

Pamphlets to Read

**LETTERS OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF JAPAN IN
REPLY TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF
THE SOVIET UNION**

**ON THE MEETING CONVENED IN MOSCOW
FROM MARCH 1 BY THE CPSU
LEADERSHIP**

Articles in AKAHATA, Organ of the Communist
Party of Japan

**ON INTERVENTIONS IN AND SUBVERSIVE
ACTIVITIES AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC
MOVEMENTS OF OUR COUNTRY AND
OUR PARTY BY THE CPSU LEADER-
SHIP AND THE INSTITUTIONS
AND ORGANIZATIONS
UNDER ITS GUIDANCE**

An Article in AKAHATA, Organ of the
Communist Party of Japan

Published by
FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
Peking (37), China

Available from
GUOZI SHUDIAN
China Publications Centre
P.O. Box 399, Peking, China

**ON THE INTRINSIC NATURE
OF N.S. KHRUSHCHOV'S
PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE
LINE**

An Article by Observer in AKAHATA, Organ of
the Communist Party of Japan

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

ON THE INTRINSIC NATURE
OF N.S. KHRUSHCHOV'S
PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE
LINE

An Article by Observer in AKAHATA, Organ of
the Communist Party of Japan

(November 22, 1964)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1965

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

On the Intrinsic Nature of N.S. Khrushchov's Peaceful Co-existence Line was originally published on November 22, 1964 in AKAHATA, the official daily newspaper of the Japanese Communist Party. This translation is from the December 1964 issue of the *Bulletin*, an English-language monthly published by the Japanese Communist Party.

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

(1) WHO HAVE PRAISED N.S. KHRUSHCHOV?	2
(2) CAPITULATIONISM WHICH HAS SUBMITTED TO NUCLEAR THREAT	8
(3) PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE SUBSTITUTED BY FOLLOWING IN THE WAKE OF THE UNITED STATES	23
(4) ILLUSION ABOUT "PEACEFUL" IMPERIALISM	34
(5) SETTLEMENT OF TOTAL ACCOUNTS OF THE KHRUSHCHOV LINE	42

ALREADY one month has passed since the decision of the CPSU Central Committee on the dismissal of N.S. Khrushchov was announced. The new leadership of the CPSU has not yet announced the truth regarding the dismissal. But it is a well-known fact that N.S. Khrushchov did not resign on account of "his advanced age and bad health" but he was dismissed from his post because the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been faced with the serious bankruptcy of its domestic and foreign policies under N.S. Khrushchov's leadership. And it also leaves no room for doubt that his "failure" in the Soviet Union's foreign policy occupied a very important position in the political background which made the CPSU leadership determine to take such an "emergency measure" as the dismissal of N.S. Khrushchov.

The question of the Khrushchov line in the foreign policy is never the question which concerns only the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. By their attempt at forcing their line of unprincipled concession and surrender to the imperialist forces, especially, to U.S. imperialism under the feigned name of the Marxist-Leninist "peaceful co-existence" line upon the Socialist camp, the international Communist movement, the world peace movement and the whole international democratic movements, N.S. Khrushchov and his followers not only have created and spread wider disunity of the international Communist movement but also have inflicted serious damages on the whole anti-imperialist peace forces. Backed by the anti-Party revisionists and rightwing

social-democrats, N.S. Khrushchov's so-called "peaceful co-existence" line has exerted harmful influence upon the peace and democratic movements in our country and has hindered their correct unity and advance. N.S. Khrushchov's responsibility is quite serious.

All the more because of that, it is a quite important task for the Marxist-Leninists in Japan to make a critical summary of the Khrushchov line in the foreign policy on the occasion of the dismissal of N.S. Khrushchov and to elucidate where the root lies, which not only has led the government and Party of the Soviet Union to the difficult position of today, but also has created confusion in and harmful influence on the international Communist movement. It is necessary not only for sweeping away the harmful opportunist influence of N.S. Khrushchov's so-called "peaceful co-existence" line from the peace and democratic movements in our country, and for making the dismissal of N.S. Khrushchov not merely a temporary episode in the process of the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism, but for developing it as a positive movement of the struggle to overcome modern revisionism and to recover unity of the international Communist movement.

(1) WHO HAVE PRAISED N.S. KHRUSHCHOV?

As is well-known, since the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, N.S. Khrushchov has distorted the peaceful co-existence policy and tried to force it upon the whole international Communist movement. Later, he has labelled those Marxist-Leninist Parties, which assume a critical attitude toward the "peaceful co-existence" policy claimed by him, "jingoist" who always turns his back against peaceful co-existence and desires a thermonuclear

war, and has claimed that the origin of differences of opinion within the present-day international Communist movement lies in the alternative of whether to choose the way of peaceful co-existence or to choose the way of thermonuclear war.

"Certain dogmatists, having degraded to the Trotzkyite stand, are trying to force the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries toward the road which leads to world war." They "desire to push history in the direction of bringing about war and to solve the question of which, communism or capitalism, will triumph, by means of war through the course of annihilating millions, tens of millions of people". (N.S. Khrushchov's Address at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, January, 1963)

As is well-known, the Central Committee of the CPSU, while N.S. Khrushchov was still its first secretary, in its letter of April 18, 1964 addressed to our Party's Central Committee thrust even at our Party a slanderous charge that "abandoning the struggle for peaceful co-existence", our Party "insists on war between states with different social systems, a new world war — consequently, thermonuclear war". But it is a shameless fabrication of N.S. Khrushchov and his followers that within the international Communist movement there exist parties and currents which refuse peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems and advocate a world war.

The Moscow Statement approved by 81 Communist and Workers' Parties defines the struggle for safeguarding peaceful co-existence and preventing war with unanimous support of Marxist-Leninist Parties of the whole world, as the primary task of Communists of the whole

world and advocates that struggles must be waged resolutely against every war policy and every aggressive policy of imperialism and for establishing relations between states with different social systems along the principles of peaceful co-existence which have been put into concrete shape such as the so-called five principles of peace (territorial integrity and mutual respect of sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, mutual non-intervention in internal affairs, mutual benefit and peaceful co-existence) and the ten principles of peace at the Bandung Conference. The principled standpoint of the Moscow Statement is also our Party's consistent standpoint. The Programme of the Communist Party of Japan decided at the Eighth Party Congress clearly defines the basic stand of our Party which is fighting for safeguarding world peace and for peaceful co-existence of states as follows:—

“The Party fights for peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems. The Party demands the prohibition of nuclear weapons and fights for general disarmament. The Party fights for the normalization of diplomatic relations with all states, for the development of economic and cultural exchange, and for the extension of friendly and good-neighbourly relations between the Japanese people and other nations of the world. The Party fights against every preparation for aggressive and atomic war which is being pushed forward jointly by U.S. imperialism and Japanese traitorous reactionary forces and is directed against the socialist countries and the Afro-Asian nations.”

The “Draft Report” of the Central Committee to the Ninth Party Congress, put this standpoint of the Programme into more concrete shape, posed “the task to

defend peace in Asia and the world and to achieve peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems” as one of the six struggle tasks confronting our Party and pointed out as the concrete content and direction of the struggle for peaceful co-existence firstly “the struggle against the pro-American, anti-communist and aggressive foreign policy of the traitorous reactionary forces around monopoly capital and for the frustration of the Japan-South Korea talks, restoration of the Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations and conclusion of the Japan-Soviet Peace Treaty”, and secondly “the struggle for the total ban on nuclear weapons and nuclear tests and the conclusion of a general disarmament in solidarity with the peace and democratic forces of the world, the struggle against every aggressive war and preparation conducted in various parts of the world by the world forces of reaction headed by U.S. imperialism”.

The Moscow Statement which has defined peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems as one pillar of the foreign policy of Socialist countries and as one of important aims of the struggle for world peace and also the same view, which runs through the Programme of our Party, are the joint guiding line for the activities of Communists of the world and of our Party who even today firmly uphold the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Inasmuch as one does not outrageously distort facts and resort to groundless slanders, it is impossible to make the Marxist-Leninist Parties, which are fighting against modern revisionism, “opponents” of the peaceful co-existence policy.

It is true, however, that the question of peaceful co-existence which has certainly been unanimously approved of by all the Marxist-Leninist Parties is one of the

greatest issues on which sharpest differences of opinion have come out in the present international polemics. But it is not because "bellicose" parties and currents, which refuse peaceful co-existence and advocate world war, have appeared as claimed by N.S. Khrushchov and his flatterers. It is a controversy which has arisen because, with regard to the problem of peaceful co-existence, the CPSU leadership headed by N.S. Khrushchov had fundamentally fallen into an anti-Marxist Leninist position which deviates from the position defined by the Moscow Declaration and Statement, abandoned the struggle against the war policy of imperialism and surrendered to imperialism. That is, today's controversy concerning the problem of peaceful co-existence is not one whether to be for peaceful co-existence or against it, but whether or not to correctly and firmly uphold the Marxist-Leninist peaceful co-existence policy.

