

REPLY
TO
KHRUSHCHOV

Resolution of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of Brazil

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

REPLY
TO
KHRUSHCHOV

Resolution of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of Brazil

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1964

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This pamphlet contains two articles: "Reply to Khrushchov", an abridged text of the resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil of July 27, 1963, and "The Great Theory of Marxism-Leninism Is Bound to Triumph on Our Continent" by José Duarte. The latter appeared originally in the August 16-31 issue of *A Classe Operária* of the Communist Party of Brazil under the title "Attacks on the Communist Party of China — Support to Opportunism". The present English translation of both articles has been made from the Chinese text given in the Peking *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*), September 4, 1963.

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

REPLY TO KHRUSHCHOV	
Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil (Abridged)	1
THE GREAT THEORY OF MARXISM-LENINISM IS BOUND TO TRIUMPH ON OUR CONTINENT	
José Duarte	17

REPLY TO KHRUSHCHOV

Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil

(Abridged)

In its Open Letter published in *Pravda* on July 14 attempting to reply to the arguments presented by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in its June 14 letter, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union accused the Chinese comrades of organizing and supporting various anti-Party groups who "come out against the Communist Parties in the United States, Brazil, Italy, Belgium, Australia and India", and mentioned by name leading members of the Communist Party of Brazil.

The accusation of the leaders of the CPSU is simply absurd and without any reason whatsoever; it runs counter to the interests of the revolutionary movement.

On what ground did the Central Committee of the CPSU make the above-mentioned charge? The leaders of the CPSU are well aware of the events that have happened in the communist movement in our country since 1956. As a result of these events, two Parties have appeared: the Communist Party of Brazil and the Brazilian Communist Party.

FACTS WHICH PROVOKED THE SPLIT

It is well known that following the 20th Congress of the CPSU, a powerful revisionist trend appeared in the communist ranks, with Agildo Barata as its main spokesman. The majority of the members of the Party and its Central Committee were then against the manifestations of revisionism. Although certain mistakes were committed in conducting the ideological struggle, measures were taken to defend the Party from the influence of the ideas alien to the proletariat, and to ensure the unity of the Party. Luiz Carlos Prestes also took part in this struggle against revisionism. But, after the development in the CPSU in June 1957 in which Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich and other comrades were excluded from the Party's leadership, Prestes made a sudden change which seemed difficult to comprehend. He expressed complete agreement with the ideas then upheld by Agildo Barata and his clique. From then on, he has become a fervent defender of revisionism, and notorious persons of this group have all gathered around him. He has become a fanatic apologist for capitalist development in Brazil, working still more energetically than he did when he supported the stand of Earl Browder in 1945.

In March 1958, Prestes, by dint of anti-Party tactics, made the Central Committee adopt a political line which is typically opportunist. This line has not only brought serious harm to the Brazilian revolutionary movement but also openly negated the militant tradition of the Party.

However, this new political line began to meet with growing resistance in the Central Committee and among the members. The revisionists were losing ground. In 1960 the position of Prestes and the other reformists in

the leading organ of the Party was by no means stable. Even a majority under their control became precarious. In these circumstances they decided to convene the Fifth Party Congress with the sole aim of removing all those opposed to this Rightist policy from the Party's leadership. They attempted to control the Party by holding out prospects of an easy victory in the elections, asserting that once Marshal Lott was elected the Party would be sure to obtain a legal status and to hold government posts.

The Fifth Congress was prepared tendenciously. Although an extensive debate had been unfolded on the pages of the organ of the Central Committee during a period preceding the congress, currency was given to lies and slanders against those who opposed revisionism. Undue interference was made in all conferences and assemblies of the Party in order to make them approve this opportunist political line and elect persons who agreed to this line as delegates. It is enough to point out the fact that in the polemics unfolded in the press more than half of the articles expressed disagreement with Prestes' views; at many preparatory meetings of the congress large numbers of Party members opposed the theses advanced by the Central Committee. However, as a result of the machinations mentioned above, only a small number of the Party members who disagreed were among the delegates to the Fifth Congress. Consequently, the congress failed to reflect the will of the Party. The Fifth Congress attained the real purpose for which it was convened: the expulsion of 12 full Members of the Central Committee out of a total of 25, and several Alternate Members from the Central Committee.

