouraging individualism and selfishness. Because of him, manual labor is again considered sordid and love of pleasure at the expense of other people's labor is again considered honorable. Certainly, the social ethics and atmosphere promoted by Khrushchev are far removed from communism, as far as can be.

Going forward to communism means moving towards the withering away of the state. A communist society with a state apparatus for oppressing the people is inconceivable. The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is actually no longer a state in its original sense, because it is no longer a machine used by the exploiting few to oppress the overwhelming majority of the people but a machine for exercising dictatorship over a very small number of exploiters, while democracy is practiced among the overwhelming majority of the people.

Khrushchev is altering the character of Soviet state power and changing the dictatorship of the proletariat back into an instrument whereby a handful of privileged bourgeois elements exercise dictatorship over the mass of Soviet workers, peasants and intellectuals. He is continuously strengthening his dictatorial state apparatus and intensifying his repression of the Soviet people. It is indeed a great mockery to talk about communism in these circumstances.

A comparison of all this with the principles of scientific communism readily reveals that in every respect the revisionist Khrushchev clique is leading the Soviet Union away from the path of socialism and onto the path of capitalism and, as a consequence, further and further away from, instead of closer to, the communist goal of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

Khrushchev has ulterior motives when he puts up his signboard of communism. He is using it to fool the Soviet people and cover up his effort to restore capitalism. He is using it to deceive the international proletariat and the revolutionary people the world over and betray proletarian internationalism. Under this signboard, the Khrushchev clique has itself abandoned proletarian internationalism and is seeking a partnership with US imperialism for the partition of the world; moreover, it wants the fraternal socialist countries to serve its own private interests and not to oppose imperialism or

to support the revolutions of the oppressed peoples and nations, and it wants them to accept its political, economic and military control and be its virtual dependencies and colonies.

Furthermore, the Khrushchev clique wants all the oppressed peoples and nations to serve its private interests and abandon their revolutionary struggles, so as not to disturb its sweet dream of partnership with imperialism for the division of the world, and instead submit to enslavement and oppression by imperialism and its lackeys.

In short, Khrushchev's slogan of basically "building a communist society within twenty years" in the Soviet Union is not only false but also reactionary.

The revisionist Khrushchev clique says that the Chinese "go to the length of questioning the very right of our Party and people to build communism."⁵⁰⁸ This is a despicable attempt to fool the Soviet people and poison the friendship of the Chinese and Soviet people. We have never had any doubts that the great Soviet people will eventually enter into communist society. But right now the revisionist Khrushchev clique is damaging the socialist fruits of the Soviet people and taking away their right to go forward to communism. In the circumstances, the issue confronting the Soviet people is not how to build communism but rather how to resist and oppose Khrushchev's effort to restore capitalism.

The revisionist Khrushchev clique also say that "the CPC leaders hint that, since our Party has made its aim a better life for the people, Soviet society is being bourgeoisified, is 'degenerating.'"⁵⁰⁹ This trick of deflecting the Soviet people's dissatisfaction with the Khrushchev clique is deplorable as well as stupid. We sincerely wish the Soviet people an increasingly better life. But Khrushchev's boasts of "concern for the well-being of the people" and of "a better life for every man" are utterly false and demagogic. For the masses of the Soviet people life is already bad enough at Khrushchev's hands. The Khrushchev clique seeks a "better life" only for the members of the privileged stratum and the bourgeois elements, old and new, in the Soviet Union. These people are appropriating the fruits of the Soviet people's labor

⁵⁰⁸ M. A. Suslov, Report at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU, February 1964.

⁵⁰⁹ See "Open Letter of the CC of the CPSU to all Party Organizations, to all Communists of the Soviet Union," p. 504 of this volume.

and living the life of bourgeois lords. They have indeed become thoroughly bourgeoisified.

Khrushchev's "communism" is in essence a variant of bourgeois socialism. He does not regard communism as completely abolishing classes and class differences but describes it as "a bowl accessible to all and brimming with the products of physical and mental labor."⁵¹⁰ He does not regard the struggle of the working class for communism as a struggle for the thorough emancipation of all mankind as well as itself but describes it as a struggle for "a good dish of goulash." There is not an iota of scientific communism in his head but only the image of a society of bourgeois philistines.

Khrushchev's "communism" takes the United States for its model. Imitation of the methods of management of US capitalism and the bourgeois way of life has been raised by Khrushchev to the level of state policy. He says that he "always thinks highly" of the achievements of the United States. He "rejoices in these achievements, is a little envious at times."⁵¹¹ He extols to the sky a letter by Roswell Garst, a big US farmer, which propagates the capitalist system;⁵¹² actually he has taken it as his agricultural program. He wants to copy the United States in the sphere of industry as well as in that of agriculture and, in particular, to imitate the profit motive of US capitalist enterprises. He shows great admiration for the American way of life, asserting that the American people "do not live badly"⁵¹³ under the rule and enslavement of monopoly capital. Going further, Khrushchev is hopeful of building communism with loans from US imperialism. During his visits to the United States and Hungary, he expressed on more than one occasion his readiness "to take credits from the devil himself."

Thus it can be seen that Khrushchev's "communism" is indeed "goulash communism," the "communism of the American way of life" and "communism seeking credits from the devil." No wonder he often tells representatives of Western monopoly capital that once such "communism" is realized in the

⁵¹⁰ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech for the Austrian Radio and Television, July 7, 1960.

⁵¹¹ N. S. Khrushchev, Interview with Leaders of US Congress and Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, September 16, 1959.

⁵¹² N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU, February 1964.

⁵¹³ N. S. Khrushchev, Talk at a Meeting with Businessman and Public Leaders in Pittsburgh, USA, September 24, 1959.

Soviet Union, “you will go forward to communism without any call from me.”⁵¹⁴

There is nothing new about such “communism.” It is simply another name for capitalism. It is only a bourgeois label, sign or advertisement. In ridiculing the old-line revisionist parties which set up the signboard of Marxism, Lenin said:

Wherever Marxism is popular among the workers, this political tendency, this “bourgeois Labour Party,” will swear by the name of Marx. It cannot be prohibited from doing this, just as a trading firm cannot be prohibited from using any particular label, sign, or advertisement.⁵¹⁵

It is thus easily understandable why Khrushchev's “communism” is appreciated by imperialism and monopoly capital. The US Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said:

To the extent that goulash and the second pair of trousers and questions of that sort become more important in the Soviet Union, I think to that extent a moderating influence has come into the present scene.⁵¹⁶

And the British Prime Minister Douglas-Home has said:

Mr. Khrushchev said that the Russian brand of communism puts education and goulash first. That is good; goulash-communism is better than war-communism, and I am glad to have this confirmation of our view that fat and comfortable Communists are better than lean and hungry Communists.⁵¹⁷

Khrushchev's revisionism entirely caters to the policy of “peaceful evolution” which US imperialism is pursuing with regard to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. John Foster Dulles said:

There was evidence within the Soviet Union of forces toward greater liberalism which, if they persisted, could bring about a basic change in the Soviet Union.⁵¹⁸

⁵¹⁴ N. S. Khrushchev, Talk at a Meeting with French Parliamentarians, March 25, 1960.

⁵¹⁵ V. I. Lenin, “Imperialism and the Split in Socialism” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII.

⁵¹⁶ Dean Rusk, Interview on British Broadcasting Corporation Television, May 10, 1964.

⁵¹⁷ A. Douglas-Home, Speech at Norwich, England, April 6, 1964.

⁵¹⁸ J. F. Dulles, Press Conference, May 15, 1956.

The liberal forces Dulles talked about are capitalist forces. The basic change Dulles hoped for is the degeneration of socialism into capitalism. Khrushchev is effecting exactly the "basic change" Dulles dreamed of.

How the imperialists are hoping for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union! How they are rejoicing!

We would advise the imperialist lords not to be happy too soon. Notwithstanding all the services of the revisionist Khrushchev clique, nothing can save imperialism from its doom. The revisionist ruling clique suffers from the same kind of disease as the imperialist ruling clique; they are extremely antagonistic to the masses of the people who comprise over ninety percent of the world's population, and therefore they, too, are weak and powerless and are paper tigers. Like the clay Buddha that tried to wade across the river, the revisionist Khrushchev clique cannot even save themselves, so how can they endow imperialism with long life?

HISTORICAL LESSONS OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Khrushchev's revisionism has inflicted heavy damage on the international communist movement, but at the same time it has educated the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people throughout the world by negative example.

If it may be said that the Great October Revolution provided Marxist-Leninists in all countries with the most important positive experience and opened up the road for the proletarian seizure of political power, then on its part Khrushchev's revisionism may be said to have provided them with the most important negative experience, enabling the Marxist-Leninists in all countries to draw the appropriate lessons for preventing the degeneration of the proletarian party and the socialist state.

Historically all revolutions have had their reverses and their twists and turns. Lenin once asked:

If we take the matter in its essence, has it ever happened in history that a new mode of production took root immediately, without a long succession of setbacks, blunders and relapses?⁵¹⁹

The international proletarian revolution has a history of less than a century counting from 1871 when the proletariat of the Paris Commune made the first heroic attempt at the seizure of political power, or barely half a

⁵¹⁹ V. I. Lenin, *A Great Beginning*, Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1977, p. 18.

century counting from the October Revolution. The proletarian revolution, the greatest revolution in human history, replaces capitalism by socialism and private ownership by public ownership and uproots all the systems of exploitation and all the exploiting classes. It is all the more natural that so earth-shaking a revolution should have to go through serious and fierce class struggles, inevitably traverse a long and tortuous course beset with reverses.

History furnishes a number of examples in which proletarian rule suffered defeat as a result of armed suppression by the bourgeoisie, for instance, the Paris Commune and the Hungarian Soviet Republic of 1919. In contemporary times, too, there was the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary in 1956, when the rule of the proletariat was almost overthrown. People can easily perceive this form of capitalist restoration and are more alert and watchful against it.

However, they cannot easily perceive and are often off their guard or not vigilant against another form of capitalist restoration, which therefore presents a greater danger. The State of the dictatorship of the proletariat takes the road of revisionism or the road of "peaceful evolution" as a result of the degeneration of the leadership of the Party and the state. A lesson of this kind was provided some years ago by the revisionist Tito clique who brought about the degeneration of socialist Yugoslavia into a capitalist country. But the Yugoslav lesson alone has not sufficed to arouse people's attention fully. Some may say that perhaps it was an accident.

But now the revisionist Khrushchev clique has usurped the leadership of the Party and the State, and there is grave danger of a restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, the land of the Great October Revolution with its history of several decades in building socialism. And this sounds the alarm for all socialist countries including China, and for all the communist and workers' parties, including the Communist Party of China. Inevitably it arouses very great attention and forces Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people the world over to ponder deeply and sharpen their vigilance.

The emergence of Khrushchev's revisionism is a bad thing, and it is also a good thing. So long as the countries where socialism has been achieved and also those that will later embark on the socialist road seriously study the lessons of the "peaceful evolution" promoted by the revisionist Khrushchev clique and take the appropriate measures, they will be able to prevent this

kind of “peaceful evolution” as well as to crush the enemy’s armed attacks. Thus, the victory of the world proletarian revolution will be more certain.

The Communist Party of China has a history of forty-three years. During its protracted revolutionary struggle, our Party combated both Right and “Left” opportunist errors and the Marxist-Leninist leadership of the Central Committee headed by Comrade Mao Zedong was established. Closely integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution and construction in China, Comrade Mao Zedong has led the Chinese people from victory to victory.

The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao Zedong have taught us to wage unremitting struggle in the theoretical, political and organizational fields, as well as in practical work, so as to combat revisionism and prevent a restoration of capitalism. The Chinese people have gone through protracted revolutionary armed struggles and possess a glorious revolutionary tradition. The Chinese People’s Liberation Army is armed with Mao Zedong’s thinking and inseparably linked to the masses. The numerous cadres of the Chinese Communist Party have been educated and tempered in rectification movements and sharp class struggles. All these factors make it very difficult to restore capitalism in our country.

But let us look at the facts. Is our society today thoroughly clean? No, it is not. Classes and class struggle still remain, the activities of the overthrown reactionary classes plotting a comeback still continue, and we still have speculative activities by old and new bourgeois elements and desperate forays by embezzlers, grafters and degenerates. There are also cases of degeneration in a few primary organizations; what is more, these degenerates do their utmost to find protectors and agents in the higher leading bodies. We should not in the least slacken our vigilance against such phenomena but must keep fully alert.

The struggle in the socialist countries between the road of socialism and the road of capitalism—between the forces of capitalism attempting a comeback and the forces opposing it—is unavoidable. But the restoration of capitalism in the socialist countries and their degeneration into capitalist countries are certainly not unavoidable. We can prevent the restoration of capitalism so long as there is a correct leadership and a correct understanding of the problem, so long as we adhere to the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line, take the appropriate measures and wage a prolonged, unremitting

struggle. The struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads can become a driving force for social advance.

How can the restoration of capitalism be prevented? On this question Comrade Mao Zedong has formulated a set of theories and policies, after summing up the practical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and studying the positive and negative experience of other countries, mainly the Soviet Union, in accordance with the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, and has thus enriched and developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The main contents of the theories and policies advanced by Comrade Mao Zedong in this connection are as follows:

FIRST, it is necessary to apply the Marxist-Leninist law of the unity of opposites to the study of socialist society. The law of contradiction in all things, i.e., the law of the unity of opposites, is a fundamental law of materialist dialectics. It operates everywhere, whether in the natural world, in human society, or in the human thought.

The opposites in a contradiction both unite and struggle with each other, and it is this that forces things to move and change. Socialist society is no exception. In socialist society there are two kinds of social contradictions, namely, the contradictions among the people and those between ourselves and the enemy. These two kinds of contradictions are entirely different in their essence, and the methods for handling them should be different, too. Their correct handling will result in the increasing consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the further strengthening and development of socialist society.

Many people acknowledge the law of the unity of opposites but are unable to apply it in studying and handling questions in socialist society. They refuse to admit that there are contradictions in socialist society—that there are not only contradictions between ourselves and the enemy but also contradictions among the people—and they do not know how to distinguish between these two kinds of social contradictions and how to handle them correctly, and are therefore unable to deal correctly with the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

SECOND, socialist society covers a very long historical period. Classes and class struggle continue to exist in this society, and the struggle still goes on between the road of socialism and the road of capitalism. The socialist revolution on the economic front (in the ownership of the means of pro-

duction) is insufficient by itself and cannot be consolidated. There must also be a thorough socialist revolution on the political and ideological fronts.

Here a very long period of time is needed to decide "who will win" in the struggle between socialism and capitalism. Several decades won't do it; success requires anywhere from one to several centuries. On the question of duration, it is better to prepare for a longer rather than a shorter period of time.

On the question of effort, it is better to regard the task as difficult rather than easy. It will be more advantageous and less harmful to think and act in this way. Anyone who fails to see this or to appreciate it fully will make tremendous mistakes. During the historical period of socialism it is necessary to maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat and carry the socialist revolution through to the end if the restoration of capitalism is to be prevented, socialist construction carried forward and the conditions created for the transition to communism.

THIRD, the dictatorship of the proletariat is led by the working class, with the worker-peasant alliance as its basis. This means the exercise of dictatorship by the working class and by the people under its leadership over the reactionary classes and individuals and those elements who oppose socialist transformation and socialist construction. Within the ranks of the people democratic centralism is practiced. Ours is the broadest democracy beyond the bounds of possibility for any bourgeois state.

FOURTH, in both socialist revolution and socialist construction it is necessary to adhere to the mass line, boldly to arouse the masses and to unfold mass movements on a large scale. The mass line of "from the masses, to the masses" is the basic line in all the work of our Party. It is necessary to have firm confidence in the majority of the people and, above all, in the majority of the worker-peasant masses. We must be good at consulting the masses in our work and under no circumstances alienate ourselves from them.

Both commandism and the attitude of one dispensing favors have to be fought. The full and frank expression of views and great debates are important forms of revolutionary struggle which have been created by the people of our country in the course of their long revolutionary fight, forms of struggle which rely on the masses for resolving contradictions among the people and contradictions between ourselves and the enemy.

FIFTH, whether in socialist revolution or in socialist construction, it is necessary to solve the question of whom to rely on, whom to win over and

whom to oppose. The proletariat and its vanguard must make a class analysis of socialist society, rely on the truly dependable forces that firmly take the socialist road, win over all allies that can be won over, and unite with the masses of the people, who constitute more than ninety-five percent of the population, in a common struggle against the enemies of socialism.

In the rural areas, after the collectivization of agriculture it is necessary to rely on the poor and lower-middle peasants in order to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and the worker-peasant alliance, defeat the spontaneous capitalist tendencies and extend the policies of socialism.

SIXTH, it is necessary to conduct extensive socialist education movements repeatedly in the cities and the countryside. In these continuous movements for educating the people we must be good at organizing the revolutionary class forces, enhancing their class consciousness, correctly handling contradictions among the people and uniting all those who can be united.

In these movements it is necessary to wage a sharp, tit-for-tat struggle against the anti-socialist, capitalist and feudal forces—the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries and bourgeois rightists, and the embezzlers, grafters and degenerates—in order to smash the attacks they unleash against socialism and to remold the majority of them into new men.

SEVENTH, one of the basic tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat is actively to expand the socialist economy. It is necessary to achieve the modernization of industry, agriculture, science and technology, and national defense step by step under the guidance of the general policy of developing the national economy with agriculture as the foundation and industry as the leading factor. On the basis of the growth of production, it is necessary to raise the living standards of the people gradually and on a broad scale.

EIGHTH, ownership by the whole people and collective ownership are the two forms of socialist economy. The transition from collective ownership to ownership by the whole people, from two kinds of ownership to a unitary ownership by the whole people, is a rather long process. Collective ownership itself develops from lower to higher levels and from smaller to larger scale. The people's communes which the Chinese people have created are a suitable form of organization for the solution of the question of this transition.

NINTH, "Let a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend" is a policy for stimulating the growth of the arts and the progress of science and for promoting a flourishing socialist culture. Education must serve proletarian politics and must be combined with productive

labor. The working people should master knowledge and the intellectuals should become habituated to manual labor.

Among those engaged in science, culture, the arts and education, the struggle to promote proletarian ideology and destroy bourgeois ideology is a protracted and fierce class struggle. It is necessary to build up a large detachment of working-class intellectuals who serve socialism and who are both "red and expert," i.e., who are both politically conscious and professionally competent, by means of cultural revolution, and revolutionary practice in class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment.

TENTH, it is necessary to maintain the system of cadre participation in collective productive labor. The cadres of our Party and state are ordinary workers and not overlords sitting on the backs of the people. By taking part in collective productive labor, the cadres maintain extensive, constant and close ties with the working people. This is a major measure of fundamental importance for a socialist system; it helps to overcome bureaucracy and to prevent revisionism and dogmatism.

ELEVENTH, the system of high salaries for a small number of people should never be applied. The gap between the incomes of the working personnel of the Party, the government, the enterprises and the people's communes, on the one hand, and the incomes of the mass of people, on the other, should be rationally and gradually narrowed and not widened. All working personnel must be prevented from abusing their power and enjoying special privileges.

TWELFTH, it is always necessary for the people's armed forces in a socialist country to be under the leadership of the Party of the proletariat and under the supervision of the masses, and they must always maintain the glorious tradition of a people's army, with unity between the army and the people and between the officers and men.

It is necessary to keep the system under which officers serve as common soldiers at regular intervals. It is necessary to practice military democracy, political democracy and economic democracy. Moreover, militia units should be organized and trained all over the country, so as to make everybody a soldier. The guns must forever be in the hands of the Party and the people and must never be allowed to become the instruments of careerists.

THIRTEENTH, the people's public security organs must always be under the leadership of the Party of the proletariat and under the supervision of the mass of the people. In the struggle to defend the fruits of socialism and

the people's interests, the policy must be applied of relying on the combined efforts of the broad masses and the security organs, so that not a single bad person escapes or a single good person is wronged. Counter-revolutionaries must be suppressed whenever found, and mistakes must be corrected whenever discovered.

FOURTEENTH, in foreign policy, it is necessary to uphold proletarian internationalism and oppose great-power chauvinism and national egoism. The socialist camp is the product of the struggle of the international proletariat and working people. It belongs to the proletariat and working people of the whole world as well as to the people of the socialist countries.

We must truly put into effect the fighting slogans, "Workers of all countries, unite!" and "Workers and oppressed nations of the world, unite!," resolutely combat the anti-Communist, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary policies of imperialism and reaction and support the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed classes and oppressed nations.

Relations among socialist countries should be based on the principles of independence, complete equality and the proletarian internationalist principle of mutual support and mutual assistance. Every socialist country should rely mainly on itself for its construction. If any socialist country practices national egoism in its foreign policy, or, worse yet, eagerly works in partnership with imperialism for the partition of the world, such conduct is degenerate and a betrayal of proletarian internationalism.

FIFTEENTH, as the vanguard of the proletariat, the Communist Party must exist as long as the dictatorship of the proletariat exists. The Communist Party is the highest form of organization of the proletariat. The leading role of the proletariat is realized through the leadership of the Communist Party. The system of party committees exercising leadership must be put into effect in all departments.

During the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the proletarian party must maintain and strengthen its close ties with the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people, maintain and develop its vigorous revolutionary style, uphold the principle of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of its own country, and persist in the struggle against revisionism, dogmatism and opportunism of every kind.

In the light of the historical lessons of the dictatorship of the proletariat Comrade Mao Zedong has stated:

Class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment are the three great revolutionary movements for building a mighty socialist country. These movements are a sure guarantee that Communists will be free from bureaucracy and immune against revisionism and dogmatism, and will forever remain invincible. They are a reliable guarantee that the proletariat will be able to unite with the broad working masses and realize a democratic dictatorship. If, in the absence of these movements, the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and ogres of all kinds were allowed to crawl out, while our cadres were to shut their eyes to all this and in many cases fail even to differentiate between the enemy and ourselves but were to collaborate with the enemy and become corrupted and demoralized, if our cadres were thus dragged into the enemy camp or the enemy were able to sneak into our ranks, and if many of our workers, peasants and intellectuals were left defenseless against both the soft and the hard tactics of the enemy, then it would not take long, perhaps only several years or a decade, or several decades at most, before a counter-revolutionary restoration on a national scale inevitably occurred, the Marxist-Leninist party would inevitably become a revisionist party or a fascist party, and the whole of China would change its colour.⁵²⁰

Comrade Mao Zedong has pointed out that, in order to guarantee that our Party and country do not change their colour, we must not only have a correct line and correct policies but must train and bring up millions of successors who will carry on the cause of proletarian revolution.

In the final analysis, the question of training successors for the revolutionary cause of the proletariat is one of whether or not there will be people who can carry on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary cause started by the older generation of proletarian revolutionaries, whether or not the leadership of our Party and state will remain in the hands of proletarian revolutionaries, whether or not our descendants will continue to march along the correct road laid down by Marxism-Leninism, or, in other words, whether or not

⁵²⁰ Mao Zedong, "Note on *The Seven Well-Written Documents of Zhejiang Province Concerning Cadres' Participation in Physical Labor*" in *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, Vol. IX, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2020, pp. 1-2.

we can successfully prevent the emergence of Khrushchevite revisionism in China.

In short, it is an extremely important question, a matter of life and death for our Party and our country. It is a question of fundamental importance to the proletarian revolutionary cause for a hundred, a thousand, nay ten thousand years. Basing themselves on the changes in the Soviet Union, the imperialist prophets are pinning their hopes on "peaceful evolution" on the third or fourth generation of the Chinese Party. We must shatter these imperialist prophecies. From our highest organizations down to the grass-roots, we must everywhere give constant attention to the training and upbringing of successors to the revolutionary cause.

What are the requirements for worthy successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat?

They must be genuine Marxist-Leninists and not revisionists like Khrushchev wearing the cloak of Marxism-Leninism.

They must be revolutionaries who wholeheartedly serve the majority of the people of China and the whole world, and must not be like Khrushchev who serves both the interests of a handful of members of the privileged bourgeois stratum in his own country and those of foreign imperialism and reaction.

They must be proletarian statesmen capable of uniting and working together with the overwhelming majority. Not only must they unite with those who agree with them, they must also be good at uniting with those who disagree and even with those who formerly opposed them and have since been proven wrong. But they must especially watch out for careerists and conspirators like Khrushchev and prevent such bad elements from usurping the leadership of the Party and government at any level.

They must be models in applying the Party's democratic centralism, must master the method of leadership based on the principle of "from the masses, to the masses," and must cultivate a democratic style and be good at listening to the masses. They must not be despotic like Khrushchev and violate the Party's democratic centralism, make surprise attacks on comrades or act arbitrarily and dictatorially.

They must be modest and prudent and guard against arrogance and impetuosity; they must be imbued with the spirit of self-criticism and have the courage to correct mistakes and shortcomings in their work. They must

not cover up their errors like Khrushchev, and claim all the credit for themselves and shift all the blame on others.

Successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat come forward in mass struggles and are tempered in the great storms of revolution. It is essential to test and know cadres and choose and train successors in the long course of mass struggle.

The above principles advanced by Comrade Mao Zedong are creative developments of Marxism-Leninism, to the theoretical arsenal of which they add new weapons of decisive importance for us in preventing the restoration of capitalism. So long as we follow these principles, we can consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, ensure that our Party and state will never change colour, successfully conduct the socialist revolution and socialist construction, help all peoples' revolutionary movements for the overthrow of imperialism and its lackeys, and guarantee the future transition from socialism to communism.

Regarding the emergence of the revisionist Khrushchev clique in the Soviet Union, our attitude as Marxist-Leninists is the same as our attitude towards any "disturbance"—first, we are against it; second, we are not afraid of it.

We did not wish it and are opposed to it, but since the revisionist Khrushchev clique has already emerged, there is nothing terrifying about it, and there is no need for alarm. The earth will continue to revolve, history will continue to move forward, the people of the world will, as always, make revolutions, and the imperialists and their lackeys will inevitably meet their doom.

The historic contributions of the great Soviet people will remain forever glorious; they can never be tarnished by the revisionist Khrushchev clique's betrayal. The broad masses of workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals and Communists of the Soviet Union will eventually surmount all the obstacles in their part and march towards communism.

The Soviet people, the people of all the socialist countries and the revolutionary people the world over will certainly learn lessons from the revisionist Khrushchev clique's betrayal. In the struggle against Khrushchev's revision-

ism, the international communist movement has grown and will continue to grow mightier than before.

Marxist-Leninists have always had an attitude of revolutionary optimism towards the future of the cause of the proletarian revolution. We are profoundly convinced that the brilliant light of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of socialism and of Marxism-Leninism will shine forth over the Soviet land. The proletariat is sure to achieve complete and final victory on earth.

Letter of the CC of the CPC of July 28, 1964

July 28, 1964

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 14, 1964, pp. 1-10.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, July 31, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 31, pp. 5-11.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has received the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated June 15, 1964. This letter was not delivered to us until June 20, whereas its contents had already been disclosed in the bourgeois press in the West before the 20th.

In your letter you distort and reject the reasonable proposal advanced in our letter of May 7, 1964 and turn a deaf ear to the views of the many fraternal parties demanding unity and opposing a split. In this letter of yours, you have laid down a revisionist political program and a divisive organizational line for an international meeting of the fraternal parties. This shows that you are determined to prepare and call such a meeting arbitrarily, unilaterally and illegally with the aim of effecting an open split in the international communist movement.

(I)

On the question of convening an international meeting of the Fraternal Parties, the Communist Party of China has always adhered to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and advocated a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism after full preparation and by unanimous agreement reached through consultation; it is firmly opposed to a schismatic meeting. We have invariably persisted in this stand. You say in your letter that we “make a volte-face.” This is merely an attempt to substitute lies for facts.

What are the facts?

As early as the spring of 1962, that is, shortly after the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, the CPC actively supported the proposal made by the Communist Party of Indonesia, the Workers' Party of Viet Nam and the Communist Party of New Zealand for the convocation of an international meeting of the fraternal parties to eliminate the differences which you had brought into the open before the enemy. In its letter to you dated April 7, 1962, the Central Committee of the CPC declared that it "wholeheartedly supports the proposal to convene a meeting of the fraternal parties" and pointed out that to ensure its success "many difficulties and obstacles have to be overcome beforehand and much preparatory work has to be done." You seem to have either forgotten or failed to understand these words. If you have forgotten them, it shows how bad your memory is; if you have failed to understand them, it testifies to the poverty of your comprehension. Didn't we clearly state that to make a success of the meeting "many difficulties and obstacles have to be overcome beforehand and much preparatory work has to be done?"

We took this stand with the aim of eliminating the differences and strengthening unity in the interest of the common struggle against the enemy. However, in your letter of May 31, 1962, you rejected the proposal for convening an international meeting of the fraternal parties. You subsequently took a series of steps to worsen the relations between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and between our two countries, and at the successive Congresses of five European fraternal parties in the winter of 1962 you stirred up a fresh adverse current against the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties.

Despite all this, in July 1963 the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party sent a delegation to Moscow for the talks between our two Parties. We had hoped that these talks would yield positive results and thus make a contribution to the preparations for convening an international meeting of the fraternal parties. However, you showed not the slightest sincerity with regard to these talks. In the midst of them you published your Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to Party Organizations and All Communists in the Soviet Union, thus widening and deepening the differences in the international communist movement and erecting further road-blocks in the way of an international meeting.

In the spring of 1964 we made another major effort to overcome the many obstacles set by you and to bring about a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. Since in your letter to us dated November 29,

1963 you had merely paid lip-service to unity and failed to put forward any concrete measures for convening an international meeting, we on our part made a four-point proposal in our letter to you dated February 29, 1964 for the preparation and convocation of an international meeting of the fraternal parties. The proposal reads as follows: (1) For the cessation of the public polemics it is necessary for the Chinese and Soviet Parties and other fraternal parties concerned to hold various bilateral and multilateral talks in order to find through consultation a fair and reasonable formula acceptable to all and to conclude a common agreement. (2) The Chinese Communist Party consistently advocates and actively supports the convening of a meeting of representatives of all communist and workers' parties. Prior to the meeting adequate preparations should be made, and difficulties and obstacles should be overcome. Together with the other fraternal parties, we will do everything possible to ensure that this meeting will be a meeting of unity on the basis of the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism. (3) The resumption of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties is a necessary preparatory step for making the meeting of the fraternal parties a success. We propose that the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties be resumed in Beijing, from October 10 to 25, 1964. (4) In order to make further preparations for the meeting of representatives of all fraternal parties, we propose that the Sino-Soviet talks be followed by a meeting of representatives of seventeen fraternal parties, namely, the parties of Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and Viet Nam, and the parties of Indonesia, Japan, Italy and France.

On your part what have you been doing in the last few months?

On February 12 this year and behind our backs, you sent a letter directed against the CPC to fraternal parties in a plot to take "collective measures" against us. We have repeatedly asked you to send us a copy of this letter. However, to this day you refuse to do so and are still obligated to us on this score.

At the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU on February 14 this year, you delivered an anti-Chinese report and adopted an anti-Chinese decision, crying that you would "come out openly and strongly against the incorrect views and dangerous actions of the CPC leadership."

On April 3 you published the anti-Chinese documents of the February Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU and proceeded to launch

a new anti-Chinese campaign. According to incomplete statistics, in April alone your central press and that of the Union Republics carried more than a thousand articles and other items attacking China.

You have brought great political and organizational pressure to bear upon fraternal parties, intensified your subversive and divisive activities within fraternal parties, and extended your collusion with defectors, renegades, Trotskyites, the Tito clique and reactionaries of every description. For example, you staged the act of betrayal by Yoshio Shiga, Ichizo Suzuki and others in order to injure the Japanese Communist Party which upholds Marxism-Leninism. You are busy ganging up with the Indonesian reactionaries in order to injure the Communist Party of Indonesia which upholds Marxism-Leninism.

All this shows that you are actively working for an open split in the international communist movement. In order to rush a schismatic meeting, you proposed a pressing timetable in your letter of March 7, 1964, in which the holding of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties was scheduled for May this year, that of the preparatory meeting of twenty-six fraternal parties for June-July and that of the international meeting of the fraternal parties for the autumn. This revealed the steps you wanted to take in hastening an open split.

We have given serious and repeated thought to the grave situation caused by your divisive activities and seen through your intention to hold a schismatic meeting. Therefore, we pointed out in our letter of May 7 this year that it would be better to hold the international meeting of fraternal parties later rather than earlier, or even not to hold it, in these circumstances. For the same reason we made the proposal in that letter that it would be more appropriate to postpone the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties till some time in the first half of next year, say May, and pointed out that, judging by present circumstances, it might require perhaps four or five years, or even longer, to complete the preparations for an international meeting.

In short, in order to eliminate the differences and strengthen unity in the interest of the common struggle against the enemy, we have always stressed that “many difficulties and obstacles have to be overcome” and “much preparatory work has to be done” so as to convene a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. When you failed to make any concrete proposal for convening an international meeting, it was for the purpose of upholding unity and opposing a split that we put forward a concrete proposal for the preparation of such a meeting in our letter of February 29. When you

decided to convene a schismatic meeting, it was likewise for the purpose of upholding unity and opposing a split that we called for more time to overcome the greater number of difficulties and obstacles and to make a series of preparations in our letter of May 7. We have consistently opposed a hurried meeting and the attempt to split the international communist movement, because it would be detrimental to the strengthening of unity and to the common struggle against the enemy.

In the past you too said that an international meeting could not be convened before ample preparations were made. On January 16, 1963, N. S. Khrushchev, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, said that if the meeting were to be held in a hurry, it would lead to “the danger of a split.” Why is it that you have made a volte-face and are trying to prepare and convene an international meeting in a blitzkrieg-like manner?

Presumably you think that your so-called preparations are almost complete. But from the above-stated facts people can see clearly that what you call preparations are aimed not at the elimination of differences and the strengthening of unity but at the exacerbation of differences and the creation of a split. You are not preparing to convene a meeting of unity but preparing to convene a schismatic meeting.

Obviously, the more such preparations you make, the greater the obstacles you place in the way of a meeting of unity, the greater the necessity for more arduous and protracted preparations by the Marxist-Leninist parties to overcome these obstacles, and the farther the date for a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism will recede.

In your letter of June 15 this year, you insist on hastily preparing and calling a schismatic meeting. This runs altogether counter to the common aspirations of all the Marxist-Leninist parties of the world for a meeting of unity.

(II)

Your letter demonstrates that you have prepared a revisionist political program for an international meeting to split the world communist movement.

In your letter you say that at this meeting you will “seek for ways to unity and not to dissociation” and will concentrate on revealing what there is “in common” so as to “formulate common positions.” This is a pure fraud.

You arrogantly proclaim in your letter that the 20th Congress of the CPSU is “the symbol of... a new line of the entire world communist movement”

and state that you “will firmly continue to follow” the line laid down by the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU. You also say menacingly that whoever does not approve of the line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU represents “the reaction of conservative forces in the communist movement to the creative Marxism-Leninism of the modern epoch” and “is permeated with the ideology of the personality cult.” This means that you flagrantly want to impose on the entire international communist movement the revisionist line which was initiated at the 20th Congress of the CPSU and rounded off into a complete system at its 22nd Congress. In asserting that it is necessary, “in keeping with the changes that have occurred in the international situation, to supplement and elaborate the ideas of the Declaration and Statement, and creatively examine and solve new problems,” you actually want to substitute the revisionist line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU for the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement.

In the light of your views and activities over the years, one can clearly see the revisionist essence of the major theses which your letter contains and which you are trying to impose on the international meeting.

In asserting that “most of the socialist countries are completing an important period of their development and are approaching new heights in the construction of a new society,” you actually want to introduce the “party of the entire people” and the “state of the whole people,” change the proletarian character of the communist parties, abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat and open the floodgates to the restoration of capitalism.

In saying that the socialist countries need “to improve the forms of cooperation and mutual assistance” and “coordination of political and economic activities,” you really want the fraternal countries to obey your baton and become your dependencies or colonies economically, politically and militarily.

In claiming that “there is now much that is new in the forms of organization and the methods” of struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries, you are actually propagating the “parliamentary road” and the theory of “structural reform,” “peaceful transition” and the liquidation of proletarian revolution.

In stating that “the disintegration of imperialism’s colonial system has entered its closing stage,” you really want to liquidate the struggle of the oppressed nations against imperialism and old and new colonialism.

In reducing the external policy of the socialist countries solely to that of “preserving peace and promoting peaceful coexistence,” you are actually opposed to struggling against imperialism and to supporting the revolution of the oppressed peoples and nations.

In substituting the concept that “the imperialist reactionaries led by the wild men of the US and other imperialist powers” for the concept that “US imperialism has become an enemy of the peoples of the whole world” as stated in the Statement of 1960, you actually want to ally yourselves with the US ruling clique, whom you call “wise men,” and in partnership with US imperialism to carve up the world and oppose the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of all countries.

What you mean by “settling the differences,” revealing what there is “in common” and the necessity to “attend the proposed conferences with a constructive program” boils down to one thing: you really want to force the Marxist-Leninist parties to accept the revisionist line peddled by the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU.

Your favorite trick is to try and make capital out of the sentence in the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 concerning the 20th Congress of the CPSU; But you know perfectly well that the Chinese Communist Party has always been against that sentence. At both meetings of the fraternal parties, you made repeated requests claiming that you would face great difficulties unless the sentence was included. It was out of consideration for your difficulties that we made concessions on this point. At the meeting in 1960 the delegation of the Chinese Communist Party stated that this was the last time it would do so. It is absolutely impermissible that you should use this sentence as a subterfuge for pushing your revisionist line or as a big stick with which to attack fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties. Why must all parties submit to the resolutions of a single party? Why should it be considered a great crime if they refuse to do so? May we ask, what kind of logic is this? What kind of principle for guiding the relations among fraternal parties is this?

