REFUTATION OF THE NEW LEADERS OF THE CPSU ON "UNITED ACTION"

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

Richard
Harrison
1910

REFUTATION OF THE NEW LEADERS OF THE CPSU ON "UNITED ACTION"

by the Editorial Departments of *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*) and *Hongqi* (*Red Flag*)

(November 11, 1965)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1965

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

THE UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT MUST BE BASED ON PRINCIPLE

The history of the international communist movement is one of struggle by Marxism against opportunism and revisionism, a history of struggle by Marxists to safeguard the international unity of the proletariat and to oppose attempts by opportunists and revisionists to divide it.

Upholding the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, the Communist Party of China has always held aloft the great banner of international proletarian unity. We maintain that in the struggle against capitalism and imperialism and in the course of the world revolution, the international proletariat can defeat the enemy only through uniting its own forces and uniting with all other forces that can be united.

The founders of communist theory, Marx and Engels, advanced the fighting slogan, "Workers of all countries, unite!" This slogan has educated and inspired workers all over the world and stimulated united struggle by the working class for its emancipation. The international unity of the proletariat advocated by Marx and Engels is one of struggle to fulfil its great historical mission on a world-wide scale.

Succeeding to the cause of Marx and Engels, Lenin carried Marxism forward to a new stage. Leninism is Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution. Lenin steadfastly persevered in international proletarian unity on the basis of Marxism. In the historical conditions of rising struggle by the oppressed nations against imperialism, he put forward the fighting slogan, "Workers and oppressed nations of the world, unite!" This slogan stimulated united struggle by the working-class movement of the countries in the West and the national liberation movement of the oppressed nations

in the East. It represented a still broader unity of the international revolutionary forces.

In the light of the new changes in international class relations and the balance of forces after World War II, Comrade Mao Tse-tung advanced the slogan of establishing an international united front against U.S. imperialism. This united front has the unity of the international proletariat as its core and the unity between the international proletariat and the oppressed nations as its foundation. It means uniting closely with the masses of the people, who constitute over 90 per cent of the world's population, uniting with all the political forces subject to U.S. aggression, control, interference or bullying, and making use of every possible contradiction, all for the purpose of isolating U.S. imperialism, the main enemy of the people of the whole world, to the maximum extent and dealing it the hardest possible blows. This is the way to mobilize all the positive factors conducive to world revolution for the achievement of victory in the people's revolutionary struggle in every country. It is a strategic principle of vital importance formulated by Comrade Mao Tse-tung on the question of world revolution in the new historical conditions.

Under Comrade Mao Tse-tung's leadership, the Communist Party of China has always upheld international proletarian unity, the unity of the workers and the oppressed nations of the world, and the unity of all the forces opposing U.S. imperialism. We have carried out this line unswervingly and with great success.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the international unity of the proletariat is revolutionary unity, unity based on principle. Its achievement demands resolute and unequivocal struggle against all brands of opportunists and splitters.

Marx taught us that in the struggle to achieve international proletarian unity, there should be "no haggling about principles". When speaking on the need for principled struggle against the opportunists to achieve genuine unity, Engels said, "Unity is quite a good thing so long as it is possible, but there

are things which stand above unity", and "the development of the proletariat proceeds everywhere amidst internal struggles".[1] He also said that "people of limited intelligence . . . want to stir everything into one nondescript brew, which, the moment it is left to settle, throws up the differences again but in much sharper contrast because they will then be all in one pot".[2] Marx and Engels declared explicitly that "it is . . . impossible for us to cooperate with people who wish to expunge this class struggle from the movement".[3]

Lenin strongly condemned the revisionists of the Second International for betraying Marxism and the common cause of opposition to imperialism, for siding with the bourgeoisie of their own countries and degenerating into flunkeys of monopoly capital, into social-chauvinists and social-imperialists.

He pointed out that, far from undermining the unity of the proletarian party, the struggle against opportunism and revisionism was indispensable for its achievement. He said,

> Without struggle there cannot be any sorting out, and without sorting out there can be no successful advance, and also no *solid* unity. And those who are now beginning to struggle are by no means *destroying* unity. There is already no unity, it has already been destroyed, destroyed all along the line . . . and open and direct struggle is one of the essential conditions for restoring unity.[4]

It was precisely from the principled stand of Marxism-Leninism that the Communist Party of China waged a long

---

[1] "Engels to A. Bebel, October 28, 1882", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, p. 427.

[2] "Engels to A. Bebel, June 20, 1873", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, p. 345.

[3] "Marx and Engels to A. Bebel, W. Liebknecht, W. Bracke and Others ('Circular Letter'), September 17-18, 1879", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, p. 395.

[4] V. I. Lenin, "To A. A. Yakubova", *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., SPPL, Moscow, 1950, Vol. XXXIV, p. 32.

struggle against the revisionist leadership of the CPSU headed by Khrushchov in order to uphold the unity of the international communist movement based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and to consolidate and broaden the united front against U.S. imperialism.

Why was it that we published the two articles on the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in 1956? Why was it that we insisted on a series of revolutionary principles and delivered a memorandum on the question of peaceful transition to the Central Committee of the CPSU when the 1957 Declaration was being drawn up? Why did we publish "Long Live Leninism!" and the two other articles in 1960? Why did we systematically criticize Khrushchov's revisionist, divisive and great-power chauvinist views in our reply of September 1960 to the letter of information from the Central Committee of the CPSU? Why was it that we insisted on reaffirming a number of revolutionary principles and distributed our memorandum on the question of peaceful transition among all the fraternal Parties when the 1960 Statement was being drawn up? Why did we publish "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement", giving a comprehensive explanation of our views on a series of fundamental problems of the contemporary world revolution? Why did we publish the nine comments on the open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU, publicly repudiating Khrushchov revisionism? Why did we publish a series of documents and articles to criticize the Soviet-U.S.-British treaty, exposing the traitorous action of the Khrushchov clique in allying itself with U.S. imperialism against the people of the world? Why did we warn the Khrushchov clique in the numerous talks and exchanges of letters between the Chinese and the Soviet Parties that it must rein in on the edge of the precipice? The purpose of all this was to defend Marxism-Leninism, the unity of the international communist movement based on Marxism-Leninism and the unity of all the forces opposing U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

It was precisely the series of resolute struggles waged by the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist Parties that hastened the bankruptcy of Khrushchov revisionism and drove its founder into an impasse and finally into the grave he had dug for himself.