Lenin once advised G.V. Plekhanov that "you can tell a man's mistakes by the people who praise him". (V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 7 "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back") This can be applied to the Khrushchov "peaceful co-existence" line as it is. Those who were shocked most by the announcement of the dismissal of N.S. Khrushchov from his post are the reactionary forces of the world headed by U.S. imperialism together with the international current of modern revisionism. Each of them stressed the wisdom of the Khrushchov "peaceful co-existence" line and unanimously expressed the expectation that the new CPSU leadership would also follow his "peaceful co-existence" line.

For instance, in his special broadcasting all over the United States on October 18, 1964, U.S. President, L.B. Johnson greatly praised that since the "Caribbean crisis",

N.S. Khrushchov, reflecting his past "mistake", had walked along the road of collaboration with the United States and strongly called on the new Soviet regime to continue to walk the Khrushchov line.

"There were times when he was guilty of dangerous adventure. It required great American firmness and good sense — first in Berlin and later in the Cuban missile crisis — to turn back his threats and action without war.

Yet he learned from mistakes and he was not blind to realities. In the last two years his government had shown itself aware of the need of sanity in this nuclear age.

He joined in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. He joined in the hot line which can help prevent a war by accident. He agreed that space should be kept free of nuclear weapons. In these actions he demonstrated good sense and sober judgement. . . .

Two men share top responsibility in the Soviet Union. . . . We can hope that they will share with us our great objective: — the prevention of nuclear war."

In our country, too, N.S. Khrushchov's "peaceful co-existence" line since its early days has already found its sympathizers in the rightwing leadership of the Democratic Socialist Party which has consistently supported the world policy of the United States from its thoroughgoing anti-communist standpoint and Suehiro Nishio, Chairman of the Democratic Socialist Party, paid the following tribute: — "We welcome N.S. Khrushchov's line of realistic politics" (His talk at Kobe on July 23, 1963). When N.S. Khrushchov was dismissed from his post, and the entire bourgeois press simultaneously praised him and carried editorials hoping that the new regime would follow N.S. Khrushchov's "peaceful co-

existence" line and leaders of the Liberal Democratic Party and the financial circle unanimously gave talks to a similar effect.

"He was a great statesman who mapped out the peaceful line centered on the thawing between the United States and Soviet Union and has solved pending matters of domestic affairs one by one" (A. Iwasa, President of Fuji Bank). "Mr. N.S. Khrushchov has promoted the peaceful co-existence line and seems to be a beloved person" (T. Ishizaka, President of the Federation of Economic Bodies). "Since Mr. N.S. Khrushchov has played a big role in easing the international tension, I feel his resignation is regrettable" (K. Uemura, Vice-President of the Federation of Economic Bodies). "We hope that the new Soviet regime will more strongly promote its peaceful co-existence policy." (T. Miki, Secretary General of the Liberal Democratic Party. Evening edition of "Nihon Keizai" of Oct. 16)

N.S. Khrushchov has indeed distorted the Marxist-Leninist peaceful co-existence policy and has emasculated and transmuted it to such an extent as to be wholeheartedly welcomed by representatives of U.S. imperialism such as L.B. Johnson and notorious Japanese reactionary forces centered on the Liberal Democratic Party and monopoly capital.

(2) CAPITULATIONISM WHICH HAS SUBMITTED TO NUCLEAR THREAT

Where has N.S. Khrushchov's "peaceful co-existence" line departed from the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary position? Let us see its main points.

The first point of issue is that N.S. Khrushchov claimed that today when nuclear missile weapons which might

annihilate mankind have appeared, to safeguard peaceful co-existence has become the "primary task" of mankind, which has priority over any other task, and he tried to justify his line of capitulationism to imperialism on the pretext of the threat of nuclear war, and furthermore demanded that the peoples' revolutionary movements and national-liberation movement be subordinated to the task of "peaceful co-existence".

It was in his two speeches, right after the so-called "Caribbean crisis" in autumn, 1962 — his report to the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union in December, 1962 and his address at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany in January, 1963 — that N.S. Khrushchov developed his views in the most systematic form. Regarding the danger of thermonuclear war, N.S. Khrushchov stated in those speeches as follows:—

(1) The present-day world is "something like living on a powder magazine filled with thermonuclear weapons" and in any place of the world, "fuses, which will not stick at blazing up a total nuclear rocket war, are hidden in the origin of an aggressive fire" created by the imperialists. (N.S. Khrushchov's Report to the Supreme Soviet)

(2) And once a world nuclear war breaks out, not only the capitalist system will perish, but mankind will also receive a destructive blow and the very preconditions for socialist revolution and building communism will themselves be lost. "It is unthinkable to build Communist civilization on the ruin of the center of world culture, on the earth devastated and contaminated by nuclear explosion ashes." (N.S. Khrushchov's Address at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany)

J.F. Kennedy once likened the life of people, who are frightened at the danger of extermination by thermonuclear war, to "a nuclear sword of Damocles" and said that the nuclear sword "is suspended with a very thin string which might be cut off at any moment by accident, by miscalculation and by insanity". (J.F. Kennedy's Speech at the General Assembly of the United Nations, in September 1961)

Repeating the words of J.F. Kennedy's almost exactly, N.S. Khrushchov likened today's world to "something like living on a powder magazine filled with thermonuclear weapons" which may explode at any moment.

The so-called theory of "extermination of mankind by thermonuclear war", which, at a glance, looks as if the danger of nuclear war has been most seriously taken into consideration, is in fact, not only against the principled position of Marxism-Leninism defined by the Moscow Statement, but also is against N.S. Khrushchov's own previous contention. This should be regarded as a starting point of his capitulationism and concretely indicates that N.S. Khrushchov has become a captive of the nuclear threat of imperialism.

Needless to say that today when thermonuclear weapons with greatest destructive power have emerged, a world war prepared by the imperialists — even if it is, after all, a suicide action of imperialism leading to the collapse of the whole capitalist system — will bring tremendous destructive results to socialist countries, and cause immeasurable damage to mankind and the struggle to prevent world war and to win world peace and peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems is a task graver than any other time in the past. There is no Marxist-Leninist who denies this.

But if Marxist-Leninists draw from the danger of "extermination of mankind" by thermonuclear war a conclusion that only the prevention of total thermonuclear war **at any cost** is "primarily" important, and that faced with the danger of "extermination of mankind" by thermonuclear war, the distinction between imperialism and socialism has lost its significance and the revolutionary movement and the national-liberation movement have now only a secondary significance, it cannot but inevitably lead to capitulationism which kneels down before the nuclear threat of imperialism and endlessly retreats. This is really what imperialism aims at. And it is clear that capitulationism frightened by the nuclear threat not only is far from being of use to prevent the danger of nuclear war to be launched by imperialism, but rather increasingly strengthens the nuclear threat policy of imperialism, favours the development of its war and aggression policy and brings the result that really increases the danger of nuclear war.

While stressing that thermonuclear war under preparation by the imperialist forces headed by the United States is a serious danger for the whole of mankind which brings annihilation and destruction to scores of millions and hundreds of millions of people and calling upon the whole world's peoples to rise up to fight the struggle for the prevention of nuclear war, the Moscow Statement clarifies the resolute attitude of not submitting to the nuclear threat of imperialism by correctly warning that if the imperialist forces thoughtlessly unleash thermonuclear war, it is not socialism but imperialism and capitalism that will perish. "But should the imperialist maniacs start war, the people will sweep capitalism out of existence and bury it."

It is indeed the only principled standpoint. Only by firmly upholding such a militant position, can the anti-imperialist peace forces repel the nuclear blackmail policy of imperialism and thereby create the prerequisite for struggle to really prevent nuclear war. On the contrary, should the anti-imperialist peace forces, even slightly submitting to the nuclear threat, step out of the militant position, the task for the prevention of nuclear war cannot be fulfilled. In order to prevent nuclear war, it is necessary not to be frightened by the nuclear blackmail of imperialism, but to crush the nuclear blackmail policy of imperialism by the struggle of the whole world's peoples.

Previously N.S. Khrushchov also, at least for a time, upheld this standpoint, and claimed that if the imperialists unleash a new world war it "will cause only the collapse of capitalism" and socialism will survive in spite of enormous damage which it will sustain and will emerge victoriously on a world scale.

"We say that a new world war will only bring collapse to capitalism. In this case we have not the slightest doubt that Socialist countries will not suffer damage from this war. Since there are modern massacring weapons, no doubt that they will be subjected to enormous damage. But we are convinced that Socialism will still survive and capitalism will not be maintained. In spite of huge damage, mankind will not only survive, but will make further development. Should a war break out, nations will tend to permanently sever their relations with the social system which gives birth to war and will establish a Socialist order in their respective countries." (N.S. Khrushchov interviewed by James Reston of the *New York Times* in October, 1957)

It is quite natural that the "peaceful co-existence" line of N.S. Khrushchov who has lost sight of the standpoint which once he himself claimed and has surrendered to the nuclear blackmail of imperialism, becomes the capitulationist line which avoids the struggle against the nuclear war policy of imperialism and "tries to defend peace" by solely making concession to imperialism.