It must be pointed out that the revisionist line of your 20th and 22nd Congresses is the root cause of the differences in the present international communist movement. In recent years, this revisionist line of yours has met with opposition from more and more Marxist-Leninist parties and Marxist-Leninists, and it is being increasingly discredited. A thorough criticism and repudiation of your revisionist line is imperative if the international

meeting of the fraternal parties is to be a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. You are trying hard to impose this revisionist line on the international meeting of the fraternal parties, and this only serves to show that you are determined to call a meeting to bring about an open split.

(III)

The procedure and steps you advance in your letter for the illegal preparation and convocation of an international meeting constitute a comprehensive organizational plan for openly splitting the international communist movement.

You have premeditated everything: what kind of meeting it is to be, who should prepare it, who should take part in it and who should convene it—on all these questions you claim the last word. To you, all the fraternal parties are mere puppets qualified only to move at your command. These practices of yours are permeated with the spirit of great-power chauvinism and of a “patriarchal father party.”

First, on the preparatory meeting for an international meeting of the fraternal parties. In our letter of February 29 this year we proposed a preparatory meeting consisting of the representatives of seventeen fraternal parties, but you did not agree. In our letter of May 7 we stated that in principle we are not against increasing the number of participants in the preparatory meeting, but that first consideration should be given to those fraternal parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism. In your present letter you still refuse to consider our reasonable proposal and insist that the preparatory meeting consists of the representatives of the twenty-six parties.

You cannot have forgotten that it was the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party which, in its letter to you on the eve of the Bucharest meeting of 1960, proposed the formation of a committee to draft the documents for the Moscow meeting of 1960, and that the twenty-six members of the drafting committee were subsequently decided on through consultation among the fraternal parties. These twenty-six fraternal parties were only members of the drafting committee for the Moscow meeting of 1960, and they have no hereditary rights; they are not the members of a permanent organization for preparing all international meetings; moreover, no such permanent organization has ever existed.

We have already said in our letter of May 7, 1964 that the situation now is vastly different from that in 1960. Two Parties now exist in some of the twen-

ty-six countries and you and we differ as to which of the two should attend the meeting, while many fraternal parties also hold differing opinions.

On the question of convening the preparatory meeting of the international meeting and its participants, it is necessary to achieve unanimity through consultation among the fraternal parties, or otherwise no preparatory meeting of whatever kind will be legal.

Second, on the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties. The Communist Party of China and many fraternal parties maintain that the holding of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties is a necessary preparatory step for the convening of the international meeting. You also said so in the past. Even in your letter of March 7 this year you still talked about “the necessity of continuing the bilateral meeting of representatives of the CPSU and the CPC, and of afterwards preparing and calling a meeting of all the communist and workers’ parties.”

But in your present letter you separate the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties from the preparatory work for the international meeting of the fraternal parties and avoid giving an answer to the concrete proposal in our letter of May 7 concerning the continuance of these bilateral talks, only mentioning vaguely that the question of these talks “can be decided at any time by agreement between the CPSU and CPC.” Clearly, you now regard the occurrence or non-occurrence of the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties as of little import and are trying to brush them aside and to prepare and call an international meeting without attaining an agreement through consultation between our two Parties. What is this if not a resolve to call a meeting to precipitate a split?

Third, on the composition of the international meeting of the fraternal parties. It is stated in your letter that all those parties which took part in the meetings of 1957 and 1960 and signed their documents are entitled to attend. What is the meaning of this? Everyone is aware that the renegade Tito clique took part in the meeting of 1957 and signed the “Peace Manifesto.” Obviously, you intend to smuggle the Tito clique—a clique which the 1960 meeting unanimously condemned—into the international meeting of the fraternal parties. We are strongly opposed to this.

On the question of new participants in the international meeting, you have put forward in your letter a most absurd criterion, according to which only those parties supporting your revisionist “general line” should participate, while the Marxist-Leninist parties which have been rebuilt after break-

ing with revisionism would not be allowed to participate. We tell you frankly, this will never do. If the international meeting of the fraternal parties is to be a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, these Marxist-Leninist parties will of course be entitled to participate, and no one has any right to exclude them. If you intend to hold a schismatic meeting of revisionists, it is absolutely futile for you to expect the Marxist-Leninist parties to join you in your scheme for splitting the international communist movement.

Fourth, on the question of the convener of an international meeting of the fraternal parties. In your letter you say that the CPSU has a “special responsibility” in the matter of calling international meetings, and you quote the decision of the meeting of 1957 and Comrade Mao Zedong’s speech. But the wording of the decision you quote is clear: “Entrust the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with the function of convening Meetings of the Communist and Workers’ Parties in consultation with the fraternal parties.” In other words, the CPSU must hold consultations with the fraternal parties before calling any meeting. In referring to the CPSU’s initiative in calling international meetings, Comrade Mao Zedong presupposed prior consultations with the fraternal parties, and there has never been the slightest implication that you may act arbitrarily. Moreover, we wish to point out that the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation among the fraternal parties was established at the meeting of the fraternal parties in 1960. Therefore, it is necessary to get the unanimous approval of the fraternal parties to call an international meeting, and in no case should some of the fraternal parties impose their will on others and compel them to agree to the holding of a meeting. Should you dare to violate this principle by refusing to reach a unanimous agreement through consultation with all the fraternal parties, you will have no right whatsoever to call any international meeting.

On all the above questions concerning the procedure and steps for preparing and convening an international meeting, the fraternal parties of the world, including the old ones and those rebuilt or newly founded, may hold different views, all of which should be fully respected and given ample consideration. Unanimous agreement must be reached among the fraternal parties on these questions in accordance with the principle of consultation on an equal footing and through bilateral or multilateral talks. It would be completely illegal for you to prepare and call a meeting by issuing commands as though you were an overlord, and to do so would likewise serve to show that you are determined to call a meeting to bring about an open split.

(IV)

In recent years, the forces of Marxism-Leninism in all parts of the world have rapidly grown and gained strength in the struggle against modern revisionism. Marxist-Leninists in many countries have come out boldly against the revisionists' divisive activities and they have rebuilt Marxist-Leninist parties or groups in a very short time. They have demonstrated the great revolutionary spirit and heroic militancy of fighters for communism and have brought about a very promising situation for the revolutionary movement in their countries. In this struggle the modern revisionists are increasingly revealing their true features in their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism. The revisionist leading cliques of many parties have been brushed aside by the revolutionary people. All this runs counter to your desires, makes you anxious and uneasy and strikes terror into your hearts.

Your letter brazenly charges us with "the intensification of factional, disruptive activities, and the utmost exacerbation of polemics." This only serves to show that you are so terrified by the mighty forces of Marxism-Leninism that you have taken leave of your senses and are talking nonsense.

The splits that have occurred in the communist parties of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Ceylon and many other countries are the result of your own pursuit of a revisionist and divisive line and of your own frenzied subversive and factional activities. It is you yourselves who, by waving the baton, have imposed the revisionist line on a number of fraternal parties, directed their revisionist leaders arbitrarily to push aside and persecute Marxist-Leninists and even to expel them, and thus precipitated the splits in these parties. Because the Marxist-Leninists in these parties are deprived of their right to wage inner-party struggle against revisionism, they are compelled to rebuild revolutionary parties of the proletariat in order to continue the anti-revisionist struggle. The more you persist in your revisionist and divisive line, the greater will be the number of Marxist-Leninists who will rebuild revolutionary parties of the proletariat and wage struggle against you. This is the inexorable logic of the struggle.

You set yourselves up as the supreme arbiter of the international communist movement, saying that the Marxist-Leninist groups and parties which have been rebuilt or newly founded "are outside the communist movement, and no power on earth can drag them into its ranks." It seems as though nothing may exist on earth without your recognition or approval; This is

the philosophy of all decaying forces in relation to newborn forces. All the newborn forces in the history of mankind have grown and gained strength despite the extreme reluctance of decaying forces to recognize them, Neither the refusal of the revisionists of the Second International to recognize the Bolshevik Party of Lenin nor the US imperialists' non-recognition of the Soviet state in the past and of the People's Republic of China in the present succeeded in preventing their growth. The newborn forces of Marxism-Leninism, will continue to exist and grow throughout the world despite your refusal to recognize them. The more vicious your vituperation, the clearer the proof that they are doing the right thing and doing it effectively.

Contrary to your attitude, the Communist Party of China and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties show great admiration for those Marxist-Leninists who have rebuilt revolutionary parties of the proletariat. It is our unshirkable proletarian internationalist duty to maintain close ties with them and to give firm support to their revolutionary struggle. We did so before, we are doing so now, and, however you may revile us, we will continue to do so in the future and do it more and do it better.

Furthermore, we must warn you that your interference in and subversion of fraternal parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism and oppose revisionism are doomed to complete failure. Such despicable actions on your part only serve to expose your ugly features in colluding with the reactionaries and sabotaging the people's revolutionary struggles. Recently you unilaterally published your letters to the Central Committee of the Japanese Communist Party and unscrupulously launched open attacks on the valiant Japanese Party which is standing in the forefront of the struggle against US imperialism and domestic reaction. You work hand in glove with the US and Japanese reactionaries and support Yoshio Shiga, Ichizo Suzuki and other renegades from the Japanese Communist Party in your efforts to subvert the Japanese Party and to undermine the revolutionary movement in Japan. We resolutely oppose your criminal action which is a betrayal of proletarian internationalism. We strongly support the struggle of the Japanese Communist Party against your interference and subversion. We resolutely support the struggle of the Indonesian Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties against your disruptive activities.

Speaking of the public polemics, everybody knows that you started them yourselves. At first, you were determined to conduct public polemics, you refused to listen to any advice, and the more you were urged not to do so,

the more active you became. You imagined that by keeping up the polemics you could overwhelm the Marxist-Leninists and wipe them off the face of the earth. But things have rapidly developed in a direction opposite to your wishes. In the present great debate your true features as revisionists have been rapidly exposed and in some respects thoroughly exposed, while the forces of Marxism-Leninism have grown rapidly. This great debate has become a furnace throwing off the dross of revisionism, and it portends an inevitable new upsurge in the proletarian world revolution. Today, it is no use your fearing or trying to suppress it. You kindled the fire, the flames of public polemics have spread all over the world, and how is it possible for you to wrap them up in paper now?

In your letter you charge us with “planning to carry on the public polemics endlessly.” We can tell you that we have not finished replying to your Open Letter of July 14, 1963 and have not yet begun to reply to the anti-Chinese report and anti-Chinese decision of your February Plenum this year, and we reserve the right to reply to the more than three thousand anti-Chinese articles and other items you have published over the past year. So long as you persist in your revisionist line and refuse to admit your errors publicly, we will certainly continue the great debate. Since you have put forward an out-and-out revisionist program and persisted in imposing it on the international communist movement, it is only natural that we, as a serious Marxist-Leninist party, should thoroughly expose and refute your revisionism. Without thoroughly clarifying such major issues of principle as the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism and the general line of the international communist movement, how can there be a basis for the unity of the fraternal parties and how can an international meeting of the fraternal parties be held successfully?

Your letter once again rejects our proposal for the publication by each side in its own press of the articles and material of the other side in the polemics. Apparently our proposal has made you tremble with fear. Your argument is that you refuse to reprint our material in order to avoid undermining the Soviet people’s “feeling of friendship and fraternity” for the Communist Party and the people of China. This is indeed strange logic. Are you not undermining Sino-Soviet friendship when you publish thousands of articles and other items, slandering and vilifying the Communist Party of China and do your worst to confuse people with lies? You malign us as “pseudo-Marxists” and “modern Trotskyites”; as adherents of “petit-bourgeois Utopianism

in an undisguised form,” “plain anti-Sovietism,” “anti-communism,” “belli-cose nationalism,” “racism,” “great-Han chauvinism” and “hegemonism”; as “Beijing apostates,” “modern strike-breakers of the revolution,” “pseudo-revolutionaries” and “spiritual fathers of the present-day Right-wing socialists”; as “falling into the company of the forces of imperialist reaction” and “the company of inveterate colonialists,” etc. Can it be that you are defending Sino-Soviet friendship by this torrent of abuse? You reject our proposal and dare not publish our articles and material which present the facts and reason matters out, because you are well aware that the broad masses of the Soviet people and of the members of the CPSU really cherish Sino-Soviet friendship and are able to distinguish between right and wrong, and because it will be still more difficult for you to keep on going once they have read our articles and know the truth.

To boost your own morale, you say in your letter that the more time passes, the more life will prove you right and us wrong. If so, why are you so jittery? Why are you shouting yourselves hoarse in cursing the newborn forces of Marxism-Leninism? Why are you so anxiously asking for a stop to the public polemics? Why are you so hastily preparing an international meeting? Isn't it best for you to let time prove that our line is wrong? To get to the root of the matter, time is not on your side, and you have lost faith in your own future. Reality is a compelling force and your letter, which lacks reason and conviction and is characterized by a mouse-like timidity despite its air of ferocity, reflects your state of mind. But what can be done about it? All this is of your own making. You have picked up a rock only to drop it on your own toes, and who else is to blame?

(V)

The Communist Party of China persists in its stand for an international meeting of the fraternal parties for unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, to be held after ample preparations, and we are firmly opposed to your schismatic meeting.

The Central Committee of the CPC solemnly declares: We will never take part in any international meeting, or any preparatory meeting for it, which you call for the purpose of splitting the international communist movement.

It is clear to everyone that, as the differences in the international communist movement are so serious and the dispute is so fierce, a hasty international

meeting can yield only bad results and not good ones. Should you disregard our solemn warning, discard the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation and insist on calling an international meeting unilaterally and illegally, the only consequence will be an open split.

During the fourteen years from the dissolution of the Communist International in 1943 to 1957, there was not a single international meeting of all communist parties. But this did not hinder the progress of the cause of international communism. On the contrary, during those fourteen years, the Chinese revolution triumphed, the revolutions of different types in a number of countries in East Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America triumphed, and the revolutionary cause in other countries made great progress. Experience has proved that the most important thing for a Communist Party is to be able to integrate the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution in its own country, to adhere to a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line and to carry on the revolutionary struggle independently. Wherever this is done, the people's revolutionary cause will advance step by step towards victory, and a contribution will be made to the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat. Wherever this is not done, the revolutionary cause will suffer setbacks and defeats.

Since 1957, two international meetings of the fraternal parties have been held. The 1957 meeting charted a common program for the international communist movement. But soon after the meeting you abandoned the revolutionary principles of the Declaration, energetically pushed ahead with your revisionist line and tried to impose it upon fraternal parties. At the 1960 meeting of fraternal parties, our Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties justly criticized your line of revisionism. However, you did not in the least repent and mend your ways but cast aside the revolutionary principles of the 1960 Statement, stuck to your anti-Marxist-Leninist stand and kept on widening and deepening the differences in the international communist movement. In these circumstances, how can a meeting of unity based on Marxism-Leninism be held?

That is why we say, "It would be better to hold the international meeting of fraternal parties later rather than earlier, or even not to hold it, in these circumstances." No harm was done but much good occurred during the fourteen years when no international meeting of the fraternal parties was held; Why should a meeting be called in such a great hurry now?

Now you want to convene a grand assembly for a split—rather it should be called a minor schismatic gathering. In relation to the total number of Communists in the world, those who really believe in revisionism constitute only a small fraction, and they are bound to come to grief. The revisionists are seriously disunited and divergent in their views. There are some who dance obediently in response to your baton, but their number is dwindling. Therefore, history will prove that the meeting you intend to call unilaterally and forcibly, without consultation with the fraternal parties and without their agreement, can be nothing but an insignificant meeting which is against communism, against the people and against the revolution and which serves the bourgeoisie, like the “congresses” called by the Second International to oppose Leninism.

Since you have made up your minds, you will most probably call the meeting. Otherwise, by breaking your word would you not become a laughing-stock down the centuries? As the saying goes, you can't dismount from the tiger you are riding. You are caught in an insoluble dilemma. You are falling into a trap of your own making and will end by losing your skin. If you do not call the meeting, people will say that you have followed the advice of the Chinese and the Marxist-Leninist parties, and you will lose face. If you do call the meeting, you will land yourselves in an impasse without any way out. In the present historical juncture this is a grave crisis for you revisionists, a crisis of your own making. Are you not aware of it? We firmly believe that the day your so-called meeting takes place will be the day you step into your grave.

Dear comrades! Once again we sincerely advise you to rein in on the brink of the precipice and not to prize such false and useless “face-saving”; But if you refuse to listen and are determined to take the road to doom, well, suit yourselves! Then we will only be able to say:

*Flowers fall off, do what one may;
Swallows return, no strangers they.*⁵²¹

With fraternal greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China**

⁵²¹ Two verses from a poem of Yan Shu (991-1055), *Washing Creek Sands (Huan xi sha)*. The poem urges the listener to enjoy the present moment, as things are about to change —Ed.

Letter of the CC of the CPC of August 30, 1964

August 30, 1964

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 16, 1964, pp. 4-6.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, September 4, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 36, pp. 6-7.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has received the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated July 30, 1964. Completely ignoring the desire of fraternal parties for unity and their opposition to a split, your letter slams the door tight against consultations on the question of convening an international meeting of the fraternal parties and issues the order for an open split in the international communist movement.

We pointed out in our letter to you of July 28 this year that “you are determined to prepare and call a meeting arbitrarily, unilaterally and illegally with the aim of effecting an open split in the international communist movement” and that “you have laid down a revisionist political program and a divisive organizational line for an international meeting of the fraternal parties.” We stated, “You have premeditated everything: what kind of meeting it is to be, who should prepare it, who should take part in it and who should convene it—on all these questions you claim the last word” To you, all the fraternal parties are mere puppets qualified only to move at your command. We also explained the consequences to you, pointing out that in calling a small schismatic gathering which is against communism, against the people and against the revolution you would wilfully take the road to your doom, and we sincerely advised you to rein in on the brink of the precipice.

In your letter of July 30, you pay no heed whatsoever to our letter of July 28. You also turn a deaf ear to the recent appeals of many fraternal parties opposing the calling of a hasty schismatic meeting.

In your letter you arbitrarily lay it down that a drafting committee shall be convened without the prior attainment of unanimous agreement through

bilateral and multilateral talks by the Chinese and Soviet parties and all the other fraternal parties concerned. The members of the drafting committee must be the twenty-six parties you have designated, no more and no less, and there is no room for any discussion on this question. Every member party of the drafting committee must immediately submit to you a list of its delegates who must report in Moscow before December 15 without fail.

You even decide before the convening of your appointed drafting committee that an international meeting shall be held in the middle of next year.

Furthermore, you have the effrontery to declare in your letter that, whether or not the fraternal parties participate, the drafting committee you have designated shall open shop as scheduled and the international meeting unilaterally called by you shall begin on the date prescribed.

Thus the day in December 1964 on which you convene your drafting committee will go down in history as the day of the great split in the international communist movement.

You have used many fine words in your letter in order to deceive public opinion. you say that your purpose in calling an international meeting is to “preserve” and “strengthen” unity and not to effect a split. If that were so, then at least the procedures and steps for preparing and convening an international meeting of the fraternal parties should be decided by unanimous agreement among all the fraternal parties of the world through bilateral or multilateral talks in accordance with the principle of consultation on an equal footing. But completely violating the principle of achieving unanimity through consultation among the fraternal parties, ignoring the views of fraternal parties opposed to a hurried meeting, and not caring whether or not the fraternal parties participate, you are determined to call a meeting. Is there the least desire for unity in all this? Is it not clear that you are working for a split?

You say that in calling the international meeting you want to seek “things in common which unite all the fraternal parties.” This is a whopping lie. The fraternal parties do indeed have things in common—they are the revolutionary principles of the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960. But you have long since thrown these things in common overboard and are proceeding further and further down the road of revisionism. So far from showing any desire to renounce your revisionist line, you now insist on forc-

ing it on the international meeting. In these circumstances, what is there in common between yourselves and the world's Marxist-Leninists?

Today, the most urgent common task before the Communists and revolutionary people of the world is to oppose US imperialism and its lackeys. But you are bent on colluding with the US imperialists and on seeking common ground uniting you with them. You have repeatedly indicated to US imperialism that you want to disengage from all fronts of struggle against it. When US imperialism recently launched its armed aggression against a fraternal socialist country, the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, not only did you fail to declare explicit support for Viet Nam in its struggle against US aggression, but you even aided and abetted the aggressor by actively supporting the US attempt to intervene in Viet Nam through the United Nations. While you pursue this anti-communist, anti-popular and anti-revolutionary line, how can the Marxist-Leninists reach any agreement or take any common action with you?

Moreover, you are using every kind of threat to intimidate other fraternal parties as well as us. In fact, you are banking on your subversion and disruption of fraternal parties through your collusion with the imperialists and reactionaries and through your employment of right-wing Social Democrats, Trotskyites, defectors and renegades. These activities of yours are nothing to be afraid of; you have already done more than enough in this line. The more you act in this way, the more things will develop contrary to your wishes. It is beyond your power to subvert or disrupt the fraternal parties upholding Marxism-Leninism. On the contrary, in the struggle against you they will grow in staunchness and in numbers. Your contemptible activities will only further reveal your true features as betrayers of the revolution. "How can ants topple the giant tree?" Taken together, the imperialists, the reactionaries and the revisionists are a mere handful whom history will discard.

Concerning the preparation and convening of an international meeting and its composition, we have repeatedly said that it is necessary to achieve unanimity of views through consultation among all the fraternal parties, including the old ones and those rebuilt or newly founded. Otherwise, no matter what drafting committee or international meeting you convene, it will be illegal.

We will never be taken in by your fine words, never submit to your threats, never be accomplices in your divisive activities and never share with you the responsibility for splitting the international communist movement. If we

were to take part in your schismatic meeting, it would be tantamount to legalizing your illegal activities, to recognizing your right to destroy the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as laid down in the Declaration and the Statement, and to accepting the CPSU as a patriarchal father party. Naturally we will never act this way, for we hold ourselves bound by principles and responsible to history.

Here we reiterate the stand of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China as stated in our letter to the Central Committee of the CPSU dated July 28, 1964:

The Communist Party of China persists in its stand for an international meeting of the fraternal parties for unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, to be held after ample preparations, and we are firmly opposed to your schismatic meeting.

The Central Committee of the CPC solemnly declares: We will never take part in any international meeting or any preparatory meeting for it, which you call for the purpose of splitting the international communist movement.

In unilaterally deciding to convene a drafting committee in December this year and an international meeting in the middle of the next year, you must be held responsible for all the consequences of openly splitting the international communist movement.

Together with all the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties and all the Marxist-Leninists of the world, the Communist Party of China is determined to raise still higher the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism, the banner of unity based on proletarian internationalism and the militant banner of anti-imperialism, and is determined to carry to the end the struggle against your revisionism, your splittism and your capitulationism.

We have already warned you that the day you call a schismatic meeting will be the day you step into your grave. Your letter of July 30 shows that, disregarding all consequences, you have taken another long step towards this grave of your own digging. At this critical juncture, we hope you will weigh the pros and cons and choose carefully between continuing on the road to doom and turning back to safety.

With fraternal greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China**

Why Khrushchev Fell

EDITORIAL IN THE *RED FLAG*

November 21, 1964

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, Nos. 21-22, 1964, pp. 1-8.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, November 27, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 48,
pp. 6-9.

Khrushchev has fallen.

This arch-schemer who usurped the leadership of the Soviet Party and State, this number one representative of modern revisionism, has finally been driven off the stage of history.

This is a very good thing and is advantageous to the revolutionary cause of the people of the world.

The collapse of Khrushchev is a great victory for the Marxist-Leninists of the world in their persistent struggle against revisionism. It marks the bankruptcy, the fiasco of modern revisionism.

How was it that Khrushchev fell? Why couldn't he muddle on any longer?

This question has aroused different comments from different political groups all over the world.

The imperialists, the reactionaries, and the opportunists and revisionists of all shades, whether they sympathize with Khrushchev or have had conflicts of interest with him, have expressed varied views on the sudden collapse of this seemingly "strong man," Khrushchev.

Many communist and workers' parties have also published articles or documents expressing their opinion on Khrushchev's downfall.

In the present article we too would like to discuss the question of Khrushchev's downfall.

For Marxist-Leninists, this downfall is not something which is hard to understand. Indeed, it may be said to have been fully expected. Marxist-Leninists had long foreseen that Khrushchev would come to such an end.

People may list hundreds or even thousands of charges against Khrushchev to account for his collapse. But the most important one of all is that he has vainly tried to obstruct the advance of history, flying in the face of the

law of historical development as discovered by Marxism-Leninism and of the revolutionary will of the people of the Soviet Union and the whole world. Any obstacle on the peoples road of advance must be removed. The people were sure to reject Khrushchev, whether he and his kind liked it or not. Khrushchev's downfall is the inevitable result of the anti-revisionist struggle waged staunchly by the people of the Soviet Union and revolutionary people throughout the world.

Ours is an epoch in which world capitalism and imperialism are moving towards their doom and socialism and communism are marching towards victory. The historic mission this epoch has placed on the people is to bring the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the exploitation of man by man through their own efforts and in the light of the concrete conditions of their respective countries. This is the inexorable trend of historical development, and the common demand of the revolutionary people of the world. This historical trend is an objective law which operates independently of man's will, and it is irresistible. But Khrushchev, this buffoon on the contemporary political stage, chose to go against this trend in the vain hope of turning the wheel of history back onto the old capitalist road and of thus prolonging the life of the moribund exploiting classes and their moribund system of exploitation.

Khrushchev collected all the anti-Marxist views of history's opportunists and revisionists and out of them knocked together a full-fledged revisionist line consisting of "peaceful coexistence," "peaceful competition," "peaceful transition," "the state of the whole people" and "the party of the entire people." He pursued a capitulationist line towards imperialism and used the theory of class conciliation to oppose and liquidate the people's revolutionary struggles. In the international communist movement, he enforced a divisive line, replacing proletarian internationalism with great-power chauvinism. In the Soviet Union he worked hard to disintegrate the dictatorship of the proletariat, attempting to replace the socialist system with the ideology, politics, economy and culture of the bourgeoisie, and to restore capitalism.

In the last eleven years, exploiting the prestige of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the first socialist country that had been built up under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, Khrushchev did all the bad things he possibly could in contravention of the genuine will of the Soviet people. These bad things may be summed up as follows:

1. On the pretext of “combating the personality cult” and using the most scurrilous language, he railed at Stalin, the leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people. In opposing Stalin, he opposed Marxism-Leninism. He tried at one stroke to write off all the great achievements of the Soviet people in the entire period under Stalin’s leadership in order to defame the dictatorship of the proletariat, the socialist system, the great Soviet Communist Party, the great Soviet Union and the international communist movement. In so doing, Khrushchev provided the imperialists and the reactionaries of all countries with the dirtiest of weapons for their anti-Soviet and anti-Communist activities.

2. In open violation of the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960, he sought “all-round cooperation” with US imperialism and fallaciously maintained that the heads of the Soviet Union and the United States would “decide the fate of humanity,” constantly praising the chieftains of US imperialism as “having a sincere desire for peace.” Pursuing an adventurist policy at one moment, he transported guided missiles to Cuba, and pursuing a capitulationist policy at another, he docilely withdrew the missiles and bombers from Cuba on the order of the US pirates. He accepted inspection by the US fleet and even tried to sell out Cuba’s sovereignty by agreeing, behind the Cuban Government’s back, to the “inspection” of Cuba by the United Nations, which is under US control. In so doing, Khrushchev brought a humiliating disgrace upon the great Soviet people unheard of in the forty years and more since the October Revolution.

3. To cater to the US imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail and prevent socialist China from building up her own nuclear strength for self-defense, he did not hesitate to damage the defense capabilities of the Soviet Union itself and concluded the so-called partial nuclear test ban treaty in collusion with the two imperialist powers of the United States and Britain. Facts have shown that this treaty is a pure swindle. In signing this treaty Khrushchev perversely tried to sell out the interests of the Soviet people, the people of all the socialist countries and all the peace-loving people of the world.

4. In the name of “peaceful transition” he tried by every means to obstruct the revolutionary movements of the people in the capitalist countries, demanding that they take the so-called legal, parliamentary road. This erroneous line paralyzes the revolutionary will of the proletariat and disarms the revolutionary people ideologically, causing serious setbacks to the cause of revolution in certain countries. It has made the communist parties in a num-

ber of capitalist countries lifeless social-democratic parties of a new type and caused them to degenerate into servile tools of the bourgeoisie.

5. Under the signboard of “peaceful coexistence” he did his utmost to oppose and sabotage the national liberation movement and went so far as to work hand in glove with US imperialism in suppressing the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations. He instructed the Soviet delegate at the United Nations to vote for the dispatch of forces of aggression to the Congo, which helped the US imperialists to suppress the Congolese people, and he used Soviet transport facilities to move these so-called United Nations troops to the Congo. He actually opposed the revolutionary struggles of the Algerian people, describing the Algerian national liberation struggle as an “internal affair” of France. He had the audacity to “stand aloof” over the events in the Gulf of Bac Bo engineered by US imperialism against Viet Nam, and cudged his brains for ways to help the US provocateurs get out of their predicament and to whitewash the criminal aggression of the US pirates.

6. In brazen violation of the Statement of 1960, he spared no effort to reverse its verdict on the renegade Tito clique, describing Tito who had degenerated into a lackey of US imperialism as a “Marxist-Leninist” and Yugoslavia which had degenerated into a capitalist country as a “socialist country.” Time and again he declared that he and the Tito clique had “the same ideology” and were “guided by the same theory” and expressed his desire to learn modestly from this renegade who had betrayed the interests of the Yugoslav people and sabotaged the international communist movement.

7. He regarded Albania, a fraternal socialist country, as his sworn enemy, devising every possible means to injure and undermine it, and only wishing he could devour it in one gulp. He brazenly broke off all economic and diplomatic relations with Albania, arbitrarily deprived it of its legitimate rights as a member state in the Warsaw Treaty Organization and in the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, and publicly called for the overthrow of its Party and state leadership.

8. He nourished an inveterate hatred for the Communist Party of China which upholds Marxism-Leninism and a revolutionary line, because the Chinese Communist Party was a great obstacle to his effort to press on with revisionism and capitulationism. He spread innumerable rumors and slanders against the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao Zedong and resorted to every kind of baseness in his futile attempt to subvert socialist China. He perfidiously tore up several hundred agreements and contracts

and arbitrarily withdrew more than one thousand Soviet experts working in China. He engineered border disputes between China and the Soviet Union and even conducted large-scale subversive activities in Sinkiang. He backed the reactionaries of India in their armed attacks on socialist China and, together with the United States, incited and helped them to perpetrate armed provocations against China by giving them military aid.

9. In flagrant violation of the principles guiding relations among the fraternal countries, he encroached upon their independence and sovereignty and willfully interfered in their internal affairs. In the name of “mutual economic assistance,” he opposed the independent development of the economies of fraternal countries and forced them to become a source of raw materials and an outlet for finished goods, thus reducing their industries to appendages. He bragged that these were all new theories and doctrines of his own invention, but in fact they were the jungle law of the capitalist world which he applied to relations among socialist countries, taking the Common Market of the monopoly capitalist blocs as his model.

10. In complete violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties, he resorted to all sorts of schemes to carry out subversive and disruptive activities against them. Not only did he use the sessions of the Central Committee and Congress of his own Party as well as the Congresses of some fraternal parties to launch overt, large-scale unbridled attacks on the fraternal parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism, but in the case of many fraternal parties he shamelessly bought over political degenerates, renegades and turncoats to support his revisionist line, to attack and even illegally expel Marxist-Leninists from these parties, thus creating splits without considering the consequences.

11. He wantonly violated the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation among fraternal parties and, playing the “patriarchal father party” role, he willfully decided to convene an illegal international meeting of the fraternal parties. In the notice dated July 30, 1964, he ordered that a meeting of the so-called drafting committee of the twenty-six fraternal parties be held on December 15 this year, so as to create an open split in the international communist movement.

12. To cater to the needs of the imperialists and the domestic forces of capitalism, he pursued a series of revisionist policies leading back to capitalism. Under the signboard of the “state of the whole people,” he abolished the dictatorship of the proletariat; under the signboard of the “party of the entire

people,” he altered the proletarian character of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and divided the Party into an “industrial” and an “agricultural” party in contravention of the Marxist-Leninist principle of party organization. Under the signboard of “full-scale communist construction” he tried in a thousand and one ways to switch back to the old path of capitalism the world’s first socialist state which the Soviet people under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin had created by their sweat and blood. His blind direction of Soviet agriculture and industry wrought great havoc with the Soviet national economy and brought great difficulties to the life of the Soviet people.

Everything Khrushchev did over the last eleven years proves that the policy he pursued was one of alliance with imperialism against socialism, alliance with the United States against China, alliance with the reactionaries everywhere against the national liberation movements and the people’s revolutions, and alliance with the Tito clique and renegades of all descriptions against all Marxist-Leninist fraternal parties and all revolutionaries fighting imperialism. This policy of Khrushchev’s has jeopardized the basic interests of the Soviet people, the people of the countries of the socialist camp and the revolutionary people all over the world.

Such are the so-called meritorious deeds of Khrushchev.

The downfall of a fellow like Khrushchev is certainly not due to old age or ill health, nor is it merely due to mistakes in his methods of work and style of leadership. Khrushchev’s downfall is the result of the revisionist general line and the many erroneous policies he pursued at home and abroad.

Khrushchev considered the masses of the people as simply beneath his notice, thinking that he could manipulate the destiny of the Soviet people at his own sweet will and that the “heads” of the two great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, could settle the destiny of the people of all countries. To him, the people were nothing but fools and he alone was the “hero” making history. He vainly tried to force the Soviet people and the people of other countries to prostrate themselves under his revisionist baton. Thus he placed himself in direct opposition to the Soviet people, to the people of the countries of the socialist camp and to the proletariat and revolutionary people of the whole world, and got himself into an impasse—he was deserted by his own followers and could not extricate himself from internal and external difficulties. He put the noose around his own neck—dug his own grave.

History has witnessed many buffoons who cherished the idle hope of turning back the tide of history, but they all came to an ignominious end. Countless instances have demonstrated that the evil-doer who goes counter to the needs of social development and the will of the people can only end up as a ridiculous good-for-nothing, no matter what kind of “hero” he may have been, and no matter how arrogant. To start with the aim of doing harm to others only to end up by ruining oneself—such is the general law governing these people.

“Personages” such as Bakunin in the period of the First International were arrogant anti-Marxist “heroes” in their day, but they were soon relegated to the garbage-heap of history. Anti-Marxist “heroes” like Bernstein and Kautsky in the period of the Second International were once “formidable giants” entrenched in leading positions, but in the end history wrote them down as notorious renegades. Trotsky, the ringleader of the opposition faction, decked himself out as a “hero” after Lenin’s death, but facts confirmed the correctness of Stalin’s remark: “he resembles an actor rather than a hero; and an actor should not be confused with a hero under any circumstances.”

“But progress is the eternal law of man’s world.” History has taught us that whoever wants to stop the wheel of history will be ground to dust. As Comrade Mao Zedong has repeatedly pointed out, imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers, and the revisionists are too. However rampant and overbearing they may be, “heroes” representing reactionary classes and reactionary forces are actually paper tigers, powerful only in appearance; they are only fleeting transients soon to be overwhelmed by the surging waves of history. Khrushchev is no exception. Just think of his inordinate arrogance in the days when he viciously attacked Stalin and Marxism-Leninism at the 20th and 22nd Congresses, and when at the Bucharest meeting he launched his surprise attack on the Chinese Communist Party which upholds Marxism-Leninism. But it did not take long for this anti-Soviet, anti-Communist and anti-Chinese “hero” to meet the same fate as his revisionist predecessors. However much people reasoned with him and asked him to return to the fold, he paid not the slightest heed and finally plunged to his doom.

Khrushchev has fallen and the revisionist line he enthusiastically pursued is discredited, but Marxism-Leninism will continue to overcome the revisionist trend and forge ahead, and the revolutionary movement of the people

of all countries will continue to sweep away the obstacles in its path and surge forward.

Nevertheless, the course of history will continue to be tortuous. Although Khrushchev has fallen, his supporters—the US imperialists, the reactionaries and the modern revisionists—will not resign themselves to this failure. These ogres are continuing to pray for Khrushchev and are trying to “resurrect” him with their incantations, vociferously proclaiming his “contributions” and “meritorious deeds” in the hope that events will develop along the lines prescribed by Khrushchev, so that “Khrushchevism without Khrushchev” may prevail. It can be asserted categorically that theirs is a blind alley.

Different ideological trends and their representatives invariably strive to take the stage and perform. It is entirely up to them to decide which direction they will take. But there is one point on which we have not the slightest doubt. History will develop in accordance with the laws discovered by Marxism-Leninism; it will march forward along the road of the October Revolution. Beyond all doubt, the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the great Soviet people, with their revolutionary traditions, are fully capable of making new contributions in safeguarding the great socialist achievements, the lofty prestige of the first socialist power founded by Lenin, the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the victorious advance of the revolutionary cause of the proletariat.

Let the international communist movement unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism!

Appendix

Appendix 1

Outline of Views on the Question of Peaceful Transition

A WRITTEN OUTLINE PRESENTED BY THE DELEGATION OF THE CPC TO
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU

November 10, 1957

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 17, 1963, pp. 28-30.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, September 13, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 37, pp. 21-22.