One year has elapsed since the fall of Khrushchov and the rise of the new leaders of the CPSU. How do the new leaders compare with Khrushchov? Have they changed Khrushchov's revisionist and divisive line? All the evidence shows that they are still pursuing his line but with double-faced tactics more cunning and hypocritical than those of Khrushchov.

In numerous speeches, documents and articles the new leaders of the CPSU have been vociferously advocating "united action" on the part of the Communist Parties and the socialist countries. They are incessantly spouting such fine words as "unity", "common struggle against the enemy", "unity against imperialism" and "joint support for the struggle of the Vietnamese people". But this is all false. Their deeds run counter to their words. At the plenary session of the Central Committee of the CPSU in September of this year, Brezhnev, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, openly denounced the Communist Party of China while prating about "unity against imperialism". This has laid bare the ugly features of the new leaders of the CPSU as protagonists of sham unity and real hostility towards China.

Just as the U.S. imperialists, the most aggressive of all the imperialists, try to disguise themselves as angels of peace, so the biggest revisionists and splitters seek to present themselves as ardent lovers of unity. The call of the new leaders of the CPSU for "united action" is nothing but a fraud.

Let us now take the lies of the new leaders of the CPSU about "united action" and refute them one by one. Let us expose their fraudulence by citing their misdeeds both internationally and at home in the course of the past year.

THE KHRUSHCHOV REVISIONISTS HAVE UNDERMINED THE COMMON BASIS OF UNITY

One of the arguments of the new leaders of the CPSU for "united action" is that all the Communist Parties have "a common ideology" and "a common programme".

Indeed, the Communist Parties should have a common ideology in Marxism-Leninism and a common programme in the revolutionary principles jointly drawn up in the Declaration of 1957 and Statement of 1960. But the Khrushchov revisionists have completely betrayed this common ideology and common programme and thoroughly undermined the common basis for unity among the Communist Parties.

The new leaders of the CPSU have faithfully taken over the mantle of Khrushchov. They have not changed into Marxist-Leninists or even into semi-Marxist-Leninists; they remain out-and-out Khrushchov revisionists, pursuing Khrushchov revisionism but without Khrushchov. In November 1964 they told the members of the Chinese Party and government delegation to their faces that there was not a shade of difference between themselves and Khrushchov on the question of the international communist movement or of relations with China. Time and again they have categorically stated that the general line adopted by the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU "was, is and will be the only, immutable, line in the entire home and foreign policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state".[1]

Like Khrushchov, the new leaders of the CPSU try to negate and oppose all anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles by preaching that "today peaceful coexistence . . . is the most important condition for the social renovation of the world",[2] that "peaceful competition" between the two systems is the sole means for the "victory of communism over capitalism

[1] L. I. Brezhnev, Speech at the Reception of the Soviet Cosmonauts, October 19, 1964.

[2] N. V. Podgorny, "Great October", *Cuba Socialista*, November 1964.

on an international scale"[1] and that the "chances" of peaceful transition "grow many times over".[2]

Like Khrushchov, the new leaders of the CPSU insist on abolishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Party of the proletariat and on setting up the "state of the whole people" and the "party of the entire people". Moreover, they say that "like the dictatorship of the proletariat, the state of the whole people is a stage conforming to law and common to all countries in the development of the socialist state"[3] and that "the transformation of our Party into a Party of the entire people" is "of great significance far beyond the borders of our country".[4]

The new leaders of the CPSU have further developed Khrushchov revisionism by openly spreading the fallacy that socialism can be achieved without the leadership of the proletariat. They say that in the capitalist world "the transition to socialist transformation in one country or another can also take place without the direct leadership of the working class".[5] Shamelessly emasculating Lenin's theory on the dictatorship of the proletariat, they allege that "Lenin did not connect the transition to the non-capitalist road with the obligatory establishment of political power under the leadership of the proletarian Party, i.e., in fact with the dictatorship of the proletariat".[6] According to this allegation of theirs, the pro-

---

[1] *The International Revolutionary Movement of the Working Class*, edited by B. N. Ponomarev (editor-in-chief) and others, Russ. ed., SPPL, Moscow, 1964, p. 214.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 269.

[3] A. Andreyev, "The Development of the Marxist-Leninist Doctrine Concerning the Socialist State in the Programme of the CPSU", *Kommunist Sovetskoi Latvi*, No. 12, 1964.

[4] Y. Frantzev, "The Role of the Masses of the People in the Historical Process", *Kommunist*, No. 18, 1964.

[5] *The International Revolutionary Movement of the Working Class*, edited by B. N. Ponomarev (editor-in-chief) and others, Russ. ed., SPPL, Moscow, 1964, p. 325.

[6] K. Brutentz, "The Contemporary Stage of the National Liberation Movement", *Kommunist*, No. 17, 1964.

letarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are totally unnecessary and the Communist Party can very well be dispensed with. In propagating this ultra-reactionary theory, which is a thorough betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, the new leaders of the CPSU are not only giving an ideological weapon to the reactionaries, who are hostile to communism and the people, but are trying to confuse those nations and peoples who are in the stage of national-democratic revolution with regard to the aim of their present struggle and to induce them to abandon their task of combating imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

The essence of the Khrushchov revisionist theory and line, which the new leaders of the CPSU are persisting in and developing further, is to protect imperialist rule in the capitalist world and restore capitalism in the socialist world.

Between the Marxist-Leninists and the Khrushchov revisionists there is a difference of fundamental line, a major difference between what is right and what is wrong. In the circumstances, how can there be "a common ideology" and "a common programme" between the Marxist-Leninists and the Khrushchov revisionists? How can there be a common basis for unity? In the circumstances, the relation between the Khrushchov revisionists and ourselves is certainly not one in which "what binds us together is much stronger than what divides us", as alleged by the new leaders of the CPSU; on all the fundamental issues of the present epoch the relation is one of sharp opposition; there are things that divide us and nothing that unites us, things that are antagonistic and nothing that is common.

Since there is such a difference of fundamental line, the achievement of unity requires either that we discard Marxism-Leninism and follow their revisionism, or that they renounce revisionism and return to the path of Marxism-Leninism. These are the only alternatives. It is impermissible and indeed utterly wrong if we take an equivocal or vague position on such a sharp question.

