

**COMMENTS ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE
CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU**

by the Editorial Departments of
Renmin Ribao and *Hongqi*

*The following pamphlets are now available in various
languages:*

1. THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CPSU AND OURSELVES
2. ON THE QUESTION OF STALIN
3. IS YUGOSLAVIA A SOCIALIST COUNTRY?
4. APOLOGISTS OF NEO-COLONIALISM
5. TWO DIFFERENT LINES ON THE QUESTION OF WAR AND PEACE
6. PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE — TWO DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED POLICIES
7. THE LEADERS OF THE CPSU ARE THE GREATEST SPLITTERS OF OUR TIMES
8. THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND KHRUSHCHOV'S REVISIONISM
9. ON KHRUSHCHOV'S PHONEY COMMUNISM AND ITS HISTORICAL LESSONS FOR THE WORLD

Published by **FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS**
Pai Wan Chuang, Peking (37), China

Distributed by **GUOZI SHUDIAN**
China Publications Centre
P. O. Box 399, Peking, China

**LETTER OF
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA
IN REPLY TO THE LETTER OF
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF
THE SOVIET UNION
DATED JUNE 15, 1964**

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

**LETTER OF
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA
IN REPLY TO THE LETTER OF
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF
THE SOVIET UNION
DATED JUNE 15, 1964**

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1964

CONTENTS

LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA IN REPLY TO THE LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION DATED JUNE 15, 1964 1

APPENDIX

LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU OF JUNE 15, 1964 TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPC 27

**LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA
IN REPLY TO THE LETTER OF
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION
DATED JUNE 15, 1964**

July 28, 1964

The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has received the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated June 15, 1964. This letter was not delivered to us until June 20, whereas its contents had already been disclosed in the bourgeois press in the West before the 20th.

In your letter you distort and reject the reasonable proposal advanced in our letter of May 7, 1964 and turn a deaf ear to the views of the many fraternal Parties demanding unity and opposing a split. In this letter of yours, you have laid down a revisionist political programme and a divisive organizational line for an international meeting of the fraternal Parties. This shows that you are determined to prepare and call such a meeting arbitrarily, unilaterally and illegally with the aim of effecting an open split in the international communist movement.

(I)

On the question of convening an international meeting of the fraternal Parties, the Communist Party of China has always adhered to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and advocated a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism after full preparation and by unanimous agreement reached through consultation; it is firmly opposed to a schismatic meeting. We have invariably persisted in this stand. You say in your letter that we "make a volte-face". This is merely an attempt to substitute lies for facts.

What are the facts?

As early as the spring of 1962, that is, shortly after the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, the CPC actively supported the proposal made by the Communist Party of Indonesia, the Workers' Party of Viet Nam and the Communist Party of New Zealand for the convocation of an international meeting of the fraternal Parties to eliminate the differences which you had brought into the open before the enemy. In its letter to you dated April 7, 1962, the Central Committee of the CPC declared that it "whole-heartedly supports the proposal to convene a meeting of the fraternal Parties" and pointed out that to ensure its success "many difficulties and obstacles have to be overcome beforehand and much preparatory work has to be done". You seem to have either forgotten or failed to understand these words. If you have forgotten them, it shows how bad your memory is; if you have failed to understand them, it testifies to the poverty of your comprehension. Didn't we clearly state that to make a success of the meeting

"many difficulties and obstacles have to be overcome beforehand and much preparatory work has to be done"?

We took this stand with the aim of eliminating the differences and strengthening unity in the interest of the common struggle against the enemy. However, in your letter of May 31, 1962, you rejected the proposal for convening an international meeting of the fraternal Parties. You subsequently took a series of steps to worsen the relations between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and between our two countries, and at the successive Congresses of five European fraternal Parties in the winter of 1962 you stirred up a fresh adverse current against the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties.

Despite all this, in July 1963 the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party sent a delegation to Moscow for the talks between our two Parties. We had hoped that these talks would yield positive results and thus make a contribution to the preparations for convening an international meeting of the fraternal Parties. However, you showed not the slightest sincerity with regard to these talks. In the midst of them you published your Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to Party Organizations and All Communists in the Soviet Union, thus widening and deepening the differences in the international communist movement and erecting further road-blocks in the way of an international meeting.

In the spring of 1964 we made another major effort to overcome the many obstacles set by you and to bring about a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. Since in your letter to us dated November 29, 1963 you had merely paid lip-service to unity and

failed to put forward any concrete measures for convening an international meeting, we on our part made a four-point proposal in our letter to you dated February 29, 1964 for the preparation and convocation of an international meeting of the fraternal Parties. The proposal reads as follows: (1) For the cessation of the public polemics it is necessary for the Chinese and Soviet Parties and other fraternal Parties concerned to hold various bilateral and multilateral talks in order to find through consultation a fair and reasonable formula acceptable to all and to conclude a common agreement. (2) The Chinese Communist Party consistently advocates and actively supports the convening of a meeting of representatives of all Communist and Workers' Parties. Prior to the meeting adequate preparations should be made, and difficulties and obstacles should be overcome. Together with the other fraternal Parties, we will do everything possible to ensure that this meeting will be a meeting of unity on the basis of the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism. (3) The resumption of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties is a necessary preparatory step for making the meeting of the fraternal Parties a success. We propose that the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties be resumed in Peking, from October 10 to 25, 1964. (4) In order to make further preparations for the meeting of representatives of all fraternal Parties, we propose that the Sino-Soviet talks be followed by a meeting of representatives of seventeen fraternal Parties, namely, the Parties of Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and Viet Nam, and the Parties of Indonesia, Japan, Italy and France.

On your part what have you been doing in the last few months?

On February 12 this year and behind our backs, you sent a letter directed against the CPC to fraternal Parties in a plot to take "collective measures" against us. We have repeatedly asked you to send us a copy of this letter. However, to this day you refuse to do so and are still obligated to us on this score.

At the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU on February 14 this year, you delivered an anti-Chinese report and adopted an anti-Chinese decision, crying that you would "come out openly and strongly against the incorrect views and dangerous actions of the CPC leadership".

On April 3 you published the anti-Chinese documents of the February Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU and proceeded to launch a new anti-Chinese campaign. According to incomplete statistics, in April alone your central press and that of the Union Republics carried more than a thousand articles and other items attacking China.

You have brought great political and organizational pressure to bear upon fraternal Parties, intensified your subversive and divisive activities within fraternal Parties, and extended your collusion with defectors, renegades, Trotskyites, the Tito clique and reactionaries of every description. For example, you staged the act of betrayal by Yoshio Shiga, Ichizo Suzuki and others in order to injure the Japanese Communist Party which upholds Marxism-Leninism. You are busy ganging up with the Indonesian reactionaries in order to injure the Communist Party of Indonesia which upholds Marxism-Leninism.

All this shows that you are actively working for an open split in the international communist movement. In order to rush a schismatic meeting, you proposed a pressing timetable in your letter of March 7, 1964, in which the holding of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties was scheduled for May this year, that of the preparatory meeting of twenty-six fraternal Parties for June-July and that of the international meeting of the fraternal Parties for the autumn. This revealed the steps you wanted to take in hastening an open split.