The first practical conclusion which N.S. Khrushchov drew from his "theory of annihilation by nuclear war of mankind" was that "peaceful co-existence" in the era of nuclear war will not be secured by the resolute active struggle of the Socialist camp and the world's peoples against the nuclear policy of imperialism, but will be mainly achieved by "reasonable" negotiations and "mutual concessions" based on common cognition. With bitterest words N.S. Khrushchov denounced those people, who maintained the basic position to safeguard peace by the struggle against imperialism, as Trotzkyite adventurists who lent hands to the most aggressive imperialist forces "to force the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries toward the road to bring about a world war".

"We, Communists, and those people with progressive ideas and faith should not fall into adventurism and give a chance for bringing a world war to the aggressive forces of imperialism which are losing their conviction of the victory of their system." (N.S. Khrushchov's Address at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany)

As was shown by N.S. Khrushchov's action at the time when he was faced with the danger of invasion by U.S. imperialism into Cuba, however, it was none other than N.S. Khrushchov who had fallen into adventurism, which have nothing to do with socialism, by introducing nuclear

missiles into Cuba with the only aim of making the U.S. ruling circle "feel more realistic the danger of thermonuclear war" (The Report at the Supreme Soviet). The adventurism which tried to intimidate the imperialists not with the popular strength of anti-imperialism, peace and independence, but with nuclear missiles, immediately turned itself into greatest capitulationism, submitted to the demands of U.S. imperialism in the name of "victory of reason" or "mutual concession and retreated as far as to conclude" between the United States and the Soviet Union "international inspection" which infringes the sovereignty of Cuba, without having necessary prior consultations with the Cuban Government, once it encountered with U.S. imperialism which counterattacked it with the nuclear blackmail policy to enforce Cuba-invasion backed by the preparations for a nuclear war against the Soviet Union. His "mutual concessions" are in fact a unilateral concession.

The second practical conclusion which N.S. Khrushchov drew out is, on the pretext that in the nuclear war era the revolutionary movement and national-liberation movement are inseparably connected with the task of the prevention of nuclear war and the avoidance of nuclear war is the absolute postulation of our time, to subordinate these struggles to their "peaceful co-existence" policy, to secure the victory of Socialism over capitalism through peaceful economic competition under peaceful co-existence and to make it the basic policy of the struggle for Socialism.

N.S. Khrushchov says:—

"Today, the struggle for peace is the most important condition for the struggle for Socialism. At present, whatever question there may be concerning the revolu-

tionary movement of the working class and the national-liberation movement it is unthinkable if divorced from the struggles to safeguard peace and to avoid world thermonuclear war. Precisely, this is the most important tactical lesson which the world Communist movement should learn from the latest event on the Caribbean Sea." (Ibid.)

"Today, when the nature of war has changed and the forces relations in the world have turned favourable for the forces of peace and Socialism, the peaceful co-existence policy has gained the aim and task far more important than the past and it is virtually gaining a new content. The final goal of the peaceful co-existence policy is to secure the most favourable condition for Socialism to win victory over capitalism in peaceful economic competition." (Ibid.)

Such policy which N.S. Khrushchov tried to force upon Socialist countries and the international Communist movement is the Marxist-Leninist peaceful co-existence policy which has been turned into quite a different opportunist policy on the pretext of the unprecedented destructive power of nuclear weapons.

Firstly, for Marxist-Leninists, the principle of "peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems" does not presuppose that imperialism discards its war and aggression policy and converts itself into peace-loving people. The war and aggression policy, that is, the aggressive trend toward the destruction of Socialism and suppression of other nations is rooted in the nature of imperialism. If this is to be completely eliminated, then, imperialism itself has to be eliminated and a powerful anti-imperialist struggle against the war policy of imperialism is necessary to actually frustrate its war

policy. Consequently, for Marxist-Leninists peaceful co-existence can be realized only when Socialist countries and the world's peoples jointly fight against the war policy of imperialism and tie its aggressive hand. Therefore, for Marxist-Leninists peaceful co-existence does not mean a new world-order without the struggle against imperialism in which both "peaceful imperialism" and peaceful socialism amicably co-exist. Even after a certain success is gained in pressing peaceful co-existence upon the imperialists on the basis of the advance of the anti-imperialist peace struggle of the world's peoples, it is impossible to maintain a state of peaceful co-existence without constantly fighting against and defeating the imperialist aggressive forces which are always trying to pursue their war and aggression policy even under peaceful co-existence and destroy the relations of peaceful co-existence. To realize and secure peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems by the struggle against the war policy of imperialism—this is what forms the nucleus of Marxist-Leninist peaceful co-existence.

N.S. Khrushchov, however, has emasculated the revolutionary nucleus of the Marxist-Leninist peaceful co-existence policy by introducing the unprecedented destructive power of nuclear weapons and has changed it into a policy of compromise with and surrender to imperialism. However much one may stress the destructive power of nuclear weapons, no one can justify N.S. Khrushchov's capitulationism to it.

Inasmuch as the ringleader who threatens the world and mankind with the danger of nuclear war is imperialism which, in order to realize the ambition of world domination, is devoted to nuclear war preparations and is

carrying on the nuclear intimidation policy, it is clear that the task to prevent nuclear war, to safeguard world peace and to realize peaceful co-existence can be achieved only when it is based upon the policy to fully develop the struggle of the world's peoples against imperialism's war and aggression policy and to defeat the nuclear war policy of imperialism by the international united front of the anti-imperialist peace forces. "The broadest possible united front of peace supporters, fighters against the imperialist policy of aggression and war inspired by U.S. imperialism, is essential to preserve world peace." (The Moscow Statement) Only when negotiations and "mutual concessions" between Socialist countries and imperialist countries correctly link themselves with the advance of the anti-imperialist, peace struggle of the world's peoples in the course that the struggles of the peace and democratic forces of the world such as the world Socialist system, the international working class movement, the national-liberation movement, the peace defence movement, etc. frustrate and defeat the war programme of imperialism, they can play an important and positive role for the cause of peaceful co-existence and peace defence and can impose upon the imperialists this or that agreement to really restrict the aggressive policy of the imperialists and to give an effective blow to their war policy.

The Khrushchov line which, discarding the above basic standpoint of Marxism-Leninism, restricts the anti-imperialist struggle of Socialist countries and peoples of various countries with the accusation that it is an adventurism to stimulate the imperialists and provoke nuclear war, and tries to secure peaceful co-existence exclusively by "reasonable" negotiation with imperialist countries

which presupposes common cognition of the "danger of thermonuclear war", is literally the line which completely capitulates to the nuclear blackmail policy of imperialism and demands concession and capitulation to imperialism from the world's peoples. It is far from the road for peaceful co-existence, but only strengthens the position of imperialism and gives impetus to its war and aggression policy.

And even if based on such a capitulationist line certain "eased tension" has been realized between a part of the Socialist countries and imperialist countries, it has not been won by really delivering a blow at the nuclear war policy of imperialism and defeating it, but is "the easing of tension" built upon compromise with and flattery to imperialism. Therefore, it cannot be regarded as a true advance in the direction of peaceful co-existence. On the contrary, this sort of "eased tension" weakens the anti-imperialist peace struggle of the world's peoples and fulfills the role to encourage the deceptive "dual policy" of imperialism by spreading the dangerous illusion as though "peaceful co-existence" is being realized when the war policy of imperialism is actually threatening genuine peace.

Secondly, for Marxist-Leninists, the peaceful co-existence policy neither can be a substitute for the revolutionary movement and the national-liberation movement nor does it hold the "primary" position in the struggles of the world's peoples in preference to the above movements. The Moscow Statement defines that "Our time . . . is a time of struggle between the two opposing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, a time of breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, . . . of the triumph of

socialism and communism on a world-wide scale", and clearly formulates the revolutionary standpoint that the fundamental problem of our time is that all the revolutionary forces of our time such as the Socialist camp, the revolutionary movement of the working class in capitalist countries, the national-liberation struggle of oppressed nations and others, join into one current and erode and destroy the imperialist world system.

As was shown by the fact that the possibility to prevent world war and its conditions have been fundamentally created by the victories of a series of the socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions in Asia and Europe after World War II, the possibility of peaceful co-existence, and prospect of world peace are themselves, on the whole, defined by the balance of power between the imperialist war forces and the anti-imperialist peace forces which are composed of the three major forces, that is, the Socialist camp, the revolutionary movement in capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement.

With regard to relations between peaceful co-existence and the revolutionary movement, however, N.S. Khrushchov has also departed from the very principled standpoint of Marxism-Leninism and once more on the pretext that the avoidance of nuclear war is the supreme task of our time, he claims that it is the basic premise of the struggle for socialism in our time to subordinate the revolutionary and national-liberation movement to his "peaceful co-existence" policy so that socialism win a victory over capitalism in peaceful economic struggle. This is virtually to push the socialist revolution far away into the infinite distance, to press the national-liberation struggle into the scope permissible for imperialism and to assume the stand of **maintain-**

ing the status quo, the stand which makes it the only supreme task of our time only to maintain after all the rapprochement between "the United States and the Soviet Union" through unprincipled following in the wake of the United States in complete opposition to the revolutionary standpoint of the Moscow Statement.