1. On the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism, it would be more flexible to refer to the two possibilities, peaceful transition and non-peaceful transition, than to just one, and this would place us in a position where we can have the initiative politically at any time.

a. Referring to the possibility of peaceful transition indicates that for us, the use of violence is primarily a matter of self-defense. It enables the communist parties in the capitalist countries to sidestep attacks on them on this issue, and it is politically advantageous—advantageous for winning the masses and also for depriving the bourgeoisie of its pretexts for such attacks and isolating it.

b. If practical possibilities for peaceful transition were to arise in individual countries in the future when the international or domestic situation changes drastically, we could then make timely use of the opportunity to win the support of the masses and solve the problem of state power by peaceful means.

c. Nevertheless, we should not tie our own hands because of this desire. The bourgeoisie will not step down from the stage of history voluntarily. This is a universal law of class struggle. In no country should the proletariat and the Communist Party slacken their preparations for the revolution in any way. They must be prepared at all times to repulse counter-revolutionary attacks and, at the critical juncture of the revolution when the working class is seizing state power, to overthrow the bourgeoisie by armed force if it uses armed force to suppress the people's revolution (generally speaking, it is inevitable that the bourgeoisie will do so)

2. In the present situation of the international communist movement, it is advantageous from the point of view of tactics to refer to the desire for peaceful transition. But it would be inappropriate to over-emphasize the possibility of peaceful transition. The reasons are:

a. Possibility and reality, the desire and whether or not it can be fulfilled, are two different matters. We should refer to the desire for peaceful transition, but we should not place our hopes mainly on it and therefore should not over-emphasize this aspect.

b. If too much stress is laid on the possibility of peaceful transition, and especially on the possibility of seizing state power by winning a majority in parliament it is liable to weaken the revolutionary will of the proletariat, the working people and the Communist Party and disarm them ideologically. To the best of our knowledge, there is still not a single country where this possibility is of any practical significance. Even if it is slightly more apparent in a particular country, over-emphasizing this possibility is inappropriate because it does not conform to the realities in the overwhelming majority of countries. Should such a possibility actually occur in some country, the Communist Party there must on the one hand strive to realize it, and on the other hand always be prepared to repulse the armed attacks of the bourgeoisie.

d. The result of emphasizing this possibility will neither weaken the reactionary nature of the bourgeoisie nor lull them.

e. Nor will such emphasis make the social democratic parties any more revolutionary.

f. Nor will such emphasis make communist parties grow any stronger. On the contrary, if some communist parties should as a result obscure their revolutionary features and thus become confused with the social democratic parties in the eyes of the people, they would only be weakened.

g. It is very hard to accumulate strength and prepare for the revolution, and after all, parliamentary struggle is easy in comparison. We must fully utilize the parliamentary form of struggle, but its role is limited. What is most important is to proceed with the hard work of accumulating revolutionary strength.

3. To obtain a majority in parliament is not the same as smashing the old state machinery (chiefly the armed forces) and establishing new state machinery (chiefly the armed forces). Unless the military-bureaucratic state machinery of the bourgeoisie is smashed, a parliamentary majority for the proletariat and their reliable allies will either be impossible (because the bourgeoisie will

amend the constitution whenever necessary in order to facilitate the consolidation of their dictatorship) or undependable (for instance, elections may be declared null and void, the Communist Party may be outlawed, parliament may be dissolved, etc.).

4. Peaceful transition to socialism should not be interpreted in such a way as solely to mean transition through a parliamentary majority. The main question is that of the state machinery. In the 1870s, Marx was of the opinion that there was a possibility of achieving socialism in Britain by peaceful means, because “at that time England was a country in which militarism and bureaucracy were less pronounced than in any other.” For a period after the February Revolution, Lenin hoped that through “all power to the Soviets” the revolution would develop peacefully and triumph, because at that time “the arms were in the hands of the people.” Neither Marx nor Lenin meant that peaceful transition could be realized by using the old state machinery. Lenin repeatedly elaborated on the famous saying of Marx and Engels, “The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes.”

5. The social democratic parties are not parties of socialism. With the exception of certain Left wings, they are parties serving the bourgeoisie and capitalism. They are a variant of bourgeois political parties. On the question of socialist revolution, our position is fundamentally different from that of the social democratic parties. This distinction must not be obscured. To obscure this distinction only helps the leaders of the social democratic parties to deceive the masses and hinders us from winning the masses away from the influence of the social democratic parties. However, it is unquestionably very important to strengthen our work with respect to the social democratic parties and strive to establish a united front with their left and middle groups.

6. Such is our understanding of this question. We do hold differing views on this question, but out of various considerations we did not state our views after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Since a joint Declaration is to be issued, we must now explain our views. However, this need not prevent us from attaining common language in the draft Declaration. In order to show a connection between the formulation of this question in the draft Declaration and the formulation of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we agree to take the draft put forward today by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a basis, while proposing amendments in certain places.

Appendix 2

Statement of the Delegation of the Communist Party of China at the Bucharest Meeting of Fraternal Parties

June 26, 1960

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 17, 1963, pp. 30-31.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, September 13, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 37, pp. 22-23.

- (1) The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China maintains that at this meeting Comrade Khrushchev of the Delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has completely violated the long-standing principle in the international communist movement that questions of common concern should be settled by consultation among fraternal parties, and has completely broken the agreement made prior to the meeting to confine it to an exchange of views and not to make any decision; this he has done by his surprise attack of putting forward a draft communique of the meeting without having consulted the fraternal parties on its contents beforehand and without permitting full and normal discussion in the meeting. This is an abuse of the prestige enjoyed by the CPSU in the international communist movement, a prestige which has been built up over the long years since Lenin's time, and it is, moreover, an extremely crude act of imposing one's own will on other people. This attitude has nothing in common with Lenin's style of work and this way of doing things creates an extremely bad precedent in the international communist movement. The Central Committee of the CPC considers that this attitude and this way of doing things on the part of Comrade Khrushchev will have extraordinarily grave consequences for the international communist movement.
- (2) The Communist Party of China has always been faithful to Marxism-Leninism and has always steadfastly adhered to the theoretical positions of Marxism-Leninism. In the past two years and more, it has been completely faithful to the Moscow Declaration of 1957, and has

firmly upheld all the Marxist-Leninist theses of the Declaration. There are differences between us and Comrade Khrushchev on a series of fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. These differences have a vital bearing on the interests of the entire socialist camp, on the interests of the proletariat and the working people of the whole world, on the question of whether the people of all countries will be able to preserve world peace and prevent the imperialists from launching a world war, and on the question of whether socialism will continue to score victories in the capitalist world, which comprises two-thirds of the world's population and three-fourths of its land space. All Marxist-Leninists should adopt a serious attitude towards these differences, give them serious thought and hold comradely discussions, so as to achieve unanimous conclusions. However, the attitude Comrade Khrushchev has adopted is patriarchal, arbitrary and tyrannical. He has in fact treated the relationship between the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union and our Party not as one between brothers, but as one between patriarchal father and son. At this meeting he has exerted pressure in an attempt to make our Party submit to his non-Marxist-Leninist views. We hereby solemnly declare that our Party believes in and obeys the truth of Marxism-Leninism and Marxism-Leninism alone, and will never submit to erroneous views which run counter to Marxism-Leninism. We consider that certain views expressed by Comrade Khrushchev in his speech at the Third Congress of the Rumanian Party are erroneous and in contravention of the Moscow Declaration. His speech will be welcomed by the imperialists and the Tito clique and has indeed already been welcomed by them. When the occasion arises, we shall be ready to carry on serious discussions with the CPSU and other fraternal parties on our differences with Comrade Khrushchev. As for the Letter of Information of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Communist Party of China, which Comrade Khrushchev has distributed in Bucharest, the Central Committee of the CPC will reply to it in detail after carefully studying it; the reply will explain the differences of principle between the two Parties, setting forth the relevant facts, and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China will hold serious, earnest and comradely discussions with fraternal parties. We are convinced that in any case the truth of Marxism-Leninism will triumph in the end. Truth does not

fear contention. Ultimately, it is impossible to portray truth as error or error as truth. The future of the international communist movement depends on the needs and the struggles of the people of all countries and on the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, and will never be decided by the baton of any individual.

- (3) We, the Communist Party of China, have always striven to safeguard the unity of all communist parties and the unity of all socialist countries. For the sake of genuine unity in the international communist ranks and for the sake of the common struggle against imperialism and reaction, we hold that it is necessary to unfold normal discussions on the differences and that serious questions of principle should not be settled in a hurry by abnormal methods or simply by vote. Nor should one impose on others arbitrary views which have not been tested in practice or which have already proved to be wrong in such tests. Comrade Khrushchev's way of doing things at this meeting is entirely detrimental to the unity of international communism. But however Comrade Khrushchev may act, the unity of the Chinese and Soviet Parties and the unity of all the communist and workers' parties is bound to be further strengthened and developed. We are deeply convinced that, as the international communist movement and Marxism-Leninism develop, the unity of our ranks will constantly grow stronger.
- (4) If the relations between our two Parties are viewed as a whole, the above-mentioned differences between Comrade Khrushchev and ourselves are only of a partial character. We hold that the main thing in the relations between our two Parties is their unity in the struggle for the common cause; this is so because both our countries are socialist countries and both our Parties are built on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and are fighting to advance the cause of the whole socialist camp, to oppose imperialist aggression and to win world peace. We believe that Comrade Khrushchev and the Central Committee of the CPSU and we ourselves will be able to find opportunities to hold calm and comradely discussions and resolve our differences, so that the Chinese and Soviet Parties may become more united and their relations further strengthened. This will be highly beneficial to the socialist camp and to the struggle of the people of the world against imperialist aggression and for world peace.

- (5) We are glad to see that the Draft Communique of the Meeting put forward here affirms the correctness of the Moscow Declaration. But the presentation of the Marxist-Leninist theses of the Moscow Declaration in this draft is inaccurate and one-sided. And it is wrong that the draft avoids taking a clear stand on the major problems in the current international situation and makes no mention at all of modern revisionism, the main danger in the international working-class movement. Therefore, this draft is unacceptable to us. For the sake of unity in the common struggle against the enemy, we have submitted a revised draft and propose that it be discussed. If it is not possible to reach agreement this time, we propose that a special drafting committee be set up to work out, after full discussions a document which is acceptable to all.

Appendix 3

The Five Proposals for Settlement of the Differences and Attainment of Unity Contained in the Letter of the Central Committee of the CPC in Reply to the Letter of Information of the Central Committee of the CPSU

September 10, 1960

Source: *Red Flag (Hongqi)*, No. 17, 1963, p. 32.

Translation: *Beijing Review*, September 13, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 37, p. 23.

Striving to settle the differences successfully and to attain unity, we put forward the following proposals in all sincerity:

1. The fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the Declaration and the Manifesto of the 1957 Moscow Meeting are the ideological foundation for the unity between our two Parties and among all fraternal parties. All our statements and actions must be absolutely loyal to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the Moscow Declaration, which we should use as the criteria for judging between truth and falsehood.
2. The relations among the socialist countries and among the fraternal parties must strictly conform to the principles of equality, comradeship and internationalism as stipulated by the Moscow Declaration.
3. All disputes among the socialist countries and among the fraternal parties must be settled in accordance with the stipulations of the Moscow Declaration, through comradesly and unhurried discussion. Both the Soviet Union and China, and both the Soviet and Chinese Parties, bear great responsibilities regarding the international situation and towards the international communist movement. They should have full consultations and unhurried discussions on all important questions of common concern in order to have unity of action. If the disputes between the Chinese and Soviet Parties cannot be settled for the time being in consultations between the two Parties, then unhurried discussions should be continued. When necessary, the views of both

sides should be presented completely objectively to the communist and workers' parties of all countries so that these parties may make correct judgements after serious deliberation and in accordance with Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the Moscow Declaration.

4. It is of the utmost importance for Communists to draw a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves, between truth and falsehood. Our two Parties should treasure and value our friendship and join hands to oppose the enemy, and should not make statements or take actions liable to undermine the unity between the two Parties and the two countries and thus give the enemy the opportunity of driving a wedge between us.
5. On the basis of the above principles, our two Parties, together with other communist and workers' parties, should strive through full preparation and consultation to make a success of the meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties of all countries to be held in Moscow in November this year, and, at this meeting, should work out a document conforming to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the 1957 Moscow Declaration to serve as a program to which we should all adhere, a program for our united struggle against the enemy.

Letters of the CPSU

Letter of the CC of the CPSU of February 21, 1963

February 21, 1963

Source: *Beijing Review*, March 22, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 12, pp. 8-10.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, guided by the supreme interests of our Common cause, has decided to write this letter to you in order to express our considerations concerning the need to make a common effort to strengthen the unity of the world communist movement in accordance with the principles of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism, the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow meetings. We are addressing you, being deeply convinced that in the present conditions there is no task more important for the Marxist-Leninist parties than the struggle for the cohesion of our ranks, for strengthening the unity of all the socialist countries.

All who treasure the great cause of peace and socialism cannot but feel serious concern over the situation which has arisen of late in the communist movement. The open, ever aggravating polemics are shaking the unity of fraternal parties, seriously damaging our common interests. The disputes which have arisen within the ranks of the international communist movement obstruct the successful struggle against imperialism, weaken the efforts of the socialist countries in the international arena, adversely affect the activities of fraternal parties, especially of those in capitalist countries where a complicated internal political situation has arisen.

The enemies of socialism are striving to take advantage of the differences that have arisen within the communist movement to divide the socialist countries, to split the national-liberation movement, to strengthen their own positions.

In conditions of the new balance of forces in 'the world, the imperialist aggressors are not in a position to overpower the closely welded socialist community militarily. Therefore, they put their main stake on subverting our cohesion. Unless we have unity in the fight against our common enemy,

if we act separately in the face of imperialism, that can only weaken our efforts and, therefore, strengthen the positions of the enemies of socialism. The direct duty of Marxist-Leninist parties, above all, the biggest parties like the CPSU and the CPC, is not to allow events to develop in a direction that would confront the communist movement with serious difficulties, to do everything in order to eliminate 'the present abnormal situation and achieve unity of the ranks of the communist movement, and cohesion of the socialist community.

We are deeply convinced that the difficulties experienced now by the communist movement are transient and can surely be overcome. We possess everything needed to strengthen our unity and cohesion. Evaluating the present situation from the viewpoint of the historical prospects of the development of world socialism, one cannot but come to the conclusion that the common, the main things that unite the CPSU, the CPC, all the Marxist-Leninist parties, are immeasurably higher and more significant than the existing differences. We are welded together by the unity of the class interests of the proletariat, of the working people of the whole world, by the great Marxist-Leninist teaching. No matter how serious our differences might seem today, one cannot forget that in the great historical struggle of the forces of socialism against capitalism, we are standing with you on the same side of the barricade.

Being aware of the entire complexity of the present situation, we hold at the same time that the existing differences should not be exaggerated and the colours laid too thick.

An objective analysis of the discussion going on in the communist movement shows that in many instances in the course of the polemics the differences that arise are artificially inflated and exacerbated, an overdue accent is made on disputed issues. The heat of polemics at times prevents a calm and sober appraisal of the substance of the problems that have arisen, eclipsing the main things that underlie our unity.

The Marxist-Leninist parties jointly worked out programmatic documents—the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow meetings—the loyalty to which they invariably stress. Steadfastly carrying out the common line agreed upon by the world communist movement, the CPSU is waging active struggle against imperialism, for the triumph of the great ideals of socialism and communism all over the globe. Our Party spares no efforts in the struggle to prevent a new world war, to strengthen peace and the secu-

riety of the peoples. The CPSU and the Soviet Government by all means—economic, political, and even by rendering assistance in arms—support the national-liberation movement. Faithful to proletarian internationalism, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union always follows the militant slogan: “Workers of all countries, unite!” The CPSU works to strengthen the world socialist community to strengthen its influence on the entire course of historical development. The successes of communist construction in the Soviet Union are a contribution of our people to the cause of strengthening world socialism, raising its authority and force of attraction.

For its part, the Communist Party of China has continually pointed out that it firmly stands by the positions of the Declaration and the Statement and adheres to the conclusions and propositions contained therein, that its main aim is to struggle against imperialism, for the triumph of socialism and communism the world over. The CPC stresses its adherence to the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, acknowledges the correctness of the conclusion of the Statement concerning the possibility of preventing a new world war. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China recognizes that the principle of proletarian internationalism remains the main principle guiding mutual relations among the communist parties and the socialist countries, and affirms its loyalty to the slogan “Workers of all countries, unite!”

Common positions on such cardinal questions are a good basis for increasing cohesion and overcoming the difficulties that have arisen. Provided firm adherence to the documents of the Moscow meetings, there is no substantial reason for exacerbating the existing differences, because a correct solution can be found for them.

Of course, it is not excluded that different approaches to the understanding of certain problems of current world development can and do emerge in the communist movement. This can be explained by the different conditions in which this or that detachment of the world communist movement is working. But such differences in opinion, if not exaggerated artificially, should in no way resolve into a deep conflict; they can well be overcome through joint comradely consultations.

In view of all that, the Central Committee of the CPSU considers that it is especially important to take immediate concrete practical steps to ensure our unity, to improve the climate in the relations between all fraternal parties. It was these considerations that guided the First Secretary of the Central Com-

mittee of the CPSU Comrade N. S. Khrushchev when speaking at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany he proposed on behalf of our Party that polemics among communist parties be discontinued as well as criticism of other parties within one's own Party. As known, this proposal found a wide response and support in the world communist movement.

By writing this letter the Central Committee of the CPSU wants to make a new step towards overcoming the difficulties that have arisen. In the interests of strengthening our friendship and better mutual understanding we propose to the Central Committee of the CPC to hold a bilateral meeting of representatives of the CPSU and the CPC. Considering the importance of this meeting, and to be more sure of achieving its aims, we would rather have the aforementioned meeting held at a high level. During the talks it would be possible to take up point by point all the major questions of interest to both Parties, especially those relating to the common tasks of our struggle. As to the problems on which different viewpoints actually prove to exist, agreement should be reached on measures that would help make our positions closer to each other. If you agree to such a meeting, the place and time to hold it could be settled additionally.

A meeting of representatives of the CPSU and the CPC, the significance of which is obvious to everybody, would also play an important role in preparing a conference of Marxist-Leninist parties, in creating the favorable climate without which it could not work successfully.

The CPSU, like many other fraternal parties, has advocated as it does now, the convocation of the conference, considering that there are serious enough grounds for that. As we see it, the attention of the conference should be centered on the common tasks of the struggle against imperialism and its aggressive plans, for the further advancement of the liberation movement of the peoples, for the rallying and all-round development of the world socialist community and increasing its influence throughout the world, for strengthening the unity of the communist movement.

We have already set forth our view concerning the need to convene a conference in our letter to you of May 31, 1962, and confirm it now again. It is our common duty to do everything for the conference to lead to the further rallying of Marxist-Leninist parties and to greater unity. We are prepared to carefully study and support any initiative aimed at overcoming the existing difficulties. The main thing needed now is goodwill to settle on the basis of

Marxism-Leninism, the problems that have arisen, not to permit any actions that could obstruct the strengthening of our unity.

Dear Comrades,

All Marxist-Leninist parties are aware that a highly important moment has arrived in the development of the world communist movement. Upon us, upon our Parties, upon the correctness of our policy depends whether we shall continue marching further together in the same ranks, or shall allow ourselves to get involved in a hard and needless struggle which could only lead to mutual estrangement, to the weakening of the forces of socialism, and to undermining the unity of the world communist movement.

On our Parties rests the historical responsibility for enabling the Soviet and Chinese peoples to live like brothers. The unity of the CPSU and the CPC is of tremendous importance to the socialist community and to the entire communist movement. Future generations will not forgive us if in the present conditions in which acute struggle is going on between the two systems we should fail to find in ourselves the courage and strength, under the guidance of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism to surmount the existing differences. History has placed on the first detachments of the revolutionary movement, which have delivered their countries from the yoke of capitalism, the great task to establish and develop relations of a new type, brotherly and friendly relations between peoples, and to set the example of a future socialist society for all mankind. Our Parties are duty-bound to find a way out of the existing situation and courageously and resolutely sweep away what obstructs our friendship. This is the only road that Marxist-Leninists can and must take.

We, are deeply convinced that the overcoming of the differences that have arisen would accord not only with the interests of the CPSU and the CPC but also with the basic aims of the common struggle of the international communist movement for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism. It is only necessary to display goodwill and profound understanding of the aims and interests of our struggle; then no obstacle can prevent us from strengthening and developing our friendship and cohesion of the international communist movement.

With communist greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union**

Letter of the CC of the CPSU of March 30, 1963

March 30, 1963

Source: *Beijing Review*, June 21, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 25, pp. 23-32.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union notes with satisfaction that our proposals on measures aimed at strengthening unity and solidarity in the ranks of the communist movement have met with a favorable response on the part of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. We welcome your agreement to the holding of a meeting between representatives of the CPSU and CPC. This meeting is called upon to play an important part in creating a favorable atmosphere in relations between the fraternal parties and in smoothing out the differences which have arisen in recent times in the world communist movement. We would like to hope that as a result of this meeting it will be possible to carry out a number of constructive measures to surmount existing difficulties.

In its letter the CPC Central Committee invites Comrade N. S. Khrushchev to visit Beijing en route to Cambodia. The CPSU Central Committee and Comrade N. S. Khrushchev express gratitude for this invitation. Comrade N. S. Khrushchev would with great pleasure visit the People's Republic of China, and meet the leadership of the Communist Party of China to exchange views on urgent questions of the international situation and of the communist movement with the object of achieving a common understanding of our tasks and strengthening solidarity between our Parties. However, it is not in fact planned that Comrade N. S. Khrushchev will make a tour of Cambodia as you mention in your letter. As we all know, in conformity with a decision passed by our leading bodies on February 12, 1963, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, President of the Presidium of the US Supreme Soviet, will travel to Cambodia, as the Cambodian Government has already been notified and as has been announced in the press. Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, who has already visited the People's Republic of China three times, does not lose hope

of availing himself of your kind invitation in the future to visit China and meet the Chinese comrades.

We remember that during his stay in Moscow in 1957 Comrade Mao Zedong said that he had only been in the US twice and had only visited Moscow and Leningrad. He expressed the desire to visit the Soviet Union again to become better acquainted with our country. He said then that he would like to travel from the Far Eastern borders of our country to the western borders, and from the northern to the southern borders. We welcomed this desire of Comrade Mao Zedong.

The US Central Committee sent a letter to Comrade Mao Zedong on May 12, 1960, inviting him to come and spend a holiday in the US and familiarize himself with the life of the Soviet people. Unfortunately, Comrade Mao Zedong could not at that time avail himself of our invitation. The CPSU Central Committee would welcome a visit by Comrade Mao Zedong. The best time for such a visit would be the approaching spring or summer, which are the good seasons of the year in our country. We are also ready at any other time to give a worthy reception to Comrade Mao Zedong as a representative of a fraternal party and of the fraternal Chinese people. In this tour of our country, Comrade Mao Zedong would not, of course, be alone. Comrades from the leadership of our Party would go with him and it would be a fine opportunity for an exchange of opinion on different questions. Comrade Mao Zedong would be able to see how the Soviet people are working, and what successes they have scored in the construction of communism and in the implementation of the Program of our Party.

If a visit by Comrade Mao Zedong to Moscow cannot take place at present, we are ready to accept your ideas about a top level meeting between representatives of the CPSU and CPC in Moscow. We believe that a meeting of this kind could take place around May 15, 1963, if this date is acceptable to you.

We are very pleased that the Chinese comrades, like ourselves, regard the forthcoming meeting of representatives of the CPC and the CPSU as a "necessary step in preparing for the meeting of representatives of communist and workers' parties of all countries." Indeed, without violating the principle of equality and without infringing upon the interests of other fraternal parties, this meeting must facilitate the better preparation and holding of the meeting. Without such a meeting, and without the ending of open polemics in the press and of criticism within the Party of other fraternal parties, preparation

for the meeting and the achievement of its main aim—the strengthening of the unity of the international communist movement—would be difficult. Precisely for this reason the Central Committee of the CPSU, while agreeing with the proposals made by the Vietnamese, Indonesian, British, Swedish and other comrades at the beginning of 1962 regarding the convocation of a meeting of fraternal parties of all countries, at the same time stressed the need for taking such measures as would create a favorable atmosphere for the work of the world communist forum.

In its letter of February 22, 1962, the Central Committee of the CPSU urged that “unnecessary arguments be stopped regarding questions on which we have different opinions, that public statements capable of aggravating rather than smoothing out our differences be given up.” In the letter to the Central Committee of the CPC of May 31, 1962, we wrote:

As you are well aware, our Party has always come out and still comes out for collective discussion of vital problems of the world communist movement. The Central Committee of the CPSU was the initiator of the meetings of fraternal parties in 1957 and 1960. In both cases these meetings were connected with serious changes in the international situation and the need for working out corresponding tactics in the communist movement. Now too we fully support the proposal for the convocation of a meeting of all the fraternal parties.

We considered it would be useful in the preparations for such a meeting that the fraternal parties could thoroughly and profoundly analyse the new phenomena in international affairs and their own activity in carrying out the collective decisions of our movement. The Central Committee of the CPSU displayed concern, perfectly understandable to all Communists, that the meeting should not aggravate the differences but do as much as possible to overcome them.

In their pronouncements many of the leaders of fraternal parties have recently been justly expressing the same point of view on the necessity of taking, before the meeting, a number of steps to create a normal situation in the communist movement and to place conflicts of opinions within the permissible bounds of a comradely party discussion. Now you also agree with this, as is seen from your letter, and it can be said that certain progress has been made in the preparation of the forthcoming meeting.

It goes without saying that when our two Parties are discussing questions concerning all fraternal parties, the discussion can only be of a preliminary nature. The 1957 and 1960 Meetings have shown that the elaboration of the policy of the international communist movement can be successful only if all fraternal parties collectively take part in it and if due consideration is given to the extensive experience of all its component detachments.

We have attentively studied your views concerning the range of questions which could be discussed at the meeting of representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. These are important questions, and we are ready to discuss them.

In our turn, we would like to dwell in this letter on some questions of principle, which, in our opinion, are the center of attention of the fraternal parties and their struggle for our common cause. We do not mean, of course, an exhaustive statement of our views on these questions. We only wish to note that which is of paramount importance, by which we are guided in our policy in the international arena and in our relations with fraternal parties.

We hope that this statement of our views will help to define the range of questions requiring an exchange of opinions at a bilateral meeting and will contribute to overcoming the existing differences. We are doing this so as to stress once again our determination to uphold firmly and consistently the ideological standpoint of the entire world communist movement, its general line as expressed in the Declaration and the Statement.

During the time that has passed since the adoption of the Statement, experience has not only not invalidated any of its main conclusions, but has, on the contrary, fully confirmed the correctness of the course taken by the world communist movement, as worked out jointly through generalization of present-day experience and the creative development of Marxism-Leninism.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union proceeds from the basis that our epoch, whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism, initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is an epoch of struggle between two opposed social systems, an epoch of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, an epoch of the collapse of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, an epoch of transition to socialism by ever more nations, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale.

The situation that has developed in the world and the: changes in the development of the class forces in the international arena which opened up new opportunities for our movement demanded that a general line be worked out for the world communist movement, a general line in conformity with its basic tasks at the present stage.

After the Second World War a number of countries in Europe took the road of socialism, a socialist revolution triumphed in China and other Asian countries, and a world socialist system was formed. The new system grew strong in the countries of People's Democracy and was able to ensure a rapid rate of economic, political and cultural development in the countries following the road of socialism. The socialist community was closely united politically and militarily. Thanks to the achievements of the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries the correlation of forces in the world changed substantially in favor of socialism, and to the detriment of imperialism. An important part in this respect was played by the ending of America's monopoly of atomic and hydrogen weapons and by the creation of a mighty war potential by the Soviet Union.

The formation of the world socialist system is a historic achievement of the international working class and of all the working people. This achievement is the incarnation of mankind's dreams of a new society. The growth of production and the vast achievements of science and engineering in the socialist countries have helped to provide the socialist community with an economic and military might that reliably defends the gains of socialism and also serves as a mighty mainstay of peace and security for the peoples of the world.

The radical change in the correlation of forces is also connected with a further intensification of the general crisis of capitalism, the intensification of all its contradictions. After the end of the Second World War a change occurred in the distribution of forces within the imperialist camp. Following the economic center, the political and military centers of imperialism also shifted from Europe to the United States of America. The monopolist bourgeoisie of the USA has become the main citadel of international reaction and has assumed the role of the savior of capitalism. The American imperialists are now performing the functions of an international gendarme. Using the policy of military blocs, the American imperialists endeavor to subordinate to their rule to other capitalist states. This evokes opposition to the United States on the part of France, West Germany, Japan and other major capitalist

states. The recovery of the economy of the capitalist countries which had suffered in the world war, and their rate of development, more rapid than in the United States, intensify the desire of a number of European countries to free themselves from the American diktat. All this leads to the aggravation of existing centers of imperialist competition and conflicts, and the appearance of new ones and weakens the capitalist system on the whole.

The anti-popular and rapacious nature of imperialism has not changed, but with the formation of the world socialist system and the growth of its economic and military might the ability of imperialism to influence the course of historical development has been noticeably narrowed, while the forms and methods of its struggle against the socialist countries and the world revolutionary and national-liberation movement have changed. The imperialists are frightened by the tempestuous growth of the forces of socialism and the national-liberation movement, they unite their forces, make feverish efforts to continue the struggle for their exploiting aims, and everywhere strive to undermine the positions of the socialist countries and the national-liberation movement, and to weaken their influence.

It is perfectly obvious that in our age the main content and the chief trends of the historical development of human society are no longer determined by imperialism but by the world socialist system by all the progressive forces struggling against imperialism for the reorganization of society along socialist lines. The contradiction between capitalism and socialism is the chief contradiction of our epoch. On the outcome of the struggle of the two world systems the destinies of peace, democracy and socialism depend to a decisive extent. And the correlation of forces in the world arena is changing all the time in favor of socialism.

The struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for their national and social liberation, and the successes already achieved in this field, the growing struggle of the working class, of all the working people of the capitalist countries against the monopolies and against exploitation, in the interests of social progress, are of the greatest importance for the destinies of the historical development of mankind. Socialist revolutions, national-liberation anti-imperialist and anti-colonial revolutions, people's democratic revolutions, extensive peasant movements, the struggle of the masses for the overthrow of fascist and other tyrannical regimes, general democratic movements against national oppression—in our time all these merge into a single world revolutionary stream undermining and destroying capitalism.

Working out its policy in conformity with the new conditions, the world communist movement could not fail to take into account quite seriously also such an important factor as the radical qualitative change in the military-technical means of waging war resulting from the emergence and stockpiling of thermonuclear weapons possessing unprecedented destructive force. Until disarmament is effected the socialist community must always maintain superiority over the imperialists in their armed forces. We shall never allow the imperialists to forget that should they unleash a war with the aim of deciding by force of arms whether mankind must develop along the road of capitalism or of socialism, it will be the last war, the one in which imperialism will be finally routed.

Under present-day conditions it is the duty of all champions of peace and socialism to use to the utmost the existing favorable opportunities for the victory of socialism, and not to allow imperialism to unleash a world war.

The correct analysis of the alignment of class forces in the world arena, and the correct Marxist-Leninist policy elaborated at the Moscow Meetings, made it possible for the fraternal parties to gain major successes in developing the world socialist system, and facilitated the growth of the class revolutionary struggle in the capitalist countries and of the national-liberation movement.

The socialist system is exerting an ever-growing influence on the course of world development. The entire world revolutionary process is today developing under the direct influence of the great example provided by the new life in the countries of socialism. The more successfully the ideas of communism make their way to the minds and hearts of the general masses, the greater and more significant are our achievements in the building of socialism and communism. It is, therefore, clear that he who wants to bring closer the victory of socialism throughout the entire world should, in the first place, show concern for strengthening the great socialist community and its economic might, should seek to raise the standard of living of its peoples, develop science, engineering and culture, consolidate its unity and solidarity and the growth of its international authority. The Statement of the Moscow Meeting places the responsibility to the international working-class movement for the successful building of socialism and communism on the Marxist-Leninist parties and the peoples of the socialist countries.

Tirelessly strengthening the world socialist system, the fraternal parties and peoples of our countries make their contribution to the great cause of

the struggle of the international working class, of all the working people, of the entire liberation movement for solving the basic problems of the day in the interests of peace, democracy and socialism.

The present correlation of forces in the world arena gave the socialist countries, together with all peace-loving forces, the opportunity of envisaging as an entirely feasible task for the first time in history that of averting a new world war and of ensuring peace and security of the peoples.

The years that have passed since the adoption of this Statement have fully corroborated the correctness of this thesis. The failure of the aggressive forces to push mankind over the abyss of a destructive thermonuclear war is a highly important result of the strengthening of the might of the socialist countries, of the peace-loving foreign policy which they unswervingly pursue and which is increasingly winning recognition and support among hundreds of millions of people and gaining the upper hand over the imperialist policy of aggression and war.

No Marxist doubts that imperialism, losing one position after another, is trying by every means to preserve its domination over peoples and to regain its lost positions. At present the greatest conspiracy ever of the international imperialism is taking place against the countries of socialism and the world movement of liberation. Of course, there is no guarantee that the imperialists will not try to unleash a world war. The Communists should clearly see this danger.

But the position of the aggressor under present-day conditions radically differs from his position before the Second World War and, even more, before the First World War. In the past, wars usually ended with some capitalist countries defeating others, but the vanquished continued to live, regained their strength after a time, and even proved able to start renewed aggression, as is shown, in particular, by the example of Germany. A thermonuclear war does not offer such a prospect to any aggressor, and the imperialists are compelled to reckon with this. Fear of a retaliatory blow, fear of retribution, keeps them from letting loose a world war. The socialist community has become so strong that imperialism can no longer impose its conditions on the peoples and dictate its will as before. This is a historic gain by the international working class and the peoples of all countries.

By virtue of its predatory nature imperialism cannot get rid of the desire to solve contradictions in the international arena by means of war. But on the

other hand it cannot unleash a world thermonuclear war without realizing that it will thereby place itself in danger of being destroyed.

A world war, such as imperialism threatens mankind with, is not fatally inevitable. With the balance of forces increasingly tipping in favor of socialism and against imperialism, and with the forces of peace increasingly gaining weight over the forces of war, it will become really possible to rule out the possibility of world war from the life of society even before socialism fully triumphs on earth, with capitalism still existing in a part of the world.

Of course, to prevent such a war it is necessary to continue strengthening the socialist system to the utmost and to rally all the forces of the international working-class and the national-liberation movement, to rally all democratic forces. Those who prize the interests of socialism and the interests of peace must do everything to frustrate the criminal designs of world reaction and to prevent it from unleashing a thermonuclear war and dragging hundreds of millions of people down into the grave with it. A sober appraisal of the inevitable consequences that a thermonuclear war would have for the whole of mankind and for the cause of socialism sets before Marxist-Leninists the need to do everything in our power to prevent a new world conflict.

The CPSU Central Committee firmly abides by the thesis of the 1960 Statement that "In a world divided into two systems, the only correct and reasonable principle of international relations is the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems advanced by V. I. Lenin and further elaborated in the Moscow Declaration and Peace Manifesto of 1957, in the decisions of the 20th and 21st Congresses of the CPSU, and in the documents of other communist and workers' parties."

Our Party, which the great Lenin educated in the spirit of relentless struggle against imperialism keeps in mind Lenin's warning that moribund capitalism is still able to cause humanity untold calamities. The Soviet Union is doing everything to boost its economy and to improve its defenses on this basis; it is building up its armed might and maintaining its armed forces in a state of constant readiness. However, we have employed and will continue to employ our country's increasing might not to threaten anyone or to fan war passions, but to consolidate peace, prevent another world war, and defend our own country and the other socialist countries.

The policy of peaceful coexistence accords with the vital interests of all the peoples; it serves to strengthen the positions of socialism, to help the interna-

tional influence of the socialist countries, and to increase the authority and influence of the Communists.

Peaceful coexistence does not imply conciliation between socialist and bourgeois ideologies. That policy would spell abandonment of Marxism-Leninism and obstruction of the building of socialism. Bourgeois ideology is a sort of Trojan horse, which imperialism is trying to sneak into the ranks of the communist and working-class movement. The peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems presupposes an unremitting ideological, political and economic struggle between the two social systems, and the class struggle of the working people inside the countries of the capitalist system, including armed struggle when the peoples find that necessary, and the steady advance of the national-liberation movement among the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries.

The facts go to show that efforts to prevent a world war in no way weaken the forces of the world communist and national-liberation movements, but on the contrary rally the broadest masses to the Communists. It was precisely in conditions of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems that the socialist revolution triumphed on Cuba, that the Algerian people gained national independence, that more than 40 countries won national independence, that the fraternal parties grew in number and strength, and that the influence of the world communist movement increased.

Availing themselves of the conditions of peaceful coexistence, the socialist countries are scoring more and more victories in the economic competition with capitalism. Our adversaries realize that it is difficult for them to count on winning the competition against us. They are unable to keep up with the rapid economic advance of the socialist countries; they are powerless in the face of the appeal that the example of the socialist countries makes to the peoples under capitalism's yoke.

As the economy of the socialist commonwealth advances, the advantages and superiority of socialism, and the greater opportunities of the working people to obtain material and spiritual riches, as compared to capitalism, will display themselves more and more vividly. The rising standards of living the socialist countries are a great magnet for the working class of all the capitalist countries. The achievements of the socialist commonwealth will constitute a kind of catalyst, a revolutionizing factor in broadening the class struggle in the capitalist countries and enabling the working class to triumph over capitalism.