Are we expected to follow the new leaders of the CPSU in order to achieve unity under their revisionist programme? Wouldn't that mean that we must join them in betraying Marxism-Leninism, in putting down the people's revolutions in various countries and in acting as accomplices of the imperialists? It goes without saying that we will never do so.

Are we expected to look on and remain completely silent without criticizing, exposing and opposing the new leaders of the CPSU, while they are betraying all the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, striving for Soviet-U.S. collaboration to dominate the world and opposing the people's revolutions in various countries? Wouldn't that mean that we must also abandon Marxism-Leninism, act as their ally in opposing the people's revolutions and become the accomplice of imperialism? It goes without saying that we will never do that either.

If the new leaders of the CPSU really want unity with the Marxist-Leninists, they must change their revisionist line and honestly admit their mistakes. They must publicly and solemnly admit before the Communists and the people of the world that their Khrushchov revisionism, great-power chauvinism and splittism are wrong, publicly admit that the revisionist line and programme decided upon at the 20th and the 22nd Congresses of the CPSU are wrong, and publicly guarantee not to repeat the errors of Khrushchov revisionism. Is it possible that they will do all this?

The antagonism between Marxism-Leninism and Khrushchov revisionism is a class antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; it is the antagonism between the socialist and the capitalist roads and between the line of opposing imperialism and that of surrendering to it. It is an irreconcilable antagonism.

As Lenin said, "Unity is a great thing and a great slogan. But what the workers' cause needs is the *unity of Marxists,*

not unity between Marxists, and opponents and distorters of Marxism."[1]

UNITED ACTION IS IMPOSSIBLE WITH THOSE WHO TRANSPOSE ENEMIES AND FRIENDS

The new leaders of the CPSU argue that even if there are differences of theory and line, these can be put aside and that "united action" should be taken and "unity against the enemy" achieved in practical struggle against imperialism.

The sharpest difference of theory and line between Marxism-Leninism and Khrushchov revisionism concerns precisely the question of handling our relations with enemies and friends, in other words, the question of whether to oppose or unite with imperialism, and above all the question of whether to oppose or unite with U.S. imperialism. This difference is decisive for all the most important practical actions in the international class struggle. How can it possibly be put aside in favour of an unprincipled unity that does not distinguish between enemies and friends?

The reactionary nature of Khrushchov revisionism is expressed in concentrated form in the line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for the domination of the world. The Khrushchov clique completely transposed enemies and friends; it regarded U.S. imperialism, the arch enemy of the people of the world, as its closest friend, and the Marxist-Leninists of the world, including those of the Soviet Union, as its principal enemy.

It was precisely on this question that Khrushchov revealed himself as a renegade. It was on this question that the Marxist-Leninists of the whole world waged the sharpest struggle against the Khrushchov revisionists. And it was on this question that the Khrushchov revisionists were spurned by the revolutionary people of the world.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Unity", *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, Vol. XX, p. 232.

How have the new leaders of the CPSU acted on this question? Have they changed the line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for world domination? Have they stopped transposing enemies and friends? Have they changed from being a force allied with U.S. imperialism to one opposing it?

The facts show they have not.

Let us consider the facts:

ONE. Immediately after taking office, the new leaders of the CPSU extolled Johnson as "sensible" and "moderate". They have continued to proclaim that the Soviet Union and the United States are two super-powers on which the fate of the world depends, that "there are sufficiently broad areas for cooperation" between them, and that "there are still many unutilized potentialities".[1] Even after the rabid expansion by U.S. imperialism of its war of aggression in Viet Nam, they have kept on stressing their desire for the "development and improvement of relations with the United States of America". At times they find it necessary to talk about a tendency towards a "freeze" in Soviet-U.S. relations, but behind the scenes they are stepping up their secret diplomacy and their deals with the United States.

TWO. The signing of the partial nuclear test ban treaty by the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain was an important landmark in Khrushchov's alliance with the United States against China. Not only have the new leaders of the CPSU accepted this legacy, but with this treaty as a basis they are actively plotting new deals with the United States for the "prevention of nuclear proliferation" and similar so-called "disarmament" measures in an effort to maintain the monopoly of the two nuclear overlords, the Soviet Union and the United States, against China and all other independent countries.

---

[1] A. A. Gromyko, Speech at the Plenary Session of the 19th General Assembly of the United Nations, December 7, 1964.

THREE. U.S. imperialism has been using the United Nations as a tool for opposing the revolutions of the people of the world. Catering to U.S. imperialism, Khrushchov used the United Nations as a stock exchange for the domination of the world by two great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States. The new leaders of the CPSU have continued this reactionary policy. They have again brought up Khrushchov's proposal for a standing U.N. armed force. They voted in the United Nations for a "cease-fire" and for the realization of "national reconciliation" in the Congo (L.), and they also voted for the "cease-fire" in the Dominican Republic. Wherever the people rise up in armed struggle against U.S. imperialism or win victories in such struggle, and wherever U.S. imperialism suffers defeats and finds itself in a predicament, the new leaders of the CPSU hurriedly come forward to help it out. Together with the U.S. imperialists, they are using the United Nations to attack, weaken and divide the forces opposing imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and to save, strengthen and extend U.S. imperialist positions. They serve as a fire-brigade for U.S. imperialism trying to stamp out the flames of revolution.

On April 7 this year, together with his proposal for "unconditional discussions" on the question of Viet Nam, Johnson publicized the scheme for "the international development of Southeast Asia" in order to undermine the struggle against U.S. imperialism waged by the people of Viet Nam and the other Southeast Asian countries and to step up economic infiltration, and he expressed the hope that the Soviet Union would join in. The United States regards the establishment of the "Asian Development Bank" as a means of putting this scheme into practice. In response to Johnson's call, the new leaders of the CPSU went so far as to send a delegation to Bangkok in October to sit together with delegations from the United States, Japan, and such puppet cliques as the Chiang Kai-shek gang, South Korea and "Malaysia" and take an active part in preparing for the establishment of the "Asian

Development Bank". Such is the ardour of the new leaders of the CPSU for united action with U.S. imperialism.

FOUR. The new leaders of the CPSU have taken over and expanded the enterprises of the firm of Kennedy, Nehru and Khrushchov which Khrushchov worked hard to establish. They have carried further their alliance against China with the Indian reactionaries who are controlled by the U.S. imperialists. During Shastri's visit to the Soviet Union, they granted India aid to the tune of U.S. $900 million in one go, which is more than all the loans Khrushchov extended to India in nine years. They have speeded up their plans for military aid to India and are working hand in glove with the United States to help India's arms expansion, so that the Indian reactionaries are able to use Soviet-made weapons against China and other neighbouring countries.