This argument which claims that the interests of the revolutionary movement and national-liberation movement should be sacrificed in the interests of "peace" is, needless to say, an opportunist argument in complete opposition to the revolutionary standpoint of Marxism-Leninism which regards our time as the era of the fall of imperialism and the victory of socialism. But this does not exhaust the negative role of N.S. Khrushchov's "peaceful co-existence".

Even if the question is restricted only to the task of peaceful co-existence which N.S. Khrushchov makes virtually the only supreme task, such a policy of maintaining the status quo cannot make imperialism accept peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, nor is it still less able to surely realize and consolidate world peace in the future.

Needless to say, the fundamental change of the balance of power on a world scale centered on the formation of the Socialist world system has **already at present** created, thanks to the struggle of the world anti-imperialist peace forces, the real possibility to nip the imperialists' world war plan in the bud and to realize peaceful co-existence of states. But U.S. imperialism has not discarded its nuclear war policy, the real danger of world war to break out still remains and as is clear from the latest situation in Indo-China it can never be allowed to underestimate the danger of world war. In the struggle to prevent the

danger and to secure world peace, no one can deny that the national-liberation movement of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples plays a great role. The national-liberation movement in those areas confronts face to face with the war and aggression policy of imperialism and deals serious blows at its strongholds. Therefore it is one of the basic contents of the struggle for world peace and peaceful co-existence to positively support the national-liberation movement and to consolidate international solidarity with it. N.S. Khrushchov's "peaceful co-existence" line which in the name of "peaceful co-existence" either restricts the national-liberation movement or takes a passive attitude in supporting it, turns its back on the genuine interests of the struggle for world peace and peaceful co-existence and in reality increases the danger of world war. This is so because if the national-liberation war disappears, if the revolutionary movement is gone and if the world popular movements become only the "peaceful co-existence" movement in the style of N.S. Khrushchov, then not only the force to prevent the imperialists' war policy will be decisively weakened, but also the imperialists will be assured that they can easily continue their aggression.

Furthermore, in the struggle for world peace and peaceful co-existence in our time, not only the task to prevent world war, but also the task to eliminate the very danger of world war and to realize and secure peaceful co-existence in a more consolidated state have been raised, but it is impossible even to approach the task by means of the policy in the style of N.S. Khrushchov to maintain the status quo. It is because in order to achieve the task, it is necessary precisely to **transform the status quo**, that is, not only to increase the political,

economic and military strength of the Socialist world system, but also to fundamentally change the force relations between the imperialist war forces and the anti-imperialist peace forces and to create absolute superiority of the anti-imperialist peace and Socialist forces through the victory of the revolutionary movement which overthrows the rule of imperialism in imperialist home countries and also through the victory of the national-liberation movement which drives away the domination of imperialism out of Asian, African and Latin American countries.

With regard to the question of peace, too, the Moscow Statement upholds the Marxist-Leninist standpoint of transformation, correctly places the prospect of the peace struggle of the world's peoples in the prospect of the victory of the liberation struggle and thereby clarifies that (1) should the anti-imperialist forces of the world make joint efforts under the present force relations, "world war can be prevented". At the same time, it clarifies that (2) only when the development of the Socialist system, linking itself with new victories of the revolutionary movements in capitalist countries and colonial, dependent countries, has made "the superiority of the forces of Socialism and peace" "absolute", "a real possibility to exclude world war from the life of society will be created" and that (3) "the victory of Socialism all over the world" is needed in order to secure lasting peace by "finally eliminating the social and national cause of every war".

This viewpoint is precisely the sole Marxist-Leninist viewpoint on the establishment of peaceful co-existence and the relations between peaceful co-existence and the revolutionary movement, and the emergence of thermonuclear weapons with unprecedented destructive power

does not cause any change in the nature of the state of affairs.

Thus, N.S. Khrushchov's line of "peaceful co-existence" is the anti-Marxist-Leninist line which has fallen into dual capitulationism in the fear of the nuclear blackmail policy of imperialism. Should the world's peoples be led by such a policy, it would be impossible either to win world peace and to really liberate the world from the threat of thermonuclear war, or to really open a path toward peaceful co-existence and consolidate world peace.

(3) PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE SUBSTITUTED BY FOLLOWING IN THE WAKE OF THE UNITED STATES

The second question is that N.S. Khrushchov has substituted the peaceful co-existence policy with the "U.S.-Soviet collaboration" policy and furthermore, by beautifying the main current of U.S. imperialism as the "peaceful co-existence" forces, he has turned the slogan of peaceful co-existence especially into the slogan of following in the wake of U.S. imperialism.

Already at the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU which declared that the principle of peaceful co-existence is the "general line of foreign policy" of Socialist countries, N.S. Khrushchov, under the cloak of "peaceful co-existence", began to exclusively propagate "U.S.-Soviet collaboration". He claimed (1) that in the final analysis, the world situation depends on the relations between the two great powers, the United States and the Soviet Union which "are the world greatest industrial nations, the mightiest states in military sense and, in addition, have nuclear weapons and powerful conventional armaments" (N.S. Khrushchov's Talk with Carthridge, Chief Editor of *New York Times*, in May, 1957) and (2) that it is

possible to "guarantee firm and stable peace all over the world for a long time, if only the 'trust' between the two great powers, that is, the United States and the Soviet Union, is secured" (N.S. Khrushchov's Talk with James Reston in October, 1957). In particular when he visited the United States in 1959, he made utmost efforts to sell the idea of "peace by the United States and the Soviet Union to the ruling circle of the United States".

"Just think what will happen to international relations, if the United States which is the most powerful country in the capitalist world and the Soviet Union which is the biggest and mightiest country among Socialist countries establish neighbourly friendly relations and make one further step to enter into a relation of co-operation which will grow into such amity as desired by us. Once Mr. D. Eisenhower wrote that 'If both the United States and the Soviet Union trust each other, then whatever differences of opinion break out among other countries, it will not affect general accord and peace'. I agree with his words. . . . On our part, we will make every possible effort to secure a mutual trust between the Soviet Union and the United States and thereby, we hope that we shall be able to serve to maintain world peace in the interests of all nations." (N.S. Khrushchov's Speech at the Meeting with Representatives of Businessmen and Public Persons of Pittsburgh City on September 24, 1959)

Taking another step, N.S. Khrushchov even claimed that if the Soviet Union and the United States cooperate with each other, they, backed by their mighty armed forces, can prevent any aggressive plan mapped by whatever state in the world from being put into practice, and so to speak, can fulfill the role of "tribune" for the peoples of the world.

"Should a peaceful friendly relationship be achieved between the United States and the Soviet Union, no country can aggravate the international situation. It is because taking the position of our two countries into consideration, they simply have to give up their aggressive plan." (N.S. Khrushchov's Speech at the Soviet-India Friendship Gathering in September, 1961)

And while being keen on propaganda and sale of the "U.S.-Soviet collaboration" idea which is virtually following in the wake of the United States, N.S. Khrushchov had almost completely abandoned the exposure and investigation of the aggression and war policy of imperialism — which are the activities pointed out by the Moscow Statement as one of most important contents of the struggle for peace, that is, the activities "indefatigably to lay bare the policy of the imperialists, to keep a watchful eye on the intrigues and manoeuvres of the warmongers, arouse the righteous indignation of the people against those who are heading for war".

N.S. Khrushchov's idea of "peace by the United States and the Soviet Union" is one which brazenly reflects big-power chauvinism that the Soviet Union is indeed a big power representing the whole Socialist system and the world situation is decided through negotiations between big powers, and Soviet centralism that if the Soviet Union's security is secured, then whatever dispute may break out in other areas it will not affect the general situation. Even just in this respect, it is clear that this has completely discarded the principle of proletarian internationalism which a Socialist country should uphold as fundamentals of its foreign policy. On top of it, the very other party, by the cooperation with whom N.S. Khrushchov tried to guarantee "strong and stable peace",

is the U.S. imperialists who have become the **chieftain** of West German, Japanese militarists and other imperialist aggressive forces, have made British, French and West German imperialists subordinate allies, have drawn a great number of capitalist countries in Europe, Asia, Latin America and other areas into aggressive military blocs, have ramified networks of military alliances and military bases in various areas of the world, have been keen on the preparations for nuclear war against the Socialist camp and have repeated military aggressions against the national-liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Moscow Statement clearly defines that "the main forces of aggression and war are U.S. imperialism" and repeatedly emphasizes that peaceful co-existence of states can be realized, above all, only through the struggle against the aggression and war policy of U.S. imperialism. Such position of the Moscow Statement and the Khrushchov line to "secure world peace" through the alliance with U.S. imperialism, the major enemy of peace, can never be compatible.

In order to justify his line of following in the wake of the United States, the line which has no relation to the Marxist-Leninist peaceful co-existence policy, N.S. Khrushchov tied this to the "theory of extermination of mankind by nuclear war", brought out the "theory" that the danger of nuclear war converts the imperialists with "realistic sense" in the direction of accepting peaceful co-existence irrespective of whether they like it or not, began to extoll the leaders of U.S. imperialism as the "peaceful co-existence" forces, and started to propagate that a summit conference with the leaders of imperialism is the most important means for peaceful co-existence.