The peoples embarking on socialism inherit from the past economies and cultures at different levels. Regardless of this, however, socialism awakens mighty productive forces—as exemplified by the Soviet Union and the People’s Democracies. The Soviet Union has already outpaced the leading capitalist countries of Europe in economic development and has taken second place in the world; the time is not far off when it will take first place in the world. The other socialist countries have likewise gained great successes. The socialist system is so progressive by nature that it enables the peoples to swiftly eliminate their backwardness, to catch up with the more highly developed countries, and, marching in one rank with them, to fight for the building of communism.

All this inspires the peoples, giving them the conviction that they can embark upon the road of socialism and score achievements, regardless of their present level of historical development. The advance of the peoples to a new life is facilitated by their opportunity to select the best from the world’s experience in building socialism, taking into account both the merits and the shortcomings in the practices of socialist construction.

The faster the productive forces of the socialist countries develop, the higher their economic potential will rise, and the stronger the influence of the socialist community will become on the rate and trend of the whole of historical development in the interests of peace and of the complete triumph of socialism.

Our Party proceeds from the thesis that there are favorable international and internal conditions in the present epoch for more and more countries to go over to socialism. This is true of the developed capitalist countries as well as of the countries which have recently achieved national independence.

The world revolutionary process is developing on an ever larger scale, embracing all continents. The struggle of the working class in the developed capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement are closely linked, and help one another. The course of social development has led to a situation in which the revolutionary struggle, in whichever country it takes place, is directed against the main common enemy, imperialism and the monopoly bourgeoisie.

The Marxist-Leninist parties throughout the world have a common ultimate aim, to mobilize all forces in the struggle for the winning of power by the workers and the laboring peasantry, and to build socialism and communism. In drawing up the tactical policy for their struggle, every Communist

Party must take into account the experience of the entire world communist movement, must take into consideration those interests, aims and tasks set by our movement as a whole, its general line at the present time.

But at the same time, the working out of forms and methods of fighting for socialism in each separate country is the internal affair of the working class of that country and of its communist vanguard. No other fraternal party, whatever its membership, experience and authority, can lay down the tactics, forms and methods of the revolutionary struggle in other countries. Revolution is the cause of the masses themselves. An accurate analysis of the actual situation and a correct estimation of the correlation of forces are among the most important conditions of a revolution. The enthusiasm of the revolutionary masses in the struggle for the victory of a socialist revolution cannot be kept back when objective and subjective conditions are ripe. It would be tantamount to death. But a revolution cannot be artificially instigated if conditions for it are not yet ripe. A premature uprising, as the experience of the revolutionary class struggle teaches, is doomed to failure. Communists rally the working people under the red banner in order to win in the struggle for a better life on earth, and not to perish, even though heroically. Heroism and self-sacrifice, necessary in revolutionary battles, are of no use by themselves, but only for the victory of the great ideas of socialism.

The CPSU has always hailed and will continue to hail the revolutionary working class and the working people of any country who, headed by their communist vanguard, make skillful use of the revolutionary situation to inflict a crushing blow against the class enemy and to establish a new social system.

The tactics and policy of the communist parties in the capitalist countries have in common substantial features connected with the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism and the correlation of forces that have developed in the international arena. The development of state-monopoly capitalism has, besides aggravating the contradictions of the capitalist society which appeared before, also given birth to new contradictions. State-monopoly capitalism has led to a still greater narrowing of the social base of imperialism within a country, and to the concentration of power in the hands of a small group of the strongest monopolists. This gives rise, on the other hand, to a joint anti-monopoly movement embracing the working class, the peasants, the petit bourgeoisie, the working intellectuals and certain other sections of capitalist society interested in freeing themselves from the sway

of the monopolies and from exploitation, and interested in changing over to socialism.

Our time is characterized by a sharp growth in the significance of democratic movements—the struggle for world peace, for the prevention of a world thermonuclear catastrophe, for the preservation of national sovereignty; movements in defense of democracy, against the onslaught of fascism, for the introduction of agrarian transformations, the humanistic movement in defense of culture, and others.

Our Party fully adheres to Leninist principles and to the principles expressed in the Statement, in saying that socialist revolution is not necessarily connected with war. If world wars bring about triumphant revolutions, revolutions are nevertheless entirely possible without wars.

If Communists were to start tying up the victory of the socialist revolution with world war, this would not evoke any sympathy for socialism, but would drive the masses away from it. With modern means of warfare having such terrible destructive consequences, an appeal like this would only play into the hands of our enemies.

The working class and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist parties, endeavor to carry out socialist revolutions in a peaceful way without civil war. The realization of such a possibility is in keeping with the interests of the working class and all the people, and with the national interests of the country. At the same time the choice of the means of developing the revolution depends not only on the working class. If the exploiting classes resort to violence against the people, the working class will be forced to use non-peaceful means of seizing power. Everything depends on the particular conditions and on the distribution of class forces within the country and in the world arena.

Naturally, no matter what means are used for the transition from capitalism to socialism, such a transition is possible only by means of a socialist revolution and of the dictatorship of the proletariat in various forms. Appreciating highly the selfless struggle of the working class headed by the Communists in the capitalist countries, the CPSU considers it its duty to render them every kind of aid and support.

Our Party regards the national-liberation movement as an integral part of the world revolutionary process, as a mighty force destroying the front of imperialism. The peoples of the former colonies are today rising to full stature as independent creators of history, and are seeking ways to promote their national economy and culture. The growth of the forces of the socialist

system actively helps the liberation of the oppressed peoples, their achievement of economic independence, the further development and expansion of the national-liberation movement, and the peoples' struggle against all forms of old and new colonialism.

The national-liberation movement has entered the final stage of the abolition of colonial regimes. The time is not far off when all the peoples as yet living under the yoke of the colonialists will win freedom and independence. The freed peoples are now faced with the problem of consolidating political independence, overcoming economic and cultural backwardness and putting an end to all forms of dependence upon imperialism.

The countries that have thrown off the colonial yoke carry out the vital tasks of national resurgence successfully only in vigorous struggle against imperialism and the remnants of feudalism, by uniting all the patriotic forces of the nation in a single national front—the working class, the peasantry, the national bourgeoisie and the democratic intellectuals.

The peoples who are fighting for their national liberation and have already won political independence have ceased, or are ceasing, to serve as a reserve for imperialism; with the support of the socialist states and of all progressive forces they are more and more frequently inflicting defeats upon the imperialist powers and coalitions.

The young national states are developing at a time when there is competition between the two world social systems. This circumstance has the strongest influence on their political and economic development, upon the choice of the roads they will follow in the future. The states that have recently achieved their national liberation belong neither to the system of socialist states nor to the system of capitalist states, but the overwhelming majority of them have not yet broken away from the orbit of the world capitalist economy, although they hold a special place there. This part of the world is still exploited by the capitalist monopolies.

Now when political independence has been won, the struggle of the young sovereign states against imperialism, for their ultimate national revival, for economic independence, comes to the forefront. The achievement of complete independence by the developing countries would mean a further serious weakening of imperialism, for then the entire present system of the predatory, unequal international division of labor would be destroyed, and the foundation of the economic exploitation of the "world countryside" by the capitalist monopolies would be undermined. The development

of independent national economies in the developing countries relying upon the effective assistance of the socialist system will deal a further heavy blow against imperialism.

In the struggle for the attainment and consolidation of independence it is necessary to muster the whole of a nation's forces in readiness to fight against imperialism. In an endeavor to strengthen its dominant position after the attainment of independence, the right-wing national bourgeoisie sometimes succeeds in establishing reactionary political regimes for a time, and starts persecuting Communists and other democrats. However, such regimes are short-lived for the simple reason that they obstruct progress and the solution of vital national problems—primarily the attainment of economic independence and the development of productive forces. That is why, in spite of the active support of the imperialists, these regimes will be overthrown as a result of the struggle of the masses.

The CPSU regards fraternal alliance with the peoples who have shaken off the colonial yoke and with the peoples of semi-colonial states as one of the corner-stones of its international policy. Our Party considers it its international duty to help the peoples who have taken the road of winning and consolidating national independence, all the peoples fighting for the complete abolition of the colonial system. The Soviet Union has always supported the sacred wars of the peoples for freedom, and given every kind of moral, economic, military and political support to the national-liberation movement.

The Soviet people gave great support to the Algerian people when they fought against the French colonialists. When the Yemeni people rose up in revolt against slavery in their country, we were the first to offer them a helping hand. We rendered various kinds of aid to the Indonesian people in their struggle for the liberation of West Irian, against the Dutch imperialists who got their support from the US imperialists. We hail the struggle of the Indonesian people for the liberation of Northern Kalimantan.

Colonialists, both old and new, are busy weaving intrigues and plots against the liberation movement of the peoples of Southeast Asia. Our sympathies and support are invariably with those who fight for national freedom and independence. We are deeply convinced that, in spite of all the efforts of the American imperialists and their puppets, the peoples of South Vietnam and South Korea will be victorious in their struggle and will achieve the reunification of their native lands.

While being against the export of revolution, our Party has always done everything to prevent the export of counter-revolution. We are firmly convinced that the interconnection and unity of action of the three great revolutionary forces of our time—the peoples building socialism and communism, the international revolutionary working-class movement, and the national-liberation movement—are the foundation of the peoples' struggle against imperialism, and a guarantee of their victory.

The entire course of world development in recent years has fully confirmed the correctness of the policy of the communist movement, which has yielded remarkable practical results. Thanks to the realization of this policy, the forces fighting against imperialism, for peace, national independence and socialism, have scored new successes. The CPSU considers it its duty consistently and steadfastly to carry out this policy.

We are firmly convinced that there are no grounds for revision of this policy.

Besides this, the CPSU Central Committee is of the opinion that it would be beneficial during the preparations for the meeting, as well as at the meeting of representatives of communist and workers' parties, to exchange opinions on the new aspects with which life has in recent years enriched the policy of the world communist movement as laid down in the Declaration and Statement.

In your letter, dear comrades, you justly note that the guarantee of all our achievements is the strengthening of the unity of the communist movement and the solidarity of the socialist countries. In recent time the CPSU has at its congresses and at international Communist meetings time and again expressed its conception of the principles concerning the relations between Marxist-Leninist parties. We emphasized, for the whole world to see, that in the communist movement, just as in the socialist community, all communist and workers' parties, of all socialist countries have always been completely equal. In the communist movement there are no "superior" and "subordinate" parties. And it could not be so. The domination of any party, or the manifestation of any hegemony whatsoever, does not benefit the international communist and workers' movement; on the contrary, it can only do it harm. All communist parties are independent and equal. All bear responsibility for the destiny of the communist movement, for its victories and setbacks, all must build their relations on the basis of proletarian internationalism and mutual assistance.

We also proceed from the basis that proletarian internationalism places equal demands on all parties, big and small, but makes no exceptions for anyone. All fraternal parties must show equal concern that their activities be based on Marxist-Leninist principles, in accordance with the interests of strengthening the unity of the socialist countries and of the entire world communist and workers' movement.

The formation and development of the world socialist system give special significance to the question of correct relations between Marxist-Leninist parties. Communist and workers' parties in the countries of socialism are ruling parties. They bear responsibility for the destiny of the states, for the destiny of their peoples. Under these conditions the violation of Marxist-Leninist principles in the relations between parties can affect not only party interests but the interests of the wide masses of the people.

Guided by the supreme interests of our cause, the CPSU has eliminated the consequences of the Stalin personality cult, and done everything to restore in full the Leninist principles of equality in the relations between the fraternal parties and respect for the sovereignty of socialist countries. This has played a large and positive role in strengthening the unity of the entire socialist community. A favorable situation has been created for the strengthening of our friendship on the basis of equality, respect for the sovereignty of each state, mutual assistance and comradely cooperation, voluntary fulfilment of international duty by each country. At the same time, we should like to emphasize that socialist equality not only means having equal rights to take part in working out collectively the common policy but also entails equal responsibilities for the fraternal parties of socialist countries for the destinies of the entire community.

The Statement of the Moscow Meeting of the Fraternal Parties stressed the need for the closest alliance between countries breaking away from capitalism, for the pooling of their efforts in the building of socialism and communism. National interests and the interests of the socialist system as a whole combine harmoniously. Life has proved convincingly that every country can best solve its national tasks only through the closest cooperation with the other socialist countries on the basis of genuine equality and mutual aid.

Our unity—our well-concerted actions do not arise spontaneously. They are dictated by objective necessity; they are the result of conscious activities, of the purposeful internationalist policy of the Marxist-Leninist parties and their tireless concern for the uniting of our ranks. We do not close our eyes

to the fact that different interpretations of certain questions of internal construction and the international communist movement, different interpretations of the forms and methods of our cooperation may occur in the relations between socialist countries. This is possible, for the countries making up the world socialist system are at different stages in the construction of a new society, and their experience in developing relations with the outside world is not the same in all respects. One should not exclude the possibility, either, that differences may result from different approaches to the solution of some questions of Marxism-Leninism in individual fraternal parties. To exaggerate the role of national, specific features may lead to a departure from Marxism-Leninism. To ignore national features may lead to a breaking away from life and from the masses, and do harm to the cause of socialism.

All this necessitates constant efforts to find ways and means to enable us to settle the differences arising, from positions of principle and with the least damage to our common cause.

We Communists can argue between ourselves. But in all circumstances our sacred duty remains the education of the peoples of our countries in the spirit of deep solidarity with all the peoples of the socialist community. Communists must inculcate in the peoples not only love for their own country, but also love for the whole of the socialist community, for all peoples; they must foster in each man and woman living in any socialist country an understanding of their fraternal duty towards the working people of the world. Failure to do this means failure to follow the first rule of Communists, which requires the uniting of the Marxist-Leninist parties and the peoples building socialism, the cherishing of our unity above all else.

Ideological and tactical differences must in no circumstances be used to incite nationalist feelings and prejudices, mistrust and dissension between the socialist peoples. We declare with full responsibility that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has never taken and will never take a single step that could sow hostility among the peoples of our country towards the fraternal Chinese people or other peoples. On the contrary, in all circumstances our Party has steadily and consistently propagated the ideas of internationalism and warm friendship with the peoples of the socialist countries, and with all peoples of the world. We consider it important to stress this, and we hope that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China shares this view.

In the international communist, working-class and liberation movements it is necessary to unite all efforts, mobilizing the peoples for struggle against imperialism. The militant call “Workers of all countries, unite!” formulated by Marx and Engels means that at the basis of this unity lies anti-imperialist class solidarity, and not any principle of nationality, colour or geographical location. The uniting of the masses in the struggle against imperialism solely on the basis of their belonging to a particular continent—whether Africa, Asia, Latin America or Europe—can be detrimental to the fighting peoples. This would be not uniting but in fact splitting the forces of the united anti-imperialist front.

The strength of the world communist movement lies in its faithfulness to Marxism-Leninism and to proletarian internationalism. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has fought and will continue to fight any departure from Marxism-Leninism and any opportunism. We firmly adhere to the principles of the Statement of 1960 indicating the necessity for a struggle on two fronts—against Right and “Left” opportunism. The Statement rightly says that the main danger in the world communist movement is revisionism, and at the same time points out the necessity for a resolute struggle against sectarianism and dogmatism, which can become the main danger at any stage in the development of separate parties if not consistently combated.

Motivated by the desire to consolidate the unity of the world communist movement on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, our Party will continue to fight resolutely against both right-wing and left-wing opportunism, which are today no less dangerous than revisionism. But while being implacable as regards fundamental questions of principle in the theory and tactics of the communist movement, while struggling against revisionism and sectarianism, we shall spare no effort to elucidate, by painstaking comradely discussion, questions on which there are different interpretations, so as to clear away all extraneous obstacles interfering with our unity. In so doing, we proceed from the premise that when criticizing any mistake relating to questions of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the fraternal parties, and also interim national conferences of the communist movement, should set themselves the objective of pointing out the danger of such mistakes and of helping to remedy them, and not of harping on these mistakes for all time. We are striving to facilitate the complete uniting of revolutionary forces, and not their disintegration or the amputation of one or another section in our

movement. Naturally, Communists cannot allow concessions on points of principle in Marxist-Leninist theory.

As an internationalist party, the CPSU carefully studies the experience accumulated in the struggles of the Marxist-Leninist parties in all countries. We greatly prize the struggle being waged by the working class and its revolutionary vanguard of communist parties in France, Italy, the USA, Britain, the other capitalist countries, as well as the heroic struggle which the communist parties of Asian, African and Latin American countries are carrying on for national and social emancipation from the domination of the imperialist monopolies, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

The communist parties have developed into influential national forces, into advanced detachments of fighters for the happiness of their peoples. No wonder the reactionaries are striking blow after blow at the Communists in their efforts to break their will. In their fight against the communist movement the reactionaries bring out the shop-soiled lie about the "hand of Moscow," claiming that the communist parties are not a national force but a vehicle for the policy of another country, the tool of another country. The imperialists are doing this with evil intent, in order to counter the mounting influence of the communist parties, in order to make the masses suspect them, in order to justify police persecution of the Communists.

However, all honest-minded men and women know that the communist parties are the true upholders and champions of national interests, that they are staunch patriots who combine love for their country and proletarian internationalism in their struggle for the happiness of the people. The CPSU considers it its obligation to give every support to its brothers in the heroic struggle they are waging in the capitalist countries, to strengthen international solidarity with them.

These, in general outline, are some of our ideas on important contemporary questions of principle, on the strategy and tactics of the international communist movement, which we thought it necessary to touch upon in this letter.

Being firmly convinced that the present policy of the international communist movement, which found its expression in the Declaration and Statement of the fraternal parties, is the only correct one, we believe that at the forthcoming meeting between the representatives of the CPSU and CPC it would be expedient to discuss the following most urgent problems:

- a. Questions concerning the struggle for the further strengthening of the might of the world socialist system and its transformation into the decisive factor in the development of human society, which is the main distinguishing feature of our era. We could jointly discuss how faster and better to secure a victory for the socialist countries in peaceful economic competition with capitalism;
- b. Questions concerning the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence. The need to pool the efforts of all peace-loving forces for the struggle to prevent a world thermonuclear war. The creation and the strengthening of the broadest united front of peace supporters. The exposure of the reactionary essence of imperialism, the heightening of vigilance and the mobilization of the broad masses to fight against the preparations being made by the imperialists for a new world war, frustrate their aggressive schemes and isolate the forces of reaction and war. Assertion in international relations of the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. The struggle for general and complete disarmament and for the elimination of the traces of the Second World War;
- c. Questions concerning the struggle against imperialism headed by the US. The use, in the interests of our cause, of the weakening positions of capitalism and the growing instability of the entire capitalist system of world economy, the aggravation of contradictions of capitalism, and above all contradictions between labor and capital, and the severe crisis in bourgeois ideology and politics. Support of the revolutionary and class struggle of the working people in capitalist countries against the monopolies, for their social liberation, for the abolition of the exploitation of man by man, for the extension of the democratic rights and freedoms of the peoples;
- d. Questions concerning the national-liberation movement. The support and utmost development of the national-liberation movement of the peoples. The struggle for the complete and final ending of colonialism and neo-colonialism in all its forms. The rendering of support to peoples fighting against colonialism, and also to countries which have achieved their national liberation. The development of economic and cultural cooperation with these countries;

- e. Questions concerning the consolidation of the unity and cohesion of the socialist community and of the ranks of the communist movement. The need for consolidating in every way the international communist movement, the most influential political force of our times, particularly in conditions where the imperialist reactionaries have joined forces in the fight against communism. The prevention of any actions which could undermine this unity, the firm adherence by each fraternal party to the assessments and conclusions worked out jointly. The continuation of the struggle against revisionism and dogmatism, as an indispensable condition for the defense of Marxism-Leninism in its pure form, and of its creative development, and for the further successes of the communist movement. The development of relations among the fraternal parties on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism and mutual aid and support. The working out of joint measures to intensify the ideological and political struggle against imperialism and reaction.

During the talks it will be possible to discuss all the questions mentioned in your letter, questions of common interest stemming from the tasks in the struggle to implement the decisions of the Moscow Meetings. An important role could be played by the discussion of the questions connected with the consolidation of unity between the US and the People's Republic of China.

In your letter you raise the Albanian and Yugoslav questions. We have already written to you that these questions, though of a basic nature, cannot and should not eclipse the main problems of our times which call for discussion at our meeting.

Our Party, having condemned the splitting activities of the Albanian leaders, has at the same time taken a number of steps towards normalizing the relations between the Albanian Party of Labour and the CPSU and other fraternal parties. In spite of the fact that the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour have recently been coming out with slanderous attacks on our Party and the Soviet people, we, being guided by supreme interests, do not relinquish the hope that the relations between the CPSU and the Albanian Party of Labour may be improved. At the end of February this year the CPSU Central Committee once again took the initiative and suggested to the Central Committee of the Albanian Party of Labour that a bilateral meeting be

held between representatives of our two Parties. However, this comradely step on our part did not meet with due response on the part of the Albanian leadership. The leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour did not even deem it necessary to acknowledge our letter containing the CPSU Central Committee's proposal about the bilateral meetings. Having obviously later come to their senses, the Albanian leaders sent us a letter in which, after, some reservations and stipulations, they speak of such a meeting. If real desire is in fact shown, we are ready to have a meeting.

As far as Yugoslavia is concerned, we maintain, proceeding from an analysis and assessment of the objective economic and political conditions in that country, that it is a socialist country, and in our relations with it we strive to establish closer relations between the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia and the socialist commonwealth, in accordance with the policy pursued by the fraternal parties for the cementing together of all the anti-imperialist forces of the world. We also take into consideration the definite positive tendencies shown of late in Yugoslavia's economic and socio-political life. Meanwhile the CPSU is aware of the serious differences that exist with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia on several ideological questions and considers it necessary to tell the Yugoslav comrades so frankly, criticizing those views of theirs which it finds wrong.

In its letter of March 9, 1963, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China agrees with us in saying that today the world communist movement faces a crucial time. It depends on us, on our Parties, on the correctness of our policy, whether we continue to advance together in one rank or allow ourselves to be involved in a struggle harmful to the working class, to our peoples and to all working people, a struggle that can only result in mutual estrangement, weaken the forces of socialism, and undermine the unity of the world communist movement.

Naturally, being large, strong parties, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China would emerge from this situation with smaller losses; but as far as the other fraternal parties, especially those working in complex conditions, are concerned, they would be faced with great and moreover unnecessary complications, which, of course, is not our aim.

Everything depends on how we act in this serious and complex situation. Are we to continue engaging in polemics, to fall prey to our passions, and to turn arguments into recriminations and unproved accusations and sallies

against the fraternal parties? Or are we, aware of the great responsibility that we bear for the destinies of our great cause, to direct developments along a different channel, and show enough courage to rise above all that divides us today, cease uncomradely polemics, and concentrate on a search for ways of consolidating militant Soviet-Chinese cooperation, of consolidating the friendship of all the fraternal parties?

We realize that any movement, including the communist movement, is unthinkable without controversy. However, no differences, no displeasure at the behavior of a particular party, can justify methods of struggle detrimental to the interests of the international communist movement. The deeper and broader our understanding of the aims and tasks of the international working class, the greater the vigor with which we should strive to analyse our differences, however serious they may seem today, quietly and relevantly, and prevent them from interfering with our positive work, from disorganizing the revolutionary activities of the international working class.

Let us struggle together for consistent adherence to the Marxist-Leninist course in the international communist movement, against revisionism and dogmatism, for closer unity in the ranks of the international communist movement, for respect for collectively worked out policies, and against any violations or arbitrary interpretations of these.

Our Party does not succumb to the heat of the polemic struggle but, aware of our common responsibility to the world communist movement, wishes to stop the dangerous process of sliding into a new series of discussions. It is obvious to everyone that we could have found much to say in defense of the Leninist policy of the CPSU, in defense of the common line of the international communist movement, in reply to groundless attacks made in articles recently carried by the Chinese press. And if we are not doing it now it is only because we do not want to gladden the foes of the communist movement. We hope that the harm caused by the sharpening polemics will be realized, and the interests of the unity of the socialist system and the international communist movement will be placed above all else. Therefore we suggest a meeting to you, not in order to aggravate the dispute but in order to reach a mutual understanding on major problems that have arisen in the international communist movement.

We know that such a meeting is being looked forward to by our friends in all the countries of the world, and that they pin great hopes on it. It depends on us, on our will and reason, whether results gladdening to our friends and

upsetting to the enemies of communism will be achieved at the meeting. This will be our common contribution to the cause of the struggle for the liberation of all oppressed people, for the victory of peace and socialism on earth, for the triumph of the great revolutionary doctrine of Marxism-Leninism.

With communist greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet
Union**

Open Letter of the CC of the CPSU to all Party Organizations, to all Communists of the Soviet Union

July 14, 1963

Source: *Beijing Review*, July 26, 1963, Vol. VI, No. 30, pp. 28-46.

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the CPSU deems it necessary to address this open letter to you in order to set out its position on the fundamental questions of the international communist movement in connection with the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China of June 14, 1963.

Soviet people are well aware that our party and government, expressing the will of the entire Soviet people, spare no efforts to strengthen fraternal friendship with the peoples of all the socialist countries, with the Chinese people. We are united by common struggle for the victory of communism. We share the same aim, the same aspirations and hopes.

For many years relations between our parties were good. But **some time ago there came to light serious differences between the CPC on the one hand, and the CPSU and the other fraternal parties, on the other. At the present time, the statements and actions of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, which are undermining the cohesion of our parties and the friendship of our peoples, are causing increasing concern to the CPSU Central Committee.**⁵²²

For its part, the CPSU Central Committee has been doing everything possible to overcome the differences that have arisen, and in January this year proposed the cessation of open polemics in the communist movement, so that the issues be discussed calmly and in a businesslike manner, and solved on a principled Marxist-Leninist basis. This proposal of the CPSU met with the warm support of all the fraternal parties. Agreement was subsequently reached on a meeting between representatives of the CPSU and the CPC, which is now taking place in Moscow.

The CPSU Central Committee hoped that the Chinese comrades would, like ourselves, display goodwill and would facilitate the success of the meet-

⁵²² The bold-type emphases in this letter are *Remnin Ribao's* -Ed.

ing in the interests of our peoples, in the interests of strengthening the unity of the communist movement. **To our regret, when agreement was reached on the Moscow meeting of representatives of the CPSU and CPC, when the delegations were appointed and the date of the meeting set, the Chinese comrades, instead of submitting the divergencies for discussion at this meeting, unexpectedly found it possible not only to state the old differences openly, before the entire world, but also to advance new charges against the CPSU and other Communist parties. This found expression in the publication of the June 14 letter of the CPC Central Committee, which gives an arbitrary interpretation of the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow meetings of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties, and distorts the basic principles of these historic documents. The CPC Central Committee letter contains groundless, slanderous attacks on our party and on other Communist parties, on the decisions of the 20th, 21st, and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU and on the CPSU Program.**

As you know from the statement of the CPSU Central Committee published in *Pravda* on June 19, the Presidium of the CPSU Central Committee, having studied the June 14 letter of the CPC Central Committee, **arrived at the conclusion that its publication in the Soviet press at that time would have been inadvisable. Publication of the letter would, naturally, have required a public reply on our part; this would have further aggravated the controversy and inflamed passions, and would have thereby worsened relations between our parties.** Publication of the letter of the CPC Central Committee would have been the more untimely since a meeting was to be held between representatives of the CPSU and CPC with the purpose, in our opinion, of contributing, through comradely examination of existing differences, to better mutual understanding between our two parties on the vital questions of present-day world development, and of creating a favorable atmosphere for the preparation and holding of a meeting of representatives of all Communist and Workers' parties.

At the same time, the Presidium of the CPSU Central Committee considered it necessary to acquaint the members of the CPSU Central Committee and all the participants in its Plenary Meeting with the letter of the CPC Central Committee, and inform them of the substance of the differences between the CPC leadership and the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties.

In its unanimously adopted decision the Central Committee Plenum fully endorsed the political activity of the CPSU Central Committee Presidium and of First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR N. S. Khrushchev aimed at further uniting the forces of the world communist movement, and all the steps taken by the CPSU Central Committee Presidium in its relations with the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum instructed the Presidium of the Central Committee unswervingly to follow the line of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of our party at the meeting with representatives of the CPC, a line approved at the meetings of representatives of the Communist parties and embodied in the Declaration and Statement, a line that has been fully confirmed by life, by the course of international developments. The Central Committee Plenum emphatically rejected as groundless and slanderous the attacks of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on our party and other Communist parties, on the decisions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses, on the Program of the CPSU. Expressing the will of the entire party, it declared its readiness and determination consistently to pursue a course to unite our fraternal parties and overcome existing differences. The Plenum declared that our party would continue its efforts to strengthen unity on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, fraternal friendship between the CPSU and the CPC in the interests of the struggle for our common cause.

Unfortunately, recent events have shown that the Chinese comrades interpret our restraint in their own way. They depict our sincere striving to avoid a sharpening of the controversy in the communist movement as little short of an intention to hide the views of the Chinese leaders from the Soviet Communists and people. Mistaking our restraint for weakness, the Chinese comrades, contrary to the standards of friendly relations between fraternal socialist countries, began, with increasing importunity and persistence, unlawfully to circulate in Moscow and other Soviet cities the June 14 letter of the CPC Central Committee, of which a large number of copies were printed in Russian. **Not content with this, the Chinese comrades began sedulously to popularize and spread throughout the world this letter and other documents directed against our party, not scrupling to use imperialist publishing houses and agencies for their distribution.**

The position has been aggravated by the fact that when the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs drew the attention of the Chinese Ambassador in the Soviet Union to the impermissibility of such **actions, which constitute a gross violation of our country's sovereignty**, the Chinese representatives, far from stopping them, declared in a demonstrative way that they regarded it as their right to continue to circulate the letter in the USSR

On July 7, when the Moscow meeting had already begun, a mass rally was held in Beijing at which the Chinese expelled from the Soviet Union for the unlawful distribution of materials containing attacks on our party and the Soviet government were hailed as heroes by Chinese officials. **Seeking to instigate among the fraternal Chinese people sentiments and feelings unfriendly to the USSR**, the Chinese officials tried, at this rally, to prove their right to violate the sovereignty of our state and the standards of international relations. On July 10, the CPC Central Committee issued another statement, in which it justifies these actions and, **in effect, tries to arrogate to itself the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union**, which the Soviet government, naturally, will never allow. Such actions can only aggravate relations and can do nothing but harm.

In its leading article on July 13, the Beijing *People's Daily* again attacked our party and gave a **distorted interpretation** of the fact that the Soviet press did not publish the June 14 letter of the CPC Central Committee.

The frankly unfriendly actions of the CPC leaders, their persistent striving to aggravate the controversy in the international communist movement, the deliberate distortion of our party's position, the misinterpretation of our motives in temporarily refraining from publishing the letter, impel us to publish the letter of the CPC Central Committee of June 14, 1963, and to give our appraisal of it.

Everyone who reads the letter of the CPC Central Committee will see behind the fine phrases about unity and cohesion unfriendly, slanderous attacks on our party and the Soviet Union, a striving to play down the historic significance of our people's struggle for the victory of communism in the USSR, for the triumph of peace and socialism throughout the world. The document contains every manner of charge, direct and veiled, against the CPSU and the Soviet Union. Its authors permit themselves fabrications, unseemly and insulting to Communists, about "betrayal of the interests of the international proletariat and all the peoples of the world," "departure from Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism," hint

at “cowardice in face of the imperialists,” “a step back in the course of historic development,” and even at “organizational and moral disarming of the proletariat and all the working people” tantamount to “contributing to the restoration of capitalism” in our country. How can they say these things about the party of the great Lenin, about the motherland of socialism, about the people who were the first in the world to accomplish a socialist revolution, upheld its great gains in fierce battles against international imperialism and domestic counter-revolution, are displaying miracles of heroism and dedication in the effort to build communism, are faithfully fulfilling their internationalist duty to the working people of the world.

I

For nearly half a century the Soviet Union, under the leadership of the Communist Party, has been fighting for the triumph of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, for the freedom and happiness of the working people throughout the world. From the very first days of the Soviet state, when the great Lenin stood at its helm, and right up to the present day, our people have rendered and are rendering tremendous and disinterested assistance to all the peoples fighting for liberation from the yoke of imperialism and colonialism, for the building of a new life.

World history furnishes no example of a country rendering aid to other countries on such a scale in the development of their economy, science and technology.

The working people of China and the Chinese Communists felt in full measure the fraternal solidarity of the Soviet people, of our party, both in the period of their revolutionary struggle for the liberation of their country and in the years of socialist construction. Immediately after the formation of the People’s Republic of China, the Soviet government signed with the government of People’s China a Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance, which is a powerful weapon against imperialist encroachments, a factor for consolidating peace in the Far East and the whole world.

The Soviet people generously shared with their Chinese brothers their experience in socialist construction, accumulated over many years, their achievements in the fields of science and technology. Our country has rendered and is rendering substantial aid to the economic development of People’s China. With the active assistance of the Soviet Union, People’s China built 198 factories, factory departments and other industrial units equipped

with up-to-date machinery. With the assistance of our country, China started such new industries as automobiles, tractors, aircraft and others. The Soviet Union handed over to the PRC more than 21,000 sets of scientific and technical documentation, including more than 1,400 major projects. We have invariably helped China strengthen her defense capacity and create a modern defense industry. Thousands of Chinese specialists and workers have been trained in Soviet higher schools and in our industries. Now, too, the Soviet Union continues its technical assistance to the People's Republic of China in the construction of 88 industrial enterprises and projects. **We mention all this not by way of boasting, but only because of late the CPC leaders have sought to belittle the significance of Soviet aid; nor do we forget that the Soviet Union, in its turn, received needed goods from the PRC.**

It is not so long ago that the Chinese leaders spoke justly and eloquently about the friendship of the peoples of China and the Soviet Union, about the unity of the CPSU and the CPC, giving a high appraisal of Soviet aid and urging the people to learn from the experience of the Soviet Union.

Comrade Mao Zedong said in 1957: "In their struggle for national liberation, the Chinese people had the fraternal sympathy and support of the Soviet people. After the victory of the Chinese revolution the Soviet Union has likewise been rendering all-round and immense assistance in the construction of socialism in China. The Chinese people will never forget all this."

One can only regret that the Chinese leaders have begun to forget this.

Our party, all Soviet people, rejoiced at, and took pride in, the successes of the great Chinese people in building the new life. Speaking at a reception in Beijing on the tenth anniversary of the People's Republic of China, Comrade N. S. Khrushchev said: "The heroic and industrious people of China demonstrated, under the leadership of their glorious Communist Party, what a people is capable of when it takes power into its own hands... Now everybody admits the successes of the Chinese people and the Communist Party of China. The peoples of Asia and Africa see along which path, under which system, the talents, the creative forces of the people can be fully developed, so that a nation can demonstrate the breadth and depth of its mighty creative strength."

That is how things stood until the Chinese leaders began to deflect from the general course of the world communist movement.

In April 1960 the Chinese comrades openly revealed their disagreements with the-world communist movement by publishing the collection of articles "Long Live Leninism!" This collection, made up, in the main, of distorted, truncated and incorrectly interpreted passages from well-known works of Lenin, contained propositions directed, in substance, against the fundamentals of the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of 1957, which was signed on behalf of the CPC by Comrade Mao Zedong, against the Leninist policy of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, against the possibility of preventing world war in the present era, against recognition of the peaceful as well as non-peaceful road of development of socialist revolution. The CPC leaders tried to impose their views on all the fraternal parties. In June 1960, during the Beijing session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Chinese leaders, without the knowledge of the leadership of fraternal parties, arranged a meeting of representatives of several parties then in Beijing and launched open criticism of the position of the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties and the Declaration adopted by the Moscow Meeting in 1957. Furthermore, the Chinese comrades aired their differences with the CPSU and the other fraternal parties from the open tribune of a non-party organization.

Such steps by the CPC leadership aroused anxiety in the fraternal parties. In view of this, an attempt was made at the Bucharest Meeting of Communist Parties in 1960 to discuss the differences that had arisen with the leaders of the CPC. Representatives of 50 Communist and Workers' parties subjected the views and actions of the Chinese leaders to comradely criticism and urged them to return to the path of unity and cooperation with the international communist movement, in conformity with the principles of the Moscow Declaration. Unfortunately, the CPC leadership disregarded this comradely assistance and continued to pursue its erroneous course and deepen its differences with the fraternal parties.

Anxious to prevent such a development of events, the CPSU Central Committee suggested talks with the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. These took place in Moscow in September 1960. But then, too, it was impossible to resolve the differences due to the stubborn unwillingness of the CPC delegation to heed the opinion of a fraternal party. At the Meeting of Representatives of 81 Communist and Workers'

Parties in November 1960, the absolute majority of the fraternal parties rejected the incorrect views and concepts of the CPC leadership. The Chinese delegation at this meeting stubbornly upheld its own particular views and signed the Statement only when the danger of its complete isolation became clear.

It is now perfectly clear that in appending their signatures to the 1960 Statement, the CPC leaders were only maneuvering. Shortly after the meeting they resumed the propaganda of their policy, using as their mouthpiece the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour. Behind the back of our Party they launched a campaign against the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet government.

In October 1961 the CPSU Central Committee made fresh efforts to normalize relations with the CPC. Comrades N. S. Khrushchev, F. R. Kozlov and A. I. Mikoyan had talks with Comrades Zhou Enlai, Peng Zhen and other leading CPC officials attending the 22nd CPSU Congress. Comrade N. S. Khrushchev explained in detail to the Chinese delegation the position of the CPSU Central Committee on the questions of principle discussed at the 22nd Congress and stressed our invariable desire to strengthen friendship and cooperation with the Communist Party of China.