The comrades holding different views, though subjected to such despicable discrimination, observed the resolution of the Fifth Congress with good discipline. But Prestes and his followers continued their revisionist activities and finally set out to undermine the foundation of the Party. In August 1961, in violation of the resolution of the congress and under the pretext of acquiring legal status for the Party they decided to found a new party. The Communist Party of Brazil was cast aside and was replaced by the Brazilian Communist Party. Provisions that the Party is guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism were deleted from the Party Constitution. The programme advanced was less radical than that of the Labour Party or the Socialist Party.

Party members who disagreed with such a flagrant violation of democratic centralism and who were determined to preserve Party unity demanded that the Central Committee renounce the position it had taken or call an extraordinary congress. They made clear that they would never approve the abolition of the Communist Party of Brazil. The answer from the opportunist leading clique was to take punitive measures, dissolve organizations, expel long-tested Party members and whip up a despicable calumny campaign against the honest Communists.

UNJUSTIFIED ATTACKS BY THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU

In these circumstances what were the true revolutionaries to do? They had no alternative but to reorganize

the Communist Party of Brazil. They convened an Extraordinary National Conference in São Paulo in February 1962 to discuss the situation and decide future policies. Delegates from various states took part in the conference. The conference decided to rebuild the Party, adopted a Marxist-Leninist programme, resolved to publish the Party's traditional organ, and elected a new Central Committee. Remaining in the Communist Party of Brazil are eight members of the former Central Committee, some leaders of trade union and youth organizations, and many rank-and-file members who have engaged in uninterrupted Party activities for more than twenty years. Among their leaders are many comrades who had spent many years in reactionary prisons.

As a result of the work done in the past year, the Party's membership has swelled from several hundred to several thousand, its organizations have been set up in all parts of the country, and its influence has been widened among the masses. The Party has intensified its political activity and substantially increased the circulation of its organ.

Such being the case, how can the Central Committee of the CPSU led by Khrushchov say that the Communist Party of Brazil is an anti-Party group? How can they accuse this legitimate vanguard of the working class of Brazil, this organization which remains true to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism, of being engaged in splitting activities? Can Khrushchov and the Central Committee of the CPSU justify their charges by citing any action taken by the Communist Party of Brazil that is against the revolution and the interests of the Brazilian people?

These charges of the Central Committee of the CPSU can only be regarded as all-out encouragement to the rotten reformist faction headed by Prestes which has led the Brazilian communist movement to a split, and as an attempt to shift the blame on to the Chinese comrades for the splits in the Communist Parties of certain countries.

It is indeed distressing to Brazilian revolutionaries that such charges should have come from the leaders of the Party founded by Lenin which had in its history relentlessly opposed opportunism and given resolute support under all circumstances to revolutionaries. Being Communists educated by the example of the Bolshevik Party, we have consistently looked upon the Soviet Union as a powerful base of the world revolutionary movement. Consequently we cannot agree to the acts of those people who, holding leading positions in the biggest socialist country, have betrayed the glorious tradition of Bolshevism and overtly supported the revisionists in all parts of the world. Notwithstanding the slanders of the present leaders of the CPSU and their distortion of truth, we would like to take this opportunity to convey our admiration and gratitude to the Soviet people who carried out the Great October Revolution, established socialism over one-sixth of the globe and smashed Nazi-fascism in a most cruel war. Nothing can make us depart from the principles of proletarian internationalism, Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary struggle.

By supporting and encouraging the Prestes reformist faction, Khrushchov and the Central Committee of the CPSU have objectively set themselves against the revolutionary movement in our country.

BANKRUPTCY OF THE OPPORTUNIST LINE

Facts have demonstrated how much the Brazilian Communist Party has become discredited in the eyes of the broad masses and the democratic forces, as a result of its opportunist political line.

The name of the Party has been changed and Party principles mutilated for the sake of registering at the Electoral Court. Yet, more than a year has passed and this new reformist party has not acquired legal status.

These and many other events fully testify to the bankruptcy of the policy pursued by the Brazilian Communist Party.

