

6

**STRENGTHEN
THE UNITY OF
THE COMMUNIST
MOVEMENT FOR
THE TRIUMPH
OF PEACE AND
SOCIALISM**

**‘Pravda’ Editorial
Article**

Michael
Harron
1971

STRENGTHEN
THE UNITY OF
THE COMMUNIST
MOVEMENT FOR
THE TRIUMPH
OF PEACE AND
SOCIALISM

Editorial article
in 'Pravda' on
January 7th.

Soviet Booklet
No. 105.

London,
January, 1963

MANKIND is now in one of the most crucial stages of its development. This stage is packed with major developments and sharp clashes between the forces of socialism and peace and the forces of imperialism, reaction and war. The new world—the world of socialism, freedom and happiness, the real springtime of mankind—is gaining in strength and growing, pressing on the old world, the world of capitalism, violence and exploitation. And the results of the year 1962 are new and clear evidence of this.

The main result of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other countries of socialism, the heroic struggle of the Cuban people and all the peaceloving forces in the past year, was that the attack on Cuba, carefully prepared by the aggressive imperialist circles of the United States, was thwarted. Socialist Cuba has been defended and is confidently continuing her triumphant advance. The threat of a world thermonuclear war has been warded off from mankind. It has been proved once again that the forces of socialism and peace are capable of curbing imperialist aggressors.

The main result of the creative endeavours of the Soviet people and of the working people of the other socialist countries has been a powerful upsurge of their economies and cultures, a strengthening of the might of the socialist community, a growth of its international authority and influence.

The main result of the national liberation movement has been the triumph of liberating anti-imperialist revolutions in vast areas of the former colonial world and the rise of this movement to a new and higher stage.

The main result of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries has been the fact that new sections of the working people have joined in the sharpest class battles, an intensification of the struggle against the oppression and iniquity of monopoly capital, the growth of the influence of the Communist Parties and of the ideas of socialism.

The international communist movement has achieved magnificent successes. And this has been due, above all, to the fact that, at all stages in its struggle, it has remained unswervingly loyal to the banner of Marxism-Leninism, and has been guided by this victorious teaching in all its activities. At the Moscow meetings in 1957 and 1960 the communists worked

out a new strategic and tactical line, in keeping with the new historical conditions. The course of world development irrefutably confirms that loyalty to this line and unity of the communist movement are the guarantee of all victories.

It has been on the basis of the documents of the Moscow meetings, embodying and developing the Leninist line of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was supported by the fraternal parties, that the world communist movement has made striking advances in every direction. The Leninist strategy of active struggle against imperialism, for world peace and the triumph of socialism, has raised the ideology of communism to unprecedented heights. Communism and peace have become inseparable in the minds of the peoples. The main thesis of the imperialists—the thesis concerning the Soviet Union's alleged aggressiveness, which they have used for the arms race, for preparing war—has been refuted.

The Soviet Union has demonstrated by all its actions, by its entire policy, that it is the main stronghold of peace and an implacable fighter against imperialism. The peoples realise on the basis of numerous examples that communism is saving the world from thermonuclear war and that the communists are the most resolute and consistent defenders of peace. And this, in present-day conditions, is one of the main factors for the spread of communist influence.

The recent congresses of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Italy have convincingly demonstrated what beneficial results unswerving implementation of the strategic and tactical line of the international communist movement brings to the Communist Parties of both socialist and capitalist countries.

The congresses of the fraternal parties of Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia have determined the roads for completing the building of socialism and a gradual transition to the laying of the material and technical foundation of communism. The congress of the fraternal Communist Party of Italy outlined extensive measures for intensifying the struggle against monopoly capital, for peace, democracy and socialism. These congresses have made an important contribution to the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the transition of the peoples' democracies to the completion of the building of socialism, a contribution to the consolidation of the communist movement.

The congresses of the fraternal parties have rallied the broad masses of the working people for resolute struggle for the victory of socialism, against imperialism.

The international communist movement is on the correct

Marxist-Leninist road. Magnificent prospects lie before it. The main thing required of the communists is loyalty to the Leninist course that has been adopted, and the cohesion of their ranks.