We have given serious and repeated thought to the grave situation caused by your divisive activities and seen through your intention to hold a schismatic meeting. Therefore, we pointed out in our letter of May 7 this year that it would be better to hold the international meeting of fraternal Parties later rather than earlier, or even not to hold it, in these circumstances. For the same reason we made the proposal in that letter that it would be more appropriate to postpone the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties till some time in the first half of next year, say May, and pointed out that, judging by present circumstances, it might require perhaps four or five years, or even longer, to complete the preparations for an international meeting.

In short, in order to eliminate the differences and strengthen unity in the interest of the common struggle against the enemy, we have always stressed that "many difficulties and obstacles have to be overcome" and "much preparatory work has to be done" so as to convene a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. When you failed to make any concrete proposal for convening an international meeting, it was for the purpose of upholding unity and opposing a split that we put for-

ward a concrete proposal for the preparation of such a meeting in our letter of February 29. When you decided to convene a schismatic meeting, it was likewise for the purpose of upholding unity and opposing a split that we called for more time to overcome the greater number of difficulties and obstacles and to make a series of preparations in our letter of May 7. We have consistently opposed a hurried meeting and the attempt to split the international communist movement, because it would be detrimental to the strengthening of unity and to the common struggle against the enemy.

In the past you too said that an international meeting could not be convened before ample preparations were made. On January 16, 1963, N. S. Khrushchov, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, said that if the meeting were to be held in a hurry, it would lead to "the danger of a split". Why is it that you have made a volte-face and are trying to prepare and convene an international meeting in a blitzkrieg-like manner?

Presumably you think that your so-called preparations are almost complete. But from the above-stated facts people can see clearly that what you call preparations are aimed not at the elimination of differences and the strengthening of unity but at the exacerbation of differences and the creation of a split. You are not preparing to convene a meeting of unity but preparing to convene a schismatic meeting.

Obviously, the more such preparations you make, the greater the obstacles you place in the way of a meeting of unity, the greater the necessity for more arduous and protracted preparations by the Marxist-Leninist Parties to overcome these obstacles, and the farther the date for

a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism will recede.

In your letter of June 15 this year, you insist on hastily preparing and calling a schismatic meeting. This runs altogether counter to the common aspirations of all the Marxist-Leninist Parties of the world for a meeting of unity.

(II)

Your letter demonstrates that you have prepared a revisionist political programme for an international meeting to split the world communist movement.

In your letter you say that at this meeting you will "seek for ways to unity and not to dissociation" and will concentrate on revealing what there is "in common" so as to "formulate common positions". This is a pure fraud.

You arrogantly proclaim in your letter that the 20th Congress of the CPSU is "the symbol of . . . a new line of the entire world communist movement" and state that you "will firmly continue to follow" the line laid down by the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU. You also say menacingly that whoever does not approve of the line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU represents "the reaction of conservative forces in the communist movement to the creative Marxism-Leninism of the modern epoch" and "is permeated with the ideology of the personality cult". This means that you flagrantly want to impose on the entire international communist movement the revisionist line which was initiated at the 20th Congress of the CPSU and rounded off into a complete system at its 22nd Congress. In asserting that

it is necessary, "in keeping with the changes that have occurred in the international situation, to supplement and elaborate the ideas of the Declaration and Statement, and creatively examine and solve new problems", you actually want to substitute the revisionist line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU for the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement.

In the light of your views and activities over the years, one can clearly see the revisionist essence of the major theses which your letter contains and which you are trying to impose on the international meeting.

In asserting that "most of the socialist countries are completing an important period of their development and are approaching new heights in the construction of a new society", you actually want to introduce the "party of the entire people" and the "state of the whole people", change the proletarian character of the Communist Parties, abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat and open the floodgates to the restoration of capitalism.

In saying that the socialist countries need "to improve the forms of cooperation and mutual assistance" and "coordination of political and economic activities", you really want the fraternal countries to obey your baton and become your dependencies or colonies economically, politically and militarily.

In claiming that "there is now much that is new in the forms of organization and the methods" of struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries, you are actually propagating the "parliamentary road" and the theory of "structural reform", "peaceful transition" and the liquidation of proletarian revolution.

In stating that "the disintegration of imperialism's colonial system has entered its closing stage", you really want to liquidate the struggle of the oppressed nations against imperialism and old and new colonialism.

In reducing the external policy of the socialist countries solely to that of "preserving peace and promoting peaceful coexistence", you are actually opposed to struggling against imperialism and to supporting the revolution of the oppressed peoples and nations.

In substituting the concept that "the imperialist reactionaries led by the wild men of the U.S. and other imperialist powers" for the concept that "U.S. imperialism has become an enemy of the peoples of the whole world" as stated in the Statement of 1960, you actually want to ally yourselves with the U.S. ruling clique, whom you call "wise men", and in partnership with U.S. imperialism to carve up the world and oppose the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of all countries.

What you mean by "settling the differences", revealing what there is "in common" and the necessity to "attend the proposed conference . . . with a constructive programme" boils down to one thing: you really want to force the Marxist-Leninist Parties to accept the revisionist line peddled by the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU.

Your favourite trick is to try and make capital out of the sentence in the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 concerning the 20th Congress of the CPSU. But you know perfectly well that the Chinese Communist Party has always been against that sentence. At both meetings of the fraternal Parties, you made repeated requests claiming that you would face great difficulties unless the sentence was included. It was out of consid-

eration for your difficulties that we made concessions on this point. At the meeting in 1960 the delegation of the Chinese Communist Party stated that this was the last time it would do so. It is absolutely impermissible that you should use this sentence as a subterfuge for pushing your revisionist line or as a big stick with which to attack fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties. Why must all Parties submit to the resolutions of a single Party? Why should it be considered a great crime if they refuse to do so? May we ask, what kind of logic is this? What kind of principle for guiding the relations among fraternal Parties is this?

It must be pointed out that the revisionist line of your 20th and 22nd Congresses is the root cause of the differences in the present international communist movement. In recent years, this revisionist line of yours has met with opposition from more and more Marxist-Leninist Parties and Marxist-Leninists, and it is being increasingly discredited. A thorough criticism and repudiation of your revisionist line is imperative if the international meeting of the fraternal Parties is to be a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. You are trying hard to impose this revisionist line on the international meeting of the fraternal Parties, and this only serves to show that you are determined to call a meeting to bring about an open split.

(III)

The procedure and steps you advance in your letter for the illegal preparation and convocation of an international meeting constitute a comprehensive organiza-

tional plan for openly splitting the international communist movement.

You have premeditated everything: what kind of meeting it is to be, who should prepare it, who should take part in it and who should convene it — on all these questions you claim the last word. To you, all the fraternal Parties are mere puppets qualified only to move at your command. These practices of yours are permeated with the spirit of great-power chauvinism and of a “patriarchal father party”.

First, on the preparatory meeting for an international meeting of the fraternal Parties. In our letter of February 29 this year we proposed a preparatory meeting consisting of the representatives of seventeen fraternal Parties, but you did not agree. In our letter of May 7 we stated that in principle we are not against increasing the number of participants in the preparatory meeting, but that first consideration should be given to those fraternal Parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism. In your present letter you still refuse to consider our reasonable proposal and insist that the preparatory meeting consist of the representatives of the twenty-six Parties.

You cannot have forgotten that it was the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party which, in its letter to you on the eve of the Bucharest meeting of 1960, proposed the formation of a committee to draft the documents for the Moscow meeting of 1960, and that the twenty-six members of the drafting committee were subsequently decided on through consultation among the fraternal Parties. These twenty-six fraternal Parties were only members of the drafting committee for the Moscow meeting of 1960, and they have no hereditary

rights; they are not the members of a permanent organization for preparing all international meetings; moreover, no such permanent organization has ever existed.