REVOLUTIONARY PARTY AND REFORMIST PARTY

How can the Central Committee of the CPSU consider such a party the leading organization of the working class and at the same time label as an anti-Party group that party which truly represents the interests of the proletariat?

The Communist Party of Brazil is struggling to overthrow the existing regime of the latifundia owners and big bourgeoisie and to establish a true people's regime which alone can carry out the reforms necessary for the progress of the country, the well-being of the people and the winning of complete national independence. The Brazilian Communist Party, on its part, does not oppose the existing regime but merely advocates the realization of a partial structural reform of the state within the framework of the existing state power. Their pretext is that this reform paves the way for complete transformation.

The Communist Party of Brazil is striving for the formation of a people's revolutionary government representing the progressive classes and strata of the Brazilian society to replace the state power of the latifundia owners and big bourgeoisie. On the other hand, the aim of the Brazilian Communist Party is to establish a so-called nationalist-democratic government, the realization of which would involve exclusion from the government those ministers standing for capitulation and the appointment of other persons regarded as nationalists and democrats.

The Communist Party of Brazil, in order to realize a people's democratic, national-liberation revolution, insists on establishing a united front comprising all the revolutionary forces in Brazilian society, with the workers and peasants as its basic core. The Brazilian Communist Party, because it merely seeks partial reforms, tries its best to establish a so-called nationalist-democratic united front including all the bourgeoisie, even the stratum of the latifundia owners.

The Communist Party of Brazil holds that under present circumstances the ruling classes have blocked the path of peaceful revolution and so the people, while not abandoning the use of various forms of legal struggle, should be well prepared for a non-peaceful solution. On the other hand, the Brazilian Communist Party, taking no account of the actual situation in the country and in order to deceive the people, alleges that the aim of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution can be realized by peaceful means.

The Communist Party of Brazil has put forward a revolutionary programme, set forth the objective of socialism, openly affirmed that it follows the principles

of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism, and it does not hide its name and its class nature. The Brazilian Communist Party, on the other hand, has betrayed the former party, renounced the revolutionary programme and hides its own name. Therefore, it has in fact ceased to be a proletarian party.

In a word, the Communist Party of Brazil is a revolutionary party whereas the Brazilian Communist Party is a reformist party. The Communist Party of Brazil fights for safeguarding proletarian hegemony in the revolution. The Brazilian Communist Party, on the other hand, is led by the nose by the ruling classes and helps the bourgeoisie to deceive the working masses.

Therefore, there is no difficulty in Brazil in telling which faction follows the revolutionary road and which faction pursues a revisionist line. One faction defends the Marxist-Leninist policy while the other practises a typical Rightist policy.

CAUSES FOR THE SPLIT IN THE BRAZILIAN COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The Soviet leaders have charged the comrades of the Chinese Communist Party with causing a split in the Brazilian communist movement. This is but an arbitrary assertion which goes completely against the actual state of affairs and is an outright slander. Facts have proved that internal factors are the main cause of the split, which essentially arose from the penetration of bourgeois ideas into the Party. With the advance of capitalism in our country and as a result of cajoling by the bourgeoisie, the influence of these ideas has become ever greater.

The split also arose from the intolerable attitude of the reformist leaders headed by Prestes who, in the course of the ideological struggle, used methods which deserved the severest condemnation. It is equally undeniable that there exist external influences, with the greatest influence coming from the 20th Congress [of the CPSU]. By adopting a number of highly debatable propositions and raising the question of the personality cult, this congress created confusion and encouraged the opportunists of various stripes and colours and all those who opposed the existence of an independent, truly revolutionary party of the working class. Meanwhile, the vigorous ideological offensive launched by imperialism also affected the ranks of the Party.

In accusing the Chinese comrades of being responsible for the split in the Brazilian communist movement, the leaders of the CPSU revealed their contempt for the capability and fighting spirit of the Brazilian workers. Obsessed by a sense of superiority, they were unable to see that, in the face of the betrayal by the opportunists, there would inevitably appear in our country a number of people who were determined to hold high the banner of revolution, to found a political party of the proletariat, to carry on a ruthless struggle against imperialism and the latifundia system and to persist in the struggle for the victory of socialism in Brazil. When discussions were first begun within the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil, those comrades who later endeavoured to rebuild the Party were unaware of the existence of differences in the world communist movement. Later on, when they realized there were disputes on some questions they still did not know how deep the differences actually were. It was not until this year

when a series of articles were published in the Peking *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*) and the journal *Hongqi* (*Red Flag*) that the members of the Communist Party of Brazil realized exactly the extent of the existing differences. It was only then that they came to see that these differences involved not only the Chinese and Soviet Parties. What was involved was a struggle of historic significance between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism.