Unfortunately, views are being spread in the ranks of the international communist movement which are directed against a number of the principal propositions of Marxism-Leninism and are designed to undermine the cohesion of the fraternal parties. The most outspoken exponents of these dogmatic, splitting views, which are profoundly hostile to Leninism, are the top leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour.

At the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and subsequently at the congresses of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Czechoslovakia, the delegations of the Communist Party of China claimed that it was a mistake to criticise openly the line of the Albanian leaders, and tried to place on the fraternal parties the responsibility for the differences which had arisen. Making such claims however, means going against irrefutable facts and absolving from responsibility those who are in fact fighting against the common line of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The international communist movement knows that the Albanian leaders openly attacked the line of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the propositions of the 1957 Declaration already at the meeting of 81 Communist Parties in November 1960. Already at that time they expressed their disagreement with the policy of the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, with the struggle for disarmament and the peaceful settlement of disputed questions through negotiation, with the proposition concerning the variety of forms of transition to socialism.

The 1960 meeting administered a vigorous rebuff to the anti-Leninist line of the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour. The Albanian leaders, however, did not heed the voice of reason. Instead of paying attention to the warnings of experienced, tried and tested Marxist-Leninist parties, the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour launched an open and violent campaign against Marxism-Leninism, against the Statement of the 81 Parties, and showered the fraternal parties with slander and fabrications which even many open anti-communists are not employing at the present time.

Already at the Fourth Congress of the Albanian Party of Labour, in February 1961, the Albanian leaders came out openly against the principal propositions of the Statement and the Message to the Peoples of the World adopted by the meeting of the Communist Parties, and countered it with a position of their own.

This position soon became known to the entire world. International reaction was quick to realise whom the Albanian leadership is really serving, and began to praise its course of breaking with the communist movement, with the camp of socialism, and in the first instance with the Soviet Union. Already on May 19, 1961, that is to say, a long time before the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a British newspaper, *The Scotsman*, wrote that the Albanian government had burnt its bridges in its relations with the Soviet Union, and apparently for ever. Another British paper, the *Daily Telegraph*, wrote on June 3, 1961, that the anti-Soviet campaign in Albania had reached its peak in the previous weeks.

The stand taken by the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour caused great concern in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in all the Communist Parties which hold dear the unity of our ranks. Firmly abiding by the principle that disputes in the international communist movement should be settled through an exchange of views and mutual consultations between parties, the central committee of the CPSU, as early as August, 1960, twice approached the central committee of the Albanian Party of Labour proposing that a meeting be arranged between representatives of the two parties. In a letter to the central committee of the Albanian Party of Labour of August 13, 1960, the central committee of the CPSU wrote in part :

“It would be right to extinguish in good time the spark of misunderstanding that has arisen so as to prevent its kindling.

... If the central committee of the Albanian Party of Labour shares our view and does not object to an exchange of opinions, we are prepared to meet a delegation of your party at any level, at a time convenient to you.”

The Albanian leaders turned down these proposals. They rejected all attempts by the central committee of the CPSU to normalise relations.

Who, then, it may be asked, has violated the principle of consultations? Who started the attacks on the communist movement, on the programmatic documents worked out collectively by it? And who has been indulging in those attacks for a number of years? How can one describe the claims of those who substitute untruth for truth and, ignoring the will of the international communist movement, clearly encourage the splitters by propagating their views and protecting them from just criticism?

Comrade Nikita Khrushchov said at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU :

“We share the anxiety of our Chinese friends, we appreciate their concern for strengthening unity. If the Chinese

comrades wish to apply their efforts to normalising the relations between the Albanian Party of Labour and the fraternal parties, then scarcely anyone can help to accomplish this task better than the Communist Party of China. This would indeed benefit the Albanian Party of Labour and meet the interests of the entire community of socialist countries.”

Unfortunately, the situation, far from improving, has further deteriorated. The Albanian leaders are openly breaking with the communist movement, with Marxism-Leninism, and are sinking more and more deeply into the morass of dogmatism, sectarianism and vicious nationalism, and are making increasing use of the methods of the cult of the individual, which are alien to Marxism.