We have already said in our letter of May 7, 1964 that the situation now is vastly different from that in 1960. Two Parties now exist in some of the twenty-six countries and you and we differ as to which of the two should attend the meeting, while many fraternal Parties also hold differing opinions.

On the question of convening the preparatory meeting of the international meeting and its participants, it is necessary to achieve unanimity through consultation among the fraternal Parties, or otherwise no preparatory meeting of whatever kind will be legal.

Second, on the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties. The Communist Party of China and many fraternal Parties maintain that the holding of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties is a necessary preparatory step for the convening of the international meeting. You also said so in the past. Even in your letter of March 7 this year you still talked about “the necessity of continuing the bilateral meeting of representatives of the CPSU and the CPC, and of afterwards preparing and calling a meeting of all the Communist and Workers’ Parties”.

But in your present letter you separate the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties from the preparatory work for the international meeting of the fraternal Parties and avoid giving an answer to the concrete proposal in our letter of May 7 concerning the continuance of these bilateral talks, only mentioning vaguely that the question of these talks “can be decided at any time by

agreement between the CPSU and CPC". Clearly, you now regard the occurrence or non-occurrence of the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties as of little import and are trying to brush them aside and to prepare and call an international meeting without attaining an agreement through consultation between our two Parties. What is this if not a resolve to call a meeting to precipitate a split?

Third, on the composition of the international meeting of the fraternal Parties. It is stated in your letter that all those Parties which took part in the meetings of 1957 and 1960 and signed their documents are entitled to attend. What is the meaning of this? Everyone is aware that the renegade Tito clique took part in the meeting of 1957 and signed the "Peace Manifesto". Obviously, you intend to smuggle the Tito clique — a clique which the 1960 meeting unanimously condemned — into the international meeting of the fraternal Parties. We are strongly opposed to this.

On the question of new participants in the international meeting, you have put forward in your letter a most absurd criterion, according to which only those Parties supporting your revisionist "general line" should participate, while the Marxist-Leninist Parties which have been rebuilt after breaking with revisionism would not be allowed to participate. We tell you frankly, this will never do. If the international meeting of the fraternal Parties is to be a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, these Marxist-Leninist Parties will of course be entitled to participate, and no one has any right to exclude them. If you intend to hold a schismatic meeting of revisionists, it is absolutely futile for you to expect the Marxist-Leninist Parties to join you in your

scheme for splitting the international communist movement.

Fourth, on the question of the convener of an international meeting of the fraternal Parties. In your letter you say that the CPSU has a "special responsibility" in the matter of calling international meetings, and you quote the decision of the meeting of 1957 and Comrade Mao Tse-tung's speech. But the wording of the decision you quote is clear: "Entrust the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with the function of convening Meetings of the Communist and Workers' Parties in consultation with the fraternal parties." In other words, the CPSU must hold consultations with the fraternal Parties before calling any meeting. In referring to the CPSU's initiative in calling international meetings, Comrade Mao Tse-tung presupposed prior consultations with the fraternal Parties, and there has never been the slightest implication that you may act arbitrarily. Moreover, we wish to point out that the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation among the fraternal Parties was established at the meeting of the fraternal Parties in 1960. Therefore, it is necessary to get the unanimous approval of the fraternal Parties to call an international meeting, and in no case should some of the fraternal Parties impose their will on others and compel them to agree to the holding of a meeting. Should you dare to violate this principle by refusing to reach a unanimous agreement through consultation with all the fraternal Parties, you will have no right whatsoever to call any international meeting.

On all the above questions concerning the procedure and steps for preparing and convening an international meeting, the fraternal Parties of the world, including the old ones and those rebuilt or newly founded, may hold

different views, all of which should be fully respected and given ample consideration. Unanimous agreement must be reached among the fraternal Parties on these questions in accordance with the principle of consultation on an equal footing and through bilateral or multi-lateral talks. It would be completely illegal for you to prepare and call a meeting by issuing commands as though you were an overlord, and to do so would likewise serve to show that you are determined to call a meeting to bring about an open split.

(IV)

In recent years, the forces of Marxism-Leninism in all parts of the world have rapidly grown and gained strength in the struggle against modern revisionism. Marxist-Leninists in many countries have come out boldly against the revisionists' divisive activities and they have rebuilt Marxist-Leninist Parties or groups in a very short time. They have demonstrated the great revolutionary spirit and heroic militancy of fighters for communism and have brought about a very promising situation for the revolutionary movement in their countries. In this struggle the modern revisionists are increasingly revealing their true features in their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism. The revisionist leading cliques of many Parties have been brushed aside by the revolutionary people. All this runs counter to your desires, makes you anxious and uneasy and strikes terror into your hearts.

Your letter brazenly charges us with "the intensification of factional, disruptive activities, and the utmost exacerbation of polemics". This only serves to show that

you are so terrified by the mighty forces of Marxism-Leninism that you have taken leave of your senses and are talking nonsense.

The splits that have occurred in the Communist Parties of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Ceylon and many other countries are the result of your own pursuit of a revisionist and divisive line and of your own frenzied subversive and factional activities. It is you yourselves who, by waving the baton, have imposed the revisionist line on a number of fraternal Parties, directed their revisionist leaders arbitrarily to push aside and persecute Marxist-Leninists and even to expel them, and thus precipitated the splits in these Parties. Because the Marxist-Leninists in these Parties are deprived of their right to wage inner-Party struggle against revisionism, they are compelled to rebuild revolutionary parties of the proletariat in order to continue the anti-revisionist struggle. The more you persist in your revisionist and divisive line, the greater will be the number of Marxist-Leninists who will rebuild revolutionary parties of the proletariat and wage struggle against you. This is the inexorable logic of the struggle.

You set yourselves up as the supreme arbiter of the international communist movement, saying that the Marxist-Leninist groups and Parties which have been rebuilt or newly founded "are outside the communist movement, and no power on earth can drag them into its ranks". It seems as though nothing may exist on earth without your recognition or approval. This is the philosophy of all decaying forces in relation to new-born forces. All the new-born forces in the history of mankind have grown and gained strength despite the extreme reluctance of decaying forces to recognize them. Neither

the refusal of the revisionists of the Second International to recognize the Bolshevik Party of Lenin nor the U.S. imperialists' non-recognition of the Soviet state in the past and of the People's Republic of China in the present succeeded in preventing their growth. The new-born forces of Marxism-Leninism will continue to exist and grow throughout the world despite your refusal to recognize them. The more vicious your vituperation, the clearer the proof that they are doing the right thing and doing it effectively.

Contrary to your attitude, the Communist Party of China and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties show great admiration for those Marxist-Leninists who have rebuilt revolutionary parties of the proletariat. It is our unshirkable proletarian internationalist duty to maintain close ties with them and to give firm support to their revolutionary struggle. We did so before, we are doing so now, and, however you may revile us, we will continue to do so in the future and do it more and do it better.