The theses of the Chinese Communist Party expounded in the above-stated articles and the June 14 letter of the Central Committee of the CPC to the Central Committee of the CPSU cannot but make the rank-and-file members and leaders of the Communist Party of Brazil and the broad sections of workers and progressive intellectuals feel elated, inspired and greatly satisfied. These documents are a highly valuable contribution to the struggle against modern revisionism and in defence of the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism. Many of the theses which these documents defend completely correspond to the actual conditions in our country. They help us to understand better the struggle against opportunism and enable us to see that the ideological problems confronting us today are not confined to Brazil. These problems are phenomena which exist in the world communist movement as a whole.

THE THESES OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE HARMS THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

The struggles which are going on in Latin America have also proved the correctness of the Chinese Com-

munist Party's thesis concerning the national-liberation movement of oppressed nations and the role of these struggles in the world situation as a whole. The peoples of Latin America cannot afford to wait for their liberation by "peaceful competition". They are brutally oppressed by U.S. imperialism which interferes ever more flagrantly in their internal affairs, propping up this or overthrowing that government, tramples on their national sentiments and, under the cover of the false philanthropic "Alliance for Progress", intensifies the ruthless exploitation of the various countries on this continent. Latin America is a battlefield of silent warfare between U.S. imperialism and the masses of people. Therefore, only the most vigorous struggles, especially armed struggles, can pave the way for the liberation of the oppressed nations of this hemisphere. This is proved by the Cuban revolution, the uprisings in Venezuela and the guerrillas expanding in other countries.

The revisionist policy spreads illusions about U.S. imperialism, bows to its dictates and tries to damp down the struggle against it and the internal reactionaries. This policy seriously harms the revolutionary movement in Latin America. All those who are not prepared to expose resolutely the U.S. imperialists and drive them out of their own country are doomed to complete failure. Genuine revolutionaries cannot agree to Khrushchov's statements prettifying U.S. imperialism and are opposed to his frequent eulogizing of Kennedy. How can one agree to the assertion that the top chieftain of imperialism is interested in peace, that he can act sensibly in face of the contradictions between the people and imperialism? How can one believe that Kennedy, who planned the invasion of Cuba, wages "special warfare" in

south Viet Nam, organizes military coups in Latin America and is engaging in an unprecedented arms drive, is a representative of the less aggressive, less reactionary group of U.S. monopolists? To Latin Americans, Kennedy is the most ferocious enemy of peace and independence of the peoples. Thus, the broad masses of our continent see that what Khrushchov has said are lies.

Especially serious is the fact that while creating illusions about U.S. imperialism, Khrushchov crudely attacks the Chinese Communists who have led a most important revolution of our time and who have opened a new stage in the struggle for liberation of the oppressed nations. He said that China wanted thermo-nuclear war, that it wanted to bring about victory of socialism throughout the world on the ruins of an atomic explosion. Such utterances are an insult to the conscience of the people of the world.

If one studies the documents of the Chinese Communist Party and the foreign policy of People's China, one readily comes to the conclusion that the Chinese are real defenders of peace and the Chinese leaders have pointed out the correct road to prevent the outbreak of an atomic war. Khrushchov has posed a threat to peace by his unprincipled manoeuvres, concessions to imperialism, propaganda of atomic terror, adventurist activities, policy of lulling the people's vigilance and splitting the socialist camp. To avoid war, it is necessary to expose energetically the aggressive policy of imperialism, to prevent it from deceiving the masses of people, to enhance the unity of the peace-loving forces, particularly that of the socialist countries, and finally to enable the peoples to take the cause of peace into their own hands

and to carry forward struggle for the defence of peace to the end.