Recently, during India's armed aggression against Pakistan and also in connection with the Sino-Indian boundary question, the new leaders of the CPSU revealed in all its ugliness their support of the aggressor and their alliance with the United States and India against China. The Soviet Union and the United States joined in an anti-China chorus both inside and outside the United Nations. In September 1965, in statements on the armed conflict between India and Pakistan, Tass attacked China by insinuation, and *Pravda* even openly sided with India against China on the Sino-Indian boundary question. People will recall that it was precisely with a Tass statement on the Sino-Indian boundary question that Khrushchov started his public attacks on China in September 1959. But his attacks pale into insignificance in comparison with those of the present leaders of the CPSU. They have discarded even the small figleaf Khrushchov used in order to feign neutrality. Small wonder that the U.S. imperialists are gleefully hailing a "new era" in U.S.-Soviet co-operation.

The new leaders of the CPSU are able to deceive people because they sometimes make a few verbal attacks on U.S. imperialism. Why do they have to do this? The answer is

that this meets the need of the U.S. imperialists as well as the revisionists themselves. The Khrushchov revisionists have to give the appearance of opposing the United States in order to render effective help to U.S. imperialism, hoodwink the masses and sabotage revolution. Otherwise, they could not play this deceptive role, and that would not be to the advantage of U.S. imperialism. Minor attacks in words but major help in deeds — such is the way the new leaders of the CPSU serve U.S. imperialism.

Some people ask, why is it that the Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionary people cannot take united action with the new leaders of the CPSU, yet can unite with personages from the upper strata in the nationalist countries, and strive for united action with them in the anti-imperialist struggle, and can even exploit the contradictions among the imperialist countries in the struggle against the United States?

The reason is that in the contemporary world opposition to or alliance with U.S. imperialism constitutes the hallmark for deciding whether or not a political force can be included in the united front against the United States.

In Asia, Africa and Latin America, with the exception of the lackeys of imperialism, personages from the upper strata in many nationalist countries desire in varying degrees to oppose imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism headed by the United States. We should co-operate with them in the anti-imperialist struggle.

In the imperialist countries which are in sharp contradiction with the United States, some monopoly capitalists follow the U.S. imperialists, but there are also others who desire in varying degrees to oppose the United States. In the struggle against the United States, the people of the world can take united action with the latter on some questions and to a certain degree.

The crux of the matter is that, so far from opposing U.S. imperialism, the new leaders of the CPSU are allying themselves and collaborating with it to dominate the world.

They have thus set themselves in opposition to the united front against U.S. imperialism. If they really opposed U.S. imperialism and did so by actual deeds, we would readily take united action with them. But their so-called opposition to U.S. imperialism is only verbal and not genuine. We must tell them the truth: So long as their line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration against world revolution remains unchanged, and so long as they do not abandon their alliance with U.S. imperialism and reaction, we absolutely refuse to take any "united action" with them. We absolutely refuse to serve as a pawn in their secret diplomacy with U.S. imperialism or help them cover up their assistance to U.S. imperialism in suppressing the peoples' revolution in various countries.

THE NEW LEADERS OF THE CPSU ARE TAKING UNITED ACTION WITH THE UNITED STATES ON THE QUESTION OF VIET NAM

The new leaders of the CPSU never weary of saying that, however serious the differences between them, Communists must take "united action" on the question of Viet Nam at this urgent juncture in the Vietnamese people's struggle against the United States.

Since the new leaders of the CPSU have destroyed the basis of international proletarian unity, and since they transpose enemies and friends and persist in the line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for world domination, is it still possible for the Marxist-Leninist Parties to take united action with them on the question of Viet Nam?

At a time when the U.S. imperialists are committing rabid aggression against Viet Nam, all Communist Parties and socialist countries should as a matter of course take a unanimous stand and firmly support the Vietnamese people's just struggle to smash this aggression. The point is that the stand taken by the revisionist leadership of the CPSU on the question of

Viet Nam is inseparable from their revisionist programme and line, and is contrary to the principled stand required of a Marxist-Leninist party.

When Khrushchov was in power, the revisionist leadership of the CPSU openly sided with U.S. imperialism and opposed and undermined the revolutionary struggle of the Vietnamese people against U.S. aggression. They alleged that "any small 'local war' might spark off the conflagration of a world war".[1] Using this absurd argument to frighten and intimidate all peoples engaged in revolutionary armed struggle, they openly refused to support and aid the Vietnamese people in their anti-U.S. struggle. When the struggles of the Vietnamese and the Laotian peoples against U.S. imperialism grew acute, their policy on the question of Indo-China was one of "disengagement". In July 1964, they indicated the desire of the Soviet Government to resign from its post as one of the two Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference. Soon afterwards, when the U.S. imperialists engineered the Bac Bo Gulf incident, Khrushchov went so far as to concoct the slander that the incident was provoked by China.

The situation in Viet Nam developed directly contrary to the wishes of the Khrushchov revisionists. The Vietnamese people won victory after victory in their revolutionary anti-U.S. struggle, while the U.S. aggressors grew hard pressed. The new leaders of the CPSU came to realize that it was no longer advisable to copy Khrushchov's policy of "disengagement" in its totality. So they switched to the policy of involvement, that is, of getting their hand in.

The policy of involvement and the policy of disengagement are essentially the same. Both are products of Khrushchov revisionism and both are designed to meet the needs of U.S. imperialism.

---

[1] N. S. Khrushchov, Talk at a Press Conference in Vienna, July 8, 1960.

The U.S. imperialists urgently need to extinguish the roaring flames of the Vietnamese people's revolution. And so do the Khrushchov revisionists because they want to carry out their line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for world domination. When Khrushchov was following the policy of "disengagement", he was acting in close co-ordination with John F. Kennedy. And now that the new leaders of the CPSU are following the policy of involvement, they are similarly acting in tacit agreement and close collaboration with Lyndon B. Johnson.