Furthermore, we must warn you that your interference in and subversion of fraternal Parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism and oppose revisionism are doomed to complete failure. Such despicable actions on your part only serve to expose your ugly features in colluding with the reactionaries and sabotaging the people's revolutionary struggles. Recently you unilaterally published your letters to the Central Committee of the Japanese Communist Party and unscrupulously launched open attacks on the valiant Japanese Party which is standing in the forefront of the struggle against U.S. imperialism and domestic reaction. You work hand in glove with the U.S. and Japanese reactionaries and support Yoshio Shiga, Ichizo Suzuki and other renegades from the Japanese

Communist Party in your efforts to subvert the Japanese Party and to undermine the revolutionary movement in Japan. We resolutely oppose your criminal action which is a betrayal of proletarian internationalism. We strongly support the struggle of the Japanese Communist Party against your interference and subversion. We resolutely support the struggle of the Indonesian Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties against your disruptive activities.

Speaking of the public polemics, everybody knows that you started them yourselves. At first, you were determined to conduct public polemics, you refused to listen to any advice, and the more you were urged not to do so, the more active you became. You imagined that by keeping up the polemics you could overwhelm the Marxist-Leninists and wipe them off the face of the earth. But things have rapidly developed in a direction opposite to your wishes. In the present great debate your true features as revisionists have been rapidly exposed and in some respects thoroughly exposed, while the forces of Marxism-Leninism have grown rapidly. This great debate has become a furnace throwing off the dross of revisionism, and it portends an inevitable new upsurge in the proletarian world revolution. Today, it is no use your fearing or trying to suppress it. You kindled the fire, the flames of public polemics have spread all over the world, and how is it possible for you to wrap them up in paper now?

In your letter you charge us with "planning to carry on the public polemics endlessly". We can tell you that we have not finished replying to your Open Letter of July 14, 1963 and have not yet begun to reply to the anti-

Chinese report and anti-Chinese decision of your February Plenum this year, and we reserve the right to reply to the more than three thousand anti-Chinese articles and other items you have published over the past year. So long as you persist in your revisionist line and refuse to admit your errors publicly, we will certainly continue the great debate. Since you have put forward an out-and-out revisionist programme and persisted in imposing it on the international communist movement, it is only natural that we, as a serious Marxist-Leninist Party, should thoroughly expose and refute your revisionism. Without thoroughly clarifying such major issues of principle as the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism and the general line of the international communist movement, how can there be a basis for the unity of the fraternal Parties and how can an international meeting of the fraternal Parties be held successfully?

Your letter once again rejects our proposal for the publication by each side in its own press of the articles and material of the other side in the polemics. Apparently our proposal has made you tremble with fear. Your argument is that you refuse to reprint our material in order to avoid undermining the Soviet people's "feeling of friendship and fraternity" for the Communist Party and the people of China. This is indeed strange logic. Are you not undermining Sino-Soviet friendship when you publish thousands of articles and other items, slandering and vilifying the Communist Party of China and do your worst to confuse people with lies? You malign us as "pseudo-Marxists" and "modern Trotskyites"; as adherents of "petty-bourgeois Utopianism in an undisguised form", "plain anti-Sovietism", "anti-communism",

"bellicose nationalism", "racism", "great-Han chauvinism" and "hegemonism"; as "Peking apostates", "modern strike-breakers of the revolution", "pseudo-revolutionaries" and "spiritual fathers of the present-day Right-wing socialists"; as "falling into the company of the forces of imperialist reaction" and "the company of inveterate colonialists", etc. Can it be that you are defending Sino-Soviet friendship by this torrent of abuse? You reject our proposal and dare not publish our articles and material which present the facts and reason matters out, because you are well aware that the broad masses of the Soviet people and of the members of the CPSU really cherish Sino-Soviet friendship and are able to distinguish between right and wrong, and because it will be still more difficult for you to keep on going once they have read our articles and know the truth.

To boost your own morale, you say in your letter that the more time passes, the more life will prove you right and us wrong. If so, why are you so jittery? Why are you shouting yourselves hoarse in cursing the new-born forces of Marxism-Leninism? Why are you so anxiously asking for a stop to the public polemics? Why are you so hastily preparing an international meeting? Isn't it best for you to let time prove that our line is wrong? To get to the root of the matter, time is not on your side, and you have lost faith in your own future. Reality is a compelling force and your letter, which lacks reason and conviction and is characterized by a mouse-like timidity despite its air of ferocity, reflects your state of mind. But what can be done about it? All this is of your own making. You have picked up a rock only to drop it on your own toes, and who else is to blame?

(V)

The Communist Party of China persists in its stand for an international meeting of the fraternal Parties for unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, to be held after ample preparations, and we are firmly opposed to your schismatic meeting.

The Central Committee of the CPC solemnly declares: We will never take part in any international meeting, or any preparatory meeting for it, which you call for the purpose of splitting the international communist movement.

It is clear to everyone that, as the differences in the international communist movement are so serious and the dispute is so fierce, a hasty international meeting can yield only bad results and not good ones. Should you disregard our solemn warning, discard the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation and insist on calling an international meeting unilaterally and illegally, the only consequence will be an open split.

During the fourteen years from the dissolution of the Communist International in 1943 to 1957, there was not a single international meeting of all Communist Parties. But this did not hinder the progress of the cause of international communism. On the contrary, during those fourteen years, the Chinese revolution triumphed, the revolutions of different types in a number of countries in East Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America triumphed, and the revolutionary cause in other countries made great progress. Experience has proved that the most important thing for a Communist Party is to be able to integrate the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution in its

own country, to adhere to a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line and to carry on the revolutionary struggle independently. Wherever this is done, the people's revolutionary cause will advance step by step towards victory, and a contribution will be made to the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat. Wherever this is not done, the revolutionary cause will suffer setbacks and defeats.

Since 1957, two international meetings of the fraternal Parties have been held. The 1957 meeting charted a common programme for the international communist movement. But soon after the meeting you abandoned the revolutionary principles of the Declaration, energetically pushed ahead with your revisionist line and tried to impose it upon fraternal Parties. At the 1960 meeting of fraternal Parties, our Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties justly criticized your line of revisionism. However, you did not in the least repent and mend your ways but cast aside the revolutionary principles of the 1960 Statement, stuck to your anti-Marxist-Leninist stand and kept on widening and deepening the differences in the international communist movement. In these circumstances, how can a meeting of unity based on Marxism-Leninism be held?

That is why we say, "It would be better to hold the international meeting of fraternal Parties later rather than earlier, or even not to hold it, in these circumstances." No harm was done but much good occurred during the fourteen years when no international meeting of the fraternal Parties was held. Why should a meeting be called in such a great hurry now?

Now you want to convene a grand assembly for a split — rather it should be called a minor schismatic gather-

ing. In relation to the total number of Communists in the world, those who really believe in revisionism constitute only a small fraction, and they are bound to come to grief. The revisionists are seriously disunited and divergent in their views. There are some who dance obediently in response to your baton, but their number is dwindling. Therefore, history will prove that the meeting you intend to call unilaterally and forcibly, without consultation with the fraternal Parties and without their agreement, can be nothing but an insignificant meeting which is against communism, against the people and against the revolution and which serves the bourgeoisie, like the "congresses" called by the Second International to oppose Leninism.

Since you have made up your minds, you will most probably call the meeting. Otherwise, by breaking your word would you not become a laughing-stock down the centuries? As the saying goes, you can't dismount from the tiger you are riding. You are caught in an insoluble dilemma. You are falling into a trap of your own making and will end by losing your skin. If you do not call the meeting, people will say that you have followed the advice of the Chinese and the Marxist-Leninist Parties, and you will lose face. If you do call the meeting, you will land yourselves in an impasse without any way out. In the present historical juncture this is a grave crisis for you revisionists, a crisis of your own making. Are you not aware of it? We firmly believe that the day your so-called meeting takes place will be the day you step into your grave.