(1) At present when the Soviet Union has attained the strength sufficient to deliver annihilating nuclear retaliation to the United States by immediately counter-attacking against nuclear offensive which the United States might start at any moment, the policy of peace and peaceful co-existence has become the "only realistic policy of our time" even for U.S. imperialism. (N.S. Khrushchov's Speech at the Advanced Activists' Conference in June, 1960)

(2) Consequently, even among the leading circles of U.S. imperialism, those who oppose, to the end, relaxation of international tension and peaceful co-existence and "insist on waging war against the Soviet Union and other countries of the Socialist camp at a possibly earliest stage" are only the "madmen" who have lost their senses ("bellicose group") and among the same ruling circles there also exist those people who "more calmly assess the situation, understand that even if a war is launched under the existing force relations in the international arena, the United States will not win victory nor can she attain her aim" and are inclined to accept peaceful co-existence ("reasonable group"). (N.S. Khrushchov's Report at the Supreme Soviet, in December, 1962)

(3) The reality of the world situation will wake up even the most bigoted, and after all the "reasonable group" will win a victory over the "bellicose group" and "the leaders who recognize the necessity of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems" will be pushed to the fore as the U.S. leaders. (N.S. Khrushchov's Speech at the Third Congress of the Workers' Party of Rumania, in June, 1960)

(4) Summit conferences or direct negotiations between the leaders of the "reasonable group" of U.S. imperialism

and the "leader" of the Socialist camp, that is, N.S. Khrushchov are indeed the surest way to secure world peace.

From this point of view, N.S. Khrushchov, first of all, likened D. Eisenhower to a leader of the "reasonable group" of U.S. imperialism which aspired to peace, praised him up as a president "who displayed wisdom, courage and will as a state leader in his assessment of the present international situation" (N.S. Khrushchov's Report on Returning from His Visit to the United States) and strove to step into the path of "U.S.-Soviet cooperation" by means of collaboration with D. Eisenhower, constantly showing off a "Camp David spirit".

Since his collaboration with D. Eisenhower became impossible due to the U-2 plane incident in May, 1960, N.S. Khrushchov placed his expectation on the next presidential candidate, J.F. Kennedy and after his talk with the new president at Vienna in June, 1961, immediately began to propagate J.F. Kennedy as a president who "understands the heavy responsibility borne by the two mighty states". ("Results of the Vienna Talks") N.S. Khrushchov's extollment of J.F. Kennedy became ever greater after the so-called "Caribbean crisis" in October, 1962 and greatly welcomed J.F. Kennedy's speech at American University in June, 1963, as an advocacy of "necessity to find out a method to save mankind from the threat of the rearmament race and world thermonuclear war and repeatedly stressed that he shared the "same view" with J.F. Kennedy on a series of basic questions of war and peace. ("Let's strengthen the cause of peace and promote cooperation for it.") About a month later, he concluded the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty completely accepting the U.S. Administration's demands regarding the ban on

nuclear tests and openly stepped into the "U.S.-Soviet collaboration" system which he had been dreaming of for a long time.

The assassination of J.F. Kennedy at Dallas was a big blow to N.S. Khrushchov. But while ever strengthening his extollment of the "statesman of peace", J.F. Kennedy, making the best of the incident, N.S. Khrushchov began to praise the new president L.B. Johnson, bringing him up for the third political representative of the "reasonable group". N.S. Khrushchov, who visited Hungary in April, 1964, defended himself in his speech at Palsod Chemical Factory for his extollment of J.F. Kennedy's speech at American University and giving the names of L.B. Johnson, Dean Rusk and W. Fulbright as successors of J.F. Kennedy's "peaceful co-existence" line, stated as follows:—

"I have been criticized for having praised J.F. Kennedy's speech. But one should not have naive view on things. One should not think that we are wise and our enemies are all foolish. One should not close his eyes to the development of the force relations which have turned favourable for peace and socialism.

In this respect, I can take up the statement made by U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk at the end of last year. I confirm that President Lyndon B. Johnson also upholds such a position. Of late, U.S. Senator W. Fulbright has announced his calm opinion.

Of course these have not arisen from their sympathy with socialism or communism. These only show their realistic sense. That is, these are only the manifestations that they recognize that we exist, develop and are very strong."

After all, according to N.S. Khrushchov, the successive U.S. presidents and their administrations from D. Eisenhower and J.F. Kennedy to L.B. Johnson are all political representatives of the "reasonable group" which has "calmly" assessed the present force relations and has pursued the direction of peaceful co-existence, that is, "the sole realistic policy of our time".

The only practical ground for N.S. Khrushchov on which to beautify Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson as the "peaceful co-existence" forces in this way is that for the last few years they have made tactical conversion toward a certain "rapprochement with the Soviet Union". Surely it is true that these leaders of U.S. imperialism, in particular, J.F. Kennedy and L.B. Johnson converted to the "appeasement policy toward the Soviet Union" in response to N.S. Khrushchov's call for the collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union". But if they are really, as claimed by N.S. Khrushchov, converting the war policy into the "peaceful co-existence" policy, then, why, under those presidents, have the nuclear intimidation policy and the aggressive policy against Asian and African countries such as the U-2 plane incident, the invasion upon Cuba and the aggressive wars in Indo-China and the Congo been continued and intensified? N.S. Khrushchov's answer to this question is simple. According to N.S. Khrushchov, it is the result of the "hidden complicated struggle" within the U.S. ruling circle, the result caused by the President of the "reasonable group" yielding under the pressure of the "bellicose group" which denied peaceful co-existence and persistently stuck to the war policy and therefore it is not the original position of the "reasonable group". (For instance, see N.S. Khrushchov's explanation

for the U-2 plane incident. "Why could the Summit Conference not be held?") Therefore, in order to guarantee world peace, hand in hand with the "reasonable group" of imperialism, one must isolate the "bellicose group" of imperialism — this is the "fundamental strategy" of peaceful co-existence worked out by N.S. Khrushchov.

N.S. Khrushchov's hypothesis which assumes that U.S. imperialism's policy of "rapprochement with the Soviet Union" and policy of nuclear intimidation and military aggression with Asia as one of the centers are the two aspects of good and evil, essentially opposing each other and that the "reasonable group" and "bellicose group", each of which is in charge of its respective aspect, are carrying out "a hidden complicated struggle" within U.S. imperialism, is one that N.S. Khrushchov has fabricated in his brain arbitrarily and it reveals only that he has completely forgotten the Marxist-Leninist basic view on the nature of imperialism, in particular, on the "dual policy" of imperialism.

J.F. Kennedy's and L.B. Johnson's policy of "rapprochement" with the Soviet Union bears an important part of the "world strategy of U.S. imperialism which aims at the destruction of the Socialist system and the strangling of the national-liberation movement and does not, in essence, contradict the ferocious policy of military aggression and nuclear intimidation which N.S. Khrushchov exclusively attributes to the presence of the "bellicose group". The development of the policy of "rapprochement with the Soviet Union" under the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations only illustrates firstly that U.S. imperialism has changed its strategic policy that while for the present avoiding a total nuclear war against the Soviet Union which has the mightiest defensive power

and taking the present force relations into "realistic" consideration, it tries to defeat China and other Socialist countries (except the Soviet Union) and the national-liberation movement one by one, and secondly that availing themselves to the maximum of the emergence of modern revisionism centered on N.S. Khrushchov, they aim at "internal transmutation" of the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries and dismemberment of the Socialist camp. As proved by many military critics, U.S. military strategy has made a great conversion with 1959-60 as a turning point, (1) has taken the present direct offensive aim at Asian Socialist countries such as China, Korea and Viet Nam and at the same time, (2) has established strategic orientation (the limited local nuclear strategy) to restrict the Soviet Union's nuclear retaliation by concentrating huge nuclear offensive power on the Soviet Union so as to prevent its aggressive war in Asia from extending to a total nuclear war against the Soviet Union. This has been sufficiently corroborated by the fact that the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations; on the one hand, have taken the policy of "rapprochement with the Soviet Union" and, on the other, have further strengthened their aggressive policy in Asia, Africa and Latin America centering around the "China containment" policy and furthermore, virtually have not in the least relaxed nuclear rearmament to secure nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union.

In this way, the policy of "rapprochement with the Soviet Union" on the one hand and the policy of nuclear war preparations, nuclear intimidation and aggression in Asia, on the other, form the mutually inseparably connected two aspects of U.S. imperialism's world domination programme which basically aims at the destruction

of the whole Socialist system including the Soviet Union and the strangling of the national-liberation movement. As N.S. Khrushchov misjudges this state of affairs, immediately beautifies the present policy of "rapprochement with the Soviet Union" as basic conversion to the peaceful co-existence policy he will be inevitably compelled to beautify U.S. imperialism which carries out the most ferocious aggressive policy behind the policy of "rapprochement with the Soviet Union", and its "dual policy" as a whole.