Please consider the following facts:

In January 1965 the U.S. imperialists asked the Soviet Government to use its influence to have the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam accept two conditions: (1) stop supporting South Viet Nam, and first of all stop supplying it with guns; and (2) stop the attacks on cities in South Viet Nam. Faithfully obeying the orders of the U.S. imperialists, the new leaders of the CPSU officially transmitted to the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam these preposterous demands, which were aimed at forcing the Vietnamese people into unconditional surrender.

The new leaders of the CPSU have been busy running errands for the U.S. aggressors, who are anxious to find a way out of their predicament in Viet Nam. When Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, passed through Peking on his visit to Viet Nam in February 1965 and exchanged views with Chinese leaders, he stressed the need to help the United States "find a way out of Viet Nam". This was firmly rebutted by the Chinese leaders. We expressed the hope that the new leaders of the CPSU would support the struggle of the Vietnamese people and not make a deal with the United States on the question of Viet Nam. Kosygin expressed agreement with our views and stated that they would "not bargain with others on this issue". However, the new leaders of the CPSU soon went back on their promise.

Johnson wanted to play his fraudulent game of "unconditional discussions". So the new leaders of the CPSU put forward the idea of "unconditional negotiations". On February 16 this year, the day after Kosygin's return to Moscow, the Soviet Government officially put before Viet Nam and China a proposal to convene a new international conference on Indo-China without prior conditions, which in fact was advocacy of "unconditional negotiations" on the Viet Nam question. On February 23, disregarding the stand which the Vietnamese Government had taken against this proposal and without waiting for a reply from China, the new leaders of the CPSU discussed the question of calling the above-mentioned international conference with the President of France through the Soviet Ambassador to France.

Johnson's fraud of "unconditional discussions" met with a stern rebuff from the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. The new leaders of the CPSU then began publicly to insinuate that negotiations could be held if only the United States stopped its bombing of North Viet Nam. They engaged in vigorous activities in the international field with a view to putting this project into effect. In communications to certain fraternal Parties, they said explicitly that they favoured negotiations with the United States on condition it stopped bombing North Viet Nam. They also said that ways and means should be sought to settle the Viet Nam question through negotiations. And sure enough, not long afterwards Johnson came out with the manoeuvre of "the temporary suspension of bombing".

After these plots of "unconditional negotiations" and of "stopping the bombing and holding negotiations" were foiled, the new leaders of the CPSU began to collaborate with the Indian reactionaries and the Tito clique — both lackeys of U.S. imperialism — as brokers on the question of Viet Nam. In their prescription for this question there was only mention of the cessation of U.S. bombing of North Viet Nam, only abstract talk about the implementation of the Geneva agree-

ments but no mention of the fact that the crucial point in the implementation of these agreements is the complete withdrawal of the U.S. aggressor troops from Viet Nam. In addition, the new leaders of the CPSU have been engaged in secret diplomatic activities. In a nutshell, their purpose is to help the United States to bring about "peace talks" by deception, "peace talks" which could go on indefinitely and also allow the United States to hang on in South Viet Nam indefinitely.

To curry favour with U.S. imperialism, the new leaders of the CPSU went to the length of brutally suppressing demonstrations in the Soviet Union opposing U.S. imperialism and supporting Viet Nam which were held by students from Viet Nam, China and other Asian, African and Latin-American countries.

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that last April the new leaders of the CPSU let Khrushchov emerge from limbo to talk with Western correspondents. In that interview, he advocated "peaceful coexistence" and attacked the Vietnamese people's struggle against U.S. aggression, alleging that "trouble starts with small things like Viet Nam and ends with disaster".[1] This was not accidental. It shows that, like Khrushchov, the new leaders of the CPSU are afraid that the so-called "minor trouble", that is, the question of Viet Nam, may spoil their fond dreams of Soviet-U.S. collaboration.

The new leaders of the CPSU are doing exactly what Khrushchov did before them, namely, pulling the Viet Nam question into the orbit of Soviet-U.S. collaboration. Since they are co-operating so closely with the U.S. imperialists in united action, it is of course impossible for Marxist-Leninists to join in and take "united action" with them.

At bottom, the new leaders of the CPSU are clamouring for "united action" on the Viet Nam question because this slogan is highly deceptive and is apt to create the illusion that it is

---

[1] "Mr. K. Speaks", *Daily Express*, April 6, 1965.

still possible to have "unity against U.S. imperialism" with the new leaders of the CPSU who are intent on Soviet-U.S. collaboration for world domination. They do so in order to worm their way into the anti-U.S. front and carry out their policy of involvement in the service of U.S. imperialism.

Look at the trick of "aid" to Viet Nam the new leaders of the CPSU are playing and you will understand the real nature of their policy of involvement more clearly.

We have invariably held that it is the bounden proletarian-internationalist duty of all countries in the socialist camp to aid the fraternal Vietnamese people. The Vietnamese people who are standing in the forefront of the struggle against U.S. imperialism have every right and reason to demand and receive aid from every socialist country. China is helping the Vietnamese people to the best of her ability. We have stated on many occasions that if the Soviet Union genuinely wants to help the Vietnamese people in their struggle against U.S. aggression, the greater and more practical the aid the better. But what have the new leaders of the CPSU done? Whether in quantity or quality, their aid to Viet Nam is far from commensurate with the strength of the Soviet Union. They have ulterior motives in giving a certain amount of aid — they are trying to hoodwink the people at home and abroad, to keep the situation in Viet Nam under their control, to gain a say on the Viet Nam question and to strike a bargain with U.S. imperialism on it.

The U.S. imperialists appreciate the trick being played by the new leaders of the CPSU. They know full well that it is to their advantage for the new leaders of the CPSU to get involved in the Viet Nam question. Far from objecting to "aid" to Viet Nam from the new leaders of the CPSU, they welcome it. The U.S. authorities have made it clear that Soviet involvement in the Viet Nam question is preferable to Soviet non-involvement. It has been pointed out in a U.S. magazine that "eventually, an arrangement might be contrived involving the stationing of Soviet troops in North Vietnam . . . while

American troops remain in South Vietnam" and that "one of the paradoxical advantages of more direct Soviet military involvement would be the establishment of a direct American-Soviet bargaining relationship in this area".[1] In fact, the new leaders of the CPSU have disclosed the details of their so-called "aid" to Viet Nam to the Americans through various channels. On this matter, too, they are taking united action with the U.S. imperialists.