Dear comrades! Once again we sincerely advise you to rein in on the brink of the precipice and not to prize

such false and useless "face-saving". But if you refuse to listen and are determined to take the road to doom, well, suit yourselves! Then we will only be able to say:

*Flowers fall off, do what one may;
Swallows return, no strangers they.*

With fraternal greetings,

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

**LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE CPSU OF JUNE 15, 1964 TO
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE CPC**

To the Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China

Dear comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has received your letter of May 7, which contains an answer to ours of March 7 last. In your letter you not only reject all the proposals of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist Parties aimed at overcoming the difficulties in the communist movement, but virtually refuse to meet with representatives of parties, to hold talks and discuss with them common problems of concern to the Communists of the whole world. Never before has the CC CPC so frankly expressed its scorn of the opinion of fraternal parties, and its refusal to lend ear to them and take part in a joint search for ways of overcoming the differences. The entire content of your letter, as well as its rude tone, shows that for all the numerous CC CPC declarations to the effect that it is anxious to prevent a split and uphold unity, you do not want the differences to be overcome, and in practice oppose the unity of the world communist movement. You even make no attempt to deny that your aim is to

have your hands free in order to carry on factional, splitting activities. This is the only way the Marxist-Leninist parties that are concerned about the difficulties which have arisen within our movement can interpret your letter.

In sending you its letter of March 7, the CC CPSU believed that the situation in the world communist movement called for a collective examination of the difficulties, a collective formulation of advisable ways of overcoming them, and for unity of all the fraternal parties. With these aims in view, we proposed calling a CPSU-CPC meeting and a preparatory conference of delegates from twenty-six parties as speedily as possible, and holding a world Meeting even this year, by agreement among the fraternal parties. We felt that open polemics must be discontinued and all manner of subversive, splitting activities within the socialist commonwealth and the communist movement—practices which have already done considerable harm to our cause—renounced if those measures were to succeed. We reckoned with the will of most of the fraternal parties, which insist that CPSU and CPC delegates meet and that an international Communist forum be held to discuss the problems that have arisen in a comradely atmosphere, within the fraternal family of Communists, and remove the divergencies caused by the CPC leaders' splitting activities.

The proposals put forward in the CC CPSU letter of March 7 were actively supported by the world communist movement. By now the overwhelming majority of the fraternal parties have declared for convening a Meeting without delay. Some parties, while favouring a conference in principle, make certain reservations as to

the specific time when it should be called, bearing in mind your opposition to a Meeting. But as far as we know no leadership of any party, except that of the CPC and the Albanian Party of Labour, rejects the necessity for collective measures to overcome the difficulties in the communist movement and promote its unity.

The CC CPC letter of May 7 proposes postponing the conference for "four or five years or more" and, moreover, declares that "it would even be better not to convene it than to convene it." Once again you put off for a long time the bilateral meeting which the CC CPC proposed a short time ago holding in October 1964, and make such reservations to your consent to it as give cause for doubt whether the Chinese side is interested in it at all.

We state, therefore, that the CC CPC is going back on its own proposals. The CPC leaders have for a long time posed as initiators of an early conference, making it appear as if the CPSU were against it. When, in the winter of 1962, the Communist parties of Indonesia, Vietnam and New Zealand proposed a conference, you supported their proposal. You wrote on April 7, 1962, that a conference would be of "topical, positive significance in overcoming the differences existing between fraternal parties today." At the end of 1962 that attitude of the CC CPC was publicly reaffirmed in the speeches made by your delegations at the congresses of the fraternal parties of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Afterwards you declared for a conference in your letters to the CC CPSU of March 9, 1963, and June 14, 1963. Lastly, your letter of February 29, 1964, said in black and white: "The Communist Party of China invariably favours a

conference of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties of all countries, and actively supports it."

Nevertheless, the CC CPSU and other fraternal parties had only to put the question of a conference on a specific basis for you to make a volte-face. Anyone will be struck by the extremely contradictory and illogical position of the CC CPC. Until recently you enthusiastically supported the idea of a conference, and were even proud of having been the first to support the proposal for convening it because you considered it useful. Today the CPC leaders say something different. From what they say, a conference would be untimely and would, indeed, threaten the communist movement with all sorts of calamities. That wavering seems to be due solely to the fact that you have never before thought seriously of a conference—any more than you do now—because you could not count on support for your ideological and political platform on the part of a world Communist forum. It is legitimate to presume that the CC CPC is little concerned about the problem of preserving and strengthening the unity of the communist movement and that it is turning the issue of a conference into an object for an unseemly political game to breed more difficulties.

Although you vigorously flaunt your indifference to the opinion of other parties and declare that you are unafraid of a "resolute rebuff" from them, in fact you are afraid to attend a world Communist conference because you are anxious to evade a fair and straightforward discussion, and a comparison of your erroneous platform and the line of the world communist movement.

Your objections to a conference are utterly indefensible. You contend that a world conference, like a CPC-CPSU meeting, would merely "end in a quarrel and in all parties going away without achieving any results," and that "there will be an open split and everyone will go his own way."

No one can pose the issue like that or predict a split as the result of a conference unless he himself has decided on a split. Indeed, if at a conference the line pursued is one of aggravating differences and if its purpose is seen as one of condemning someone, slapping on offensive labels and making irresponsible charges, the result may be further dissociation rather than greater unity.

But the CPSU and those fraternal parties which at every stage of the differences have consistently favoured a new international meeting emphatically reject such a line, the very idea of such an approach to a conference. As far as we are concerned, the issue of a conference is inseparable from the problem of maintaining and promoting the unity of our movement. We believe that in view of the differences which the Communist movement has come up against, it is necessary, first and foremost, to concentrate on revealing what the fraternal parties have in common and what unites them, on seeking ways of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen. Fraternal parties have no better method for overcoming differences and formulating common positions than a collective exchange of views at an international forum that would enable each party to fully retain its sovereignty and yet take an active part in formulating the common line of the world communist movement.

The differences and disputes which have broken out in the communist movement and are causing it considerable damage affect the interests of every single party. That is why each party is entitled and obliged to contribute to the discussion and solution of urgent problems and to the common cause of promoting unity. It is precisely a conference that would give each party an opportunity to hear all opinions and state its point of view frankly and seriously, so that it could subsequently be taken into consideration when a common line and common decisions were formulated.

As regards the CPSU, in proposing a conference, it aims — in full accordance with the principles established within the communist movement after the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU and the Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960 — to pursue at it a line for unity, the normalisation of the situation in our movement, and a serious discussion of disputed issues, such as will make for greater unity on the basis of principle, and not for an aggravation of differences. It is our deep conviction that there are no insurmountable obstacles to this. All that is necessary is for every participant in an international meeting to show at least a minimum of goodwill, to be willing to listen carefully to other opinions and to understand them, and seek for ways to unity and not to dissociation. If the representatives of every party show an interest in overcoming the difficulties, and if the CPC delegation attends the proposed conference with a desire to seek mutual understanding with the other participants, and with a constructive programme, which the CPSU and other parties think necessary, then the conference may become a turning point in the effort for greater unity.