In its letters of February 22 and May 31, 1962, the CPSU Central Committee drew the attention of the CPC Central Committee to the dangerous consequences for our common cause that might follow from the weakening of the unity of the communist movement. We then suggested to the Chinese comrades that steps be taken to deprive the imperialists of the opportunity to use in their interests the difficulties which had arisen in Soviet-Chinese relations. The CPSU Central Committee also suggested more effective measures on such questions as exchange of internal political information, co-ordination of the positions of our fraternal parties in international democratic organizations and in other matters.

However, these letters and the other practical steps aimed at improving relations with the CPC and the PRC in all fields did not meet with a response in Beijing.

In the autumn of last year, the Presidium of the CPSU Central Committee had a long talk with Comrade Liu Xiao, the then PRC Ambassador to the USSR, before his departure from Moscow. In the course of this

conversation, the members of the Central Committee Presidium again took the initiative in strengthening Chinese-Soviet friendship. Comrade N. S. Khrushchev asked Comrade Liu Xiao to convey to Comrade Mao Zedong our proposal: "To set aside all disputes and differences, not to try to establish who is right and who is wrong, not to stir up the past, but to start our relations from a clean slate." But we did not even receive an answer to this sincere appeal.

Deepening their ideological differences with the fraternal parties, the leaders of the CPC began to carry them over to governmental relations. Chinese government agencies began curtailing economic and trade relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. On the initiative of the PRC government, the volume of China's trade with the Soviet Union was cut to nearly one-third in the past three years; delivery of complete sets of industrial plant dropped to one-fortieth of the former volume. This was done on the initiative of the Chinese leaders. We regret that the PRC leadership has embarked on such a policy. Now as always, we believe it is necessary to go on developing Soviet-Chinese relations and extend cooperation. This would be mutually beneficial, above all to People's China, which has received great assistance from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In the past, the Soviet Union developed extensive relations with China, and today, too, it wants their expansion, not curtailment. One would expect the CPC leadership to be the first to display concern for the development of economic relations with the socialist countries. However, it has been acting in the opposite direction, disregarding the damage such actions cause the PRC economy.

The Chinese leaders did not tell their people the truth about who is responsible for curtailing these relations. Extensive propaganda aimed at discrediting the foreign and domestic Policy of the CPSU, at stirring up anti-Soviet sentiment, was started among the Chinese Communists and even among the population.

The CPSU Central Committee drew the Chinese comrades' attention to these incorrect actions. We told the Chinese comrades that the people should not be prompted to praise or anathematize this or that party depending on the emergence of disputes and differences. It is clear to every Communist that disagreements among fraternal parties are but temporary episodes, whereas relations between the peoples of the socialist countries are now being shaped for all time.

Every time, however, the Chinese leaders ignored the comradely warnings of the CPSU and further strained Chinese-Soviet relations.

Beginning with the close of 1961, Chinese representatives in international democratic organizations have been openly imposing their erroneous views. In December 1961, at the Stockholm session of the World Peace Council, the Chinese delegation opposed the convocation of the World Congress for Peace and Disarmament. In the course of 1962 the work of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Peace Movement, the Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the Women's International Democratic Federation, and many other organizations, was placed in jeopardy by the divisive activities of the Chinese representatives. They opposed participation of representatives of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committees of the European socialist countries in the third Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Conference in Moshi. The leader of the Chinese delegation told the Soviet representatives that "whites have no business here." At the journalists' conference in Djakarta, the Chinese representatives followed a line designed to deny Soviet journalists full-fledged delegate status on the plea that the Soviet Union... is not an Asian country.

That the Chinese comrades should have accused the overwhelming majority of the recent World Congress of Women of splitting activities and of following a wrong political line, is strange and surprising, considering that out of the 110 countries represented, only two—China and Albania—voted against the Appeal to Women of All Continents. Is it a case of the entire multi-million army of freedom-loving women being out of step, and only two marching in step, keeping the ranks?

Such, in brief, is the history of the differences between the Chinese leadership and the CPSU and the other fraternal parties. It shows that the CPC leaders counterpose their own special line to the general line of the communist movement, trying to impose on it their own dictate, their deeply erroneous views on the key problems of our time.

II

What is the substance of the differences between the CPC on the one hand, and the CPSU and the international communist movement on the other? That question will undoubtedly be asked by everyone who reads the CPC Central Committee letter of June 14.

At first glance, many of its propositions may set one wondering: whom are the Chinese comrades actually arguing with? Are there Communists who object, for instance, to socialist revolution, or who do not regard it as their duty to fight imperialism, or support the national-liberation movement? Why is the CPC leadership so insistent on advancing such propositions?

The question may also arise: why is it impossible to agree with the position of the Chinese comrades formulated in their letter on many important problems? Take, for instance, such a cardinal problem as war and peace. The CPC Central Committee letter speaks of peace and peaceful co-existence.

The essence of the matter is that, having started an offensive against the views of the Marxist-Leninist parties on the cardinal problems of the times, the Chinese comrades, firstly, ascribe to the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties views which they have never expressed and which are alien to them; secondly, they try, by verbal acceptance of formulas and principles taken from the documents of the communist movement, to mask their erroneous views and incorrect positions. To come out openly against the peoples' struggle for peace, against peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, against disarmament, etc., would expose their policy in the eyes of the Communists and peace-loving peoples of the whole world and would alienate them. The further the polemics develop, the clearer the weakness of the CPC leadership's position becomes, the more zealously they resort to such camouflage. If this method of the Chinese comrades is not taken into consideration, it might appear to the outsider that the controversy has acquired a scholastic nature, that it concerns individual formulas, far removed from vital issues.

In point of fact, however, the controversy centers on issues affecting the vital interests of the peoples.

They are the issue of war and peace, the question of the role and development of the world socialist system, they are questions of the struggle against the ideology and practice of the "personality cult," they are questions of the strategy and tactics of the world labor movement and the national-liberation struggle.

These questions are posed by life itself, by the deep-going changes that have taken place in the socialist countries and throughout the world, the changes in recent years in the balance of strength between socialism and imperialism, the new possibilities for our movement. The communist move-

ment had to, and did, provide the answers to these questions and worked out a general line in adaptation to the conditions and requirements of the present stage of world development.

In the unanimous opinion of the Communist parties, an immense part of this was played by the 20th Congress of the CPSU, which ushered in a new stage in the development of the entire communist movement. This appraisal was recorded in the 1957 Declaration and in the 1960 Statement, the documents of the Communist parties worked out collectively and formulating the general political course of the communist movement in the present era.

But the CPC leaders have now advanced, as a counterweight, a different course; their positions are diverting more and more from the general line of the communist movement on basic issues.

This applies, above all, to the question of war and peace.

In the appraisal of the problems of war and peace, in the approach to their solution, there can be no vagueness or reservations, for this is an issue in which the destinies of peoples, the future of all mankind, are involved.

The CPSU Central Committee considers it its duty to tell the party and the people with all frankness that on the question of war and peace the CPC leadership has cardinal, fundamental differences with us, with the world communist movement. Their essence lies in the diametrically opposite approach to such vital problems as the possibility of averting a world thermonuclear war, peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, the interconnection between the struggle for peace and the development of the world revolutionary movement.

Our party, in the decisions of its 20th and 22nd Congresses, and the world communist movement in the Declaration and Statement, set before Communists as a vital and urgent task, the struggle for peace, the struggle to avert a world thermonuclear catastrophe. We realistically appraise the balance of strength in the world and draw the conclusion that, though the nature of imperialism has not changed, and the danger of war breaking out has not been averted, in modern conditions the forces of peace, of which the mighty community of socialist states is the main bulwark, can, through their joint efforts, prevent a new world war.

We also soberly appraise the radical, qualitative change of the means of waging war and, accordingly, its possible consequences. **The nuclear and rocket weapons created in the middle of this century have changed former conceptions of war.** These weapons possess unprecedented destructive

power. Suffice it to say that the explosion of only one powerful thermonuclear bomb surpasses the explosive force of all the ammunition used during all previous wars, including the first and the second world wars. And many thousands of such bombs have been accumulated.

Have Communists the right to ignore this danger? Must we tell the people the whole truth about the consequences of a thermonuclear war? We believe that undoubtedly we must. This cannot have a “paralyzing” effect on the masses, as the Chinese comrades assert. On the contrary, the truth about modern war mobilizes the will and energy of the masses for the struggle for peace, against imperialism—the source of the war danger.

The historic task of the Communists is to organize and head the struggle of the peoples to prevent a world thermonuclear war.

Prevention of a new world war is a fully real and feasible task. **The 20th Congress of our party arrived at a conclusion of the utmost importance—that in our times there is no fatal inevitability of war between states.** That conclusion is based not merely on good intentions; it is the result of a realistic, strictly scientific analysis of the balance of class forces in the world arena; it is based on the vast might of world socialism. Our views on this question are shared by the entire world communist movement. “World war can be averted”; “a real possibility will have arisen to exclude world war from the life of society even before socialism achieves complete victory on earth, with capitalism still existing in a part of the world,” the Statement stresses.

That Statement bears the signatures also of the Chinese comrades.

But what is the position of the CPC leadership? What can be the meaning of the propositions they advocate, viz., that we cannot put an end to war as long as imperialism exists; that peaceful co-existence is an illusion—it is not the general foreign-policy principle of the socialist countries; that the struggle for peace hinders revolutionary struggle?

These propositions mean that the Chinese comrades are acting contrary to the general policy of the world communist movement on questions of war and peace. They do not believe in the possibility of preventing a new world war, they underestimate the forces of peace and socialism and overestimate the forces of imperialism, and virtually ignore the mobilization of the masses to fight the war danger.

It turns out that the Chinese comrades do not believe in the ability of the peoples of the socialist countries, the international working class, and all the democratic and peace-loving forces to foil the plans of the

warmongers and achieve peace for our and future generations. What is behind the loud revolutionary phrases of the Chinese comrades? Disbelief in the strength of the working class and its revolutionary capabilities, disbelief both in the possibility of peaceful coexistence and in the victory of the proletariat in the class struggle. The struggle to prevent war unites all peace-loving forces. They differ in class composition and class interests. But they can be united by the struggle for peace, for averting war, because **the atomic bomb does not draw class distinctions**—it destroys everybody within the range of its destructive action.

To follow the road proposed by the Chinese comrades would be to alienate the masses from the Communist parties, which have won the sympathies of the peoples by their persevering and courageous struggle for peace.

In the minds of the broad masses; socialism and peace are now inseparable!

The Chinese comrades obviously underestimate all the danger a thermonuclear war would present. “The atomic bomb is a paper tiger,” it “is not at all terrible,” they contend. The main thing, they say, is to put an end to imperialism as quickly as possible, but how and with what losses this will be achieved appears to be a secondary question. Secondary for whom, it may be asked—for the hundreds of millions of people who would be doomed to death if a thermonuclear war were unleashed? For the countries that would be wiped off the face of the earth in the very first hours of such a war?

No one, not even a big state, has the right to play with the destinies of millions of people. Those who do not want to exert themselves to banish world war from the life of the peoples, to avert mass annihilation and destruction of the values of human civilization, deserve condemnation.

The CPC Central Committee letter of June 14 has much to say about “inevitable sacrifices,” allegedly in the name of the revolution. Some responsible Chinese leaders have also declared that it is possible to sacrifice hundreds of millions of people in a war. There is this assertion in the collection “Long Live Leninism!” which was approved by the CPC Central Committee: “The victorious peoples will create with tremendous speed on the ruins of destroyed imperialism a civilization a thousand

times higher than under the capitalist system, and will build a really beautiful future.”

It is permissible to ask the Chinese comrades: do they realize what sort of “ruins” a world nuclear and rocket war would leave behind?

The CPSU Central Committee—and we are convinced that the entire party and the Soviet people unanimously support us in this—cannot share the views of the Chinese leadership about the creation of “a thousand times higher civilization” on the corpses of hundreds of millions of people. Such views are fundamentally contrary to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

It is permissible to ask the Chinese comrades: what means do they propose for the destruction of imperialism? We fully favor the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. Not only do we believe in the inevitable demise of capitalism, but we are doing everything to achieve this through the class struggle, and as soon as possible. Who must decide this historic question? First of all, the working class, guided by its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist party, the working people of each country.

The Chinese comrades propose something different. They frankly say: “On the ruins of destroyed imperialism,” in other words, as a result of the unleashing of war, “a beautiful future will be built.” If we are to accept that then, indeed, there is no need for the principle of peaceful co-existence, for the struggle to strengthen peace. We cannot take such an adventuristic path: it contradicts the essence of Marxism-Leninism.

Everyone knows that under present conditions a world war would be a thermonuclear war. The imperialists will never agree to quit the scene voluntarily, to put themselves into the coffin of their own free will, without having resorted to the extreme methods at their disposal.

Apparently those who describe the thermonuclear weapon as a “paper tiger” are not fully aware of its destructive power.

We soberly take this into account. We ourselves produce thermonuclear weapons and have manufactured them in sufficient quantities. We know their destructive power full well. And if imperialism starts a war against us, we shall not hesitate to use this formidable weapon against the aggressor. But if we are not attacked, we shall not be the first to use it.

Marxists-Leninists strive to ensure durable peace not by supplications to imperialism, but by rallying the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties, by rallying the working class of all countries, by rallying the peoples fighting for

their freedom and national independence, by relying on the economic and defense might of the socialist states.

We might ask the Chinese comrades, who offer to build a beautiful future on the ruins of the old world destroyed by thermonuclear war: did they consult, on this issue, the working class of countries where imperialism is in power? The working class of the capitalist countries would be sure to tell them: are we asking you to unleash war and destroy our countries in the process of destroying the imperialists? After all, the monopolists, the imperialists, are only a comparatively small group, while the bulk of the population of the capitalist countries consists of the working class, the working peasantry, working intelligentsia. The atomic bomb does not distinguish between imperialists and working people, it strikes at areas, so that millions of workers would be killed for every monopolist destroyed. The working class, the working people, will ask such “revolutionaries”: What right have you to decide for us questions involving our very existence and our class struggle—we too want socialism, but we want to win it through the class struggle, not by unleashing a world thermonuclear war.

The way the Chinese comrades present the question can arouse legitimate suspicion that this is no longer a class approach to the struggle for the abolition of capitalism, but that there are entirely different aims. If both the exploiters and the exploited are buried under the ruins of the old world, who will build the “beautiful future?”

The fact cannot pass unnoticed, in this connection, that instead of the class, internationalist approach expressed in the slogan “Workers of all countries, united the Chinese comrades stubbornly propagate a slogan deprived of all class meaning: “The wind from the East prevails over the wind from the West.”

On questions of the socialist revolution our Party firmly adheres to Marxist-Leninist class positions, believing that in each country the revolution is carried out by the working class, the working people, without outside military interference.

It stands to reason, of course, that if the imperialist madmen unleash a war, the peoples will sweep away capitalism and bury it. But the Communists, representatives of the peoples, true champions of socialist humanism, must do everything they can to prevent another world war, in which hundreds of millions would perish.

No party that has the interests of the people at heart can fail to appreciate its responsibility in the struggle to avert another world war and endure peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems.

Expressing the policy of our party, Comrade N. S. Khrushchev said: "There will be liberative wars as long as imperialism exists, as long as colonialism exists. These are revolutionary wars. Such wars are not only permissible but even unavoidable, since the colonialists do not grant independence to nations voluntarily. Therefore it is only through struggle, including armed struggle, that the peoples can win freedom and independence." The Soviet Union is rendering the broadest support to the national-liberation movement. Everybody is familiar with the practical assistance our country has given the peoples of Viet-Nam, Egypt, Iraq, Algeria, Yemen, Cuba and other countries.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has proclaimed the Leninist principle of peaceful co-existence the general line of Soviet foreign policy and is unswervingly following that line. Since 1953, and particularly after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the effect of our peace policy and its influence on the course of international relations in the interests of the masses has sharply increased.

The Chinese comrades allege that in our understanding, the concept "peaceful co-existence" exhausts all the principles of our relations not only with imperialist countries, but also with the socialist countries and the countries that have recently broken out of the colonial yoke. They know perfectly well that this is not the case, that we were the first to proclaim the principle of friendship and comradely mutual assistance as the most important principle in relations between the countries of socialism and adhere to it firmly and consistently, that we render all-round and manifold assistance to liberated nations. And yet, for some reason, they find it to their advantage to present all this in an entirely distorted light.

The Soviet Union's persevering struggle for peace and international security, general and complete disarmament, elimination of the vestiges of World War II, negotiated settlement of all international issues, has yielded its results. Our country's prestige throughout the world stands higher than ever. Our international position is stronger than ever. We owe this to the steadily growing economic and military might of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, to their peaceful foreign policy.

The CPSU Central Committee declares that we have been following; are now following, and will continue to follow the Lenin policy of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems. In this our party sees its duty both to the Soviet people and the peoples of all other countries. To ensure peace means to contribute most effectively to the consolidation of the socialist system, and, consequently, to the growth of its influence on the entire course of the liberation struggle, on the world revolutionary process.

The deep difference in the views on war, peace and peaceful co-existence held by the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties, on the one hand, and the CPC leaders, on the other, was manifested with particular clarity during the 1962 Caribbean crisis. It was a sharp international crisis: never before had mankind come so close to the brink of thermo-nuclear war as it did last October.

The Chinese comrades claim that in the period of the Caribbean crisis we made an “adventuristic” mistake by supplying rockets to Cuba and then “capitulated” to American imperialism when we withdrew the rockets from Cuba.⁵²³

Such assertions utterly contradict the facts.

How did things actually stand? The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet government had reliable information that United States’ imperialism was about to launch armed aggression against Cuba. It was amply clear to us that to rebuff aggression, to defend the Cuban revolution effectively, would require the most resolute measures. **Imprecations and warnings—even if they are called “serious warnings” and are repeated 250 times—have no effect on the imperialists.**

Proceeding from the need to defend the Cuban revolution, the Soviet government and the government of Cuba reached agreement on the stationing of missiles on Cuba, since this was the only realistic means of preventing American imperialist aggression. The delivery of missiles to Cuba signified that an attack on her would meet with a resolute rebuff, with the employment of rocket weapons against the organizers of the aggression. This resolute step on the part of the Soviet Union and Cuba came as a shock to the American imperialists—for the first time in history they were made to

⁵²³ Such allegations were made in the leading article in the *People’s Daily* of March 8, 1963, “On the Statement of the Communist Party of the USA.” [Note in the original.]

feel that an armed attack on Cuba would be answered by a smashing blow at their own territory.

Inasmuch as it was not merely a conflict between the United States and Cuba, but a clash between the two major nuclear powers, the Caribbean crisis would have developed into a world crisis. There was a real danger of world thermonuclear war.

There were two possibilities in the prevailing situation: either to fall in with the “wild men” (the appellation of the most aggressive and reactionary representatives of American imperialism) and follow a path that would unleash a world thermonuclear war, or, using the opportunities offered by the delivery of missiles, to take all measures to reach agreement on peaceful settlement of the crisis and prevent aggression against the Cuban Republic.

We chose, as is known, the second path and we are convinced that we acted rightly. We are confident that this is the unanimous view of our people. The Soviet people have on more than one occasion demonstrated their ability to stand up for themselves, defend the cause of the revolution, the cause of socialism. And no one knows better than they how much grief and suffering war brings, what hardships and sacrifices it costs the peoples.

Agreement on the removal of the missile weapons in reply to the United States government’s commitment not to invade Cuba and keep its allies from doing so, the heroic struggle of the Cuban people, the support given them by the peace-loving nations, made it possible to thwart the plans of the extreme adventurist circles of American imperialism, which were ready to go the whole hog. As a result it was possible to defend revolutionary Cuba and save peace.

The Chinese comrades regard as an “embellishment of imperialism” our statement that the Kennedy government, too, displayed a certain reasonableness, a realistic approach in the course of the crisis around Cuba. Do they really think that all bourgeois governments, in all their doings, lack reason?

Thanks to the courageous and farsighted policy of the USSR, the staunchness and restraint of the heroic Cuban people and their government, the forces of socialism and peace proved their ability to curb the aggressive forces of imperialism and impose peace on the war advocates. This was a major victory for the policy of reason, for the forces of peace and socialism; this was a defeat for the forces of imperialism, for the policy of war gambles.

As a result, revolutionary Cuba is living in peace and is building socialism under the leadership of her United Party of the Socialist Revolution and the leader of the Cuban people, Comrade Fidel Castro Ruz.

When agreement was reached with the President of the United States, and a start thus made on liquidating the Caribbean crisis, the Chinese comrades were particularly inventive in insulting and abusing the Soviet Union, arguing that there was no believing the imperialists' word.

We are living in an age when there are two worlds, two systems: socialism and imperialism. It would be absurd to think that all the issues inevitably arising in relations between the countries of these two systems must be resolved only by force of arms, ruling out talks and agreements. If that were so, there would never be an end to war. We reject such an approach.

The Chinese comrades argue that the imperialists cannot be believed in anything, that they are bound to deceive. It is not a matter of believing, but of sober calculation. **Eight months have passed since liquidation of the crisis in the Caribbean, and the United States government is keeping its word—there has been no invasion of Cuba. We, too, have fulfilled our obligation to remove the missiles from Cuba.**

But it should also be remembered that we have undertaken an obligation to the Cuban people too: if the United States imperialists do not keep their promise and invade Cuba, we shall come to the assistance of the Cuban people. **Every sensible person realizes that in the event of an American imperialist invasion, we shall come to the assistance of the Cuban people from Soviet territory, just as we would have helped them from Cuban territory. True, in that case the rockets would be in flight slightly longer, but their precision would not be impaired.**

Why, then, do the Chinese comrades obstinately ignore the assessment the leaders of the Cuban revolution themselves have given the Soviet government's policy as a policy of fraternal solidarity and genuine internationalism? **What are the Chinese leaders dissatisfied with? The fact, perhaps, that it was possible to prevent the invasion of Cuba and the unleashing of world war?**

And what line of conduct did the CPC leadership take during the Caribbean crisis? **At that critical moment the Chinese comrades opposed to the realistic and firm stand of the Soviet government their own position. Guided by some particular concepts of their own, they concentrated the**

fire of their criticism not so much on US aggressive imperialism as on the CPSU and the Soviet Union.

The CPC leadership, which had been arguing that imperialism might at any time unleash a world war, at this crucial juncture assumed the role of critic, not of fighting ally and comrade. In those days no one heard statements from the Chinese leaders about their practical actions in defense of the Cuban revolution. Instead, the Chinese leaders were clearly working to aggravate the already critical situation in the Caribbean area, and added fuel to the smoldering coals of the conflict.

The true position of the CPC leadership on the issue of war and peace, its gross underestimation—more, its deliberate ignoring—of the struggle for disarmament, has been brought out with full clarity. The Chinese comrades object to Communists even raising this question, going to the length of pleading adherence to Marxism-Leninism, and trying to prove in every way the “infeasibility” of disarmament, on the one hand, and its needlessness on the other. Juggling with quotations, they try to prove that general disarmament is possible only with socialism triumphant the world over.

Must Marxists sit and wait for the world victory of socialism at a time when the world is in the suffocating clutches of the arms race, when the imperialists are stockpiling nuclear arms and threaten to plunge mankind into the abyss of a world war?

No, that would be criminal inaction in face of the imperative needs of the times.

This truth has long been known to all genuine Marxists-Leninists, who are aware of their responsibility to the peoples and who for several years have been waging—and will go on waging—a hard and persistent struggle for general and complete disarmament, for prohibition of nuclear weapons and their testing.

In fighting for peace, in advancing the slogan of general disarmament, we proceed from the vital interests of the peoples, take account of the actual situation and do not shut our eyes to the difficulties. The imperialists are naturally doing everything to delay and wreck agreement on disarmament—they stand to gain by this. They use the arms race to enrich themselves and to hold the people in capitalist countries in a state of fear. But must we swim with the stream? Must we follow in the wake of imperialism and refuse to mobilize all the forces to fight for peace and disarmament?

No. That would mean surrendering to the aggressive forces, to the militarists and imperialists. We believe that the working class, the working people of all countries, can force the imperialist governments to accept disarmament, can prevent war. For this they must above all become conscious of their strength and unite.

There must be opposed to the forces of imperialism and war, the organized might of the world working class. It now has the advantage of being able to rely on the material power and the defense might of the socialist countries, which stand opposed to imperialism. The time when imperialism held complete sway has gone forever. The situation has also changed sharply compared with the first decades after the October Revolution, when our country was alone and much weaker than today. In our day there is an entirely different balance of strength in the world arena. That is why **to maintain that war is inevitable is to display lack of faith in the forces of socialism, to succumb to moods of hopelessness and defeatism.**

One can repeat endlessly that war is inevitable, passing off this view as proof of one's "revolutionary spirit." In actual fact, this approach merely indicates disbelief in one's strength, fear of imperialism.

There are still powerful forces in the imperialist camp opposed to disarmament. But it is precisely to compel these forces to retreat that we must rouse the peoples' wrath against them, force them to comply with the will of the peoples.

The peoples want disarmament and believe that the Communists are the vanguard and organizers of the struggle to achieve it.

Our struggle for disarmament is not a tactical expedient. We sincerely want disarmament. And here we stand four-square on Marxism-Leninism. Way back at the close of the last century, Frederick Engels pointed out that disarmament was possible, describing it as the "guarantee of peace." In our time, the disarmament slogan was first advanced as a practical aim by V. I. Lenin, and the first Soviet proposals on complete or partial disarmament were submitted as early as 1922, at the Genoa Conference. This was in Lenin's lifetime, and he formulated the disarmament proposals.

The struggle for disarmament is a cardinal factor in averting war. It is an effective struggle against imperialism. In this struggle the socialist camp has on its side the absolute majority of mankind.

The Chinese comrades put out the slogan "spearpoint against spearpoint" as a counter-blast to the policy of the other socialist countries

aimed at improving the international situation and ending the cold war. This slogan, in effect, brings grist to the mill of imperialist brinkmanship policy and helps the arms race supporters. One gets the impression that the CPC leaders consider it to their advantage to preserve and aggravate international tension, especially in relations between the USSR and the USA. They apparently believe that the Soviet Union should reply to provocation by provocation, should fall into the traps set by the imperialist “wild men,” should accept the imperialist challenge to competition in adventurism and aggressiveness, that is, to competition in unleashing war, not in assuring peace.

To take that road would be to jeopardize the peace and security of the nations. The Communists, who cherish the interests of the peoples, will never follow that road.

The struggle for peace, for implementation of the principle of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems, is one of the most important forms of the peoples' struggle against imperialism, against the new wars it is preparing, against aggressive imperialist actions in colonial countries, against imperialist military bases on foreign territory, against the arms race, etc. This struggle is in the interests of the working class, of all the working people, and in that sense it is a class struggle.

Our party, all fraternal parties, remember, and are guided by, the conclusion drawn in the Statement that the struggle against the danger of a new world war has to be developed without waiting for the atomic and hydrogen bombs to be dropped. The struggle must be waged now and intensified from day to day. The main thing is to curb the aggressors a in good time, prevent war, not allow it to break out. Fighting for peace today implies maintaining supreme vigilance, tirelessly exposing imperialist policy, keeping close watch on the war instigators' manoeuvres and machinations, rousing the wrath of the peoples against those whose policy is war, enhancing the organization of the peace forces, constantly intensifying mass activity for peace, strengthening cooperation with all states not interested in new wars.

The struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence weakens the front of imperialism, isolates its most aggressive circles from the people and helps advance the revolutionary struggle of the working class and the national-liberation struggle of the peoples.

The struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence is organically linked with the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. “In conditions of peaceful

co-existence,” the Statement of the 81 Communist parties says, “favorable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. In their turn, the successes of the revolutionary class and national-liberation struggle promote peaceful co-existence.”

In conditions of peaceful co-existence, new important victories have been scored in recent years in the class struggle of the proletariat and in the struggle of the peoples for national freedom. The world revolutionary process is developing successfully.

For this reason, **to separate the fight for peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems from the revolutionary fight against imperialism and colonialism, for independence and socialism—to counterpose them, as the Chinese comrades do—is to reduce the principle of peaceful co-existence to a hollow phrase, to deprive it of all real meaning, to ignore, in effect, the need for resolute struggle against imperialism, for peace and peaceful co-existence. But that would be to the benefit only of the imperialists.**

In its June 14 letter, the CPC Central Committee accuses the Communist parties of extending peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems to relations between the exploiters and the exploited, between the oppressed and oppressor classes, between the working people and the imperialists. This is a monstrous fabrication and slander of the fraternal parties, which are leading the proletariat in its class battles with capital and which always support the revolutionary struggle and the just liberation wars against imperialism.

The arguments the CPC leaders advance in their struggle against the CPSU and the other fraternal parties are so feeble that they have to resort to all manner of subterfuge. They begin by ascribing to us absolutely groundless propositions of their own invention and then proceed to accuse us, to fight us and expose these propositions. That applies to their absurd allegation that the CPSU and the other fraternal parties have renounced revolution and have substituted peaceful coexistence for the class struggle. Even political-study-group students know that peaceful co-existence applies to governmental relations between socialist and capitalist states. The principle of peaceful co-existence, naturally, can in no way be extended to relations between antagonistic classes in

capitalist states. Nor is it permissible to extend it to the working-class struggle against the bourgeoisie for its class interests, or to the struggle of oppressed peoples against the colonialists. The CPSU is resolutely opposed to peaceful co-existence in ideology. This is a truism which all who regard themselves as Marxists-Leninists should have mastered.

III

There are serious differences between the CPC and the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties on the question of combating the consequences of the Stalin personality cult.

The CPC leaders have taken upon themselves the role of defenders of the personality cult and peddlers of Stalin's erroneous ideas. They are trying to impose upon other parties the order of things, the ideology and morals, the forms and methods of leadership that flourished in the period of the personality cult. Let it be frankly said that this is an unenviable role, and one that will bring them neither honor nor glory. No one will succeed in persuading Marxists-Leninists, or progressives in general, to take up the defense of the personality cult.

The Soviet people and the world communist movement highly appreciate the courage, boldness, the truly Leninist firmness of principle displayed by our party and its Central Committee headed by N. S. Khrushchev in eliminating the consequences of the personality cult.

Everyone knows that our party did this in order to remove the heavy burden that fettered the powerful forces of the people and thereby accelerate the development of Soviet society. Our party did this in order to keep pure the ideals of socialism bequeathed to us by the great Lenin and purge them of the stigma of abuse of personal power and arbitrariness. It did this in order to prevent a recurrence of the tragic events that were a concomitant of the personality cult, to help all fighters for socialism draw lessons from our experience.

The entire communist movement correctly understood and supported the struggle against the personality cult, which is alien to Marxism-Leninism, against its harmful consequences.

The Chinese leaders, too, approved. They spoke of the tremendous international significance of the 20th CPSU Congress.

In his opening address at the Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of China, in September 1956, Comrade Mao Zedong said:

“The Soviet comrades, the Soviet people, have acted in accordance with Lenin’s instructions. They have achieved brilliant successes in a brief space of time. The recent 20th Congress of the CPSU likewise worked out many correct political propositions and condemned shortcomings in the work of the party. It can be said with confidence that in future their work will develop on an exceptionally great scale.”

In the political report of the CPC Central Committee, delivered at the Congress by Comrade Liu Shaoqi, this appraisal was further amplified:

“The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, held in February this year, is a most important political event of world-wide significance. It not only outlined the magnificent sixth five-year plan and a number of most important political directives aimed at furthering the cause of socialism and condemned the personality cult, which had led to serious consequences in the party, but it also advanced proposals for the further promotion of peaceful co-existence and international cooperation and made an outstanding contribution to the relaxation of international tension.”

Comrade Deng Xiaoping, in his report on changes in the Party Rules at the same Eighth Congress of the CPC, said:

“Leninism requires that party decisions on all important questions be taken by an appropriate collective, and not individually. The 20th Congress of the CPSU convincingly demonstrated the great importance of unswerving observance of the principle of collective leadership and of the struggle against the personality cult. This has had a tremendous influence not only on the CPSU, but also on Communist parties in all countries of the world.”

In the well-known editorial in the *People’s Daily* newspaper, “Once More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat” (December 1956), the Chinese comrades wrote:

The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union displayed tremendous determination and courage in eliminating the Stalin cult, in exposing Stalin’s grave errors and in eliminating the consequences of Stalin’s errors. Throughout the world Marxists-Leninists and those who sympathize with the cause of communism support the efforts of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to correct the errors and wish the Soviet comrades complete success in their efforts.

And that is how things really stood.

Any unbiased person who compares these pronouncements of the Chinese leaders with the CPC Central Committee letter of June 14 will see that they have made a 180-degree turn in their evaluation of the 20th Congress of our party.

But are vacillation and inconsistency permissible on such questions of principle? Of course, they are not. **Either the Chinese leaders had no differences with the CPSU Central Committee on these questions of principle before, or all these statements were false.**

It is well known that practice is the best criterion of truth. And practice has convincingly proved that realization of the line of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU has produced splendid results in the life of our country. In the ten years since the time when our party made a sharp turn towards restoration of the Leninist principles and norms in party life, Soviet society achieved truly majestic results in economic, scientific and cultural development, in raising prosperity standards, in consolidating its defense potential, in the successful pursuance of its foreign policy.

The atmosphere of fear, suspicion and uncertainty which poisoned the life of the people in the period of the personality cult became a thing of the past. No one can deny that the Soviet people began to live better and enjoy the benefits of socialism. Ask the worker (and there are millions of them!) who moved into a new apartment, ask the pensioner who is well provided for in his old age, the collective farmer who is now well-to-do, ask the thousands upon thousands of people who suffered unjust repressions in the period of the personality cult and to whom freedom and their good name were restored, and you will know what practical meaning the victory of the Leninist course of the 20th CPSU Congress has had for the Soviet people.

Ask those whose fathers and mothers were victims of repression in the period of the personality cult what it meant to have their fathers, mothers and brothers accepted as honest people, and to know that they themselves are not outcasts of our society, but worthy and full-fledged sons and daughters of the Soviet fatherland.

Industry, agriculture, culture, science, art—no matter where we turn, we witness rapid progress. Our spaceships are furrowing the expanses of the Universe, and this, too, provides brilliant confirmation that the course along which our party leads the Soviet people is a correct one.

Of course, we do not maintain that we have done everything for Soviet man, for improving his life. The Soviet people understand that the achieve-

ment of this principle depends not only on our wish. We have to build communist society and create an abundance of material benefits. That is why our people are working with such devotion to accelerate the production of material and cultural values and bring closer the victory of communism. Everyone can see that we are following a correct course, that we clearly see the prospects of our development.

The CPSU Program maps out a concrete plan of the construction of communism. Its implementation will ensure the Soviet people the highest living standards and will be the start of our gradual transition to the inspiring communist principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

The Soviet people find it strange and fantastic that the Chinese comrades should seek to discredit the Program of the CPSU, that majestic plan of building communist society.

The CPC leaders hint that, since our party has made its aim a better life for the people, Soviet society is being "bourgeoisified," is "degenerating." According to their logic, if people wear bast sandals and eat thin soup from a common bowl—that is communism, and if a working man lives well and wants to live better still tomorrow—that is very nearly the restoration of capitalism.

And this philosophy they want to present to us as the latest revelation of Marxism-Leninism! This fully exposes the authors of such "theories" as men who have no faith in the strength and capabilities of a working class that has taken power into its own hands and created its own socialist state.

If we turn to the history of our country, to the CPSU Program, we will readily see where we began when, under the leadership of Lenin, we took power into our hands, and what summits the Soviet people have reached. Our country has been transformed into a great socialist power. In volume of industrial production the Soviet Union is first in Europe and second in the world. It will soon surpass the United States and advance to first place. The Soviet working class, the Soviet collective-farm peasantry, the Soviet intelligentsia, are the creators of all our victories.

We are convinced that not only the Soviet people, but the peoples of other socialist countries, too, are capable of great achievements on the labor front—all that is necessary is correct guidance of the working class and peasantry, and that those responsible for such guidance think realistically and

take decisions that direct the people's strength and energies along the correct path.

In an attempt to justify the personality cult, the Chinese leaders have overloaded their letter with allegations about a class struggle in the USSR, and allege that the CPSU Program proposition on a state of the entire people and a party of the entire people is wrong. These allegations are far removed from Marxism.

We do not intend to analyze all their arguments in detail in this letter. Anyone who reads the CPC Central Committee letter of June 14 will undoubtedly notice that **its arguments are utterly helpless and betray complete isolation from Soviet life.** We are being taught that hostile classes still remain in Soviet society and the need therefore remains, we are told, for the dictatorship of the proletariat. What classes? From the CPC letter one concludes that they are "bourgeois hangers-on, parasites, black marketeers, thieves, idlers, hooligans and embezzlers."

The Chinese comrades certainly have a unique notion of classes and class struggle. Since when have these parasitic elements been considered a class? And what class? A class of idlers or a class of hooligans, a class of embezzlers, or a class of parasites? In no society do criminals constitute a class. Even schoolboys know that. And, of course, these elements do not constitute a class in socialist society. These are manifestations of the survivals of capitalism.

You do not need proletarian dictatorship to combat such elements. The state of the entire people can fully cope, and is coping, with this task. We know from our own experience that the better the educational work of party, trade union and other public organizations, the higher the role of the public, the better the work of the Soviet militia, the more effective is the struggle against crime.