The allegation made by Khrushchov and certain leaders of some Parties that the Chinese leaders want to drag mankind into a thermo-nuclear war is unworthy of Communists. All the attempts to show that the Chinese Communists are out of step, and falsely presenting them as advocates of atomic war will be condemned by revolutionaries and all honest people. To what length the revisionists have gone! In their eyes, it is the Chinese Communists but not the imperialists who want to fight an atomic war!

UNITE ON THE BASIS OF PRINCIPLES

The violent attacks by Khrushchov and the Central Committee of the CPSU on the revolutionaries of other countries have disrupted the unity of the world communist movement and are part of the splitting activities of the modern revisionists. This is not the first time they have attacked fraternal Parties. For some time now they have been persistently uttering all sorts of diatribes against the Albanian Party of Labour which fought bravely against Nazism and fascism. This Party has led the Albanian people's liberation movement and is now leading the country in advancing victoriously along the road of socialist construction; it has consistently adhered to the position of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism. They have even instigated to overthrow the Albanian leaders. Not satisfied with this, they have gone further and adopted measures damaging the country's economy and created difficulties for its

socialist construction. While pursuing this policy which should be condemned, Khrushchov and the Central Committee of the CPSU have done all they could to win the sympathy of Tito, who has betrayed Marxism-Leninism in order to get American dollars. They have also lavished economic aid on Nehru's reactionary group, which is pursuing a policy of aggression and endless provocations against People's China.

The charges of Khrushchov against the Communist Party of Brazil, like the slanders spread by Prestes and his followers against the long-tried revolutionary fighters, are futile. The vilifications of the revisionists can only make those who join the genuine working-class party feel proud. Revisionists support revisionists but not revolutionaries. Revolutionaries support revolutionaries but not revisionists.

In taking this position we are upholding a principled policy. We stand for the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist ideas contained in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. We are of the opinion that the Brazilian Communists can only seek unity on the basis of a revolutionary political line. The working class and people all over the world must maintain unity in order to deal with imperialism, defend the cause of peace, and hold high the banner of revolution in the march towards victory.

We should not interpret unity as mere compromise, and so conceal the differences. Unity can never be obtained if the viewpoint expressed by Nikita Khrushchov to the Chinese comrades is allowed to prevail: "Put aside all disputes and differences, not to try and establish who is right and who is wrong, not to rake up

the past, but start our relations with a clear page." This has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism: It is characteristic of the policy of the social democrats. Differences should not be concealed, let alone put aside. Differences should be overcome by the ideological struggle which is indispensable in forwarding the revolutionary movement so as to guarantee the solid unity of the Communists and uphold the purity of the great proletarian doctrine.

We believe that the heroic and experienced Party of the great Lenin will find the best way to liquidate the erroneous position of its leadership which has caused untold damage to the revolutionary struggle, establish a correct relationship with the fraternal Parties and repudiate revisionism, the most dangerous trend in the world communist movement.

The Communist Party of Brazil holds that truth must be told. Truth will triumph sooner or later. Defying all obstacles, we are determined to hold aloft the banner of Marxism-Leninism in our country and do all in our power to strive for the victory of the cause of revolution.

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of Brazil**

Rio de Janeiro, July 27, 1963

**THE GREAT THEORY OF MARXISM-LENINISM IS
BOUND TO TRIUMPH ON OUR CONTINENT**

José Duarte

Following the publication of the July 14 Open Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Parties in some Latin American countries spoke out against the views held by the Chinese comrades. These Parties have vigorously and impatiently declared their unconditional support for the line advocated by the leaders of the CPSU. Some of them, like Luiz Carlos Prestes, representing the Brazilian Communist Party, have adopted defensive tactics, while others, like Luis Corvalan, representing the Communist Party of Chile, have taken the offensive. But all of them have taken an opportunist position, distorted the truth, and resorted to the same methods as are used in the Open Letter of the CPSU.