It is only natural that Marxist-Leninists could not and cannot resign themselves to the violation of the provisions of the Declaration and the Statement, that they could not and cannot fail to rise up with the utmost determination in defence of communist principles. It is therefore obvious that one should not be distressed by the fact that the anti-Leninist position of the Albanian leaders has come in for criticism at the recent congresses of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Czechoslovakia, but by the fact that there are people who gird up their loins against the parties which defend the banner of the Moscow meetings.

The dispute as to what line the communist movement should follow is not an abstract one, but a deeply principled dispute of prime importance. The Marxist-Leninist line of consolidating the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, the line of economic competition between socialism and capitalism and the guarantee of the victory of communism in these conditions is imparting an unprecedented power of attraction to our movement, and is drawing the broadest masses of the people to its side, whereas the line which the dogmatists are trying to impose is a line of lack of faith in the forces of communism, of the masses of the people, lack of faith in the possibility of the victory of socialism in new countries without war between states, without a world war.

Such a line, should it assert itself, would repel the peoples of the capitalist countries from the countries of socialism, would repel millions of people from the communist movement, would place the communists in isolation, and would put a brake on the entire liberating process of the struggle of the peoples.

The most important, the most vital problem of our time is the problem of war and peace. In real life the choice is: Either peaceful co-existence between states with different

social systems, or devastating war. There is no other alternative. The question arises: What position should the communists take? Only one position—the position of peaceful co-existence. The international working-class and liberation movement is waging a great offensive struggle against imperialism in the conditions of peaceful co-existence. The socialist countries do not need war. They are successfully developing in peaceful conditions and will be victorious in the peaceful economic competition with capitalism, a fact which will be of exceptional importance for making the peoples choose the socialist way as the only correct one.

The Albanian leaders—for instance, Enver Hoxha—boast that they do not agree with those who “regard peaceful co-existence as the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries.”

But what, then, is the general line? War? If so, where, then, is the difference between such an approach to the solution of the question of the victory of communism or capitalism and the point of view held by the adventurist circles of imperialism? In point of fact, the only difference is that the frenzied imperialists have lost faith in the ability of capitalism to hold its own in the competition with socialism, while the dogmatists do not believe in the possibility of the victory of communism in the conditions of peaceful competition between states with different social systems. But would any Marxist-Leninist agree that the way to the victory of communism lies through thermonuclear war?

In our times, even the imperialists find it difficult to come out openly against peaceful co-existence. It is all the more difficult for people who regard themselves as communists to do so. Therefore, the Albanian dogmatists also say, gritting their teeth, that they “do not object” to the concept of peaceful co-existence.

But, then and there, they declare that the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems means a “line of *rapprochement* and fusion with imperialism” and that the question of whether or not there is to be a war is settled by the chiefs of the general staffs of the imperialist countries; they allege that world peace can be preserved in one way **only**—by burying imperialism. This is a direct and open deviation from the Statement of the Communist Parties which reads: “A real possibility will have arisen to exclude world war from the life of society even before socialism achieves complete victory on earth, with capitalism still existing in a part of the world, and that “the time has already come when the attempts of the imperialist aggressors to start a world war can be curbed.”

The most important thing in the struggle for peace is to curb the aggressors in good time, to avert war, to prevent it from flaring up. This is particularly necessary in the light of the unprecedented destructive force of modern weapons. The Statement says: “Monstrous means of mass annihilation and destruction have been developed which, if used in a new war, can cause unheard of destruction to entire countries and reduce key centres of world industry and culture to ruins. Such a war would bring death and suffering to hundreds of millions of people, among them people in countries not involved in it.”

In contrast to these propositions, the dogmatists insist that nuclear war is not to be feared, that modern weapons are monstrous only “in the view of the imperialists and reactionaries,” and that “the atom bomb is a paper tiger.” This is nothing but a renunciation of the main goal in the struggle for peace indicated in the Statement, a renunciation of the whole policy of peaceful co-existence.