There is no refuting the fact that Soviet society is now made up of two main classes—the workers and the peasants, also the intelligentsia, that no class of Soviet society occupies a position enabling it to exploit other classes. Dictatorship is a class concept; over whom do the Chinese comrades propose to exercise dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union: over the collective-farm peasantry or the people's intelligentsia? One must reckon with the fact that in socialist society the class of workers and the class of peasants have changed substantially, that the differences and distinctions between them are being steadily obliterated.

After the complete and final victory of socialism, the working class effects its guiding role not through dictatorship of the proletariat. It still remains the front-rank class of society in conditions of full-scale construction of communism. Its front-rank role is determined by its economic position, by the fact that it is directly connected with the highest form of socialist property, and by the fact that it is more steeled by decades of class struggle and revolutionary experience.

The Chinese comrades refer to Marx's proposition that the content of the transition period from capitalism to communism can be only the dictatorship of the proletariat. But Marx had in mind communism as a whole, as an integral socio-economic formation (of which socialism is the first stage), the transition to which is impossible without socialist revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat. There are a number of pronouncements of V. I. Lenin, emphasizing with absolute clarity that the dictatorship of the proletariat is needed precisely to overcome resistance of the exploiting classes, organize socialist construction, ensure the victory of socialism—the first phase of communism. It is clear from this that the need for dictatorship of the proletariat disappears after the victory of socialism, when only working people, friendly classes, the nature of which has changed radically, remain in society and there is no one to suppress.

If we were to extract the substance of the mass of pseudo-theoretical disquisitions on these questions in the CPC Central Committee letter, it would boil down to the following: the Chinese comrades are opposed to the CPSU policy of developing socialist democracy, so forcefully formulated in the decisions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Party Congresses and the CPSU Program. It is no mere accident that their lengthy letter does not even mention the development of democracy in conditions of socialism, in conditions of building communism.

It is hard fully to ascertain the Chinese comrades' motivation in upholding the personality cult. In effect, this is the first time in the history of the international communist movement that we meet with open extollation of the personality cult. It should be observed that even at the height of the personality cult in our country, Stalin himself was forced, at least in words, to reject this petit-bourgeois theory, saying that it stemmed from the Socialist-Revolutionaries.

The attempt to plead the authority of Marx and Lenin in defense of the ideology of the personality cult can only evoke surprise. Are the Chinese

comrades really unaware of the fact that in the very early days of our party Lenin conducted a vigorous struggle against the Narodniks' theories of the hero and the mob, that genuine collective methods of leadership in the Central Committee of our party and the Soviet state were implemented under Lenin, that Lenin was an extraordinarily modest person and mercilessly castigated the slightest manifestations of toadyism and servility?

Of course, the struggle against the personality cult has never been regarded by our party or the other Marxist-Leninist parties as negation of the authority of party and government leaders. Time and again, at the 20th and 22nd Congresses and on other occasions, the CPSU has stressed that the party values the authority of its leadership, that, while rejecting the personality cult and combating its consequences, the party has a high regard for leaders who really express the interests of the people and devote all their strength to the struggle for communism, and for this reason enjoy deserved prestige.

IV

The next important issue of difference concerns the ways and methods of the revolutionary struggle of the working class in capitalist countries, of the struggle for national liberation, and the ways of transition of all mankind to socialism.

This is how the Chinese comrades depict our differences on this issue: one side—they themselves—stands for world revolution; the other side—the CPSU and the Marxist-Leninist parties—has forgotten the revolution, even “fears” it and, instead of revolutionary struggle, is concerned with such things “unworthy of a genuine revolutionary as peace, economic development of the socialist countries and improvement of their peoples' living standards, the struggle for the democratic rights and vital interests of the working people in capitalist countries.

In reality, however, the line of division between the views of the CPC and those of the international communist movement lies on an entirely different plane: the CPC leaders speak of world revolution where necessary and where not, and flaunt “revolutionary” phrases on every occasion, often without occasion, whereas the other side—those whom the Chinese comrades criticize—approach the question of revolution seriously and, instead of highfalutin phrases, are perseveringly working to find the most correct paths for the victory of socialism, paths that accord

with the conditions of the era, and are devotedly fighting for national independence, democracy and socialism.

Let us examine the principal views of the Chinese-comrades on the problems of the present-day revolutionary movement.

Will it help the countries and peoples to pass over to socialism if, in the name of “world revolution,” they abandon the struggle for peace, the policy of peaceful co-existence and peaceful economic competition, the struggle for the vital interests of the working people and for democratic reforms in capitalist countries? Is it true that in advocating peace and pursuing a policy of peaceful co-existence, the Communists of the socialist countries are concerned only for themselves and are oblivious to their class brothers in the capitalist countries?

Everyone who ponders on the meaning of the present struggle for peace and against thermonuclear war will realize that the Soviet Communists and the fraternal parties in other socialist countries are, by their peace policy, rendering invaluable assistance to the working class and working people generally of the capitalist countries. **Nor is it merely a matter of averting nuclear war in order to save from destruction the working class and the people of whole countries, even continents, though this is in itself ample justification of our policy.**

There is another consideration—this policy is the best way of helping the international revolutionary labor movement achieve its basic class aims. Is it not an immense contribution to the working-class struggle that the lands of socialism, in the conditions of the peace they themselves won, are scoring remarkable achievements in economic development, advancing from victory to victory in the scientific and technical fields, steadily improving the living and working conditions of the people and developing and perfecting socialist democracy?

In face of these successes and victories every worker in every capitalist country will say: “Socialism has proved in practice its superiority over capitalism. It is a system worth fighting for.” Socialism is now winning men’s hearts and minds, not only through books, but primarily by its deeds, by the living example it has set.

The 1960 Statement regards as the chief distinctive feature of our time the fact that the socialist world system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of human society. All the Communist parties represented at the

meeting arrived at the conclusion that the international working class and its creation, the socialist world system, is the central factor of our era.

The solution to all the other problems confronting the revolutionary movement depends in very great measure on strengthening the socialist world system. That is why the Communist and Workers' parties have assumed the obligation "*indefatigably to strengthen the great socialist community of nations, whose international role and influence on the course of world events are growing from year to year.*" And it is in the accomplishment of this all-important task that our party sees its supreme international duty.

V. I. Lenin taught us that "*we exert our main influence on the international revolution by our economic policy... In this field the struggle is being waged on an international scale. When we solve this task, we shall have won on an international scale, finally and for certain.*" (*Works*, Vol. 32, p. 413.)

That behest of the great Lenin has been firmly assimilated by the Soviet Communists; it is being followed by Communists in other lands of socialism. But, it appears, some comrades have decided that Lenin was wrong.

What is this, disbelief in the ability of the socialist countries to win the economic race with capitalism? Or is it the attitude of men who, confronted with the difficulties of socialist construction, are disappointed and do not see the possibility of exerting our main influence on the international revolutionary movement by our economic achievements, by the example of successful socialist construction in our countries? They want to achieve the revolution quicker by following paths which, in their opinion, are a shortcut. But the victorious revolution can consolidate and extend its achievements and prove socialism's superiority over capitalism only by labor, only by the labor effort of the people. True, this is not easy, especially in the case of revolutions performed in countries inheriting underdeveloped economies. But the example of the Soviet Union and of many other socialist countries convincingly shows that, even under these conditions, immense progress can be made and the superiority of socialism over capitalism demonstrated to the world, providing there is correct leadership.

Further: what is more favorable for the working-class revolutionary struggle in capitalist countries—an atmosphere of peace and peaceful co-existence, or an atmosphere of unrelaxing international strain and cold war?

There can be no doubt about the answer. For everyone knows that the ruling element in the imperialist powers, is exploiting the cold-war atmosphere to instigate chauvinism, war hysteria and rabid anti-communism in order to place in power the most arrant reactionaries and pro-fascists, abolish democracy, make short shrift of the political parties, trade unions and other mass organizations of the working class.

The Communists' fight for peace tremendously strengthens their ties with the masses, their authority and influence and, consequently, helps to create what is known as the political army of the revolution.

Far from hampering and postponing the struggle for the ultimate aims of the international working class, the fight for peace and peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems makes it possible to give that struggle full scope.

It is hard to believe that the Chinese comrades, men of experience who have themselves performed a revolution, fail to appreciate the chief consideration, namely, that today the world revolution develops through the strengthening of the socialist world system, through the revolutionary class struggles of the workers in the capitalist countries, through the national-liberation movement, the strengthening of the political and economic independence of the newly liberated Afro-Asian countries, through the struggle for peace, against aggressive war, and through the anti-monopoly struggle of the masses. It develops along these and many other paths, which should not be counterposed to each other, but united and directed towards the single goal of overthrowing imperialist domination.

The Chinese comrades haughtily and insultingly accuse the Communist parties of France, Italy, the USA, and other countries of nothing less than opportunism and reformism, of "parliamentary-cretinism," even of sliding into "bourgeois socialism." On what grounds? On the grounds that these Communist parties do not advance the slogan of immediate proletarian revolution, though the Chinese leaders, too, should realize that this cannot be done in the absence of a revolutionary situation.

Every knowledgeable Marxist-Leninist knows that it is premature to advance the slogan of armed uprising in the absence of a revolutionary situation, that this would doom the working class to certain defeat. We know with what great care and seriousness V. I. Lenin regarded this problem, and with what political foresight and knowledge of the concrete situation he approached the question of selecting the time for a revolutionary rising. On

the very eve of the October Revolution Lenin pointed out that it would be too early to come out on October 24, and too late on October 26—everything might then be lost. Consequently, the seizure of power had to be undertaken on October 25. Who can determine the degree of tension of class contradictions, the existence of a revolutionary situation, the exact moment for acting? That can only be done by the working class of each country, by its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist party.

The history of the international labor movement shows that it is a bad party which, while calling itself a workers' party, devotes itself solely to economic matters, does not educate the working class in a revolutionary spirit, does not prepare it for political struggle, for the seizure of power. Such a party is bound to slide into reformism. But it is a bad party, too, that approaches political struggle out of context with the struggle for improving the economic position of the working class, the peasantry, the working people generally. Such a party is bound to become isolated from the masses. Only correct utilization of all the forms of class struggle in skillful combination enables a party to become a genuinely revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist party, the leader of the masses, a party capable of directing the working class in the onslaught on capitalism, in the achievement of power.

The mortal sin of many Communist parties in developed capitalist countries, the Chinese comrades think, is that they consider their immediate task to be the struggle for the economic and social interests of the working people, for democratic reforms that are feasible under capitalism and improve the conditions of the working class, peasantry, the petit bourgeois strata, facilitating the establishment of a broad anti-monopoly front as the basis for further struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution—in other words, that they are doing all the things set out in the Moscow Statement of 1960.

In arguing against all the things the Communist parties in developed capitalist countries are now doing, the Chinese comrades fail to display even an elementary feeling of solidarity with the Communists who are fighting capital on the frontline of the class struggle; they fail to display an understanding of the specific conditions in these countries, of the specific paths followed by the working-class revolutionary movement. In effect, they reject, “in the name of the revolution,” the very paths that lead to revolution, and are endeavoring to impose a policy that would

isolate the Communist parties from the masses, deprive the working class of its allies in the fight against monopoly rule and capitalism.

The Chinese comrades differ with the world communist movement also on the question of the forms of transition of various countries to socialism.

It is generally known that the CPSU and the Marxist-Leninist parties—and this is clearly stated in the Moscow conference documents and the CPSU Program—believe that both peaceful and non-peaceful transition to socialism is possible. Yet **the Chinese comrades obstinately affirm that our and other fraternal parties accept only the peaceful path.**

The Central Committee of the CPSU restated its position on this issue in its letter of March 30, 1963:

The working class and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist parties, endeavor to accomplish the socialist revolution by peaceful means, without civil war. Realization of this possibility would accord with the interests of the working class and the entire people, with the general national interest of the country. But, at the same time, the choice of the revolution's path of development depends not only on the working class. If the exploiting classes resort to violence against the people, the working class will be forced to take the non-peaceful path of capturing power. Everything depends on the concrete conditions, on the line-up of class forces within the country and internationally.

Needless to say, whatever the form of transition from capitalism to socialism, it is possible only through socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship in its various forms. The CPSU highly regards the self-sacrificing struggle of the working class, led by the Communists, in all capitalist countries and considers it its duty to give it every possible assistance and support.

We have time and again explained our point of view, and there is no need to set it out in more detail here.

But what is the position of the Chinese comrades on this question? It is fully apparent in all their pronouncements and in the CPC Central Committee letter of June 14.

The Chinese comrades consider recognition of armed uprising, always, everywhere and in everything, to be the chief criterion of devotion to

the revolution. They thereby virtually negate the possibility of utilizing peaceful forms of struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution, whereas Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the Communists must master all forms of revolutionary class struggle, both violent and non-violent.

Still another important issue is the relation between the international working-class struggle and the national-liberation movement of the Asian, African and Latin-American peoples.

The international revolutionary labor movement—which now includes also the socialist world system and the Communist parties of the capitalist countries—and the national-liberation movement of the Asian, African and Latin-American peoples—these are the great forces of our age, and a correct relationship between them is we cardinal condition for victory over imperialism.

How do the Chinese comrades solve this problem? Their solution is evident from their new “theory,” according to which the chief contradiction of our time is not, we are told, between socialism and imperialism, but between the national-liberation movement and imperialism. In the Chinese comrades’ opinion, the decisive force in the battle against imperialism is not the socialist world system, and not the international working-class struggle but, again we are told, the national-liberation movement.

The Chinese comrades evidently want to use this as the easiest way of winning popularity among the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. But let no one be taken in by that “theory.” Its real purpose, irrespective of the wishes of the Chinese theoreticians, is to isolate the national-liberation movement from the international working class and its creation, the socialist world system. But that would offer an immense danger to the national-liberation movement itself.

For indeed, could many Asian peoples, notwithstanding all their heroism and self-sacrifice, win through to victory if the October Revolution and, later, the emergence of the socialist world system, had not shaken imperialism to its very foundations and had not undermined colonialist strength?

And today, too, when the liberated nations have entered a new stage in their struggle and are concentrating their efforts on consolidating their political gains and economic independence—do they not realize that it would be immeasurably harder, if not altogether impossible, to accomplish these tasks without assistance from the socialist countries?

Marxists-Leninists always emphasize the epochal importance and great future of the national-liberation movement. But they believe that one of the chief conditions for its continued advance is firm alliance and cooperation with the countries of the socialist world system, the main force in the battle against imperialism, and with the labor movement of the capitalist countries. That attitude was formulated in the 1960 Statement. It is based on Lenin's idea of working-class leadership (hegemony) as a requisite for victory in the anti-imperialist struggle. Only given such hegemony, can the movement, in the final analysis, acquire a genuine socialist character, culminating in its transition to the path of socialist revolution.

That idea of Lenin, verified by the experience of the October Revolution and of other countries, has never aroused doubt in anyone. **It appears, however, that the Chinese comrades want to "correct" Lenin and prove that hegemony in the world struggle against imperialism should go not to the working class, but to the petit bourgeoisie or the national bourgeoisie, even to "certain patriotically minded kings, princes and aristocrats." And after that the CPC leadership sets out to teach the world communist movement that never, under no circumstances, must we abandon our proletarian, class approach!**

The earnest of future victories, both of the international working class and the national-liberation movement, lies in their firm alliance and cooperation, in joint struggle, dictated by their common interests, against imperialism. In this struggle, the working class, by its selfless dedication to the interests of all the peoples, wins acceptance of its leading part and convinces its allies that its leadership is a reliable guarantee of victory for itself and for them.

Our Leninist party regards the national-liberation movement as a component part of the world revolutionary process, as a mighty force combating imperialism. The great slogan "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" given us by Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific communism, became the battle banner of the international proletariat. In the new conditions of history created by the victory of the Great October Revolution, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, who continued the work of Marx and Engels, especially emphasized the unbreakable link between the socialist revolution and the national-liberation movement.

"Workers of All Countries, Unite!" was and remains the chief slogan in the struggle for the victory of the world revolution. It has acquired wider meaning in the new conditions. We know that Lenin approved the slogan:

“Workers of All Countries and Oppressed Peoples, Unite!” Emphasized in this slogan is the leading role of the proletariat and the enhanced significance of the national-liberation movement. Our party strictly abides by this Marxist-Leninist internationalist principle in all its activities.

It might be asked: what is the explanation for the erroneous propositions of the CPC leadership on the crucial issues of our age? The Chinese comrades are either completely divorced from reality and approach the problems of war, peace and revolution in a dogmatic, bookish way, failing to understand the concrete conditions of our era, or behind their clamor about “world revolution” are other aims, aims that have nothing in common with revolution.

All this shows that the policy the CPC leadership is seeking to impose on the world communist movement is an erroneous and fatal one. For what the Chinese comrades propose under the guise of a “general line” is but an enumeration of the most general tasks of the working class, an enumeration, moreover, that does not take into account the times we are living in, the real inter-relationship of class forces, and the peculiarities of the present stage of history. The Chinese comrades fail to notice, or do not want to notice, how the tasks of our movement are changing in accordance with the conditions of the present era. By reducing the general line to general tasks that apply to every stage of the transition from capitalism to socialism, they deprive it of concreteness, purposefulness and efficacy.

In working out their present policy, the fraternal parties concretely analyzed the line-up of class forces in individual countries and on a world scale, the distinguishing features in the development of the two mutually opposed systems, and the present stage in the development of the national-liberation movement.

A precise analysis of changes in the world situation enabled the fraternal parties of the whole world to work out a Marxist-Leninist definition of our era: “Our time, whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism, initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is a time of struggle between the two opposing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, a time of the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, a time of transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a worldwide scale.”

This definition of our era was the basis for a correct approach in working out the strategy and tactics of the world communist movement.

The Marxist-Leninist parties have defined their general line, the basic propositions of which are as follows:

– the nature and content of the world revolutionary process in our time are determined by the merger into a single stream of the struggle against imperialism waged by the peoples building socialism and communism, the revolutionary working-class movement in capitalist countries, the national-liberation movement of oppressed peoples, and general democratic movements; the decisive role in the alliance of anti-imperialist revolutionary forces belongs to the international working class and its chief creation—the socialist world system, which exerts its main influence on the development of the world socialist revolution by the power of its example, by its economic progress;

– due to the prevailing objective conditions of history (extreme sharpening of imperialist aggressiveness, emergence of weapons of vast destructive power, etc.) central among all the tasks confronting the anti-imperialist forces in the present era is the struggle to prevent thermonuclear war. Uniting all the peace forces to defend peace and save mankind from nuclear disaster is the primary task of the Communist parties;

– the socialist revolution is performed as a result of the internal development of the class struggle in each country, its forms and paths are determined by the concrete conditions of each country. A law common to all countries is the revolutionary overthrow of capitalist power and establishment, in one or another form, of proletarian dictatorship. The task of the working class and the Communist parties is to make maximum use of possibilities now available for a peaceful path of socialist revolution, one not connected with civil war, and, at the same time, be prepared for a non-peaceful path, for armed suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie; the general democratic struggle is a necessary component of the struggle for socialism;

– the aim of the working class and the Communist parties in the national-liberation movement is to carry to completion the tasks of the anti-imperialist democratic revolution, develop and consolidate the national front based on alliance with the peasantry and the patriotically minded national bourgeoisie; prepare the conditions for forming

national-democratic states and for transition to the non-capitalist path of development;

– relations of cooperation and mutual assistance between socialist countries, solidarity and unity of the international communist and labor movement, faithful observance of jointly worked out positions and appraisals, fidelity to the Leninist principles of party life and relations between parties—these are necessary requisites for the successful solution of the historic tasks confronting the Communists.

Such, in the present era, are the basic development paths of the world revolutionary process; such are the basic propositions of the general line of the international communist movement in the present stage. The battle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism—that, briefly, is the substance of this general line. Its consistent operation is the world communist movement’s guarantee of success.

All these key principles of the international communist movement in present-day conditions, collectively worked out by the fraternal Communist and Workers’ parties and formulated in the Declaration and Statement, have found expression in the new CPSU Program, which is based entirely on a Marxist-Leninist generalization of our and international revolutionary experience.

V

The erroneous views of the CPC leaders on the cardinal political and theoretical issues of our time are inseverably linked with their practical activity, which is directed towards undermining the unity of the world socialist camp and the international communist movement.

In words, the Chinese comrades acknowledge that the unity of the USSR and the People’s Republic of China is the mainstay of the entire socialist community, but in deed they are undermining relations with our party, with our country in all fields.

The CPC leadership often speaks of its loyalty to the community of the socialist nations. But the attitude of the Chinese comrades to this community refutes their high-sounding declarations.

The figures show that in the past three years the People’s Republic of China has cut the volume of its trade with the other socialist countries by more than 50 percent. For some socialist countries the results of this policy of the Chinese comrades have been especially painful.

The actions of the Chinese leadership stand in glaring contradiction not only to the principles of mutual relations among socialist countries but, in a number of cases, to the accepted rules and norms all states should abide by.

Violation of existing agreements caused serious damage to the national economy of some socialist states. And, understandably, China's own economy is also suffering no little damage from this curtailment of economic contacts.

In an effort to justify its actions in the eyes of the people, the CPC leadership recently put forward the theory of "relying on one's own forces." In general, for each country to build socialism, relying primarily on the efforts of its people and making the best use of its own resources is the correct way of laying the material and technical basis of socialism. The construction of socialism is, in each country, primarily the concern of the people of that country, of its working class and its Communist party.

The Soviet Union, which was the first socialist country, was obliged to build socialism by relying only on its own forces and utilizing its internal resources. And although there is now a system of socialist countries, this by no means signifies that the people of any country can sit back with folded arms and rely exclusively on the assistance of other socialist countries. The Communist party of each socialist country regards it as its duty to mobilize all internal reserves for successful economic development. In its direct sense, therefore, the statement of the CPC Central Committee on the construction of socialism mainly by one's own forces would raise no objections.

However, as the entire text of the CPC Central Committee letter and numerous statements in the Chinese press show, this proposition is in effect given an interpretation that is wholly unacceptable.

The: "building of socialism chiefly by one's own forces" formula cloaks the concept of building up self-sufficient national economies with economic relations with other countries restricted to trade alone. And this approach the Chinese comrades are trying to impose on other socialist countries.

Proclamation of the "relying on one's own forces" line was apparently needed by the CPC leadership in order to weaken the bonds of close friendship among the socialist countries. This policy, it goes without saying, has nothing in common with the principles of socialist internation-

alism. It cannot be regarded otherwise than as an attempt to undermine the unity of the socialist community.

Parallel with the line of curtailing economic ties, the CPC leadership adopted a number of measures calculated to aggravate relations with the Soviet Union.

The Chinese leaders are undermining the unity not only of the socialist camp but of the entire world communist movement, trampling on the principles of proletarian internationalism and grossly violating accepted standards of relations between fraternal parties.

The CPC leadership organizes and supports various anti-party break-away groups, which oppose the Communist parties of the United States, Brazil, Italy, Belgium, Australia and India. For instance, in Belgium the CPC leadership is supporting the Grippe group, which was expelled from the party at the last congress. In the United States support is given to the subversive activities of the Left opportunist grouping "Hammer and Steel," which has made battle against the Communist Party of the United States its main aim. In Brazil, the Chinese comrades support the factional groups expelled from the Communist Party (as for instance, the Amazonas-Grabois group).

In Australia, the CPC Central Committee tried to organize splitting activities against the Communist party and its leadership with the help of a former member of the leadership, E Hill. Hill, who visited the PRC at one time, came out publicly against the Communist Party of Australia and tried to line up a group of persons of his mind. When the Communist Party of Australia expelled Hill from its Central Committee he demonstratively removed himself to Beijing.

In Italy, Chinese representatives are encouraging the activity of the group formed by former functionaries of the Padua federation of the Communist party, who issued leaflets provocationally calling for a "revolutionary" uprising.

Comrades from the CPC are making particular efforts to conduct subversive activities in the Communist and Workers' parties of the Asian, African, and Latin-American countries.

Lauding the renegades and defectors from the ranks of the communist movement, the Chinese leaders reprint in their newspapers and magazines slanderous articles from the publications of these renegade

groups directed against the policy of the CPSU, against the course of the entire world communist movement.

In Ceylon, Chinese representatives maintain close contact with the grouping of E. Samarakkody, which is a tool of the Trotskyist “Fourth International.”

The Trotskyists from the “Fourth International” are trying to utilize the position of the Chinese comrades for their own ends; they even addressed an open letter to the CPC Central Committee in which they openly declare: “The Fourth International, which from the day of its foundation has been waging... a struggle against the ideas you oppose today, stands on your side... The international secretariat of the Fourth International welcomes this discussion you have started within the entire communist movement. It urges you to develop it.”

The Chinese leaders level sharp attacks on the fraternal Communist parties and their leaders, who do not want to depart from the general line of the international communist movement. They have published and circulated in many languages articles discrediting the activity of the Communist Party of the United States, and the French, Italian and Indian Communist parties. There is no term of abuse their authors fail to hurl at well-known leaders of these fraternal parties. “Double-dealing” and “Right opportunism,” “revisionism” and “incompatibility with the standards of communist ethics,” “social-democratic degeneration” and “faint-heartedness,” “irresponsibility” and “parroting,” “supercilious and disdainful attitude towards the revolutionary peoples of the Asian, African and Latin-American countries”—they are all there.

The Chinese leaders accuse the Communist parties of the United States and Western Europe of being “at one with the most adventurist American imperialists.” The leadership of the Communist Party of India is invariably termed a “clique.” Levelled against the leaders of the Communist parties of France, Italy, India and the United States is the monstrous accusation of being “concerned for the fate of imperialism and all reactionaries.” **And in its letter of June 14 the CPC leadership sinks so low as to insinuate that the CPSU too “acts in the role of an accomplice of imperialism.” So obvious is the absurdity of this that no one but the Trotskyists have until now ever ventured to make such a slanderous charge against the great Party of Lenin.**

Is it any wonder that imperialist propoganda rejoices at such actions by the Chinese comrades? It is not by accident that the bourgeois press keeps shouting about a “crisis” in the world communist movement and urges the imperialist governments to exploit in their own interests the differences caused by the stand taken by the CPC Central Committee.

The representatives of the CPC resigned from the editorial board of the *World Marxist Review*, the collective theoretical and information magazine of the Communist and Workers’ parties, and stopped its publication in the Chinese language, seeking in this way to deprive Chinese Communists of an objective source of information about the activities of the world communist movement.

The splitting activities of the Chinese leadership in the ranks of the world Communist movement evoke rightful indignation and opposition of the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties.

The CPC Central Committee letter says that in any one party’s relations with fraternal Communist parties it is “impermissible for it to place itself above the other fraternal parties, impermissible for it to interfere in the internal affairs of fraternal parties...” This is quite a good statement. But **it is precisely the Chinese comrades who resort to such impermissible actions. Flouting the interests of the world communist movement, they ignore the standards and principles set out in the Declaration and Statement, and try to bring other parties under their influence and control.**

A graphic example of the CPC leadership’s special line within the socialist camp and the world communist movement is its position on the Albanian question. As is known, in the second half of 1960 the Albanian leaders openly came out with a Left opportunist platform on the main questions of our time, and began to pursue a policy hostile to the CPSU and the other fraternal parties. The Albanian leadership started an anti-Soviet campaign in their country that led to a rupture of political, economic and cultural relations with the Soviet Union.

The overwhelming majority of Communist and Workers’ parties emphatically condemned this anti-Leninist activity of the Albanian leaders. The CPC leaders took a totally different position and did everything they could to use the Albanian leaders as their own mouthpiece. It is known now that the Chinese comrades plainly pushed them into open struggle against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and fraternal parties.

In their attacks on the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties, the CPC leaders allot a special place for the Yugoslav question. They try to make it appear that the difficulties in the communist movement are caused by the improved relations of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries with Yugoslavia. Contrary to the facts, they persist in asserting that Yugoslavia is not a socialist country.

As is generally known, in 1955 the CPSU together with other fraternal parties took the initiative in normalizing relations with Yugoslavia so as to put an end to the prolonged conflict, for which the greater part of the blame lies with Stalin. At that time the CPC leaders had no doubts as to the nature of the socialist system in Yugoslavia. The *People's Daily* wrote then that "Yugoslavia has already achieved important successes in the building of socialism."

Objective analysis of the socio-economic processes in Yugoslavia shows that since then **socialism has grown stronger there**. Whereas in 1958 the socialist sector in industry amounted to 100 percent, in agriculture to 6 percent, and in trade to 97 percent, today the socialist sector in industry amounts to 100 percent, in agriculture to 15 percent, and in trade to 100 percent. In the period since normalization of relations was initiated, **Yugoslavia has drawn closer to the position of the Soviet Union and other socialist states on foreign policy issues.**

Why, then, have the Chinese leaders changed their position on the Yugoslav question so radically? It is hard to find any other explanation than that they viewed it as another good excuse to discredit the policy of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Soviet Communists know that differences on a number of fundamental ideological questions still remain between the CPSU and the Yugoslav League of Communists. We have told the Yugoslav leaders this openly, and continue to do so. But **it would be wrong to "excommunicate" Yugoslavia from socialism on these grounds, to cut her away from the socialist countries and push her into the camp of imperialism, as the CPC leaders are doing. The imperialists would like nothing better.**

There are now 14 socialist countries in the world. We are deeply convinced that in the near future their number will be much greater. The range of questions confronting the fraternal parties standing at the helm of the ship of state is growing wider, and besides, each of the fraternal parties works in different conditions. It is not surprising that in these circumstances the

fraternal parties may find different approaches to the solution of this or that question. How should Marxists-Leninists act in such cases? **Declare that this or that socialist country whose leaders differ with them is no longer socialist? That would be arbitrariness of the first water; such a method has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.**

Were we to follow the example of the Chinese leaders, we should, considering our serious differences with the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour, long since have declared Albania a non-socialist country. But this would be an erroneous, subjective approach to the question. Despite their differences with the Albanian leaders, the Soviet Communists regard Albania as a socialist country and, for their part, are taking steps to avert Albania's detachment from the socialist commonwealth.

It grieves us to see how the leaders of the CPC are undermining traditional Soviet-Chinese friendship and weakening the unity of the socialist countries.

The CPSU stands and will stand for the unity and cohesion of **the socialist commonwealth**, of the entire world communist movement.

VI

Let us recapitulate:

The time since the adoption of the Statement of 1960 has fully confirmed the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist program of the world communist and working-class movement. The Soviet Union's successes in building communism, the successes of socialist construction in other socialist countries exert an ever more revolutionizing influence on the minds of people all over the world. Revolutionary Cuba has lit the beacon of socialism in the Western Hemisphere. Crushing blows have been dealt the colonial system, which is now nearing its end. New victories have been scored by the working class of the imperialist countries. The world revolutionary movement is steadily advancing.

This shows that the general line of the world communist movement was set out correctly in the Statement of 1960. The task now is to work and act in conformity with this general line, to develop and apply it in reference to the specific conditions in which each given Communist party functions. **Any attempt to impose some new general line on the world communist and working-class movement, as in the CPC Central Committee letter of June 14, is therefore unsound and harmful. To accept any such "general**

line” would be to depart from the Statement of 1960, to accept programmatic propositions at variance with this Statement which was adopted by 81 parties. Our party will not take this course.

Throughout its history, our glorious Leninist party waged an implacable struggle against Right and Left opportunism, Trotskyism and revisionism, dogmatism and sectarianism, nationalism and chauvinism in all their forms both within our country and in the international arena. **Our party steeled itself and grew strong in this struggle for the purity of Marxism-Leninism; it does not fear any attacks by latter-day splitters and opportunists, whatever quarter they may come from.**

Life shows that, **having become a political organization of the entire people, the CPSU strengthened its ties with the masses, and became stronger and more highly disciplined than ever.** With the victory of socialism, the ideology of the working class—Marxism-Leninism—became the ideology of the entire people, of its advanced part. The aim of the working class—the building of communism—has become the aim of the entire people. Marxists-Leninists can only rejoice, of course, in this growth of the influence of communist ideology. Never since the death of V. I. Lenin, it may be said, has our party been so strong, so capable of accomplishing the most daring tasks connected with the building of the new world.

Now, when socialism has won fully and conclusively in our country, when we are erecting, stone by stone, the beautiful edifice of communism, our party, the entire Soviet people, are more convinced than ever that the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism will triumph throughout the world.

Our confidence is shared by the peoples of the socialist countries, by the working people of the whole world. They value highly the Soviet Union’s big contribution to the common struggle for peace, democracy, national freedom and independence, and socialism.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always stood and now stands for close friendship with the Communist Party of China. There are serious differences between us and the leaders of the CPC, but we hope that relations between our two parties, between our two peoples, should be based on the fact that we have that same aim, the building of a new communist society, and the same enemy—imperialism. The two great powers, the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China, can, by their joint efforts, do much for the triumph of communism. This both our friends and enemies know well.

At present delegations of the CPSU and the CPC are meeting in Moscow. **Unfortunately the representatives of the CPC continue to aggravate the situation at this meeting. Despite this, the CPSU delegation is exercising the utmost patience and restraint so that the talks may have a successful outcome. The near future will show whether the Chinese comrades are willing to build our relations on the basis of what unites rather than divides us, on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism.**

Our enemies are banking on aggravation of the differences between the CPC and the CPSU. They are already kinking around to see if then cannot make a good thing of it. Only the other day the *US Daily News* urged setting Red Russia and Red China against each other so that they might tear each other to pieces. We, Communists, must never let ourselves forget these insidious schemes of the imperialists.

Mindful of its responsibility to the world communist movement, to the peoples of the world, our party urges the Chinese comrades to take the course of resolving the differences and strengthening the genuine unity of our Parties on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Together with all fraternal parties, our Leninist party has worked and is working for the unity of the working class, of all the working people, in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

Before the party and the entire Soviet people, the Central Committee of the CPSU declares with all responsibility that we have done and will do everything in our power to strengthen unity with the Communist Party of China, to cement the world communist movement under the banner of Lenin, to cement the countries of the world socialist system, to render effective aid to all peoples fighting colonialism, to strengthen the cause of peace and win victory for the great ideas of communism the world over.

All the working people of the Soviet Union will rally still closer around their Communist Party and its Leninist Central Committee, will devote all their energies to bringing to completion the majestic program of the building of communism.

**Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet
Union**

Letter of the CC of the CPSU of November 29, 1963

November 29, 1963

Source: *Beijing Review*, May 8, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 19, pp. 18-21.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

Comrade Mao Zedong

Dear Comrades,

The Communist press has recently published documents in which the Marxist-Leninist parties have publicly expounded their positions on fundamental questions of the international communist movement which have been raised in the debate that has unfolded. These documents show that there are serious differences in the communist movement, differences in the understanding and interpretation of the fundamental theses of the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow meetings. We will not conceal the fact that, like many other fraternal parties, irrespective of their position, we are seriously concerned over the fact that the differences which have arisen are constantly becoming deeper and the scope of the questions under debate is constantly widening, while the sharp public polemics are assuming forms impermissible in relations among Marxist-Leninists.

Particularly disquieting is the fact that the differences on ideological questions are being transferred to interstate relations and are manifesting themselves in the field of concrete policies, thus shaking the friendship and unity of the peoples of the socialist community and weakening the anti-imperialist front. The strength and attention of the fraternal parties are being deflected from the solution of urgent problems of socialist construction and from the struggle against imperialism.

This situation in the communist movement grieves us greatly. We have more than once declared, and now reiterate, that the abnormal relations between the CPC and the CPSU are dividing the communist forces and benefiting only our enemies who on their part are seeking in every way to play on the contradictions and making use of the existing difficulties for their own anti-communist aims.

Of course Parties like the CPSU and the CPC, standing at the head of the world's two biggest states, can go on with their work even if the polemics continue. We agree that for our two Parties, even in such circumstances, as you said to the Soviet Ambassador Comrade Chervonenko, the skies will not fall, and grass and trees will continue to grow, women to bear children and fish to swim in the water.

But we cannot fail to see that the differences and sharp polemics are doing great harm to the communist movement. We also have no right to fail to think of those detachments of the communist movement which are forced to carry on the struggle against imperialism in extremely difficult and complex circumstances. Such Parties rightly consider that they require friendship with both the CPSU and the CPC. All Marxist-Leninist parties draw strength from the unity and solidarity of the communist movement for the overcoming of difficulties.

The Communists of all countries want unity of action. And they are right—without unity of action our struggle against the class enemies will be many times harder.

In the present circumstances, the most important and urgent task of the Marxist-Leninists is to prevent an undesirable development of events, and to turn the events from the zone of danger towards normalization, towards the strengthening of cooperation and unity among all the fraternal parties and socialist countries. Lenin's injunctions that each party must be conscious of its high responsibility for our common cause, and be ready to give first place to the fundamental interests of the communist movement are now timelier than ever.

Firmly following the Leninist course of the world communist movement as expressed in the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow meetings, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has considered, and still considers, itself duty bound to do all it can for the strengthening of unity.

We understand, of course, that the elimination of the difficulties that have arisen in the world communist movement requires great exertion by all the Marxist-Leninist parties. In this letter, we wish to give our views on the contribution which our two Parties could make towards the solution of this problem.

As before, we hold to the position that, despite existing serious differences, there is an objective basis for the improvement of relations between the CPSU and the CPC and between our countries—the basis being the

common fundamental interests of our two peoples and our common tasks in the struggle for socialism and communism, the support of the revolutionary workers' movement and national liberation movement, and the struggle for peace against the aggressive schemes of the imperialists.