Needless to say, within the ruling circle of U.S. imperialism, there exists the ultra-rightist group which, as represented by H. Goldwater, opposes the "dual policy" itself and supports an open war policy, and naturally various contradictions and differences between the group and the main current of monopoly capital should not be disregarded. But, by no means, it justifies N.S. Khrushchov's "basic strategy". It is because N.S. Khrushchov's argument claims that this "bellicose group" is precisely the true representatives of the aggression and war forces of U.S. imperialism, denies that both "the reasonable group" and "bellicose group" are the forces representing the interests and policy of imperialism and on the contrary, whitewashes the very responsible persons, that is, J.F. Kennedy, L.B. Johnson and the main current of U.S. monopoly capital who, at present availing themselves of the insistence of the bellicose group, actually work out the aggression and war policy of U.S. imperialism and carry it out with might and main. Needless to give any explanation, this is nothing but to help, with all one's might, U.S. imperialism put on the mask of "peace".

However much N.S. Khrushchov quibbles, it cannot be completely covered up that his "basic strategy" of col-

laboration with the "reasonable group" is objectively a strong stay to beautify the "world strategy" of U.S. imperialism and to support it from behind and creates the most favourable situation for U.S. imperialism to divert the attention of the world's peoples away from its aggressiveness and to unfold its aggression and war policy by deceiving the peoples of various countries.

(4) ILLUSION ABOUT "PEACEFUL" IMPERIALISM

The third problem is that on the basis of the prospect of "the collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union, N.S. Khrushchov has spread groundless illusion that peaceful co-existence has been already realized, and even if imperialism continues to exist as today, "a world without war" can be created and thereby he has tried to remit the peoples' vigilance against the war policy of U.S. imperialism.

First of all, let us see how N.S. Khrushchov assessed the present world situation. At the Fifteenth General Assembly of the United Nations in September, 1960, N.S. Khrushchov stated regarding the significance of peaceful co-existence as follows:—

"Of course, the acceptance of the principle of peaceful co-existence does not mean that we should begin to establish relations between states completely anew. In fact, peaceful co-existence has already become reality and has been internationally accepted. . . . How to make peaceful co-existence secure, how not to allow any deviation from peaceful co-existence, deviation which often arouses a dangerous international conflict—in fact, this is the question of today." ("World Without War and Suppression")

But, if one envisages the world situation of today squarely, how can it be really said that peaceful co-existence has already become a reality and has been internationally accepted? Did N.S. Khrushchov not see the dangerous state of affairs that U.S. imperialism actually continues its aggressive war in Laos, South Viet Nam, and the Congo, rejects even to recognize Socialist countries of China, Korea and Viet Nam and strengthens its nuclear war preparation and nuclear intimidation policy in various parts of the world? That while watching such a world situation under his own eyes, he is able either to declare that peaceful co-existence is not the aim which the world's peoples have to achieve by their struggle in the future, but the reality which has been already achieved on a world scale or to dare to claim that the remaining question is only to make peaceful co-existence more secure and how to prevent "deviation from peaceful co-existence" and accidental war, is because he is an out and out Soviet-centralist and capitulationist to U.S. imperialism who thinks that if peace is maintained between the United States and the Soviet Union, then the world is in peace, and who immediately gets an idea that if U.S. imperialism carries out a certain policy of "rapprochement with the Soviet Union" then the U.S. ruling circle has accepted the peaceful co-existence policy. For N.S. Khrushchov, the aggressive war preparations, which U.S. imperialism was making against the Socialist countries except the Soviet Union, and military aggressions by U.S. imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America were only temporary and partial "deviations" from peaceful co-existence which did not affect the general situation of world peace. However, it is clear that after all it will lead to the result, which will threaten

the Soviet Union's own peace and security to make light of the present aggressive policy of U.S. imperialism from such a narrow view of "Soviet-centralism".

No wonder that N.S. Khrushchov, to whom the present world situation already appeared as the situation in which "peaceful co-existence" had been realized on a world scale, had an absurd dream in its future prospect.

Tightly closing his eyes to the aggression and war policy of U.S. imperialism, he more boldly advances his theory of "peaceful co-existence", he claims that in the present world situation, there already exists real possibility to shut every war out of the life of society.

"We claim that in our time a real possibility has already emerged **to exclude war from the life of society completely and for ever.** Such a possibility has emerged out of the new international force relations created after World War II." (N.S. Khrushchov's Speech at Gadja Mada State University, Indonesia, in February, 1960) (Emphasized by the writer.)

Then, how is it possible "to completely eliminate" every war out of the life of society? N.S. Khrushchov's answer is simple. It is possible by carrying out "the general and complete disarmament programme, that is, by the imperialist countries and Socialist countries mutually abolishing their armaments and completely wiping out every weapon from the earth.

"Peace can be radically safeguarded through the complete abolition of the physical machinery of war." "General and complete disarmament would ring in a truly historic change in men's lives from the epoch of wars to the epoch of lasting peace on earth." "It is not to be expected, of course, that the militarist will want to disarm of their own volition. . . . But there are forces in the world

today capable of forcing them to disarm." (N.S. Khrushchov's Speech at the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, delivered July 10, 1962)

Namely, he claims that even before imperialism is overthrown, no, far from it, even under the situation in which the strong imperialist camp headed by U.S. imperialism still survives, it is possible by the presence of peace struggle of the world's peoples to disarm the imperialists, to deprive them of every violence machinery for war and suppression of the people and to realize "the world without war", the era of everlasting peace.

This "prospect" of N.S. Khrushchov's is firstly, one that has degenerated into the view of bourgeois "pacifism" which contradicts the Marxist-Leninist class stand that "As long as imperialism exists there will be soil for wars of aggression" (The Moscow Statement) and secondly one which plays with petit-bourgeois illusion that disregarding the fundamentals of the Marxist-Leninist theory of state and revolution that "The most principal question of every revolution is the question of state power" (V.I. Lenin), the imperialists who hold power in their hand, will make concession to the people's pressure and abandon the violence apparatus which are the decisive weapons to rule their own people and to subordinate other nations and which literally form the keynote of state power.

Of course, even under the present situation it has a certain positive significance in exposing and isolating the aggressive forces of imperialism that the peace forces fight against the imperialists' nuclear rearmament policy by counterposing the policy of general disarmament and in the course in which the Socialist camp and the anti-imperialist peace struggles of various peoples develop and advance, there exists a possibility to frustrate the impe-

rialist's rearmament and war preparations and to win the establishment of denuclearized zones, an agreement on ban on nuclear weapons and a general disarmament agreement in this or that form. But the creation of real possibility to realize complete disarmament, to exclude every war from the life of society and to guarantee everlasting peace, is only in the process that imperialism is finally overthrown and the victory of socialism in the world is secured. He who, having lost sight of this principled viewpoint, fancies disarmament and lasting peace under imperialism, cannot help falling into the most extreme apologetics of imperialism which dreams of an imperialist state abandoning "finally and forever" the imperialist policy of aggression and war and the material means to rule its own people and other nations and evolving into "peaceful capitalism" while maintaining economic basis of monopoly capitalism.

In respect to apology for imperialism, N.S. Khrushchov not only fancied the "evolution" of imperialism into "peaceful" capitalism through disarmament, but even depicted a pastoral prospect that imperialism washes its hands of colonialism and transforms itself into "non-aggressive" capitalism which shares part of its wealth in order to serve the economic development and independence of underdeveloped countries. Namely, it means that if the "collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union" is realized, then the Socialist countries and imperialist countries can cooperate so as to help the development and industrialization of underdeveloped countries and to lead them to economic independence. For instance, when he visited the United States in 1959, N.S. Khrushchov stressing the significance of economic cooperation of both the United States and the Soviet

Union in "aid to underdeveloped countries", stated as follows:—

"The whole world will welcome economic progress of both our country and your country. The whole world expects that both of our nations can more rapidly make independent those nations who are centuries behind in the economic development. . . . How to help those nations extricate themselves from such status quo; let's solve this question in a better, fairer and more humanly way." (N.S. Khrushchov's Speech at the Economic Club, New York)

Having connected the idea of aid to underdeveloped countries through cooperation between the Socialist countries and imperialist countries with the programme of disarmament, N.S. Khrushchov propagated that disarmament is the best way to fundamentally solve the so-called "South-North question".

"The Soviet Union is ready to share part of the fund to be saved in the Soviet Union and other countries by disarmament and an international agreement on curtailment of military expense, in order to render economic assistance to the so-called underdeveloped countries in cooperation with other countries. (N.S. Khrushchov's Speech at the Fourteenth General Assembly of the United Nations in September, 1959)

"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 per cent of \$120,000 millions spent for military purposes throughout the world were turned to that purpose, it would be possible to end hunger, disease and illiteracy in the distressed areas of the globe within twenty years."