Furthermore, the new leaders of the CPSU have been using their "aid" to Viet Nam as a pretext for wantonly vilifying China, and have been assiduously spreading the lie that "China obstructed the transit of Soviet military equipment for Viet Nam". The truth is that we have always honoured our agreements and done our utmost speedily to transport to Viet Nam all military *matériel* in transit which was furnished by the Soviet Union with the concurrence of the Vietnamese comrades. By these fabrications and slanders, the new leaders of the CPSU have supplied further proof that they stop at nothing in order to ally themselves with the United States against China.

Marxist-Leninists must penetrate the appearance of things to get at their essence. Having carefully observed the actions of the new leaders of the CPSU on the question of Viet Nam over the past year, we can only reach the following conclusion: In calling so vehemently for "united action" on the Viet Nam question and trying by every means to bring about a summit conference of the Soviet Union, Viet Nam and China and an international meeting of the socialist countries and the fraternal Parties, the new leaders of the CPSU have no other purpose in mind than to deceive the world, to tie the fraternal countries to the chariot of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for world domination, to use the question of Viet Nam as an important counter in their bargaining with the United States, and to isolate and

---

[1] Zbigniew Brzezinski, "Peace, Morality and Vietnam", *The New Leader*, April 12, 1965.

attack the Chinese Communist Party and all the other fraternal Parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism.

Things could not be clearer. If we were to take united action on the question of Viet Nam with the new leaders of the CPSU who are pursuing the Khrushchov revisionist line, wouldn't we be helping them to deceive the people of the world? Wouldn't we be helping them to bring the question of Viet Nam within the orbit of Soviet-U.S. collaboration? Wouldn't we be joining them in betraying the revolutionary cause of the Vietnamese people? Wouldn't we be joining them in attacking the Chinese Communist Party and all the other Marxist-Leninist Parties? Wouldn't we be joining them in serving as accomplices of U.S. imperialism? Of course, we shall do nothing of the sort.

"UNITED ACTION", SO CALLED, IS A MEANS OF PROMOTING SPLITTISM

The clamour raised by the new leaders of the CPSU for "united action" is an attempt both to conceal and to carry on their great-power chauvinism and splittism under the cover of hypocritical words. They claim to have "made a number of major moves" to promote unity and improve the relations between fraternal Parties and Soviet-Chinese relations. Let us look at the steps they have actually taken.

The March Moscow meeting which will remain forever infamous was convened by the new leaders of the CPSU under the slogan of "united action". Khrushchov revisionism and splittism had in effect divided the international communist movement, and the March meeting, which the new leaders of the CPSU called regardless of all consequences, was an extremely grave step to bring about an open split. Since that meeting, they have taken a number of other steps in continuation of this divisive line.

The new leaders of the CPSU have conducted a feverish campaign against the Chinese Communist Party throughout their Party and among the entire Soviet people. They have organized meetings in offices, schools, factories and villages to hear anti-Chinese speeches, wantonly attacking and vilifying China. Some of these speeches were made in the presence of Chinese comrades. They have been busy sending emissaries to many countries for the sole purpose of engaging in anti-Chinese activity and of spreading all sorts of anti-Chinese slanders. In international organizations and international activities, they stop at nothing in pushing their anti-Chinese schemes.

The new leaders of the CPSU are continuing Khrushchov's anti-Albanian policy. Although in Japan they have met with serious setbacks in their criminal effort to support Yoshio Shiga and other renegades from the Japanese Communist Party in collusion with the U.S. imperialists and the Japanese reactionaries, they remain unreconciled and are continuing their counter-revolutionary sabotage and subversion against the Japanese Communist Party. They are also continuing their attacks on the Indonesian Communist Party, the Communist Party of New Zealand and other fraternal Parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism, and are carrying on various kinds of sabotage and subversion against them.

While continuing the practice of subjecting other Communist Parties and socialist countries to pressure, sabotage and subversion, the new leaders of the CPSU are also employing the more insidious stratagems of trying to woo them, buy them over, deceive them and sow dissension among them. They take the Chinese Communist Party, which firmly opposes Khrushchov revisionism, as the main target of their concentrated attacks, and they are trying to isolate it.

In the international mass organizations, the new leaders of the CPSU, using the slogan of "united action", continue to push their capitulationist line of not opposing the United States and not supporting revolution and their work of split-

ting anti-imperialist unity. They repeat Khrushchov's despicable stock tricks at the meetings of these international organizations, rely on behind-the-scene manipulation as well as open trouble-making and even resort to such ludicrous tactics as banging tables and stamping their feet.

In the name of "united action" the revisionist leadership of the CPSU is vainly trying to recover its position as the "father party", so that it may continue to wield the baton and compel the other Communist Parties and socialist countries to do this today and that tomorrow. Actually, however, its former power and prestige are gone beyond recall. Today, the new leaders of the CPSU and their followers are drawn together by self-interest, each seeking his own ends. The baton of the new leaders is less and less effective.

Facts have shown that if the Communists of a particular country accept the hodge-podge of revisionism, great-power chauvinism and splittism of the leaders of the CPSU, the country's revolutionary cause is impaired and undermined, its Communist Party becomes corrupted, goes downhill and degenerates, and both the country and Party find themselves beset with difficulties and at the mercy of others. On the other hand, those who firmly resist and oppose this hodge-podge find themselves in a quite different and much better position. This is as true today as it was before.

One of the purposes of the new leaders of the CPSU in advocating "united action" is to stop the open polemics. They want to gag the Marxist-Leninists and prevent the latter from exposing and criticizing them, so as to be free to carry out Khrushchov revisionism.

How can such a thing be possible? The present great debate has most vividly and clearly revealed what is decadent and dying and what represents the direction of future development and victory in the international communist movement. Khrushchov revisionism has been refuted down to the last point, and this poisonous weed has been converted into good fertilizer on the fields of world revolution. Truth

becomes clearer through debate; the more the polemics, the higher the level of revolutionary consciousness and the greater the degree of revolutionary vigour. We shall certainly carry the debate to the finish and draw a clear line between what is right and what is wrong on the major problems. Failure to do so would be extremely harmful to the revolutionary cause of the people of the world and to the cause of opposing imperialism and defending world peace.

Another purpose of the new leaders of the CPSU in advocating "united action" is to stop what they call "factional activities" by the Marxist-Leninist Parties. They want to strangle the Marxist-Leninist forces which are fighting to rebuild revolutionary proletarian parties or establish new ones, and to prevent the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist Parties from supporting these new-born revolutionary forces.