The CC CPSU is perfectly aware that the divergencies between the CC CPC and other fraternal parties are very serious and have gone far. A good deal of extraneous matter, of artificialities which hinder mutual understanding, has accumulated in the relations between the two parties. A whole series of fundamental differences over highly important problems of today and of the policies of world communism have emerged and become acute. It is possible, therefore, that whatever the efforts which the Marxist-Leninist parties may make, the conference may not fully succeed in arriving at a common view on all matters. The CC CPSU is convinced, however, that even such an outcome of the conference will not amount to a split, which the CPC leaders persistently forecast. Even in a case like that, we think it possible to reach at the conference an agreement that the Communist parties commit themselves to take account of the opinions of all the conference delegates, all the Marxist-Leninist parties, to cooperate conscientiously in those fields in which their positions and interests will have turned out to be common, and refrain from any further action aggravating the difficulties and gratifying none but the class enemy. One may well ask: given this approach, why should a conference lead to a split or so much as worsen the situation in the communist movement?

We consider that the procedure for the conference proceedings suggested by us fully accords with the standards and principles of relations between Communist parties and is perfectly realistic. It is a question of really showing elementary concern for unity, tolerance and good faith, which the communist movement has a right to expect from any one of its contingents. There can

be no doubt at all as to the success of a conference provided every fraternal party and its leaders are aware of their historic responsibility for the destinies of our movement and realise the gravity of the situation and the possible consequences of a split.

In upholding the idea of a new international meeting, the CC CPSU maintains that it is indispensable not only for overcoming the differences, important as this task may be in itself. Communists should not for one moment forget their responsibility in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and national independence, for a successful advance along the road of socialism and communism.

About four years have passed since the last world conference. In this period, many important changes have taken place in the world which require study, generalisation and conclusions. The world socialist system has made notable progress in the past years. Its economic power has increased, and so has its political and ideological impact on world development. Most of the socialist countries are completing an important period of their development and are approaching new heights in the construction of a new society. Their further advance to socialism and communism makes it increasingly imperative to improve the forms of cooperation and mutual assistance, exchanges of experience, and coordination of political and economic activities.

Two opposed world policies are in evidence today, more clearly than ever before. One is directed towards preserving peace and promoting peaceful coexistence; it is pursued by the socialist countries and is supported by the majority of mankind. The other is aimed at increasing international tension and the war menace; it is

pursued by the imperialist reactionaries led by the wildmen of the US and other imperialist powers. The past years have shown how very correct were the Communist parties: conclusions regarding the possibility of averting war and isolating and defeating the forces opposed to peace.

The recent period has seen even more obvious signs of an aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, of the growth of the social and political antagonisms rending the capitalist system both within bourgeois society and internationally. There is now much that is new in the forms of organisation and the methods used by the working class of the capitalist countries in fighting for its immediate and ultimate goals. The disintegration of imperialism's colonial system has entered its closing stage. The newly-free nations' irresistible desire for socialism, and their effort to take the non-capitalist road of development has become particularly evident in recent years.

The revolutionary movement, and the champions of peace and socialism now have new great opportunities, and we Communists should think of the best ways of using these opportunities in the interests of the working class and all nations.

We are firmly convinced that a conference would be just the place to make a collective analysis of new economic and socio-political developments and processes, coordinate appraisals and positions, and enrich and specify the common political line accordingly. We state with satisfaction that the general line of the world communist movement, as defined in the 1957 and 1960 documents, has been proved by reality to be perfectly correct and has brought fraternal parties further achievements.

On the other hand, there is now a pressing need to meet in order to sum up the progress made, compare notes, review the problems confronting world communism and, in keeping with the changes that have occurred in the international situation, supplement and elaborate the ideas of the Declaration and Statement, and creatively examine and solve new problems.

In the light of all these tasks, the CC CPC proposal for putting off a new world conference for a long time is particularly unacceptable. All indications are that the conference is indispensable and the question of convening it cannot be shelved.

The most important thing, however, is, as the CC CPSU sees it, for every Marxist-Leninist party to contribute even today, regardless of the specific date of a new World Meeting, to the cause which the Meeting is to serve, that is, to the unity of the Communists of the world, and to the effort towards attaining common goals. At the moment it is important for every fraternal party to fight for these goals still more actively. Every fraternal party is faced with tasks brooking no delay; it must make a thorough study of the situation that has developed in the communist movement, participate constructively in the discussion of difficulties and in the search for ways of overcoming them and subordinate its everyday activities to the interests of the international unity of our ranks. This is the practical method for proving one's loyalty to the principles and exigencies of proletarian internationalism and to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. It is also the surest way to convene and successfully carry through a world Communist forum. We are emphatically against making the issue of the date of a conference a pretext for further argument and a

stumbling-block to the solution of the main tasks confronting the communist movement. However, we are emphatically against postponing a conference for "four or five years or more," which is what the CC CPC proposes.

Such is our position on the main issue raised in the latest letters which the CC CPSU and the CC CPC have exchanged concerning the aims and prospects of a new World Meeting.

The CC CPC letter of May 7 deals with a number of other problems, both concerning a world meeting and having no direct bearing on it. Among them is, for example, the question of the procedure of convening the conference.

The CC CPC asserts that in present-day conditions no one has a right to call a world conference since there is no permanent body of the Comintern type. From the point of view of the democratic principles of which the communist movement is based, it must be recognised that any party or group of parties is free to take such an initiative. In that event it is the duty of the other contingents of the communist movement to carefully examine and support that initiative, provided it benefits our common cause. As for the CPSU, it will be recalled that the fraternal parties have placed on it a special responsibility with regard to the convening of world meetings. The decision adopted by the 1957 Meeting reads: "Entrust the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with the function of convening Meetings of the Communist and Workers' Parties in consultation with the fraternal parties." This decision was passed unanimously, with the CPC delegation participating. What is more, Comrade Mao Tse-tung, who spoke at the afternoon

sitting of November 14, 1957, said that "it is necessary to recognise the CPSU as the party which should take the initiative in calling Meetings."

We are citing these facts to establish the truth and prevent the issue of the initiative in calling a Meeting from being made a new object of argument and a pretext for delaying a world forum of fraternal parties, which has become urgent.

The CC CPC, raising one obstacle after another to a Meeting, writes that there is a need of "great preparatory work." Our Party has always considered that the conference has to be prepared for carefully if it is to succeed. It is with this aim in view that we have proposed again and again stopping public polemics and renouncing the methods of factional activity within the world communist movement.

Everything suggests that the CC CPC, in speaking of "preparatory work," means something that is the exact opposite of it, namely, the intensification of factional, disruptive activities, and the utmost exacerbation of polemics. Frankly speaking, that is, in effect, the true reason for the Chinese leaders' stalling. At a time when the struggle is becoming more and more acute, it counts, as everything seems to indicate, on forming a bloc of parties and groups subservient to Peking. Another fact indicating this is that you are now openly trying to secure the invitation to the Meeting of fellow-thinkers you have recruited in various countries.

Since the CC CPC is turning the question of the composition of the Meeting into another point of difference, we consider it necessary to state our attitude to it. We are of the opinion that all those parties which took part in the Meetings of 1957 and 1960 and signed their docu-

ments are entitled to attend. This is all the more so because the differences in the communist movement concern the interpretation of the Declaration and Statement. Obviously, only a forum of the parties which formulated and signed those documents are in a position to interpret them correctly. Only the conference itself has a right to decide whether any new participants should be invited. In the years that have passed since the last world Meeting there have arisen in several countries (including some African countries) parties which agree with and implement the general line of the communist movement expressed in the Declaration and Statement and are the recognised spokesmen of the working-class movement of their countries. Naturally, those parties are entitled to expect an invitation to attend the new international meeting.