The dogmatists present peaceful co-existence as “renunciation of the struggle to expose imperialism,” as “halting the struggle against imperialism.” They do not understand that competition in peaceful conditions is one of the most important battlegrounds between socialism and capitalism. As for the struggle against imperialism which is proclaimed by the dogmatists, it boils down to just high-sounding condemnation in words and bad language. But should the activities in the struggle against imperialism of a Marxist-Leninist party in power be confined merely to that?

For the socialist countries, to fight against imperialism in reality, to safeguard peace, to promote in every way the development of the world liberation movement means above all:

To develop socialist society successfully and, in the first place, steadily to promote the advance of their economy. The more effective is the economic development of the socialist countries, the stronger they are economically and politically, then the greater will be their influence on the direction and pace of the development of history, the more resolutely and effectively will they defend peace;

To pursue firmly and consistently a peaceful foreign policy which will undermine the foundations of imperialism, helping to rally the peace forces and facilitating the struggle of the working masses and the oppressed peoples for their freedom and independence; to pursue a policy which deprives the enemies of socialism of the slightest chance of trying to split the forces of peace, democracy and socialism;

To show the utmost vigilance with regard to imperialism;

to strengthen in every way the might and defence potential of the whole socialist camp; to take all the measures necessary to ensure the security of the people and to preserve peace;

Tirelessly to expose the policy of imperialism, to keep a vigilant eye on the intrigues and machinations of the warmongers; to arouse the sacred anger of the peoples against those who steer a course towards war; to work for the better organisation of all the peace forces, constantly intensifying the actions of the masses of the people in defence of peace; to strengthen co-operation with all states which are not interested in new wars;

To strengthen the relations of fraternal friendship and close co-operation with the states of Asia, Africa and Latin America which are fighting for national independence and its consolidation; to give help and support to the national liberation movements;

To work in every way to strengthen the fighting solidarity of all detachments and organisations of the international working class.

It is this kind of effective struggle against imperialism that is being waged by the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties which stand firmly behind the position taken by both the Declaration and the Statement.

The prototype of the future of all mankind is being created in the countries of socialism. The peoples of our countries are called upon to make this prototype ever more attractive by all their deeds, so that every worker, getting to know the life of any socialist country, can say: "Here is my wonderful future for which it is worth while fighting unsparingly!"

"The communists," the Statement says, **"regard it as their mission not only to abolish exploitation and poverty on a world scale and rule out for all time the possibility of any kind of war in the life of human society, but also to deliver mankind from the nightmare of a new world war already in our time. The communist parties of all countries will devote all their strength and energy to the accomplishment of this great historical mission."** The communists of the Soviet Union, all the Soviet people are sparing no efforts in fulfilling this great mission in practice.

Historically, it has fallen to the lot of the Soviet people to bear the brunt of the struggle against the imperialist warmongers. It is not an easy task to bear such a burden. The Soviet people have even, not infrequently, to deny themselves things they need. But the Soviet people consciously accept this, realising that it is necessary for the peoples of the whole

world, for this and for future generations, for the victory of communism.

The peoples know that the active struggle of the Soviet Union, its strength, have played a decisive role in preventing the world war which bellicose imperialist circles have tried to touch off many times in recent years, and also in promoting the liberation struggle against imperialism.

Who was it that extinguished the raging flames of war in the Suez Canal zone in 1956 by compelling the British-French-Israeli aggressors to beat a retreat? Who was it that in 1957 prevented the invasion of Syria which the imperialists had prepared? Who was it that in 1958 prevented war from flaring up in the Middle East and in the area of Taiwan Strait?* It was the Soviet Union and all the countries of the socialist camp, the forces of peace. They—and, above all, the strength and vigorous actions of the USSR—compelled the imperialist warmongers to retreat. The entire activity of the Soviet state, of the CPSU, in the international arena in a struggle against imperialism, and in practice a tireless struggle to strengthen and expand the positions of socialism, to give real help to the peoples which are defending freedom and fighting for freedom.