If one thinks that those words were uttered to denounce and impeach new and old colonialism and nuclear rearmament policy of the imperialist countries which are wasting exorbitant military expenses for war preparations, while leaving hundreds of millions of the population in underdeveloped countries in starvation and poverty, it is a great mistake. On the contrary, N.S. Khrushchov here walks along the way of "peaceful co-existence" in his style centered on the "collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union" and "seriously" claims that if disarmament is realized, then the Socialist countries and imperialist countries can jointly give assistance to "underdeveloped countries". Actually, at the meeting of the Economic and Finance Committee of the United Nations, in December, 1963, what else can be done, but the Soviet representative, jointly with the representative of U.S. imperialism, which is "the mainstay of present-day colonialism", presented "a joint resolution on peaceful utilization of the fund to be saved by complete disarmament" and the United States and the Soviet Union jointly strove to propagate the Khrushchov idea of the solution of the "South-North question" by the cooperation of the Socialist countries and imperialist countries.

This idea which dissolves the question of the development of underdeveloped countries exclusively into the question of amount of economic aid rendered by advanced countries and recommends "joint aid" to underdeveloped countries with military expenses to be saved by disarmament as a source of revenue, completely disregards that aid to underdeveloped countries rendered by the imperialist countries is an instrument of neo-colonialism "to preserve colonial exploitation of the peoples of the former colonies by new methods and in new forms".

(The Moscow Statement). In fact, even if disarmament is carried out, an important advance is made for world peace and as a result, the United States and other imperialist countries are able to increase the fund to be transferred to "aid to underdeveloped countries", it serves only economic and political domination by neo-colonialism as far as the relation between imperialism and oppressed nations is concerned and it alone does not help economic independence of underdeveloped countries. Even if the aid is given "jointly" by the Socialist countries through the United Nations etc. it does not alter the nature of the matter. This is clear in the light of the experience of dispatching the U.N. troops to the Congo. The U.N. troops were dispatched to the Congo on the basis of the resolution unanimously adopted by the U.N. Security Council, but neither the "public" authority of the United Nations nor the Soviet Union's cooperation could prevent the U.N. troops from being turned into an instrument of U.S. neo-colonialism. However, completely turning his eyes away from the aggressive nature of "aid to underdeveloped countries" given by imperialism, and not taking up the question of the struggle to sweep away neo-colonialism of imperialism, N.S. Khrushchov propagates that if fund is saved by disarmament and aid is given, no matter by what country, as long as the necessary fund is invested, poverty of underdeveloped countries is swept away and their economic independence will be achieved. After all, this is an apology for neo-colonialism in place of the imperialists and is nothing but to pull the broad peoples of colonial and dependent countries away from the revolutionary road of the national-liberation struggle against new and old colonialism and for genuine national independence and to draw them onto the road of compromise.

Now then, it is already clear to any person that N.S. Khrushchov's theory of "peaceful co-existence" has the nature of apologetics for imperialism. His argument either of disarmament under imperialism or of aid to underdeveloped countries through the cooperation with imperialism does, after all, presuppose the most extreme theory of "transmutation" of imperialism that in the coming new world of "peaceful co-existence", imperialism will finally be reborn as peaceful and non-imperialist capitalism which abandons its war policy, completely severs its relations with new and old colonialism and is already partially being reborn, and intends to oppress the national-liberation movement in exchange for his gospel sermon.

(5) SETTLEMENT OF TOTAL ACCOUNTS OF THE KHRUSHCHOV LINE

The above is the main content of N.S. Khrushchov's "peaceful co-existence" line. In the final analysis, it only ends with making the tailing after the United States the primary task of our time, pursuance of the policy of tailing after U.S. imperialism at any cost, and "maintenance of peace in cooperation with the enemy of peace". As each of its characteristic features has been examined, it is a line of collaboration with and capitulation to U.S. imperialism, which has nothing in common with the peaceful co-existence policy to be firmly upheld by Marxist-Leninist Parties and Socialist countries. Furthermore, in order to gain U.S. imperialism's trust and to realize "the collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union" along the above line, N.S. Khrushchov, in carrying out his foreign policy, repeated its anti-popular actions that sacrifice the unity of the Socialist camp and suppress

the anti-imperialist peace struggle and national-liberation struggles. This has been shown especially by the whole course of the development of his "peaceful co-existence" diplomacy which has for the present realized the system of the "U.S.-Soviet collaboration", having started from the "Caribbean Crisis" and having passed through the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

N.S. Khrushchov and his followers had more eagerly begun to pursue the foreign policy of trailing after the United States since the "Caribbean Crisis" and at the same time, they began to force more than ever the support for various theories of beautification of U.S. imperialism and the foreign policy of trailing after the United States. Among them, what is especially impermissible is that they more than ever intensified their "anti-China policy" all over politics, economy and military affairs under the situation that it is clear to any person that U.S. imperialism seeks for one of major battlefields for its aggression and war policy in Asia and places the "China containment" policy in the foundation of its "world strategy". For some time N.S. Khrushchov and his followers had unjustifiably aggravated the state relations between China and the Soviet Union on the pretext of the differences of opinion within the international Communist movement and at that moment, they further intensified their "anti-China policy", concluded with the United States and Britain the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, one of whose major aims is obstruction of China's possession of nuclear weapons and gave a large amount of military aid to India which was repeating military provocations against China in virtual alliance with the United States. Thus, they responded to the "China containment" policy of U.S. imperialism from behind and did not hesitate to co-

operate with it either directly or indirectly. Besides, they did not positively support the struggles of the Vietnamese and Laotian peoples who are fighting against U.S. military aggression and for national independence and frequently took an attitude to compromise with imperialism, disregarding the peoples' demands. Such actions of N.S. Khrushchov and the like are indeed against the principle of proletarian internationalism and is similar to destruction of the unity of the Socialist camp and of the solidarity with the national-liberation movement. There is no room to doubt that one of their main motives was to win trust of the leaders of U.S. imperialism and to consolidate the political basis of the "U.S.-Soviet collaboration".

Well, then, what has such a "peaceful co-existence" line of N.S. Khrushchov's brought to the world? Has it been able to improve the world situation more or less in favour of peace as a result of the policy of collaboration with U.S. imperialism, having been pushed forward even at the cost of the unity of the Socialist camp?

In this respect, first let's take up N.S. Khrushchov's own appraisal. Last July and August, summing up the development of the world situation for one year since the signing of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, N.S. Khrushchov eulogized that his "peaceful co-existence" line has established mutual trust among states including the United States and the Soviet Union and emphasized that as could be found in such examples as curtailment of military budget and production reduction of nuclear fissionable materials, this "trust" has been strengthened to such an extent as they can promote the peace policy in the form of voluntarily mutually displaying "examples" even if no formal agreement has been yet concluded. And he stressed that if this "trust" is carefully extended then

it is possible to gradually improve the international situation and to maintain and strengthen world peace.

"The conclusion of this Treaty really brings a **certain degree of trust** to relations between states, opens up more desirable prospects in the future and gives a decisive influence on emergence of "the policy of mutual examples" which enables us to gradually improve the international situation. Of course the **emergence of the mutual trust** should be actually utilized for the common interests of easing tension. Relaxation of tension should be safeguarded and strengthened." (N.S. Khrushchov's Reply on July 6, 1964 to the Italian Peace Committee)

"During the whole year since the signing of the Moscow Treaty, I believe, a new experience has been gained in the international arena. Namely, having accumulated a certain degree of trust, it has become possible to promote further relaxation of international tension and agreements in various fields. Moreover, this has been achieved not only by conclusion of formal agreements, but also by the policy of "mutual examples". Consequently, it is of extreme importance **to defend such accumulation of trust and not to make trust weaker, but, on the contrary, to extend and strengthen trust by all means.** (N.S. Khrushchov's Answer to PRAVDA and IZVESTIA Journalists on occasion of the First Anniversary of the Moscow Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, on August 3, 1964)

N.S. Khrushchov's words sound as if the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty has opened the era of "mutual trust", and Socialist countries, imperialist countries and former colonial countries, "trusting" each other, can peacefully co-exist. This is, however, a "world image" too far away from the real world situation. It is true that last July N.S. Khrushchov could closely approach his long cherished

"U.S.-Soviet collaboration" and was able to establish a certain "relation of trust" between U.S. imperialism and himself. It was true that as a result of measures such as the construction of the direct "hot line" between the United States and the Soviet Union, the U.S. export of wheat to the Soviet Union, some curtailment of military budgets, the prohibition of shooting up bodies carrying nuclear weapons to the orbit and the reduction of production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons, "trust" between U.S. and Soviet leaders, at least N.S. Khrushchov's trust in U.S. leaders had been accumulated. The gist of the matter, however, does not consist in, whether or not there is "mutual trust" between the U.S. and Soviet leaders, but whether or not the mutual trust **between the U.S. and Soviet leaders** really contributes to maintenance and consolidation of peace. The real development of the world situation since the conclusion of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty gives a completely negative answer to this question.