But when the CC CPC poses the question of inviting new participants to the Meeting, it is thinking not of those parties but of the anti-party factional groups which it has brought into being and which it designates by the high-sounding name of "parties." However, those groups do not represent the working-class movement of their countries but have been artificially set up from without. It is no chance coincidence that the anti-party groups in Australia, Brazil, Belgium, Ceylon and some other countries sprang up just when the CC CPC launched its factional activities within the world communist movement. Secondly, those groups do not adhere, either in theory or in practice, to the general line of the world communist movement defined in the Declaration and Statement. On the contrary, the views they advocate betray them completely as opponents of this line. Thirdly, they are made up of anti-party opposition elements ex-

pelled from Marxist-Leninist parties and fighting against lawfully elected central committees, against tested leaders of those parties who enjoy prestige. It is indicative of the political character and composition of those groups that they have been joined by Trotskyists, anarchists and all manner of renegades and apostates. It should be said in so many words that this type of adherents to the Chinese leadership's line is no credit to it. No matter how hard you try to represent those impostors as "true revolutionaries," they are outside the communist movement, and no power on earth can drag them into its ranks.

The CC CPSU cannot overlook the attempts the letter from the CC CPC of May 7 makes to defame the tested Marxist-Leninist parties of Australia, Brazil and India. We emphatically reject the unworthy methods by which the leaders of one party, the Communist Party of China, lay claim to a special position in the communist movement, to the right to pass judgement on parties as a whole and their leaders and arbitrarily decide issues that are only for the working class of the given country to decide.

If you persist in this sort of "preparatory work" for the Meeting, i.e., strive to extend factional activity, you will only confirm the established opinion that the CPC leadership is taking matters directly towards a split.

The striving of the CC CPC to aggravate the open polemics in the communist movement has long become obvious. The propaganda campaign started by it has gone beyond the framework of any ideological polemics and developed into an open political struggle against Marxist-Leninist parties. It has nothing in common with an elucidation of the truth, with the working out of pressing problems of the theory and policy of our movement. The content, methods and tone of your statements show that

you deliberately try to expand the range of issues, distort the real stand of the Marxist-Leninist parties, slander their leadership and turn the masses against it. It is patently clear to everybody that this is not polemics any longer but a fomenting of differences and enmity. It shatters friendship among the peoples of the socialist countries, sows confusion and distrust in the ranks of the revolutionary working-class and national liberation movement and compromises world socialism. The CPC leaders thereby bring grist to the mill of the aggressive circles of imperialism, who, as everybody knows, are eagerly helping to circulate Chinese propaganda materials.

We approach the preparations for the Meeting differently. The CC CPSU has always held that in the course of the preparations there should be a creative discussion of important problems of the communist movement on the basis of comradely exchanges of opinion as provided for by the 1960 Statement. We regard a discussion of urgent problems of Marxism-Leninism, of problems of the strategy and tactics of our movement, as normal and useful. Such discussions help to advance Marxist thinking, to bring the activity of the Communist parties closer to the requirements of reality and to work out a common policy in course of preparations for meetings and conferences. However, the CC CPC's propaganda campaign, which is hostile to the communist movement in no way serves this purpose.

You threaten that you intend answering "the more than two thousand anti-Chinese articles and materials" allegedly published in the Soviet press as well as "the numerous decisions, statements and articles of several tens of fraternal parties." In other words, you plan to carry on the public polemics endlessly. That, evidently,

is your objective. You started the polemics, forced the fraternal parties to give a rebuff to your erroneous views and now, under the guise of "answers," you intend to extend the political struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties still further.

The CC CPC's proposal, contained in its letter of May 7, for concluding an agreement between the two Parties to publish materials of the other side in their press unambiguously exposes your design, which is to fan the polemics to even greater proportions.

We should like to note that while there was hope that the discussion would not go beyond a principled debate of theoretical and political issues we reprinted some Chinese materials in our press. But when it became clear that it was not a principled discussion but hostile propaganda we had to change our approach to this question. No Communist party has ever undertaken to reprint, circulate and propagate slanderous materials that are alien to socialism. No matter from whom such materials come, they help only the reactionary circles of imperialism in their struggle against world socialism.

The reprinting of articles in which our country is accused of "plotting with US imperialism," "betraying the revolution" and "restoring" capitalist practices would have served no purpose other than to undermine our people's feeling of friendship and fraternity for the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people, who, of course, cannot bear the responsibility for the present actions of their leaders. By printing a succession of such articles, the Soviet press would have had to answer each one of them. The polemics with the Chinese leadership would have thus become the prime content of our country's entire ideological life. This would have meant

distracting the attention of the Party and the people from the cardinal tasks, namely communist construction, the struggle against imperialism and aid to the revolutionary working-class and national-liberation movements. It is clear that this is something our Party will not do.

It must be reiterated that all your thoughts are directed towards further aggravating the polemics, intensifying factional activity and rejecting any collective discussion of the problems facing the communist movement. On all questions worrying Communists throughout the world, the CC CPC has taken a stand that runs counter to the common interests of our movement, to the interests of strengthening the unity of its ranks.

In this light, facts gainsay the claim that the CC CPC "consistently defends unity and struggles against a split" and that it is "making unflinching efforts to remove differences." Under present conditions, as never before, the struggle for unity requires practical constructive action. However, your actions are aimed at hindering the settlement of the differences and worsening the situation in every possible way. The negative approach which runs through the CC CPC letter of May 7, and the utter unwillingness to meet the initiative of the fraternal parties half way can have only one explanation, namely, that the Chinese leaders do not wish to take into consideration the opinions and interests of the overwhelming majority of the Communist parties, that they are waging a bitter struggle against them and deliberately seeking to split the communist movement.

It is clear to all the participants in the communist movement that by postponing a world meeting to a remote date, the CC CPC hopes in that time to increase the number of its supporters, turn them into obedient tools of

its policy and thereby attempt to create favourable conditions for itself at this future meeting. One does not have to be a prophet to forecast the complete failure of these calculations. We have not the least doubt that with time life will prove with increasing force the indefensibility of the ideological and political platform and tactical line that the CPC leaders are trying to impose upon the communist movement. The unseemly objective pursued by the Chinese leadership will become increasingly clear and those who have been temporarily deluded will see the light. It goes without saying that the splitting activity of the CC CPC can inflict and has already inflicted harm on the communist movement, particularly on those of its contingents that are waging a struggle for the cause of the working class, against imperialist reaction in the capitalist countries under the difficult conditions. But each step forward in the struggle of the working class and each new success in the development of the world socialist system will deal a blow at the erroneous and unrealistic propositions of the Chinese leaders and will prove the correctness and vitality of the Leninist line of the communist movement.