In many countries, the Marxist-Leninists have broken with the revisionist cliques and either rebuilt Marxist-Leninist Parties and organizations or founded new ones. This is the inevitable outcome of the practice of revisionism, great-power chauvinism and splittism by the leaders of the CPSU; it is the inevitable outcome of the struggle between the Marxist-Leninists and the revisionists in those countries and of the regrouping of the revolutionary forces under conditions of deepening class struggle both internationally and domestically.

Bowing to the baton of Khrushchov revisionism the leading groups in the Communist Parties of those countries have forbidden their members to do what the imperialists and reactionaries fear most, and only allowed them to do what is to the liking of the imperialists and reactionaries or is at least tolerable to them. Whoever acts differently is attacked, disciplined or expelled. Such being the case, the staunch Marxist-Leninists in those Parties are left with no alternative but to break with the revisionist leading groups, and the

founding and growth of genuine revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Parties and organizations become inevitable.

Revolution, the fight against imperialism and the fight against revisionism all have right on their side. Beyond all doubt, it is perfectly right to discard these decaying old revisionist groups and build new revolutionary parties.

We resolutely support all the forces in the world that persevere in Marxism-Leninism and revolution. It is our lofty proletarian-internationalist duty to strengthen our united action with all the Marxist-Leninist forces in the world.

"UNITED ACTION", SO CALLED, IS A SLOGAN TO DECEIVE THE SOVIET PEOPLE

The new leaders of the CPSU claim that the socialist countries have "a socio-economic system of the same type" and share the "common goal of building socialism and communism". This is one more reason they cite in their clamour for "united action".

This is throwing dust in people's eyes. Following in Khrushchov's footsteps, the new leaders of the CPSU are bringing about the further degeneration of the Soviet Union towards capitalism in the name of realizing "communism". Like Khrushchov, they use the slogan of "the state of the whole people" to abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, thus making the Soviet state degenerate into an instrument for the rule of the privileged bourgeois stratum over the Soviet people. Like Khrushchov, they use the slogan of "the party of the entire people" to alter the proletarian character of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and turn it into a party serving the interests of the privileged bourgeois stratum.

In their appraisal of Stalin, the new leaders of the CPSU pretend to be somewhat different from Khrushchov. But this is only an attempt to allay the resentment of the broad

masses of the people and Party members in the Soviet Union. Far from criticizing Khrushchov's mistake in completely negating Stalin, they have followed him in describing the period of Stalin's leadership as "the period of the personality cult". They have sponsored the publication of numerous articles and literary and other works which keep on besmirching all aspects of the great Marxist-Leninist Stalin, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system.

Taking advantage of the state power they wield, the new leaders of the CPSU have centred their efforts on undermining the economic base of socialism, socialist ownership by the whole people and socialist collective ownership, and on setting up and developing a new system of exploitation and fostering and supporting the new bourgeoisie, thus accelerating the restoration of capitalism.

The report on the problems of industry by Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, at the recent plenary session of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the resolution which it adopted marked a big step along the road of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet economy.

Through a Party resolution and government decrees, the new leaders of the CPSU have confirmed the experiments initiated in the Khrushchov period as a result of which socialist enterprises owned by the whole people degenerate into enterprises of a capitalist nature, and they have spread these experiments throughout the country. The key feature of the "new system" of industrial management they have instituted is to enforce the capitalist principle of profit and to make profit-seeking the basic motive force of production in the enterprises through the "enhancement of economic incentives". In the name of widening the enterprises' right to self-management, they have scrapped a series of important quotas formerly set by the state for the enterprises in accordance with the plan, substituting capitalist free competition for socialist planned economy. They have vested in the managers the power to hire and fire workers, fix the level

of wages and bonuses and freely dispose of large funds, thus turning them into virtual masters of the enterprises, who are able to bully and oppress the workers and usurp the fruits of their labour at will. In reality, this means restoring capitalism, replacing socialist ownership by the whole people with ownership by the privileged bourgeois stratum, and converting the socialist enterprises in the Soviet Union step by step into capitalist enterprises of a special type. This is by no means a "new creation"; it has been copied and developed from the old "experience" of the Tito clique in restoring capitalism in Yugoslavia.

It is elementary Marxism-Leninism that the system of management comes within the sphere of the relations of production and is an expression of the system of ownership. Under the guise of reforming the system of management, the new leaders of the CPSU have undermined the very foundation of the system of ownership by the whole people. This is exactly what the Tito clique of Yugoslavia did. Having a guilty conscience, the new leaders of the CPSU cry out that those who talk about the "bourgeois transformation" of the Soviet economy are "bourgeois ideologists" and "our enemies".[1] This is what the Tito clique said too. Such protestations are like the sign, "There is no silver buried here", put up by the man in the legend over the place where he hid his money.

In the countryside too, the new leaders of the CPSU are accelerating the growth of capitalism, developing the private economy, enlarging the private plots, increasing the number of privately raised cattle, expanding the free market and encouraging free trading. They are using a variety of economic and administrative measures to encourage and foster the growth of a new kulak economy, sabotaging and disintegrating all aspects of the socialist collective economy.

[1] A. N. Kosygin, "On Improving Industrial Management, Perfecting Planning, and Enhancing Economic Incentives in Industrial Production", *Moscow News*, Supplement, October 2, 1965.

Khrushchov wrought alarming havoc in Soviet agriculture. After taking office, the new leaders of the CPSU boasted that they had worked out "a scientifically based programme for an immediate and sharp rise in agricultural production".[1] But a year later, Soviet agriculture still remains in a mess, creating untold difficulties in the lives of the Soviet people. The new leaders of the CPSU are now laying the entire blame on the fallen Khrushchov. In fact, these serious troubles are precisely the outcome of their own intensified application of Khrushchov revisionism.

Facts show that the replacement of Khrushchov by these new leaders has been merely a change of personalities in the revisionist dynasty — just as all reactionary ruling classes have to change horses in order to maintain their rule. Although Khrushchov himself has fallen, the leading group of the CPSU is still the same old Khrushchov crowd; organizationally, it remains basically unchanged, and whether ideologically, politically, theoretically or in the realm of policy, theirs is still the same old Khrushchov revisionist stuff.

As Lenin pointed out, "opportunism is no chance occurrence, sin, slip, or treachery on the part of individuals, but a social product of an entire period of history".[2] It is inevitable that Khrushchov revisionism will exist as long as the social basis and the class roots which gave birth to it remain and as long as the privileged bourgeois stratum exists.