The arguments these people advance in support of the revisionist line are surprisingly untenable. They claim that they are against dogmatism, and yet facts prove that they themselves are die-hard dogmatists, simply parroting the theories of Khrushchov. They represent the resolutions adopted by the congresses of one Party as universal revolutionary laws applicable to the international communist movement as a whole. To them, Lenin's teaching on the necessity of making a critical analysis

of the experiences of other nations and Parties is worthless. They state, "Our line is based on the theses of the 20th Congress of the CPSU." They have therefore based themselves not on reality but on something proclaimed by the leaders of other Communist Parties. In this they have acted according to their subjective desires and so have deviated from the path of Marxism-Leninism.

In our country, having waited cautiously for a long while, Luiz Carlos Prestes wrote an article in the *Novos Rumos*, explaining the position taken by the faction under his leadership. In the past, he professed to take an intermediate position, but now he had come out openly on the side of modern revisionism. He stated, "Under no circumstances can our policy and activities be subject to question," and added, "Brazilian Communists have their own positive views on the questions which give rise to the differences in the international communist movement."

He has gone out of his way to attack the Albanian Party of Labour and maliciously turned facts upside down. As everybody knows, the CPSU was the first to launch an open attack on the Albanian Party of Labour and its leaders. Violating the 1957 Moscow Declaration and the 1960 Moscow Statement Khrushchov shamelessly vilified the Albanian Communists at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, in an effort to exclude them from the international communist movement; he even called for the overthrow of the leaders of that fraternal Party. Nevertheless, Prestes insists that it was the Albanian comrades who attacked the CPSU. He even has the impudence to brag how promptly he attacked the Albanian Party of Labour and supported Khrushchov's position at that time. But everybody knows that Prestes and his sup-

porters know nothing about Albania except for the information supplied to them by the Soviet leaders.

Subsequently, Prestes in his article analyses the Caribbean crisis in a self-assertive manner, giving fresh support to Khrushchov and harping monotonously on the theses of the 20th Congress of the CPSU. Using the familiar tactics of the revisionists, he attributes to Lenin what is actually a figment of his own imagination. He asserts, for instance, that the talented leader of the October Revolution "always maintained that the spread of communism throughout the world should not depend on force of arms but on the power of example". Prestes does not tell us where he obtained this idea. It is true that Lenin spoke of the impact that Soviet socialist construction would have on the revolutionary movement. Nevertheless, as an outstanding Marxist, he never failed to point out that the motive force of history is class struggle and that the advance of communism in the world must be achieved through revolution.

In his article Prestes seizes upon every opportunity to defend the theory of the peaceful road which fascinates him greatly. He insists on the so-called positive solutions and structural reforms within the framework of the existing regime, and asserts that the struggle for these goals will "weaken the machinery of suppression in the hands of the ruling classes and thus enable a large number of their members to go over to the side of the people". In his view, the state machinery in the service of the big landlords and big capitalists, particularly its instruments of suppression, could pass over to the revolutionary forces. Has this anything in common with the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state? How can one approve of the idea that a large proportion of those

people serving the ruling classes' machinery of suppression — the task of which is to persecute and hold down the revolutionary classes — can go over to the side of the forces opposing imperialism, the big landlords and the monopolies at home? It is on the basis of this idea and according to his own wishful thinking that Prestes has cooked up this strange theory about "the weakening of the machinery of suppression". This has created illusions not only towards the bourgeois politicians but towards the police. If accepted by the masses of the people, it would inevitably lead to total disaster.

Until recently Prestes has pretended to ignore *A Classe Operária* and the movement it represents — but now in the latter part of his article he decided to "remind" his followers to keep on the look-out for this paper and the activities of the real working-class Party. He repeats Khrushchov's vilifications of the leaders of the Communist Party of Brazil and labels the legitimate revolutionaries as an "anti-Party group". Scared of the increasing achievements of these revolutionaries, he turns to attack the Chinese Communist Party, and openly declares that he has taken Peking to task for allowing Radio Peking to broadcast editorials from *A Classe Operária*, which was done in a fair and democratic spirit.

The Secretary-General of the Chilean Communist Party Luis Corvalan, has adopted different methods to defend these revisionist views. In his speech to the Central Committee of the Chilean Communist Party, he made a vehement attack against the Chinese comrades while submissively taking orders from Khrushchov and other leaders of the CPSU.