In its letter the CC CPC touches upon certain points of its ideological and political differences with the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. Our Party has repeatedly set forth its stand on these points. We therefore do not find it necessary to return to them again in this letter, especially as your letter contains nothing new. For a long time you have subsisted on outright abuse and on the slapping on of labels, substituting this for an honest discussion of questions on which the CC CPC has its own special opinion. The CC CPSU emphatically rejects as patent slander your irresponsible assertion

that the CPSU "strives for an alliance with US imperialism with every fibre of its body," "opposes the national liberation movement and the proletarian revolution" and is "plotting a major conspiracy, an open split of the socialist camp and the world communist movement." Statements of this kind only discredit those who make them, those who take the liberty of making such malicious attacks against the first country of victorious socialism, a country that carries the main burden of the struggle against imperialism. Who are these clumsy fabrications intended for? Do you seriously hope to find simpletons who would believe such slander? The real purport of your assertions is that you want to delude the masses of China, set them against the Soviet people, who are the friend and brother of the Chinese workers and peasants. All this benefits only the imperialist reaction, whose cherished hope is to split the peoples of the socialist countries, sow enmity among them and bring them into conflict with each other.

With these acts you are trying to screen the real essence of the differences that you actually have with the present political line of the world communist movement. Throughout the world, Marxist-Leninists have long ago realised that the Chinese leaders have drifted away from the communist movement in such questions as war and peace, the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, the ways of accomplishing the socialist revolution, the role and ways of furthering the national liberation movement, the struggle against the ideology and practice of the personality cult and the methods of building socialism and communism.

From all the rooftops you claim that you are irreconcilable adversaries of the ideas put forward by the Twen-

tieth CPSU Congress. It is in vain that you are proud of this, comrades! You must realise that more than anything else this betrays you as the people who today adhere to outdated positions, which have long been rejected by life, by the practice of the entire world liberation movement, the entire world communist movement. The Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, as is recognised by the entire world communist movement and officially affirmed in the Declaration and Statement, initiated a new stage in the development of our movement. It has become the symbol of the creative spirit of Leninism, of a new line of the entire world communist movement, a symbol of the change from the ideology and practices of the Stalin personality cult to Leninist principles and norms.

This was the change that laid the foundation for further successes in the struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism, for an enhancement of the prestige and influence of the world communist movement, for its transition to a fresh offensive against the forces of reaction and war. The savage attacks against the decisions of the Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses of the CPSU, against the propositions and directives of the Declaration and Statement are nothing more than the reaction of conservative forces in the communist movement to the creative Marxism-Leninism of the modern epoch.

Evidently you do not even notice the extent to which the letter of the CC CPC of May 7 is permeated with the ideology of the personality cult. Your demonstrative disregard of the will of the fraternal parties, your undisguised attempt to avoid a collective discussion of the problems that have arisen and your methods of conduct-

ing polemics by piling up all sorts of political insinuations, of the most fantastic accusations, your intolerance and bitterness with regard to comrades-in-struggle bear the indelible imprint of personality cult practices.

The CC CPC tries to cover up its departure from the general line of the communist movement with the flag of revolution and struggle against imperialism, which is sacred to all Communists. But the real worth of this "revolutionary spirit" is shown by the practical deeds of the CPC leaders, by their entire activity aimed at splitting the revolutionary forces of modern times. Recently, for example, the meaning that the CPC leaders attach to their notorious theory of a so-called "intermediate zone" embracing, besides China, the imperialists of Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Britain, has become especially clear. The extent to which manifestations of a split in the communist movement, in the socialist camp, brings joy to the imperialists is seen by their attempts to find some way of effecting a rapprochement with those who are causing this split. Have the CPC leaders paid attention to the fact that namely today when Chinese propaganda is shouting loudest of all about "revolution" and a "struggle against imperialism," the ruling circles of these powers are displaying special readiness to establish closer relations with Peking. Even the US imperialists, as can be seen from many statements by US officials, declare that despite the bellicose tone of Chinese propaganda China is behaving "moderately" and that therefore the United States must "keep the door open" should there be changes in relations with China.

Today it is becoming increasingly clear to Marxist-Leninists throughout the world that on the lips of the CPC leaders "leftist" phrases mean nothing but a screen

for great-power designs and claims to hegemony which manifest themselves with growing clarity in their practical actions in the world and in the communist movement. We should like to warn you, comrades, that the road you are taking is extremely dangerous, that you are gambling with the destiny of the people of China and with their revolutionary gains.

You are trying to portray criticism of your anti-Leninist views and stand as an "anti-Chinese campaign." You know perfectly well that in all of our Party's documents special emphasis is laid on the heartfelt friendship of Soviet Communists for the Chinese people, to whom we have rendered and are prepared to continue rendering the utmost aid in the building of socialism. The CC CPSU is not engaged in stirring up among our people distrust and hostility towards China, towards its great people and towards the peoples of other countries.

It is precisely because we cherish the friendship between the Soviet and Chinese peoples, the unity between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China and the solidarity of the entire world liberation movement that we are not relaxing our efforts to normalise relations with the CPC despite the fact that the Chinese leadership is demonstrating with increasing clarity its unwillingness to improve these relations. Our long enduring patience and restraint are explained by the fact that we are devoted to the Leninist principles of internationalism, have our eyes on the future and believe in the ultimate triumph of these principles in the socialist community and the communist movement.

We reaffirm our stand with regard to the need for convening a World Meeting of Communist and Workers'

Parties as a reliable and tested method of securing the unity of Marxist-Leninist parties. We suggest that in the immediate future we should agree in principle that a Meeting must be convened and that it should not be put off for long, and that agreement on its specific date as well as on its agenda and composition should be reached through further consultations with the fraternal parties.

The CC CPSU considers that at the present stage the main effort should be concentrated on holding a preparatory conference. We reiterate our proposal that a preparatory conference should be convened and attended by representatives of the 26 Parties nominated by the World Meeting of Communist Parties as members of the Drafting Commission in 1960 and representing the interests of Communists in all the main regions of the world. We consider it necessary to reach agreement with the fraternal parties on the specific date of such a conference in the immediate future.

As before, the CC CPSU expresses its preparedness to hold a bilateral meeting of representatives of the CPSU and CPC on any agreed date. This question can be decided at any time by agreement between the CPSU and CPC.

A collective examination of problems of the Communist movement is at present the only true method recognised by all Communist parties. Therefore no Party can, without breaking with internationalism, hinder the convocation of the Meeting or unilaterally dictate terms under which such a Meeting must be held. All Parties are equal and, on the basis of the democratic principles proclaimed in the Declaration and Statement, jointly decide questions concerning our entire movement.

In conclusion the CC CPSU considers it necessary to emphasize that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

will firmly continue to follow the Leninist line laid down for it by the Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses and consistently implement the general line of the world communist movement as set forth in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement. Our Party and the entire Soviet people are faced with the epoch-making task of building a communist society. Together with all peace-loving forces we bear the responsibility for averting a world thermonuclear war, for the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. We shall spare no effort in the struggle for the attainment of the great goals of the modern epoch.

Such, too, is the position from which we approach the matter of surmounting difficulties in the world communist movement, and strengthening the unity of its ranks. We place the interests of world communism above all else and are guided by them in our relations with the Communist Party of China as with any other Party.

The CC CPSU should like to hope that the CC CPC studies the proposals made in this letter with all seriousness, once again weighs all the possible consequences of the stand taken by it and, on its part, takes steps that would lead to unity with all Marxist-Leninist Parties rather than to a split.

With fraternal greetings,

Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union

June 15, 1964

(Reprinted from *The Daily Review*, published by Novosti Press Agency, Moscow, Vol. X, No. 167, July 16, 1964.)

中国共产党中央委员会对于苏联共产党
中央委员会一九六四年六月十五日
来信的复信

*

外文出版社出版（北京）
1964年第一版
编号：（英）3050-983
00027
3-E-599P