One cannot fail to see that, besides the questions over which differences have arisen, there are also positions on which we are fully united or at least very close in our views. We have, objectively, a common position on such basic questions as the class struggle, the struggle against imperialism for the victory of the working class and all the working people, and the dictatorship of the proletariat which is established, as is seen from the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, for the destruction of those forces which offer resistance to the construction of socialism after the victory of the proletarian revolution. Although our interpretations on these questions are not in all respects the same as yours, we are deeply convinced that a calm and unprejudiced understanding of our present discussion and the elimination from it of everything that is non-essential and fortuitous will reveal wide possibilities not only for the preservation of our cooperation along many lines but also for its growth and strengthening.

Now that the CPSU and the CPC, as well as other fraternal parties, have stated their views on the questions in dispute, it would be correct not to concentrate attention on the problems on which there are differences between us but to let them wait until the heat of passion has cooled, to let time do its work. We are certain that life will demonstrate the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist line. At the same time, we could develop our cooperation in those spheres where favorable possibilities exist. Such cooperation is in the interest not only of the Soviet Union and China but also of all the peoples of the socialist community.

Concretely speaking, we propose that, notwithstanding the differences, we should place at the center of our mutual relations the development of cooperation for the sake of strengthening friendship between the Soviet Union and China and among all the socialist countries and fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties, and of coordinating actions in the various international organizations for our common aim of defending peace and combating imperialism.

Particularly great possibilities exist for the strengthening of ties between the People's Republic of China and the US in the economic field and in the fields of scientific-technical cooperation and culture. In this letter, we would

like to make a series of practical proposals, the realization of which could serve the cause of strengthening friendship between our countries.

The CC CPSU anticipates that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, on its part, will take concrete steps in this direction, particularly since the Premier of the State Council of the PRC, Comrade Zhou Enlai, is reported in the press to have declared in recent talks with foreign personalities and journalists that China intends to develop contacts with the Soviet Union and other socialist states, that China is greatly interested in the development of trade and other economic contacts and that the PRC adheres to the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence. The Premier of the PRC said that China, on her part, will resist the efforts of the imperialists to use the existing differences in order to undermine the unity of the socialist community. Such a point of view coincides with the declarations which the CC CPSU and the Soviet government, on their part, have frequently made.

The interests of both sides permit one to conclude that it would already be possible today to talk of concrete steps for setting things right in Soviet-Chinese cooperation.

Specifically, it would be possible to start in the immediate future to draw up jointly agreed preliminary plans for the exchange of goods between the PRC and the Soviet Union. In the course of the next few years the US could increase its export to China of goods in which you are interested, and the import of goods from China to the US, which would be in the interest both of our economy and of yours.

As is known, the Protocol of May 13, 1962 concluded by the governments of our two countries provides for the renewal next year of negotiations concerning the delivery to the People's Republic of China of whole sets of equipment the manufacture of which was postponed for two years at the request of the Chinese side. If your side shows interest, it would be possible in our view to come to an understanding on the broadening of technical aid to the PRC in the building of industrial enterprises and specifically to discuss the possibility of aid in the development of the petroleum industry and the building of enterprises in the mining and other industries on terms beneficial to both our countries.

Once again we affirm our readiness to send Soviet specialists to the People's Republic of China should you consider it necessary.

The Soviet Union is now drawing up her Five-Year Plan for 1966-70. China too is drawing up her third Five-Year Plan. For this reason, now is

a good time to discuss the possibilities of developing trade and other ties between our countries and to provide for corresponding measures in the plans for the national economies of both countries. Of course, it is never too late to start on the good work of strengthening cooperation between the US and the PRC, but it would be better to make a start now.

Both our countries would undoubtedly benefit from the broadening of scientific-technical cooperation and also from the development of cultural ties of many kinds. We consider that these questions could be the subject of mutual consultation and negotiation between the appropriate organs of the Soviet Union and the PRC. In making these proposals, we are naturally willing to consider attentively all your views on the widening of the cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic in the economic, scientific-technical, cultural and other fields. We understand, of course, that such ties and cooperation can develop provided you consider this beneficial to China. We on our part are convinced that it would be mutually beneficial to both China and the Soviet Union.

It is well known that economic ties are the type of cooperation in which all nations are particularly interested. Economic ties have great significance even in the relations between countries with different social systems. They create favorable conditions for implementing the principle of peaceful coexistence and help the improvement of relations among states. Extensive economic ties are all the more necessary among socialist countries, which are bound together by a common social system and common aims. Such ties are an important factor in the construction of socialism and communism and in utilizing the advantages of international socialist division of labor, and they help in strengthening the friendship among fraternal peoples, achieving new successes in the economic competition with capitalism and uniting all anti-imperialist revolutionary forces. The development of such cooperation would be a gain for China and the Soviet Union, for the socialist camp and the cause of world socialism.

We understand, of course, that each nation builds socialism and communism by relying mainly on its own forces, because no one except the people of a given country will build socialism there. But it is also evident that cooperation among socialist countries facilitates and accelerates the construction of socialism by each nation. The restoration and strengthening of the economic cooperation between our countries will help not only to accelerate the growth of the national economies of the US and China and the economy of

the entire socialist system, but also to create favorable conditions for normalizing relations in other fields.

Highly favorable pre-conditions exist for the development of cooperation between the Soviet Union and China. Our countries possess a variety of natural wealth and have accumulated considerable experience in economic and scientific-technical cooperation. It is well known how beneficial was the influence exerted by Soviet-Chinese economic cooperation on the course of socialist construction in the People's Republic of China and also on the economic growth of the Soviet Union. It is all the more to be regretted that economic cooperation and trade between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic has not only failed to grow in recent years but on the contrary has constantly shrunk.

Experience shows that the development of trading, economic and other ties improves the atmosphere in mutual relations and helps to straighten out other problems on which the relations between our countries depend. And such problems unfortunately do exist and demand solution.

You will probably agree that the situation which has arisen in recent years along different sections of the Soviet-Chinese border cannot be regarded as normal. The Soviet government has already proposed that friendly consultations take place to define the boundary in different sections precisely, considering that this will result in the removal of the causes of the present misunderstanding. Recently you, too, spoke in favor of solving this question on the basis of mutual consultation. In this connection, we are transmitting a relevant document to you.

Statements have recently been made in China concerning the aggressive policy of the Czarist government and the unjust treaties imposed upon China. Naturally, we will not defend the Russian Czars who permitted arbitrariness in laying down state boundaries with neighboring countries. We are convinced that you, too, do not intend to defend the Chinese emperors who by force of arms seized not a few territories belonging to others. But while condemning the reactionary actions of the top-strata exploiters who held power in Russia and in China at that time, we cannot disregard the fact that historically formed boundaries between states now exist. Any attempt to ignore this can become the source of misunderstandings and conflicts; at the same time, they will not lead to the solution of the problem. It would be simply unreasonable to create territorial problems artificially at the present time, when the working class is in power and when our common aim is

communism, under which state borders will gradually lose their former significance. We have all the possibilities for fully eliminating border frictions of any kind and thus showing the peoples an example of truly friendly relations between two socialist states.

We should also create conditions favorable to the improvement of relations on the party level and avoid anything that might aggravate the difficulties that have arisen in the communist movement. That the overcoming of the differences in the communist movement is a complex matter, demanding time and serious effort, is something we are fully aware of. But what is important is to go step by step in this direction, to show Leninist concern for the strengthening of the unity of the world communist movement on a principled Marxist basis, to bar any acts whatsoever that might undermine unity and to repulse factionalists and. Splitters.

We are of the opinion that even in the present complex situation there is a possibility of preventing the polemics that have spread from getting out of control, and of directing matters towards the strengthening of unity and solidarity between the CPC and the CPSU and among all the fraternal parties. The CC CPSU has more than once advocated the cessation of public polemics. We again repeated this proposal on October 25 and November 7, 1963. The Soviet press has ceased to publish materials of a polemical character. In this letter we call once more on the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party to do everything necessary for the cessation of public polemics and of other activities that harm the unity of the international communist movement and the unity of the socialist countries. We do not propose a general cessation of the exchange of views on questions of principle concerning world developments, but desire only that it should take place in the forms provided for by the Statement of the fraternal parties in 1960—through mutual consultation, negotiations and exchanges of letters.

In making these proposals, the CC CPSU bases itself on the consideration that they will help strengthen confidence and create more favorable conditions for the preparation of a world meeting of the communist and workers' parties. Recently, the CPSU and the CPC, like many other fraternal parties, have more than once advocated the convening of such a meeting. We now reaffirm this position of ours. At the same time, we underline yet again that it is the duty of all parties to help in the creation of a situation which will render such a meeting fruitful, so that it will lead not to a split in the

world communist movement but to the genuine unity and solidarity of all the fraternal parties and all the forces of peace and socialism.

These are some of our views on the concrete measures that might be taken with the aim of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen.

Please understand us correctly—our letter is dictated exclusively by concern for the strengthening of unity. We may differ in our understanding of this or that ideological problem, or in our estimates of specific phenomena of social development—life will correct those who are mistaken. But one must never even for a minute, under any circumstances, forget about the highest duty of Communists—to build the unity of the socialist community and of the entire front of the struggle against capital. The peoples trust the Communists. And we are called upon to justify their trust. Let us, by our common efforts, clear the way for the strengthening of cooperation, and take concrete measures to this end.

The CPSU and the Soviet people cherish friendly feelings for the Chinese people and the Communist Party of China and wish to strengthen the brotherhood built up in the struggle for socialism and communism. The CC CPSU is filled with determination to do all it can to achieve a turn of events for the better and to strengthen the unity of the world communist movement and the friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples.

The CPSU guides itself unswervingly by the line of the world communist movement and firmly defends the principles of the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960. Our Leninist party is waging a historic struggle for the building of communism in the US, for peace, democracy, and the national independence of peoples, for the strengthening of the world socialist community and the entire anti-imperialist revolutionary front, for the proletarian revolution and the cause of international socialism, and this accords with the interests of all the peoples.

The CC CPSU calls on the CC CPC, on its part, to undertake practical steps for the strengthening of the unity of the fraternal parties on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism in the struggle for the great cause of socialism.

**First Secretary of the Central
Committee of the Communist
Party of the Soviet Union**

N. KHRUSHCHEV

Letter of the CC of the CPSU of February 22, 1964

February 22, 1964

Source: *Beijing Review*, May 8, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 19, pp. 22-24.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the CPSU has received your letter of February 20, 1964.

The rude tone and the unworthy and insulting methods in relation to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to which you resort in this letter give us the moral right not to answer it at all. And if we have nevertheless considered it expedient to reply to you, we are doing so only in order to eliminate the possibility of any speculation or attempt to mislead the uninformed.

You express a simulated indignation at the fact that the letter of the CC CPSU dated February 12 this year, addressed to many fraternal parties, was not sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, and represent this almost as an attempt to conceal the content of this letter from you and as “sectarian” and “factional activity by the CPSU.”

How do matters stand in reality? It was no accident that we did not send you the letter of February 12 this year. In the past few months alone, the CC CPSU has repeatedly approached the leadership of the CPC both verbally and in writing with proposals that measures be jointly taken to strengthen the unity of the socialist community and the international communist movement. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has not considered it necessary even to reply to our proposals. You ignored the proposals for normalizing the situation in the communist movement, which the CPSU delegation advanced during the Moscow talks in July 1963. You did not reply to the letter of the CC CPSU dated November 29, 1963, which contained a concrete program of action for eliminating the existing differences. In exactly the same way no answer was given to the repeated verbal approaches of leaders of the CPSU to the leadership of the CPC made through Comrades Deng Xiaoping, Peng Zhen, Liu Xiao and Pan Zili.

If you care to refer to the above-mentioned documents and material, it will be easy for you to convince yourselves that they discuss the very same problems about which the CC CPSU wrote briefly to the fraternal parties in its letter of February 12 this year.

While not answering our letters, you at the same time unfolded a widespread campaign against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties and sharply intensified schismatic factional activity in the international communist movement and the democratic organizations. In an article on February 4 this year, the newspaper *Renmin Ribao* openly called for a split in the communist movement and demonstrated the unwillingness of the CPC leadership to reply to the positive proposals contained in the letter of the CC CPSU dated November 29, 1963.

In these circumstances, in the interests of the unity of the communist movement and desirous of stating its Marxist-Leninist viewpoints which are being libellously assailed by the Chinese press, the CC CPSU considered it necessary to discuss the question at the February Plenum of the Central Committee and thereafter openly to state its views. The CC CPSU decided to inform the fraternal parties of this.

We had to tell them frankly that our proposals had not evoked any positive response from the leaders of the CPC and that, broadening their schismatic activity, the latter were continuing to intensify the attacks on the common course of the world communist movement. We declared that we shared the opinion of all the fraternal parties standing genuinely on the positions of the Declaration and the Statement that it was necessary to give a rebuff to the schismatics and take collective measures for strengthening the unity of the communist movement on the principled basis of Marxism-Leninism. We once again asserted the desirability of calling a meeting of the communist and workers' parties, concerning which you yourselves made repeated declarations at one time.

Our letter condemned the intention of the leadership of the CPC to create a factional bloc with a special program under its own hegemony.

This is what was discussed in the February 12 letter of the CC CPSU.

Our principled position on all the questions contained in the February 12 letter was known to you long before we approached the fraternal parties. Before approaching them in this letter, we tried more than once to discuss questions concerning the strengthening of the unity of the communist movement with the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, and

it is no fault of ours that all these efforts produced no result. Insofar as you persistently failed to reply to our repeated letters and approaches and, what is more, presented them as expressions of our weakness, it was unnecessary and indeed useless to send you our letter of February 12.

After all this, one can only be surprised at your allegations that the CPSU “is engineering a new campaign against the CPC” “behind the back of the CPC,” adopting “two-faced tactics” and “engaging in divisive activities.” It is not difficult to see that the intention of the leadership of the CPC in exaggerating the matter of the February 12 letter and distorting the real meaning of this step by the CC CPSU by every means represents yet another clumsy attempt to lay its own fault at somebody else’s door and to shift to the CPSU the responsibility for the difficulties that have arisen in the communist movement exclusively through the fault of the CPC leadership.

As the saying goes among our people, this is using a well-known method, in which the real culprit cries, “Stop thief.”

If one is to look for real double-dealers and schismatics acting “behind the backs of the fraternal parties,” one must speak of those who have carried on factional activity for many years, and must go to those who openly argue for the necessity of a split in the communist movement and even declare it to be “an inexorable law.” How, for instance, is one to regard the following fact? As early as June 1960 Comrade Liu Shaoqi and other CPC leaders, in their talks with an Albanian delegation, slandered the CPSU, deliberately distorted the external and internal policies of our Party and tried to set the Albanian public leaders against the CPSU. These actions by the Chinese leadership evoked the just indignation of members of the Albanian delegation who openly said so to the Chinese comrades and informed the CC CPSU.

This is nothing but the most genuine behind-the-scenes factional activity against a fraternal party.

One could cite innumerable facts and, if necessary, publish documents that expose the behind-the-scenes activity of the CPC leadership against the CPSU and other fraternal parties carried on over a number of years. Representatives of fraternal parties already spoke about this to you directly at the Bucharest and Moscow meetings.

As for the CPSU, we do not conceal our views and activities from any fraternal party, including the CPC to whose representatives we have repeatedly explained our views and standpoints on all the most important questions.

The CC CPSU has utilized its right, possessed by every Communist Party, to enter into consultation on whatever problems are of concern to it. Notwithstanding the fact that in your article of February 4 you permitted delirious invective against our Party and its leadership, the CC CPSU has not allowed itself to be provoked and has not taken the path of squabbling on the principle of "spearpoint against spearpoint." While considering it necessary to give a rebuff to your schismatic activity, we have decided, utilizing party channels, to consult anew with the Central Committees of fraternal parties and let them know the steps we plan for strengthening the unity of the communist movement. This is in full conformity with the principles and norms for relations between Marxist-Leninist parties which are stipulated in the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow meetings.

The approach of the CC CPSU to the fraternal parties in its letter of February 12 was dictated by our Party's profound concern for the liquidation of the abnormal situation which has now arisen in the communist movement. It reflects the basic interests of all the Marxist-Leninist parties, the interests of the defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism.

As for your attempts to juggle with words like "great-power chauvinism," "self-important," "domineering," "inveterate habit of posing as the 'father party'," "God's will," etc. we have to tell you that the use of such expressions only testifies to the weakness of your position and to your wish in this way to cover up your own activities, which you try to ascribe to us.

For four years the fraternal parties of the whole world have been appealing to the CC CPC to approach the matter from the point of view of the common interests and to cease its attempts to impose its erroneous "general line" on the world communist movement. However, the leadership of the CPC has not only failed to heed the opinion of fraternal parties but with growing ambition is posing as the sole heir of the founders of Marxism-Leninism and the supreme judge of the theory and practice of communism. After all, it is none other than the leadership of the CPC that is attempting to dictate to the communist parties of the capitalist countries when they should begin the revolution and by what paths they should accomplish it. This leadership of the CPC pronounces irrevocable sentence on which country should be considered socialist and which should not. It is the same leadership that affixes to whole parties the labels of "correct" or "incorrect" and, depending upon whom it likes, declares some to be "outstanding Marxists" and others "modern revisionists."

Your great-power habits also appear in your last short letter when, addressing the CC CPSU, you demand that it send to you its letter of February 12. You do not request, but *demand*. One asks, by what right? Can it really be that you consider that anyone will take your tone seriously, become frightened and rush as fast as his legs can carry him to fulfil your every demand? This is not merely rude but simply ridiculous.

Your letter and its deliberately rude tone compel us to reflect once again: with what purpose was it sent? After all, nobody will believe that such an unseemly message was sent in the interests of the strengthening of friendship with the CPSU, of which you ceaselessly talk to your own people and the international communist movement, thus deceiving them. Anyone who acquaints himself with this letter will see that it is aimed at the aggravation of differences and the exacerbation of the situation in the communist movement.

If the leaders of the CPC genuinely care for the solidarity and unity of the communist movement, they should leave their erroneous path, cease schismatic activity and take their stand in the same ranks as all the world's fraternal parties.

On its part, the CC CPSU is always ready to do everything in its power for the unity of the world communist movement on a principled Marxist-Leninist basis.

Our Party, which places the interests of the unit, of the world communist movement above all else, expresses its willingness to continue to make exertions for normalizing relations with the CPC.

The CC CPSU expresses its firm conviction that the world communist movement will overcome the existing difficulties, unite its ranks even more closely under the banner of Marx-Engels-Lenin, and achieve new successes in the struggle for the great cause of the working class, for the victory of the national liberation movement, for the cause of peace and the security of the peoples, for the victory of communism.

With ardent, fraternal greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet
Union**

Letter of the CC of the CPSU of March 7, 1964

March 7, 1964

Source: *Beijing Review*, May 8, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 19, pp. 24-27.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

Dear Comrades,

The CC CPSU has received your letter of February 27, 1964. We have studied it carefully. We must tell you frankly that your letter has greatly astonished us. In this letter you again lavishly employ such words as “divisive,” “factional” and “sectarian,” by means of which you attempt to accuse our Party of some sort of behind-the-scenes activity against the CPC.

Recently you have been trying more and more often to place the blame for the emergence of the differences and the exacerbation of the struggle on the shoulders of the CPSU. The meaning of all these attempts is perfectly clear to us—you wish to justify your own actions and inflame the differences by shifting the responsibility to others.

We can say with a clear conscience that we have no responsibility whatsoever for the situation that has been created. The CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties have made and are making every effort to settle the differences with the Communist Party of China on the basis of the principles in the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow meetings. In its attitude toward your Party, the CC CPSU has at all times proceeded from the position of not allowing the intensification of differences. At first we thought that the divergences that arose several years ago were fortuitous. We did not wish to believe the information we received that the Chinese comrades were acting behind our backs and taking a line of exacerbating the struggle. We have striven at all times for mutual relations of the greatest brotherhood and confidence.

The CC CPSU is well aware of the importance of friendship between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China and between the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China, whose relations must be built on the foundation of the teachings of Marxism-Le-

ninism. We have more than once written and stated to you—as we did for instance at the time when Comrade Liu Xiao, Ambassador of the People's Republic of China to the USSR, left Moscow in October 1962—our sincere desire that the friendship between the CPSU and the CPC should remain as good as it was before 1958. This was what we most ardently hoped for. But now, unfortunately, we see that these hopes are not being realized.

The central point of the letter of the CC CPC of February 27 is in fact a proposal for the intensification of public polemics. In proposing the conclusion of an agreement on mutual publication of critical materials directed against one another, what you desire is, in essence, that the polemics between the Parties should embrace the peoples of our countries.

You must understand, comrades, that were one to publish your articles which contain so many unjust assertions and slanders against the internal and external policy of the Soviet Union, and which go so far as to assert that the “restoration of capitalism” is taking place in the USSR and that it has entered into “collusion with American imperialism,” it would only arouse a feeling of legitimate indignation among the Soviet people. Naturally, the Soviet press would not leave such attacks unanswered. And all this would mean not taking the line of strengthening the friendship between the great peoples of the Soviet Union and China but taking the line of inflaming hostility, mistrust and unfriendliness between them.

Indeed, the polemics you are conducting have long ago gone beyond the bounds of ideological dispute and been turned by you into a weapon for the struggle against the CPSU and the entire world communist movement. You pour torrents of dirt over our Party and our country, and are in essence employing the same tactics as that of the opponents of the Soviet state, who try to divide the people from the Party and the Party from the leadership. Such actions are impermissible, and calculations based on them are simply naïve. Your attacks on the CPSU, which has rich experience of struggle against the Trotskyites, the Right opportunists and the nationalists, and against external enemies, are only promoting the even greater unity of Soviet Communists and the entire Soviet people around their militant communist vanguard.

In telling the Party the truth about your subversive activities, we have always maintained and continue to adhere to self-restraint and a quiet tone of voice, and never permit any insults toward the fraternal Communist Party of China, its leaders and the Chinese people. Please consider what would

happen if we too were to take your path and reply to you with the same abuse that you heap on us, and call upon the Chinese people to fight against their leadership. If we took this path, what sort of Communists or leaders of communist parties would we be, or what sort of followers of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism who are confronted with the tasks of struggle to build a communist society? Communism does not mean the inflaming of enmity among nations; on the contrary it means their unification into a single fraternal family, regardless of nationality, colour of skin and language, for the irreconcilable struggle against exploiters and imperialism.

Guided by these very considerations, the CC CPSU in its letter of November 29, 1963 again proposed the cessation of public polemics and put forward a constructive program for the improvement of Soviet-Chinese relations and the normalization of the situation in the communist movement. At the same time, the publication of polemical material in Soviet newspapers and periodicals was discontinued. All the fraternal parties recognized these actions as expressions of the goodwill of the CPSU and hopefully expected that the leadership of the CPC would support our initiative.

Unfortunately the CC CPC did the opposite. While deliberately delaying an official answer to our appeal, in fact you replied to it by inflaming the polemics, by intensifying schismatic activities in the communist movement and by directing even more slanderous accusations at the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. This campaign culminated in the *Renmin Ribao* and *Hongqi* article of February 4, 1964 which proclaimed that the Soviet Union, together with American imperialism, was the “arch-enemy” of People’s China and contained impermissible insinuations concerning our Party and its Central Committee. The article of February 4 represented an attempt to provide some kind of theoretical basis for schismatic activities and to declare that a split in the communist movement was a phenomenon conforming to laws. This disgraceful document, like other similar material, was distributed in huge numbers and broadcast all over the world by radio in Russian and other languages.

In these circumstances, we could no longer remain silent, we had to tell the whole truth about the words and the actual deeds of the Chinese leadership so that the Plenum of the CC CPSU could discuss and appraise the situation that had arisen and speak its weighty word. After discussing the question of the struggle waged by the CPSU for the unity of the communist movement, the February Plenum of the CC CPSU, at which six thousand

party activists were present, unanimously approved the line of the Presidium of the Central Committee.

In full conformity with the accepted principles governing relations in the communist movement, the CC CPSU considered it its duty to inform fraternal parties of our intention to publish the relevant materials of the Plenum in the press and to rebuff the schismatic activities of the leadership of the CPC.

It is quite understandable that there was no sense at all in sending you our letter addressed to other fraternal parties. This would have been useless, if only because we had already repeatedly approached you with the same questions and received no answer. The letter of the CC CPSU of February 12 contained no secrets, it contained nothing we had not talked about to the leadership of the CPC much earlier. Nonetheless, you decided to use this letter as a pretext for accusing the CPSU of “behind-the-scenes... anti-Chinese” activity. It is appropriate first of all to ask: Has a Communist Party no right to address letters to whomever it considers necessary? Do we demand that the CC CPC give us an account of its correspondence?

But this is not the whole matter. We have already told you how absurd such accusations are, particularly when made by those who have actually carried on behind-the-scenes subversive activities against fraternal parties over several years. We can cite many examples of how the CC CPC, acting behind the backs of Marxist-Leninist parties and their leadership, is inspiring the creation of anti-party schismatic groups and trying to unite them in opposition to the world communist movement.

Losing its sense of reality, the CC CPC attempted to present us with an ultimatum—it demanded that it be sent the letter of the CC CPSU of February 12. When we politely explained that no Communist Party should permit itself to talk to another in the language of ultimatums, you alleged, obviously obscuring the issue, that there is no difference between the words “request” and “demand” in the Chinese language.

We hold a much higher opinion of the Chinese language. The Chinese are a great people with an ancient culture and understand the shades of meaning between “request” and “demand” perfectly well. It may even happen that the words are the same but the music is quite different. Incidentally, the word “request” was found in the Chinese language, after all, when there was a desire to use it. We hope that from now on the language of ultimatums will be excluded forever from our relations.

Why, then, was it found necessary to permit oneself to address a fraternal party in this way? Why was your entire letter of February 27, like the preceding ones, written in an exceptionally rude and impertinent tone, and studded with imprecations and insulting expressions? To irritate us, to force us to depart from principled ideological and communist positions and embark upon a “squabble at the mouth of the well?” Apparently these were indeed your intentions.

Seeking political capital, you constantly deck yourselves out as “knights” of equality and at the same time try to convince people that the CPSU is clinging to the role of a “father party.” We cannot avoid the impression that all this is done solely to enable you to fill the role of a “father party” yourselves. But times are different now. Even in Stalin’s lifetime this role had become obsolete, although he did take such a position. By permitting abuses of power within our Party and in relation to fraternal parties and annihilating people who had opinions of their own, he forfeited people’s confidence and destroyed his own prestige. During and after the war, Stalin himself apparently felt that one should not order parties about at one’s own will. This, in particular, was one of the reasons for the dissolution of the Comintern.

After Stalin’s death our Party, having analyzed all these things in an honest and Marxist-Leninist way, took steps to correct the situation that had arisen. On its own initiative, the CC CPSU corrected Stalin’s errors and restored the Leninist principle of equality in its relations with fraternal parties and countries. We withdrew our troops from countries where they had previously been stationed, including the troops from Port Arthur. We liquidated the economic joint companies in China and in other countries and took a number of other measures. It is not superfluous to note that the CC CPC at one time fully approved these steps taken by our Party and set a high value on them.

We still stand on the same positions. Today the situation is not what it was, for instance, in 1919: today Lenin is no longer alive, and no one living can take his place. It is only collectively that the Marxist-Leninist parties can work out a common line for the communist movement. There are no “father” or “son” parties, nor can there be any, but there is and must be a family of fraternal parties with equal rights and collective wisdom. Success will never attend efforts to impose one’s own views on people in disregard of their opinions and to attach labels to all who disagree with such views. That is why, even today, we call on you yet again to think over your viewpoints

and carefully to weigh up where they can lead you. That is why, despite your incessant assaults on the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties, we have exercised patience and are continuing to exercise it and are ready to make every effort to normalize the situation and strengthen the solidarity of the international communist movement.

The CC CPSU has repeatedly expressed the view that the best thing for the interests of the working class and of the revolutionary movement and for the cause of world socialism today would be the cessation of the public polemics between communist parties. Once again we propose—let us proceed in all matters from the principles of the Declaration and the Statement, and discuss disputed questions at meetings between fraternal parties or at international conferences among them. The discussions should proceed with tact and self-respect, with an understanding of the full responsibility we bear in our actions, so that the dispute may not lead to a split and do damage to the holy of holies—the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the cause of socialism.

We have no right to forget the behest of V. I. Lenin, who warned that dissensions among Communists serve to benefit the imperialists. “If discussions,” said V. I. Lenin, “then arguments; if arguments, then dissensions; if dissensions, it means the Communists have become weaker: then press on, seize the moment, take advantage of their weakening. This has become the slogan of the world that is hostile to us. We must not forget this for an instant.”⁵²⁴

If you had really been interested in strengthening the unity of the international communist ranks, then you should have accepted our proposals long ago, listened to the voice of reason and taken account of the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the Marxist-Leninist parties. The more stubbornly you persist in your intention to inflame the polemics and in your schismatic activities, the more will the Communists and all the progressive forces have grounds to be convinced that the CC CPC is not guided by the interests of socialism at all, but by incorrectly conceived national—in effect—nationalist, selfish interests.

We could refute point by point the slanderous accusations against the CPSU made off-handedly in the letter of the CC CPC of February 27, but

⁵²⁴ V. I. Lenin, “Speech at the Opening of the Congress—Tenth Congress of the RCP(B)” in *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXII.

we do not consider it necessary to do so now. What is the use of arguments, when you have no intention of seriously entering into the essence of the questions but instead simply pour yet another bucket of dirt over our Party?

We will not fall for any provocation but will proceed along Lenin's path in one family together with the Communists of the whole world. The CC CPSU again expresses its confidence that the Communist Party of China will sooner or later find the correct path to unity with this family. The sooner this happens, the better. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue to struggle for the unity of all fraternal parties on Marxist-Leninist and proletarian-internationalist principles, and on the basis of the Declaration and the Statement, the programmatic documents of the world communist movement.

We have also received your letter of February 29. From this letter, which is a belated answer to ours of November 29, 1963, it is evident that you have rejected all the proposals we made for the sake of a radical improvement of Soviet-Chinese relations, of the strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the peoples of the US and the PRC, and of the unity of the ranks of the world communist movement. The whole spirit of your letter demonstrates that the CC CPC is not concerned with improving relations between our Parties and countries but instead is inventing various accusations against the CPSU and the Soviet Union. We resolutely repudiate all your libellous attacks on the CPSU and the Soviet Union.

The CC CPSU will give its answer to this letter and will show the real meaning of your distortion of the ideological-political views of our Party and its practical activities; it will re-establish the truth.

But in our present letter we deem it necessary to set forth our position on the question that worries the whole communist movement—that of ways to overcome the differences and attain unity and solidarity among the fraternal parties.

We note that after many months of stalling and delay the CC CPC has agreed with our view concerning the necessity of continuing the bilateral meeting of representatives of the CPSU and the CPC, and of afterwards preparing and calling a meeting of all the communist and workers' parties.

The CC CPSU takes a positive view of this fact and considers it to be its internationalist duty to do its utmost, in the course of these projected meetings and discussions, to help strengthen the unity of the communist

movement and the solidarity of the fraternal parties on a Marxist-Leninist platform.

At the same time, we do not understand your motives for delaying for a long period the talking of these measures for which the time is fully ripe. By now it is perfectly clear what harm has been done to the communist movement as a result of your exacerbation of polemics and your factional activity in its midst. The questions demanding discussion have fully emerged, and the aim of the meetings is perfectly clear. Moreover, one cannot ignore the fact that the majority of the Marxist-Leninist parties are ever more urgently stressing the necessity for an international meeting.

The delaying of the bilateral meeting between representatives of the CPSU and the CPC is all the more inexplicable. Eight months have already passed since the first meeting, and you propose postponing the second for another period of similar length at a time when the speediest possible settlement of existing differences is urgently required for the improvement of the relations between two Parties and countries, and in the interests of the unity of the international communist movement and all democratic and revolutionary forces so that they can activate their joint struggle against imperialism. It is very important that our Parties should not be diverted into endless argument but concentrate our main attention on the solution of the immense tasks confronting us in the building of socialism and communism and on the struggle against our common enemy—imperialism.

Your proposal that the meeting of representatives of the CPC and the CPSU be held as late as October 1964 means in fact that the meeting of fraternal parties would be delayed by at least a year, that the settlement of the existing differences would thus be further postponed and that these differences would be further exacerbated. In our opinion, this would only bring harm to the fraternal parties and the whole world communist movement.

We also fail to understand the motives by which you were guided in making the proposal that a preparatory meeting be called composed of representatives of only seventeen fraternal parties (Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Viet Nam, GDR, China, Korea, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, US, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Japan, Italy and France).

We consider it appropriate to hold the preparatory meeting with the participation of representatives of all the fraternal parties that were on the drafting committee of the Moscow Meeting of 1960 and that jointly prepared the Statement (Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Viet Nam, GDR, China, Korea,

Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, US, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, German Federal Republic, Great Britain, Finland, Argentina, Brazil, Syria, India, Indonesia, USA, Japan and Australia).

This composition, covering the main areas of the revolutionary movement, was then approved by all the fraternal parties, and experience showed it to be helpful to the successful conduct of the 1960 Meeting and the formulation of its documents. Naturally our Party, which is charged with the duty of calling the international conference, will approach all the parties and consult with them.

Guided by all these considerations, the CC CPSU proposes:

- 1. That the meeting of representatives of the CPSU and the CPC be continued in Beijing in May 1964.*
- 2. That the preparatory meeting of representatives of twenty-six fraternal parties be called in June-July 1964.*
- 3. That the international meeting be held, with the agreement of the fraternal parties, in the autumn of 1964.*

The CC CPSU emphasizes that for the successful implementation of all these measures it is necessary that there be a cessation of public polemics and an abandonment of all types of subversive and schismatic activity in the socialist community and the communist movement.

We hope that the CC CPC will agree to these proposals and will make its constructive contribution to the preparation and implementation of the projected measures. Our proposal of these measures is prompted by deep concern for the settlement of the differences and for the unity of the international communist movement, and these measures are in accord with the fundamental interests of the peoples of the socialist countries, the working class and the working people of all countries, and with the interests of communism.

With comradely greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet
Union**

Letter of the CC of the CPSU of June 15, 1964

June 15, 1964

Source: *The Daily Review*, Novosti Press Agency, Moscow, Vol. X, No. 167, July 16, 1964.

To the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

Dear comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has received your letter of May 7, which contains an answer to ours of March 7 last. In your letter you not only reject all the proposals of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties aimed at overcoming the difficulties in the communist movement, but virtually refuse to meet with representatives of parties, to hold talks and discuss with them common problems of concern to the Communists of the whole world. Never before has the CC CPC so frankly expressed its scorn of the opinion of fraternal parties, and its refusal to lend an ear to them and take part in a joint search for ways of overcoming the differences. The entire content of your letter, as well as its rude tone, shows that for all the numerous CC CPC declarations to the effect that it is anxious to prevent a split and uphold unity, you do not want the differences to be overcome, and in practice oppose the unity of the world communist movement. You even make no attempt to deny that your aim is to have your hands free in order to carry on factional, splitting activities. This is the only way the Marxist-Leninist parties that are concerned about the difficulties which have arisen within our movement can interpret your letter.

In sending you its letter of March 7, the CC CPSU believed that the situation in the world communist movement called for a collective examination of the difficulties, a collective formulation of advisable ways of overcoming them, and for unity of all the fraternal parties. With these aims in view, we proposed calling a CPSU-CPC meeting and a preparatory conference of delegates from twenty-six parties as speedily as possible, and holding a world meeting even this year, by agreement among the fraternal parties. We felt that open polemics must be discontinued and all manner of subversive,

splitting activities within the socialist common-wealth and the communist movement—practices which have already done considerable harm to our cause—renounced if those measures were to succeed. We reckoned with the will of most of the fraternal parties, which insist that CPSU and CPC delegates meet and that an international Communist forum be held to discuss the problems that have arisen in a comradely atmosphere, within the fraternal family of Communists, and remove the divergencies caused by the CPC leaders' splitting activities.

The proposals put forward in the CC CPSU letter of March 7 were actively supported by the world communist movement. By now the overwhelming majority of the fraternal parties have declared for convening a meeting without delay. Some parties, while favoring a conference in principle, make certain reservations as to the specific time when it should be called, bearing in mind your opposition to a meeting. But as far as we know, no leadership of any party, except that of the CPC and the Albanian Party of Labour, rejects the necessity for collective measures to overcome the difficulties in the communist movement and promote its unity.

The CC CPC letter of May 7 proposes postponing the conference for "four or five years or more" and, moreover, declares that "it would even be better not to convene it than to convene it." Once again you put off for a long time the bilateral meeting which the CC CPC proposed a short time ago holding in October 1964, and make such reservations to your consent to it as give cause for doubt whether the Chinese side is interested in it at all.

We state, therefore, that the CC CPC is going back on its own proposals. The CPC leaders have for a long time posed as initiators of an early conference, making it appear as if the CPSU were against it. When, in the winter of 1962, the Communist parties of Indonesia, Vietnam and New Zealand proposed a conference, you supported their proposal. You wrote on April 7, 1962, that a conference would be of "topical, positive significance in overcoming the differences existing between fraternal parties today." At the end of 1962 that attitude of the CC CPC was publicly reaffirmed in the speeches made by your delegations at the congresses of the fraternal parties of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Afterwards you declared for a conference in your letters to the CC CPSU of March 9, 1963, and June 14, 1963. Lastly, your letter of February 29, 1964, said in black and white: "The Communist Party of China invariably favors a conference of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties of all countries, and actively supports it."