The wide support given to the liberation struggle of the Algerian people against the French colonialists; the defence of the national independence and freedom of the people of Laos; the support given to India and Indonesia in their just actions in destroying the strongholds of colonialism and in liberating Goa, Diu, Daman and West Irian; all-out assistance in the consolidation of the independent states of Asia, Africa and Latin America—these are only a few instances which show how consistently the Soviet Union is fighting against the imperialist colonialists, for the national liberation of the peoples. It was very recently that the Soviet Union gave substantial help to the people of Yemen, help which played a big role in ensuring their independence and in foiling the machinations of imperialism. Our country takes such actions in international organisations that they resound throughout the world, helping to rally all the world's progressive forces in defence of the national liberation movements. The Soviet Union was the initiator of the historic declaration of the United Nations on the granting of independence to all peoples, and is pressing for this declaration to be put into effect at the earliest possible moment.

The Soviet Union's tireless efforts to explain all the catastrophic danger of the thermonuclear war which has been prepared, the efforts which, together with all the fraternal parties,

* The Formosa Strait.—ED

and with all defenders of peace, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is taking to strengthen the vigilance of the peoples in the face of the intrigues of warmongers—all this is greatly helping to multiply the forces fighting for peace.

This is the way in which, unswervingly and consistently, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is conducting an offensive on all fronts against the forces of imperialism and war. Let those who are trying to cast aspersions on the Soviet Union's consistent struggle against imperialism ask themselves in all sincerity: Why and for what reason are they casting a slur on the principal force of peace and socialism? Whom do they help by so doing?

The postwar years have not seen a sharper international crisis, fraught with the danger of thermonuclear world conflagration, than the recent crisis American imperialism created in the area of the Caribbean Sea. What was the position assumed in that crucial hour by those who shout from Tirana? Did they support the Soviet Union, which was the main force defending revolutionary Cuba and barring the road against the atomic maniacs? No, they didn't do that. What is more, they actually helped the imperialist instigators to kindle the conflict, to set the USSR and the United States at loggerheads, thereby pushing the entire world towards the abyss of war.

Fortunately for mankind, however, this did not happen. The all-devouring holocaust of atomic and hydrogen bombs did not hit the peoples. The whole world admits that credit for this goes to the Soviet Union. The firm and flexible policy of the Soviet government and of its leader, Comrade Nikita Khrushchov, which prevented a thermonuclear catastrophe, is highly valued by a grateful mankind as an example of wisdom, reason, a genuine love of peace and concern for the destinies of the peoples.

The dogmatists disagree with this. Now that the height of the crisis is behind us, purveyors of "leftist phrases" are slanderously striving to present the case as if the Soviet Union had capitulated to imperialism and had even agreed to a "second Munich." But everyone who analyses the results of the elimination of the crisis in the area of the Caribbean Sea without bias sees that there is not a grain of truth in the accusations of the dogmatists and that the phrases they utter are actually calculated to provoke war.

The crisis in the area of the Caribbean Sea was settled through the resolute actions of the Soviet Union and of the people of Cuba against the aggressors, due to the support given to the just cause of the Cuban people by all the socialist community and by all fighters for peace. At the same time the crisis was settled on the basis of mutual concessions and

reasonable compromise. The solution of disputed questions between states without wars, by peaceful means—this is precisely the policy of peaceful co-existence in action.

Those who declare that they support the policy of peaceful co-existence, while at the same time criticising the method by which the Cuban crisis was solved, are actually rejecting the policy of peaceful co-existence.

Critics of the peaceful settlement of the conflict say that one cannot trust agreements with imperialists. But if we proceed on this basis alone, it would be tantamount to admitting that disputed questions can be settled only by war. Marxist-Leninists consider that the strength of the socialist countries has grown so much that the imperialists are compelled to reckon with it and, consequently, that they can be made to observe the commitments they assume. At the same time, Marxist-Leninists never forget the perfidy of the imperialists and urge the peoples always to be vigilant and to intensify the struggle against the aggressive intrigues of the warmongers.

What are the main results of the elimination of the crisis in the Caribbean area? The sovereignty and independence of socialist Cuba has been consolidated. The ruling circles of the United States, who insulted Cuba and prepared aggression against her, have declared for the first time through their President that they will not undertake an attack on Cuba.