Firstly, all with "mutual trust" between the U.S. and Soviet leaders, the nuclear war preparation and aggression policy did not make the slightest retrogression but the nuclear rearmament programme was continued and the stationing on a world scale of Polaris atomic submarines made progress. In Europe, the Berlin question, the German question did not make any advance though N.S. Khrushchov made every possible effort to solve as the basic problem of world peace and repeatedly said every year to "solve this year". On the contrary, the plan to nuclearize West Germany was pushed forward by the MLF programme. In particular, in Asia, the aggressive war preparations against China as one of the main offensive targets were strengthened such as exten-

sion of military aggression against Laos, South Viet Nam and Cambodia, conversion of Japan proper and Okinawa into nuclear offensive bases, drawing India into a military alliance, the dispatch of the Seventh Fleet to the Indian Ocean and great hypothetical nuclear war manoeuvres in South Korea, Okinawa and Taiwan, and last August even the open military attack on the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam was carried out. What must be stressed herein is that the "mutual trust" between N.S. Khrushchov and J.F. Kennedy-L.B. Johnson created by the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty not only does not restrict the aggressive policy of U.S. imperialism against Asia as one of its present major battlefields, but rather plays the role to encourage and promote it. The day after the dismissal of N.S. Khrushchov from his post, *New York Times'* correspondent James Reston made the following remarks which brilliantly characterized the political nature of the "mutual trust" between the United States and the Soviet Union. "President L.B. Johnson has said that however much troubles the United States has in Viet Nam, Cuba, the Congo and France, so long as Mr. N.S. Khrushchov holds his post, at least the U.S.-Soviet relations can be comparatively stable. His view is correct." (ASAHI-Shimbun, October 17, 1964). Namely, the U.S.-Soviet "mutual trust" has been established on the dual "trust" that the Soviet Union "trusts" that the U.S. Administration will not immediately wage a nuclear war against the Soviet Union and the U.S. Administration trusts that the Soviet Union will not immediately intervene with disputes in the areas other than the Soviet Union and for this reason, so long as N.S. Khrushchov led the Soviet Union and the "mutual trust" existed between the United States and

the Soviet Union, the United States was able to devote herself to her aggressive actions in Asia, Africa and Latin America without any fear of an all-out clash against the Soviet Union. Such "mutual trust" is clearly far from putting the world close to peaceful co-existence, but a "dangerous relation" which leaves the aggressive policy of U.S. imperialism to take its own course and further increases the danger of war inclusive of nuclear war.

Secondly, the U.S.-Soviet "mutual trust" has been established at the cost of the unity of the Socialist camp, the international Communist movement and the anti-imperialist peace forces of the whole world. In order to secure the "trust" of U.S. imperialism, N.S. Khrushchov virtually trampled on the solidarity relations with Asian Socialist countries at which U.S. imperialism took the present main offensive aim of its "divide and rule" policy, restricted the advance of the anti-imperialist peace struggle and the national-liberation struggle of the world's peoples, delivered attacks on the Socialist countries and Marxist-Leninist Parties which firmly upheld the stand of the struggle against U.S. imperialism, the common enemy of the world's peoples, and spread the disunity of the international Communist movement on an ever larger scale. However, as clearly stated by the Moscow Statement, the only force which can prevent the scheme of the imperialist aggressors to launch a world war and to preserve world peace is 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" and the formation of the international anti-imperialist peace united front. N.S. Khrushchov's "peaceful co-existence" line has only produced the result of giving advantage to the imperialist

aggressive forces and greatly delay the emergence of the true peace forces by betraying the unity of the Socialist camp, the international Communist movement and the world anti-imperialist forces.

In spite of the extremely difficult state of affairs, that is, the disunity of the Socialist camp and the international Communist movement existing on the part of the anti-imperialist peace forces, the aggressive policy in Asia of U.S. imperialism is being shaken from its foundation, faced with the development of a series of Socialist countries taking the lead of the struggle against the imperialist aggressive forces, the advance of the national-liberation movement of Asian peoples and the intensification of internal antagonisms within the imperialist camp. U.S. imperialism has repeatedly met with failure in South Viet Nam, Laos and South Korea, and its "China containment" policy which has been placed as the foundation of its "world strategy", has been delivered successive blows — such as the establishment of diplomatic relations between China and France, the success of China's nuclear test, the strengthened anti-imperialist solidarity of Asian and African countries and isolation of the "anti-China" policy of India — and has gone bankrupt. This most eloquently illustrates that despite U.S. imperialism's "dual policy" and N.S. Khrushchov's unprincipled concession to it, the international situation is generally developing unfavourably for the side of imperialism and favourably for the side of the peoples. And it is clear that if N.S. Khrushchov's line of "following in the wake of the United States" is fundamentally overcome, the unity of the Socialist camp and the international Communist movement and the unity of the anti-imperialist peace forces of the whole world is recovered, and energy of the peoples for inde-

pendence and peace is correctly concentrated upon the aggression and war policy of the imperialist camp headed by the United States, then the struggle for world peace and peaceful co-existence will gain a greater success and the world situation will develop more favourably for the cause of peace and independence, democracy and socialism.

In conclusion, the "peaceful co-existence" policy which has been promoted by N.S. Khrushchov's initiative has helped the aggression and war forces headed by U.S. imperialism, and at the same time has delivered blows to the anti-imperialist peace forces headed by the Socialist camp and in this dual sense has caused great damages and difficulties to the struggle for world peace and peaceful co-existence. Besides, this policy has been pushed forward by N.S. Khrushchov and his followers who hold the leading position of the Party and government in the Soviet Union, which is one of greatest Socialist states, and moreover has been forced upon the Socialist camp, the international Communist movement and the whole international democratic movements backed by the international prestige of the Soviet Union as the country which carried out the first Socialist revolution under Lenin's leadership. That is why the damage inflicted upon the world anti-imperialist peace forces by N.S. Khrushchov's peaceful co-existence policy is extremely great. It is quite a matter of course that U.S. imperialism and the world reactionary forces regret the dismissal of N.S. Khrushchov and heartily call on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to continue the Khrushchov line hereafter too.

This shows that the task to overcome the Khrushchov "peaceful co-existence" that is, the line of modern revisionism,

which surrenders to U.S. imperialism from the inside of the Socialist camp and the international Communist movement and to recover the unity of the Socialist camp and the international Communist movement in the joint struggle against U.S. imperialism has also become the most pressing task from the standpoint of safeguarding world peace from the threat of nuclear war to be waged by imperialism and of realizing correct peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems by defeating its aggression and war policy.

Already, our Party and other genuine Marxist-Leninists and Marxist-Leninist Parties of the world have resolutely developed the struggle against modern revisionism represented by N.S. Khrushchov.

The dismissal of N.S. Khrushchov, the biggest mainstay of the international current of modern revisionism and the main promoter of the "U.S.-Soviet collaboration" line following in the wake of the United States, which took place along the process of the development of the struggle is itself, a manifestation of contradiction and bankruptcy of the current of modern revisionism and has created more favourable conditions for the struggle of the Marxist-Leninists to overcome modern revisionism and to recover the unity of the international Communist movement. But the error in the foreign policy committed under N.S. Khrushchov's leadership cannot be attributed only to N.S. Khrushchov's arbitrary decision and execution and a personal and temporary deviation from a basically correct line and inasmuch as the root of the question is the fundamental departure of the very "peaceful co-existence" line in the Khrushchov style of securing world peace by following in the wake of the United States from the correct peaceful co-existence policy of Marxism-

Leninism, it is clear that the task to overcome N.S. Khrushchov's peaceful co-existence line cannot be simply solved only by the dismissal of N.S. Khrushchov.

In order to fundamentally solve the task, it is necessary to further strengthen the consistent and systematic struggle against modern revisionism along the principled direction clarified by the "Draft Report" of the Central Committee to the Ninth Party Congress. Firstly, it is to carry out the principled and uncompromising ideological and theoretical struggle against every manifestation of modern revisionism including the theory of "peaceful co-existence" of following in the wake of the United States and beautifying imperialism. Secondly, it is to make every possible effort to develop united actions based on earnest demands of the masses against the war policy of imperialism in various fields of the international democratic movements and in accordance with the characters of respective movements, furthermore, to strive for unity of immediate actions among fraternal Parties on the basis of the unified cognition of U.S. imperialism defined by the Moscow Declaration and Statement and thereby to concretely expose the line of modern revisionism surrendering to imperialism and splitting our movements. Thirdly, it is to resolutely fight against and crush the subversive and disruptive activities against our Party by the international current of revisionism and its blind followers, that is, all sorts of anti-Party revisionists in our country. Only by firmly upholding this principled attitude and policy and by continuously advancing and intensifying the struggle against modern revisionism can we make the dismissal of N.S. Khrushchov a more positive moment to crush the unprincipled "peaceful co-existence" line of modern revisionism itself, to recover the unity of

the international Communist movement and the Socialist camp and to realize the victory of Marxism-Leninism. And this is precisely the way to strengthen the unity of the anti-imperialist peace forces of the world, to totally develop the anti-imperialist struggle for peace and independence of the Socialist countries and the world's peoples and thereby to positively contribute to the security of world peace and the achievement of peaceful co-existence.

論赫魯曉夫的“和平共處”路線的本質

日共《赤旗報》評論員文章

*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1965年第一版

編号：（英）3050—1323

00033

3—E—697P