Nevertheless, the CC CPSU and other fraternal parties had only to put the question of a conference on a specific basis for you to make a volte-face. Anyone will be struck by the extremely contradictory and illogical position of the CC CPC. Until recently you enthusiastically supported the idea of a conference and were even proud of having been the first to support the proposal for convening it because you considered it useful. Today the CPC leaders say something different. From what they say, a conference would be untimely and would, indeed, threaten the communist movement with all sorts of calamities. That wavering seems to be due solely to the fact that you have never before thought seriously of a conference—any more than you do now—because you could not count on support for your ideological and political platform on the part of a world Communist forum. It is legitimate to presume that the CC CPC is little concerned about the problem of preserving and strengthening the unity of the communist movement and that it is turning the issue of a conference into an object for an unseemly political game to breed more difficulties.

Although you vigorously flaunt your indifference to the opinion of other parties and declare that you are unafraid of a “resolute rebuff” from them, in fact you are afraid to attend a world Communist conference because you are anxious to evade a fair and straightforward discussion, and a comparison of your erroneous platform and the line of the world communist movement.

Your objections to a conference are utterly indefensible. You contend that a world conference, like a CPC-CPSU meeting, would merely “end in a quarrel and in all parties going away without achieving any results,” and that “there will be an open split and everyone will go his own way.”

No one can pose the issue like that or predict a split as the result of a conference unless he himself has decided on a split. Indeed, if at a conference the line pursued is one of aggravating differences and if its purpose is seen as one of condemning someone, slapping on offensive labels and making irresponsible charges, the result may be further dissociation rather than greater unity.

But the CPSU and those fraternal parties which at every stage of the differences have consistently favored a new international meeting emphatically reject such a line, the very idea of such an approach to a conference. As far as we are concerned, the issue of a conference is inseparable from the problem of maintaining and promoting the unity of our movement. We believe that in view of the differences which the Communist movement has come up

against, it is necessary, first and foremost, to concentrate on revealing what the fraternal parties have in common and what unites them, on seeking ways of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen. Fraternal parties have no better method for overcoming differences and formulating common positions than a collective exchange of views at an international forum that would enable each party to fully retain its sovereignty and yet take an active part in formulating the common line of the world communist movement.

The differences and disputes which have broken out in the communist movement and are causing it considerable damage affect the interests of every single party. That is why each party is entitled and obliged to contribute to the discussion and solution of urgent problems and to the common cause of promoting unity. It is precisely a conference that would give each party an opportunity to hear all opinions and state its point of view frankly and seriously, so that it could subsequently be taken into consideration when a common line and common decisions were formulated.

As regards the CPSU, in proposing a conference, it aims—in full accordance with the principles established within the communist movement after the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU and the Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960—to pursue at it a line for unity, the normalization of the situation in our movement, and a serious discussion of disputed issues, such as will make for greater unity on the basis of principle, and not for an aggravation of differences. It is our deep conviction that there are no insurmountable obstacles to this. All that is necessary is for every participant in an international meeting to show at least a minimum of goodwill, to be willing to listen carefully to other opinions and to understand them, and seek for ways to unity and not to dissociation. If the representatives of every party show an interest in overcoming the difficulties, and if the CPC delegation attends the proposed conference with a desire to seek mutual understanding with the other participants, and with a constructive program, which the CPSU and other parties think necessary, then the conference may become a turning point in the effort for greater unity.

The CC CPSU is perfectly aware that the divergencies between the CC CPC and other fraternal parties are very serious and have gone far. A good deal of extraneous matter, of artificialities which hinder mutual understanding, has accumulated in the relations between the two parties. A whole series of fundamental differences over highly important problems of today and of the policies of world communism have emerged and become acute. It is pos-

sible, therefore, that whatever the efforts which the Marxist-Leninist parties may make, the conference may not fully succeed in arriving at a common view on all matters. The CC CPSU is convinced, however, that even such an outcome of the conference will not amount to a split, which the CPC leaders persistently forecast. Even in a case like that, we think it possible to reach at the conference an agreement that the Communist parties commit themselves to take account of the opinions of all the conference delegates, all the Marxist-Leninist parties, to cooperate conscientiously in those fields in which their positions and interests will have turned out to be common, and refrain from any further action aggravating the difficulties and gratifying none but the class enemy. One may well ask: given this approach, why should a conference lead to a split or so much as worsen the situation in the communist movement?

We consider that the procedure for the conference proceedings suggested by us fully accords with the standards and principles of relations between Communist parties and is perfectly realistic. It is a question of really showing elementary concern for unity, tolerance and good faith, which the communist movement has a right to expect from any one of its contingents. There can be no doubt at all as to the success of a conference provided every fraternal party and its leaders are aware of their historic responsibility for the destinies of our movement and realize the gravity of the situation and the possible consequences of a split.

In upholding the idea of a new international meeting, the CC CPSU maintains that it is indispensable not only for overcoming the differences, important as this task may be in itself. Communists should not for one moment forget their responsibility in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and national independence, for a successful advance along the road of socialism and communism.

About four years have passed since the last world conference. In this period, many important changes have taken place in the world which require study, generalization and conclusions. The world socialist system has made notable progress in the past years. Its economic power has increased, and so has its political and ideological impact on world development. Most of the socialist countries are completing an important period of their development and are approaching new heights in the construction of a new society. Their further advance to socialism and communism makes it increasingly impera-

tive to improve the forms of cooperation and mutual assistance, exchanges of experience, and coordination of political and economic activities.

Two opposed world policies are in evidence today, more clearly than ever before. One is directed towards preserving peace and promoting peaceful coexistence; it is pursued by the socialist countries and is supported by the majority of mankind. The other is aimed at increasing international tension—and the war menace; it is pursued by the imperialist reactionaries led by the wild men of the US and other imperialist powers. The past years have shown how very correct were the Communist parties: conclusions regarding the possibility of averting war and isolating and defeating the forces opposed to peace.

The recent period has seen even more obvious signs of an aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, of the growth of the social and political antagonisms rending the capitalist system both within bourgeois society and internationally. There is now much that is new in the forms of organization and the methods used by the working class of the capitalist countries in fighting for its immediate and ultimate goals. The disintegration of imperialism's colonial system has entered its closing stage. The newly free nations' irresistible desire for socialism, and their effort to take the non-capitalist road of development has become particularly evident in recent years.

The revolutionary movement, and the champions of peace and socialism now have new great opportunities, and we Communists should think of the best ways of using these opportunities in the interests of the working class and all nations.

We are firmly convinced that a conference would be just the place to make a collective analysis of new economic and socio-political developments and processes, coordinate appraisals and positions, and enrich and specify the common political line accordingly. We state with satisfaction that the general line of the world communist movement, as defined in the 1957 and 1960 documents, has been proved by reality to be perfectly correct and has brought fraternal parties further achievements.

On the other hand, there is now a pressing need to meet in order to sum up the progress made, compare notes, review the problems confronting world communism and, in keeping with the changes that have occurred in the international situation, supplement and elaborate the ideas of the Declaration and Statement, and creatively examine and solve new problems.

In the light of all these tasks, the CC CPC proposal for putting off a new world conference for a long time is particularly unacceptable. All indications are that the conference is indispensable and the question of convening it cannot be shelved.

The most important thing, however, is, as the CC CPSU sees it, for every Marxist-Leninist party to contribute even today, regardless of the specific date of a new World Meeting, to the cause which the Meeting is to serve, that is, to the unity of the Communists of the world, and to the effort towards attaining common goals. At the moment it is important for every fraternal party to fight for these goals still more actively. Every fraternal party is faced with tasks brooking no delay; it must make a thorough study of the situation that has developed in the communist movement, participate constructively in the discussion of difficulties and in the search for ways of overcoming them and subordinate its everyday activities to the interests of the international unity of our ranks. This is the practical method for proving one's loyalty to the principles and exigencies of proletarian internationalism and to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. It is also the surest way to convene and successfully carry through a world Communist forum. We are emphatically against making the issue of the date of a conference a pretext for further argument and a stumbling-block to the solution of the main tasks confronting the communist movement. However, we are emphatically against postponing a conference for "four or five years or more," which is what the CC CPC proposes.

Such is our position on the main issue raised in the latest letters which the CC CPSU and the CC CPC have exchanged concerning the aims and prospects of a new World Meeting.

The CC CPC letter of May 7 deals with a number of other problems, both concerning a world meeting and having no direct bearing on it. Among them is, for example, the question of the procedure of convening the conference.

The CC CPC asserts that in present-day conditions no one has a right to call a world conference since there is no permanent body of the Comintern type. From the point of view of the democratic principles of which the communist movement is based, it must be recognized that any party or group of parties is free to take such an initiative.—In that event it is the duty of the other contingents of the communist movement to carefully examine and support that initiative, provided it benefits our common cause. As for the

CPSU, it will be recalled that the fraternal parties have placed on it a special responsibility with regard to the convening of world meetings. The decision adopted by the 1957 Meeting reads: "Entrust the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with the function of convening Meetings of the Communist and Workers' Parties in consultation with the fraternal parties." This decision was passed unanimously with the CPC delegation participating. What is more, Comrade Mao Zedong, who spoke at the afternoon sitting of November 14, 1957, said that "it is necessary to recognize the CPSU as the party which should take the initiative in calling Meetings."

We are citing these facts to establish the truth and prevent the issue of the initiative in calling a meeting from being made a new object of argument and a pretext for delaying a world forum of fraternal parties, which has become urgent.

The CC CPC, raising one obstacle after another to a meeting, writes that there is a need of "great preparatory work." Our Party has always considered that the conference has to be prepared for carefully if it is to succeed. It is with this aim in view that we have proposed again and again stopping public polemics and renouncing the methods of factional activity within the world communist movement.

Everything suggests that the CC CPC, in speaking of "preparatory work," means something that is the exact opposite of it, namely, the intensification of factional, disruptive activities, and the utmost exacerbation of polemics. Frankly speaking, that is, in effect, the true reason for the Chinese leaders' stalling. At a time when the struggle is becoming more and more acute, it counts, as everything seems to indicate, on forming a bloc of parties and groups subservient to Beijing. Another fact indicating this is that you are now openly trying to secure the invitation to the meeting of fellow-thinkers you have recruited in various countries.

Since the CC CPC is turning the question of the composition of the meeting into another point of difference, we consider it necessary to state our attitude to it. We are of the opinion that all those parties which took part in the meetings of 1957 and 1960 and signed their documents are entitled to attend. This is all the more so because the differences in the communist movement concern the interpretation of the Declaration and Statement. Obviously, only a forum of the parties which formulated and signed those documents are in a position to interpret them correctly. Only the conference itself has a right to decide whether any new participants should be invited.

In the years that have passed since the last world Meeting there have arisen in several countries (including some African countries) parties which agree with and implement the general line of the communist movement expressed in the Declaration and Statement and are the recognized spokesmen of the working-class movement of their countries. Naturally, those parties are entitled to expect an invitation to attend the new international meeting.

But when the CC CPC poses the question of inviting new participants to the meeting, it is thinking not of those parties but of the anti-party factional groups which it has brought into being and which it designates by the high-sounding name of “parties.” However, those groups do not represent the working-class movement of their countries but have been artificially set up from without. It is no chance coincidence that the anti-party groups in Australia, Brazil, Belgium, Ceylon and some other countries sprang up just when the CC CPC launched its factional activities within the world communist movement. Secondly, those groups do not adhere, either in theory or in practice, to the general line of the world communist movement defined in the Declaration and Statement. On the contrary, the views they advocate betray them completely as opponents of this line. Thirdly, they are made up of anti-party opposition elements expelled from Marxist-Leninist parties and fighting against lawfully elected central committees, against tested leaders of those parties who enjoy prestige. It is indicative of the political character and composition of those groups that they have been joined by Trotskyists, anarchists and all manner of renegades and apostates. It should be said in so many words that this type of adherents to the Chinese leadership’s line is no credit to it. No matter how hard you try to represent those impostors as “true revolutionaries,” they are outside the communist movement and no power on earth can drag them into its ranks.

The CC CPSU cannot overlook the attempts the letter from the CC CPC of May 7 makes to defame the tested Marxist-Leninist parties of Australia, Brazil and India. We emphatically reject the unworthy methods by which the leaders of one party, the Communist Party of China, lay claim to a special position in the communist movement, to the right to pass judgement on parties as a whole and their leaders and arbitrarily decide issues that are only for the working class of the given country to decide.

If you persist in this sort of “preparatory work” for the Meeting, i.e., strive to extend factional activity, you will only confirm the established opinion that the CPC leadership is taking matters directly towards a split.

The striving of the CC CPC to aggravate the open polemics in the communist movement has long become obvious. The propaganda campaign started by it has gone beyond the framework of any ideological polemics and developed into an open political struggle against Marxist-Leninist parties. It has nothing in common with an elucidation of the truth, with the working out of pressing problems of the theory and policy of our movement. The content, methods and tone of your statements show that you deliberately try to expand the range of issues, distort the real stand of the Marxist-Leninist parties, slander their leadership and turn the masses against it. It is patently clear to everybody that this is not polemics any longer but a fomenting of differences and enmity. It shatters friendship among the peoples of the socialist countries, sows confusion and distrust in the ranks of the revolutionary working-class and national liberation movement and compromises world socialism. The CPC leaders thereby bring grist to the mill of the aggressive circles of imperialism, who, as everybody knows, are eagerly helping to circulate Chinese propaganda materials.

We approach the preparations for the Meeting differently. The CC CPSU has always held that in the course of the preparations there should be a creative discussion of important problems of the communist movement on the basis of comradely exchanges of opinion as provided for by the 1960 Statement. We regard a discussion of urgent problems of Marxism-Leninism, of problems of the strategy and tactics of our movement, as normal and useful. Such discussions help to advance Marxist thinking, to bring the activity of the Communist parties closer to the requirements of reality and to work out a common policy in course of preparations for meetings and conferences. However, the CC CPC's propaganda campaign, which is hostile to the communist movement in no way serves this purpose.

You threaten that you intend answering "the more than two thousand anti-Chinese articles and materials" allegedly published in the Soviet press as well as "the numerous decisions, statements and articles of several tens of fraternal parties." In other words, you plan to carry on the public polemics endlessly. That, evidently, is your objective. You started the polemics, forced the fraternal parties to give a rebuff to your erroneous views and now, under the guise of "answers," you intend to extend the political struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties still further.

The CC CPC's proposal, contained in its letter of May 7, for concluding an agreement between the two Parties to publish materials of the other side

in their press unambiguously exposes your design, which is to fan the polemics to even greater proportions.

We should like to note that while there was hope that the discussion would not go beyond a principled debate of theoretical and political issues we reprinted some Chinese materials in our press. But when it became clear that it was not a principled discussion but hostile propaganda we had to change our approach to this question. No Communist party has ever undertaken to reprint, circulate and propagate slanderous materials that are alien to socialism. No matter from whom such materials come, they help only the reactionary circles of imperialism in their struggle against world socialism.

The reprinting of articles in which our country is accused of "plotting with US imperialism," "betraying the revolution" and "restoring" capitalist practices would have served no purpose other than to undermine our people's feeling of friendship and fraternity for the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people, who, of course, cannot bear the responsibility for the present actions of their leaders. By printing a succession of such articles, the Soviet press would have had to answer each one of them. The polemics with the Chinese leadership would have thus become the prime content of our country's entire ideological life. This would have meant distracting the attention of the Party and the people from the cardinal tasks, namely communist construction, the struggle against imperialism and aid to the revolutionary working-class and national-liberation movements. It is clear that this is something our Party will not do.

It must be reiterated that all your thoughts are directed towards further aggravating the polemics, intensifying factional activity and rejecting any collective discussion of the problems facing the communist movement. On all questions worrying Communists throughout the world, the CC CPC has taken a stand that runs counter to the common interests of our movement, to the interests of strengthening the unity of its ranks.

In this light, facts gainsay the claim that the CC CPC "consistently defends unity and struggles against a split" and that it is "making unflagging efforts to remove differences." Under present conditions, as never before, the struggle for unity requires practical, constructive action. However, your actions are aimed at hindering the settlement of the differences and worsening the situation in every possible way. The negative approach which runs through the CC CPC letter of May 7, and the utter unwillingness to meet the initiative of the fraternal parties half way can have only one explanation, namely, that

the Chinese leaders do not wish to take into consideration the opinions and interests of the overwhelming majority of the Communist parties, that they are waging a bitter struggle against them and deliberately seeking to split the communist movement.

It is clear to all the participants in the communist movement that by postponing a world meeting to a remote date, the CC CPC hopes in that time to increase the number of its supporters, turn them into obedient tools of its policy and thereby attempt to create favorable conditions for itself at this future meeting. One does not have to be a prophet to forecast the complete failure of these calculations. We have not the least doubt that with time, life will prove with increasing force the indefensibility of the ideological and political platform and tactical line that the CPC leaders are trying to impose upon the communist movement. The unseemly objective pursued by the Chinese leadership will become increasingly clear and those who have been temporarily deluded will see the light. It goes without saying that the splitting activity of the CC CPC can inflict and has already inflicted harm on the communist movement, particularly on those of its contingents that are waging a struggle for the cause of the working class, against imperialist reaction in the capitalist countries under the difficult conditions. But each step forward in the struggle of the working class and each new success in the development of the world socialist system will deal a blow at the erroneous and unrealistic propositions of the Chinese leaders and will prove the correctness and vitality of the Leninist line of the communist movement.

In its letter the CC CPC touches upon certain points of its ideological and political differences with the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. Our Party has repeatedly set forth its stand on these points. We therefore do not find it necessary to return to them again in this letter, especially as your letter contains nothing new. For a long time you have subsisted on outright abuse and on the slapping on of labels, substituting this for an honest discussion of questions on which the CC CPC has its own special opinion. The CC CPSU emphatically rejects as patent slander your irresponsible assertion that the CPSU “strives for an alliance with US imperialism with every fiber of its body,” “opposes the national liberation movement and the proletarian revolution” and is “plotting a major conspiracy, an open split of the socialist camp and the world communist movement.” Statements of this kind only discredit those who make them, those who take the liberty of making such malicious attacks against the first country of victorious socialism, a country

that carries the main burden of the struggle against imperialism. Who are these clumsy fabrications intended for? Do you seriously hope to find simpletons who would believe such slander? The real purport of your assertions is that you want to delude the masses of China, set them against the Soviet people, who are the friend and brother of the Chinese workers and peasants. All this benefits only the imperialist reaction, whose cherished hope is to split the peoples of the socialist countries, sow enmity among them and bring them into conflict with each other.

With these acts you are trying to screen the real essence of the differences that you actually have with the present political line of the world communist movement. Throughout the world, Marxist-Leninists have long ago realized that the Chinese leaders have drifted away from the communist movement in such questions as war and peace, the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, the ways of accomplishing the socialist revolution, the role and ways of furthering the national liberation movement, the struggle against the ideology and practice of the personality cult and the methods of building socialism and communism.

From all the rooftops you claim that you are irreconcilable adversaries of the ideas put forward by the Twentieth CPSU Congress; It is in vain that you are proud of this, comrades! You must realize that more than anything else this betrays you as the people who today adhere to outdated positions, which have long been rejected by life, by the practice of the entire world liberation movement, the entire world communist movement. The Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, as is recognized by the entire world communist movement and officially affirmed in the Declaration and Statement, initiated a new stage in the development of our movement. It has become the symbol of the creative spirit of Leninism, of a new line of the entire world communist movement, a symbol of the change from the ideology and practices of the Stalin personality cult to Leninist principles and norms;

This was the change that laid the foundation for further successes in the struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism, for an enhancement of the prestige and influence of the world communist movement, for its transition to a fresh offensive against the forces of reaction and war. The savage attacks against the decisions of the Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses of the CPSU, against the propositions and directives of the Declaration and Statement are nothing more than the reaction of conservative forces in

the communist movement to the creative Marxism-Leninism of the modern epoch.

Evidently you do not even notice the extent to which the letter of the CC CPC of May 7 is permeated with the ideology of the personality cult; Your demonstrative disregard of the will of the fraternal parties, your undisguised attempt to avoid a collective discussion of the problems that have arisen and your methods of conducting polemics by piling up all sorts of political insinuations, of the most fantastic accusations, your intolerance and bitterness with regard to comrades-in-struggle bear the indelible imprint of personality cult practices.

The CC CPC tries to cover up its departure from the general line of the communist movement with the flag of revolution and struggle against imperialism, which is sacred to all Communists. But the real worth of this “revolutionary spirit” is shown by the practical deeds of the CPC leaders, by their entire activity aimed at splitting the revolutionary forces of modern times. Recently, for example, the meaning that the CPC leaders attach to their notorious theory of a so-called “intermediate zone” embracing, besides China, the imperialists of Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Britain, has become especially clear. The extent to which manifestations of a split in the communist movement in the socialist camp brings joy to the imperialists is seen by their attempts to find some way of effecting a rapprochement with those who are causing this split. Have the CPC leaders paid attention to the fact that namely today when Chinese propaganda is shouting loudest of all about “revolution” and a “struggle against imperialism,” the ruling circles of these powers are displaying special readiness to establish closer relations with Beijing. Even the US imperialists, as can be seen from many statements by US officials, declare that despite the bellicose tone of Chinese propaganda China is behaving “moderately” and that therefore the United States must “keep the door open” should there be changes in relations with China.

Today it is becoming increasingly clear to Marxist-Leninists throughout the world that on the lips of the CPC leaders “leftist” phrases mean nothing but a screen for great-power designs and claims to hegemony which manifest themselves with growing clarity in their practical actions in the world and in the communist movement. We should like to warn you, comrades, that the road you are taking is extremely dangerous, that you are gambling with the destiny of the people of China and with their revolutionary gains.

You are trying to portray criticism of your anti-Leninist views and stand as an “anti-Chinese campaign.” You know perfectly well that in all of our Party’s documents special emphasis is laid on the heartfelt friendship of Soviet Communists for the Chinese people, to whom we have rendered and are prepared to continue rendering the utmost aid in the building of socialism. The CC CPSU is not engaged in stirring up among our people distrust and hostility towards China, towards its great people and towards the peoples of other countries.

It is precisely because we cherish the friendship between the Soviet and Chinese peoples, the unity between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China and the solidarity of the entire world liberation movement that we are not relaxing our efforts to normalize relations with the CPC despite the fact that the Chinese leadership is demonstrating with increasing clarity its unwillingness to improve these relations. Our long enduring patience and restraint are explained by the fact that we are devoted to the Leninist principles of internationalism, have our eyes on the future and believe in the ultimate triumph of these principles in the socialist community and the communist movement.

We reaffirm our stand with regard to the need for convening a World Meeting of Communist and Workers’ Parties as a reliable and tested method of securing the unity of Marxist-Leninist parties. We suggest that in the immediate future we should agree in principle that a Meeting must be convened and that it should not be put off for long, and that agreement on its specific date as well as on its agenda and composition should be reached through further consultations with the fraternal parties.

The CC CPSU considers that at the present stage the main effort should be concentrated on holding a preparatory conference. We reiterate our proposal that a preparatory conference should be convened and attended by representatives of the 26 parties nominated by the World Meeting of Communist Parties as members of the Drafting Commission in 1960 and representing the interests of Communists in all the main regions of the world. We consider it necessary to reach agreement with the fraternal parties on the specific date of such a conference in the immediate future.

As before, the CC CPSU expresses its preparedness to hold a bilateral meeting of representatives of the CPSU and CPC on any agreed date. This question can be decided at any time by agreement between the CPSU and CPC.

A collective examination of problems of the Communist movement is at present the only true method recognized by all Communist parties. Therefore no party can, without breaking with internationalism, hinder the convocation of the Meeting or unilaterally dictate terms under which such a Meeting must be held. All parties are equal and, on the basis of the democratic principles proclaimed in the Declaration and Statement, jointly decide questions concerning our entire movement.

In conclusion the CC CPSU considers it necessary to emphasize that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will firmly continue to follow the Leninist line laid down for it by the Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses and consistently implement the general line of the world communist movement as set forth in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement. Our Party and the entire Soviet people are faced with the epoch-making task of building a communist society. Together with all peace-loving forces we bear the responsibility for averting a world thermonuclear war, for the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. We shall spare no effort in the struggle for the attainment of the great goals of the modern epoch.

Such, too, is the position from which we approach the matter of surmounting difficulties in the world communist movement, and strengthening the unity of its ranks. We place the interests of world communism above all else and are guided by them in our relations with the Communist Party of China as with any other party.

The CC CPSU should like to hope that the CC CPC studies the proposals made in this letter with all seriousness, once again weighs all the possible consequences of the stand taken by it and, on its part, takes steps that would lead to unity with all Marxist-Leninist parties rather than to a split.

With fraternal greetings,

**Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet
Union**

Letter of the CC of the CPSU of July 30, 1964

July 30, 1964

Source: *Beijing Review*, September 4, 1964, Vol. VII, No. 36, pp. 8-9.

To the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

Dear Comrades!

The Central Committee of the CPSU has sent to all the fraternal parties its letter of June 15 addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. The letter sets our positions on the basic questions connected with the existing differences in the international communist movement and also advances concrete proposals on measures for strengthening its unity.

Up to the present, an absolute majority of the fraternal parties have spoken out in favor of the necessity for collective action to overcome the difficulties which have sprung up in our ranks. They advocate the holding of a new international meeting of representatives of the communist and workers' parties, and, moreover, many parties insist that the convening of the meeting must not be postponed for a long time.

The Central Committee of the CPSU sees in this position taken by the fraternal parties new evidence of their great concern for the fate of the communist movement and of their awareness of the high responsibility which the current situation imposes on Communists.

Marxist-Leninists cannot shut their eyes to the fact that the differences which sprang up in our ranks four years ago not only have not lost their acuteness but are becoming more and more serious. Ideological differences have grown into open conflict, which can lead to a split in the international communist movement if measures are not taken. All this is rather adversely affecting the activities of the communist parties, especially those in the capitalist countries, doing harm to the entire world communist movement and undermining the unity of the world socialist system, and it may weaken the attractive force of the ideas of socialism.

More and more facts show that our class enemy is reckoning on making every possible use of the discord in the ranks of the Communists. Imperi-

alist reaction, especially in the USA, is stepping up its activities, striving to strengthen its positions and launch an offensive against the workers' movement, the national liberation movement and the democratic movement, trying to undermine the unity of the socialist countries and intensifying the threat of war.

No genuinely Marxist-Leninist party can remain indifferent in the face of such developments. No one else can solve the problems confronting the communist movement on behalf of us Communists. No one party alone is able to undertake the solution of the problems affecting the interests and fate of the whole movement. Here common collective efforts are essential by all the fraternal parties and all Marxist-Leninists' The fraternal parties have come precisely to these conclusions, in persistently advocating the organization of a new international meeting as the tested method for overcoming differences and working out common positions.

As is known, at the 1957 meeting the fraternal parties unanimously adopted the following decision: "Entrust the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with the function of convening Meetings of the Communist and Workers' Parties in consultation with the fraternal parties."

Up to the present, necessary consultations have been held, the question of convening an international meeting of the communist parties has been discussed in a sufficiently detailed and thorough way, and the positions of all the communist parties have become manifest. The job now is to shift the solution of the problem to a practical basis. Taking into consideration the clearly expressed will of the absolute majority of the fraternal parties, the CC of the CPSU considers that the time is ripe to begin preparatory work for the convening of an international meeting. We hold that, already this year, a drafting committee should be convened. In so far as it has already become clear in the process of preliminary exchange of views that the question of the composition of the drafting committee could become a new obstacle to its convening, we regard as the only reasonable way out the convening of the drafting committee with the same composition with which it worked during the preparations for the 1960 meeting, that is, comprising the representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the following twenty-six countries: Australia, Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Brazil, Great Britain, Hungary, Viet Nam, the German Democratic Republic, West Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, the PRC, Korea, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the USA, Syria, the US, Finland, France, Czechoslovakia and Japan.

The CC of the CPSU invites the representatives of the fraternal parties listed above to come to Moscow by December 15, 1964, so as to start on the practical work of preparation for an international meeting.

Undoubtedly, it would conform to the common wish if the committee could start working with its full membership from the beginning. However, in our opinion, the committee should also begin its work in the case that any of the twenty-six communist parties fail to send its representatives by the appointed time.

In accordance with the experience of past meetings, the drafting committee will prepare drafts of the principal documents to be submitted to the international meeting for discussion. The committee could discuss the whole range of questions concerning the holding of the international meeting and put forward its proposals on them. The drafting committee should send its proposals and recommendations on all these questions to all the fraternal parties.

The CC of the CPSU expresses the conviction that, despite the complicated situation in the communist movement, there is every ground for the drafting committee to cope with its task successfully. After the committee has accomplished the necessary preparatory work, the international meeting should be convened at the time set by the committee.

On the aims and perspectives of the meeting, the CC of the CPSU has, stated its views in its letter of June 15. We want to stress once again that for us the question of the meeting is inseparably linked up with the problem of preserving and strengthening the unity of the world communist movement. The meeting will be called not to condemn anybody, to “excommunicate” anybody from the communist movement and the socialist camp, to attach insulting labels, or to throw irresponsible charges at each other—this would lead only to further divisions, and not to the strengthening of unity. We consider that the meeting should concentrate its efforts on finding out the things in common which unite all the fraternal parties, and on seeking ways to overcome the existing differences.

In the opinion of the CC of the CPSU, each fraternal party could state its viewpoint at the meeting in a frank and matter-of-fact way, so that its viewpoint can be considered in working out the common line and joint decisions, and it should also listen to the opinions of other parties.

Apparently, the starting point of the work of the new meeting will be the decisions of the previous meetings -the Declaration of 1957 and the State-

ment of 1960 in which the general line of the world communist movement was laid down. At the same time, reaffirming the principles of the Declaration and the Statement, the new meeting might sum up the past stage, exchange experiences, go over the whole complex of problems confronting world communism, and, in accordance with the shifts that have taken place in the international situation, enrich and develop the ideas of the Declaration and the Statement and creatively consider and solve new problems. Collectively to analyse the new economic and socio-political phenomena and processes which have occurred in the past four years since the last international meeting, to coordinate appraisals and positions and to enrich and concretize the common political line accordingly—this, in our opinion, is the most important task of the new international meeting.

Like other fraternal parties, the CPSU fully realizes that the holding of the meeting in a situation in which there are acute differences is a difficult and complicated matter. It is possible that in the course of the meeting unanimity may not be reached on all questions at once, however hard all the consistent supporters of unity may strive to do so. Nevertheless, we are deeply convinced that this, too, would not mean the “formalization” of the split or the creation of obstacles to the further seeking of ways to unity. In that case, it should be possible to try to reach agreement that the participants of the meeting should undertake the obligation to take account of the opinions of all the fraternal parties, conscientiously co-operate in those fields in which common positions and interests are found, and refrain in the future from any actions which aggravate the difficulties and only gladden the class enemies.

We hope that all the fraternal parties will consider these proposals with due attention, make use of the time before the convening of the meeting to make a profound study of the situation that has arisen in the communist movement and make constructive contributions to the discussion and the search for ways to overcome the difficulties.

It is our deep conviction that there are no insurmountable obstacles to the international meeting starting its work as soon as drafts of documents are prepared by the drafting committee—about the middle of 1965. The representatives of all the eighty-one parties which participated in the meeting of 1960 may take part in the international meeting. The refusal of this or that party to join in this collective work cannot serve as a ground for further delays in carrying out measures for which the time has matured with the aim

of working out ways and means of strengthening the international unity of the Marxist-Leninists of the whole world.

Being convinced that the above proposals conform to the highest interests of world communism and to the interests of strengthening the solidarity of all the progressive and revolutionary forces of our times, and that these proposals express the will of the absolute majority of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the CC of the CPSU expects that the proposed measures will be carried out in good time and be crowned with success.

In order to enable us to keep all the fraternal parties informed of the preparatory work for the meeting, we request you to communicate to us the composition of your delegation to take part in the work of the drafting committee.

With Communist greetings,

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet
Union**

Collection “Colorful Classics”

1. *Marxism-Leninism-Maoism
Basic Course: Revised Edition*
Communist Party of India
(Maoist)
2. *Philosophical Trends in the
Feminist Movement*
Anuradha Ghandy
3. *Minimanual of the Urban
Guerrilla*
Carlos Marighella
4. *The Communist Necessity*
J. Moufawad-Paul
5. *Maoists in India: Writings
& Interviews*
Azad
6. *Five Golden Rays*
Mao Zedong
7. *Stand for Socialism Against
Modern Revisionism*
Armando Liwanag
8. *Strategy for the Liberation
of Palestine*
PFLP
9. *Against Avakianism*
Ajith
10. *Specific Characteristics of our
People’s War*
Jose Maria Sison
11. *Rethinking Socialism: What is
Socialist Transition?*
Deng-Yuan Hsu & Pao-yu
Ching
12. *Fedai Guerillas Speak on
Armed Struggle in Iran*
Dehghani, Ahmadzadeh,
Habash, Pouyan, Ashraf
13. *Revolutionary Works*
Seamus Costello
14. *Urban Perspective*
Communist Party of India
(Maoist)
15. *Five Essays on Philosophy*
Mao Zedong
16. *Post-Modernism Today*
Siraj
17. *The National Question*
Ibrahim Kaypakkaya
18. *Historic Eight Documents*
Charu Mazumdar
19. *A New Outlook on Health*
Advocators
20. *Basic Principles of Marxism-
Leninism: A Primer*
Jose Maria Sison
21. *Toward a Scientific Analysis of
the Gay Question*
Los Angeles Research Group
22. *Activist Study—Araling Aktibista
(ARAK)*
PADEPA
23. *Education to Govern*
Advocators

Collection “Foundations”

1. *The Foundations of Leninism*
Joseph Stalin
2. *Wage Labour and Capital
& Wages, Price and Profit*
Karl Marx
3. *Reform or Revolution?*
Rosa Luxemburg
4. *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*
Frederick Engels
5. *The State and Revolution*
V. I. Lenin
6. *Labour in Irish History*
James Connolly
7. *Anarchism or Socialism?
& Trotskyism or Leninism?*
Joseph Stalin
8. *Manifesto of the Communist Party
& Principles of Communism*
Karl Marx & Frederick Engels
9. *Essays in Historical Materialism*
George Plekhanov
10. *The Fascist Offensive
& Unity of the Working Class*
George Dimitrov
11. *Imperialism, the Highest
Stage of Capitalism*
V. I. Lenin
12. *The Origin of the Family, Private
Property and the State*
Frederick Engels
13. *The Housing Question*
Frederick Engels
14. *The Modern Prince
& Other Writings*
Antonio Gramsci
15. *What is to be Done?*
V. I. Lenin
16. *Critique of the Gotha Program*
Karl Marx
17. *Elementary Principles
of Philosophy*
Georges Politzer
18. *Militarism & Anti-Militarism*
Karl Liebknecht
19. *History and Class Consciousness*
Georg Lukács
20. *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy
in the Democratic Revolution*
V. I. Lenin
21. *Dialectical and Historical Materialism
& Questions of Leninism*
Joseph Stalin
22. *The Re-Conquest of Ireland*
James Connolly
23. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of
Louis Bonaparte*
Karl Marx
24. *The Right to Be Lazy
& Other Studies*
Paul Lafargue
25. *The Civil War in France*
Karl Marx
26. *Anti-Dühring*
Frederick Engels

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>27. <i>The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky</i>
V. I. Lenin</p> <p>28. <i>Marxism and the National and Colonial Question</i>
Joseph Stalin</p> <p>29. <i>“Left-wing” Communism, an Infantile Disorder</i>
V. I. Lenin</p> | <p>30. <i>The Poverty of Philosophy</i>
Karl Marx</p> <p>31. <i>The Mass Strike</i>
Rosa Luxemburg</p> <p>32. <i>Revolution and Counterrevolution in Germany</i>
Frederick Engels</p> <p>33. <i>Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR & Commentaries</i>
Joseph Stalin & Mao Zedong</p> |
|---|--|

Collection “New Roads”

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. <i>From Victory to Defeat: China’s Socialist Road and Capitalist Reversal</i>
Pao-yu Ching</p> <p>2. <i>Silage Choppers and Snake Spirits</i>
Dao-yuan Chou</p> <p>3. <i>Which East is Red?</i>
Andrew Smith</p> <p>4. <i>Mao Zedong’s “On Contradiction” Study Companion</i>
Redspark Collective</p> <p>5. <i>Critique of Maoist Reason</i>
J. Moufawad-Paul</p> <p>6. <i>Like Ho Chi Minh! Like Che Guevara!</i>
Ian Scott Horst</p> | <p>7. <i>Critiquing Brahmanism</i>
K. Murali (Ajith)</p> <p>8. <i>Operation Green Hunt</i>
Adolfo Naya Fernández</p> <p>9. <i>Of Concepts and Methods</i>
K. Murali (Ajith)</p> <p>10. <i>The German Communist Resistance</i>
T. Derbent</p> <p>11. <i>Revolution and Counter-Revolution</i>
Pao-yu Ching</p> <p>12. <i>A Commentary on the Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church</i>
CNL</p> |
|--|---|

Collection “Works of Maoism”

1. *Collected Works (1968-1987)*
Communist Party of Peru
2. *Selected Works, Volume VI*
Mao Tse-tung
3. *Selected Works, Volume VII*
Mao Tse-tung
4. *Selected Works, Volume VIII*
Mao Tse-tung
5. *Selected Works, Volume IX*
Mao Tse-tung
6. *Selected Works, Volume I*
Mao Tse-tung
7. *Selected Readings from the Works*
Jose Maria Sison
8. *Selected Works, Volume II*
Mao Tse-tung
9. *Selected Works, Volume III*
Mao Tse-tung
10. *Selected Works, Volume IV*
Mao Tse-tung
11. *Selected Works, Volume V*
Mao Tse-tung
12. *Documents of the CPC,
The Great Debate, Vol. I*
13. *Selected Works, Volume I*
Ho Chi Minh
14. *Documents of the CPC,
The Great Debate, Vol. II*