Because they are the political representatives of the privileged bourgeois stratum in the Soviet Union, just as Khrushchov was, the new leaders of the CPSU pursue domestic and foreign policies which are not proletarian but bourgeois, not socialist but capitalist. Like Khrushchov, they are in a position of antagonism to the Soviet people, who

---

[1] "In Lenin's Way, with Scientific Accuracy", editorial in *Sovetskaya Russia*, March 28, 1965.

[2] V. I. Lenin, "The Collapse of the Second International", *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, Vol. XXI, p. 247.

constitute more than 90 per cent of the Soviet population, and they are encountering ever stronger dissatisfaction and opposition on the part of the Soviet people.

When the new leaders of the CPSU loudly assert that the socialist countries have a "socio-economic system of the same type", they do so with the aim of covering up their restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, of preventing us from unmasking them, and of setting the Soviet people against China.

In our view, when a revisionist clique emerges and a capitalist comeback occurs in a socialist country, all the Marxist-Leninists in the world are duty-bound to expose and struggle against these things; this is the only correct and principled stand. The only way to serve the fundamental interests of the great Soviet people and to give them genuine support is resolutely to expose the fact that the revisionist leadership of the CPSU is restoring capitalism in the USSR.

If we should cease exposing and combating the domestic and external revisionist policies of the new leaders of the CPSU, if we should abandon our principled stand and take so-called "united action" with them, that would suit them very well. It would help them to hoodwink the Soviet people. It would hinder rather than support the Soviet people's struggle to defend the fruits of their socialist revolution; it would hinder rather than support the Soviet people's struggle against Khrushchov revisionism without Khrushchov.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has often said to comrades from fraternal Parties that if China's leadership is usurped by revisionists in the future, the Marxist-Leninists of all countries should likewise resolutely expose and fight them, and help the working class and the masses of China to combat such revisionism. Taking the same stand, we consider it our bounden proletarian-internationalist duty firmly to expose the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, to draw a clear line between ourselves and them, and to persist in the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism.

PERSEVERE IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST KHRUSHCHOV REVISIONISM

A fierce struggle is going on between the revolutionary people of the world on the one hand and the imperialists headed by the United States and their lackeys on the other. The characteristic of the present world situation is that with the daily deepening of the international class struggle, a process of great upheaval, great division and great reorganization is taking place. The revolutionary movement of the people of the world is surging vigorously forward. Imperialism and all other decadent reactionary forces are putting up a wild death-bed fight. Drastic divisions and realignments of political forces are taking place on a world scale.

The revolutionary forces of the people of the world have surpassed the reactionary forces of imperialism. The advance of the revolutionary movement of the people of the world is the main current in the present situation. The people's revolutionary struggles in all countries will certainly triumph, while imperialism, reaction and modern revisionism will step by step descend to their doom. This is the inevitable trend of world history which no decadent reactionary force can change. But imperialism and reaction will not fall unless you strike them down, and modern revisionism, too, will not collapse unless you fight it. Before being overthrown and eliminated, they will invariably collaborate and, using differing tactics, do all they can to hurl desperate attacks on the revolutionary forces. Thus, along with the growth and deepening of the revolutionary movement, there is an adverse counter-revolutionary current. The course of international development is unavoidably filled with contradictions and conflicts; there are bound to be zigzags and reversals. In all countries the people's revolutionary struggles necessarily advance in the form of waves.

As the struggle against the United States reaches a crucial phase, U.S. imperialism needs the services of Khrushchov

revisionism all the more acutely. Hence it is inevitable that the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism must sharpen.

In the course of combating Khrushchov revisionism, there is bound to be a certain unevenness in the degree of people's understanding of the struggle. This kind of phenomenon becomes particularly conspicuous when the struggle becomes sharp. That is both natural and inevitable. Lenin said that when astonishingly abrupt changes took place, people "who were suddenly confronted with extremely important problems could not long remain on this level. They could not continue without a respite, without a return to elementary questions, without a new training which would help them 'digest' lessons of unparalleled richness and make it possible for incomparably wider masses again to march forward, but now far more firmly, more consciously, more confidently and more steadfastly".[1] Just such a situation exists at present.

As the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism becomes sharper and deeper, a new process of division will inevitably occur in the revolutionary ranks, and some people will inevitably drop out. But at the same time hundreds of millions of revolutionary people will stream in.

Faced with a complex situation of this kind, Marxist-Leninists must never abandon or slur over principles, but must take a clear stand, uphold revolutionary principles and persevere in the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism. Only in this way can the unity of the revolutionary forces be strengthened and expanded.

At present, the task facing all the Marxist-Leninist Parties is to draw a clear line of demarcation both politically and organizationally between themselves and the revisionists, who are serving U.S. imperialism, and to liquidate Khrushchov revisionism in order to welcome the high tide of revolutionary struggle against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism", *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1963, Vol. XVII, p. 42.

In the final analysis, in all parts of the world including the Soviet Union, the masses of the people, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population, and the overwhelming majority of Communists and cadres want revolution and are upholding or will uphold Marxism-Leninism. They are steadily awakening and joining the ranks of the struggle against imperialism and revisionism. It is certain that over 90 per cent of the world's population will become more closely united in the fight against imperialism, reaction and modern revisionism.

All the Communist Parties and all the socialist countries will eventually unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and take united action in the struggle against imperialism. As Lenin told the old-line revisionists, the proletariat will sooner or later unite and eventually win on a world scale, "only it is moving and will move, is proceeding and will proceed, against you, it will be a victory over you".[1]

Unless the new leaders of the CPSU stop practising Khrushchovism without Khrushchov, admit and correct their mistakes and genuinely return to the revolutionary path of Marxism-Leninism, it is absolutely out of the question to expect the Marxist-Leninists to abandon the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism.

With power and to spare, we must not cease the pursuit
Or halt in mid-course for the sake of idle laurels.

This couplet summarizes an extremely important historical lesson. The Marxist-Leninists and all the other revolutionary people of the world must continue their victorious pursuit and carry the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism through to the end!

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism", *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, Vol. XXIII, p. 111.

駁苏共新領导的所謂“联合行动”

*

外文出版社出版（北京）
1965年第一版
編号：（英）3050—1346
00022
3—E—709P