It is obvious that Corvalan has an ulterior motive in asserting that the differences have arisen "between the

Chinese Communist Party and almost the whole international communist movement". This is an attempt to mislead Chilean public opinion by presenting the Chinese Communist Party, which has been courageously conducting the debate, as being quite isolated. In his view, this stupid rigmarole is a most powerful argument in his own favour. But this is not so. An increasing number of Communist Parties and Communists now hold the same ideas as the Chinese Communist Party. Moreover, even if the Chinese Communists were battling all alone against the ideas dominating the world communist movement, would this be proof that they were wrong? The history of revolutionary struggle records the following fact: During World War I, Lenin and the other Bolsheviks almost fought single-handed against the position taken by all the Social-Democratic Parties. Yet truth was on the side of the Bolsheviks. Deep differences doubtlessly exist between the Chinese Communist Party and the CPSU. But these differences do not exist between the two big Parties alone. They also exist between different Parties and within many Parties. The reason is that the current ideological struggle is one between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism.

According to a statement published in the *El Siglo* of July 21, the leaders of the Chilean Communist Party, frightened by the consequences of their own opportunist attitude and thinking that the majority must always be right, denounced the following passage in the letter of the Chinese Communist Party: "If the leading group in any Party adopt a non-revolutionary line and convert it into a reformist party, then Marxist-Leninists inside and outside the Party will replace them. . . ." Is there anything surprising about this statement? And what do

the facts of life prove? The example of Cuba fully demonstrates that if the organization which is regarded as the vanguard fails to play its role in the revolution, then other forces will take its place. When they launched the struggle to overthrow the Batista regime, Fidel Castro and his comrades did not belong to the Communist Party. What is happening in Latin America today proves that new revolutionary forces emerge wherever a Party has sunk into opportunism and fails to do anything to its credit. Such a new fighting force has now appeared in our country also and it is growing from strength to strength. The existence of the Communist Party of Brazil is an example of this truth.

In his speech Luis Corvalan insisted that the joint resolutions of all Parties be upheld. He quoted the 1957 Moscow Declaration and the 1960 Moscow Statement several times, but he was the first to violate them. All Communist and Workers' Parties pledged support of the principle explicitly defined in the Declaration and the Statement that revisionism is the main danger to the communist movement and that Tito is a renegade from Marxism-Leninism. But Corvalan has arbitrarily tampered with these unanimously adopted resolutions and alleges that "dogmatism has become the main danger". He has the effrontery to state that Tito and the Yugoslav League of Communists have abandoned their revisionist position and that their present policy on international questions is "in accord with that of the entire international communist movement". One may ask: Is it Tito who has changed or Luis Corvalan who supports the revisionist position of that renegade from Marxism and supplies him with ammunition? In an interview with newsmen, U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated that

U.S. military aid had not only bolstered the independent position of Yugoslavia against the Soviet bloc, but since 1948, had turned that country into a centre of splitting activities inside the international communist movement. Who is right, Corvalan or Dean Rusk? If Tito has changed his spots, why do the U.S. imperialists continue to grant him millions of dollars in the name of aid?

The whole speech of this Chilean reformist leader is aimed at intimidating members of his Party who disapprove of his revisionist views. He does not want them to read and discuss the documents of the Chinese comrades. He strictly bans the dissemination of these materials, and yet, in order to poison people's minds, he talks about inner-Party democracy. Nothing on earth, however, can prevent the Chilean comrades from learning the truth about the great debate which is now going on in the world communist movement, and from eventually finding the true revolutionary road.

The debate unfolded in the communist ranks helps to clarify positions in Latin America and expose those opportunists who only a short while ago posed as revolutionaries. The toiling masses who are being oppressed and enslaved by imperialism and the latifundia system have begun to realize what sort of leaders Prestes, Corvalan, Codovilla and their ilk really are.

The revisionists in Latin America are particularly concerned about the future development of this debate. But this debate can only benefit the revolutionary movement. The great theory of Marxism-Leninism is bound to triumph also on our continent. As a result of the struggle against opportunism and against the common enemy of the peoples, a revolutionary vanguard, capable of leading the people and the toiling masses to victory, will be tempered.

答赫魯曉夫

巴西共產黨中央委員會決議

*

外文出版社出版(北京)

1964年第一版

編號: (英)3050-840

00024

3-E-588p