Of course, the struggle still continues, and precisely for this reason the Soviet Union resolutely supports the well-known five demands of the Cuban Republic and is rendering it tremendous all-round assistance.

It is obvious to everyone that Cuba's position has become much stronger and that her international authority has grown. The Cuban people and their militant leaders, with Comrade Fidel Castro at their head, have displayed great courage, firmness and determination to defend their socialist achievements and have made an immense contribution to the cause of safeguarding peace. The beacon of freedom in the western hemisphere is burning still brighter. Is this a "Munich"? Is this a retreat? The authors of the term "second Munich" are obviously at odds with elementary history and don't know what they are talking about.

Life itself and the practical struggle of hundreds of millions of people have confirmed that the policy of peaceful co-existence meets the vital interests of the peoples of all countries. It has been proved that in conditions of peaceful co-existence favourable opportunities are created for promoting the class struggle in capitalist countries, the national liberation movement, democratic movements, socialist revolutions. It is a fact that the biggest upsurge of the national

liberation movement and the biggest strikes in the capitalist countries have taken place in the postwar years, that is to say, in conditions of peaceful co-existence. It is also a fact that the numerical strength of the communist parties and their influence have grown most in these years. In turn, the successes of the revolutionary class and national liberation struggle contribute to the consolidation of peaceful co-existence. And this is understandable, because an active struggle for peace, democracy and national liberation weakens and reduces the position of imperialism.

When Marxist-Leninists speak of the possibility of preventing a world war, they do not forget for a single moment that the essence of imperialism and its aggressive nature have not changed. This is taken into account by our party in the whole of its policy. At the same time it reckons with the changes in the world arena which have brought about a situation in which imperialism can no longer dictate its will to everybody and pursue its aggressive policy unimpeded. The correlation of the forces in the world is now such that the camp of socialism and peace is able to curb the aggressive forces of imperialism.

Of course, one cannot give a guarantee against "madmen" appearing in the camp of imperialism who may plunge headlong into a war venture. This is why a high level of vigilance, a strong economy and good armaments are necessary, so as to be ready to administer a crushing rebuff to an aggressor at any moment. By defying imperialism from the strategic point of view it is impossible to tame its predatory nature or stop an aggression if it is started.

A modern war cannot be approached with the old yardsticks. A world war, if we fail to prevent it, will immediately become a thermonuclear conflict, will lead to the death of millions upon millions of people, to the destruction of tremendous material values and to the devastation of whole countries. Those who do not consider the consequences of a modern war, who underestimate or simply discount nuclear weapons as being something secondary to manpower, are making a big mistake.

Can there be any doubt that, if the socialist camp had not had mighty weapons, and, above all, nuclear rocket weapons, its position in the modern world would have been absolutely different? What would the security of socialism be based upon in that case? Not, surely, on some magic incantations? Is it not clear that even those who now revile the Soviet Union so vehemently would not have held out without its backing, without its might, against imperialism which is armed to the teeth?

In their cynical gamble with human lives certain people dare

to scoff at those who defend the lives of hundreds of millions of people, accusing these fighters of "cowardice" and "spinelessness." But communists, and still less so communist statesmen and political leaders, cannot act like these irresponsible hack scribblers. After all, when they are in power they are responsible for the destinies of peoples and states, and moreover, for the fate of the world socialist system. They are in duty bound to approach in a sensible way, with the utmost sense of responsibility, the evaluation of the inevitable consequences of a modern thermonuclear war and not to repeat the outworn formulas of past centuries or resort to bombastic phrases.

Lenin severely criticised and mercilessly ridiculed the "leftist" phrasemongers as people who are unable to take into account the objective circumstances at a given turn of events and in a given state of affairs. He wrote:

"We must fight against the revolutionary phrase, we have to fight, yes, fight without fail, so that some day the bitter truth shall not be said of us: 'The revolutionary phrase about a revolutionary war has ruined the revolution'" [Collected Works, vol. 27, p. 10 Russian edition].

The international communist movement knows Lenin's definition of imperialism and has been guided by it for decades. Lenin's definition of imperialism is profound and all-embracing, it contains neither an overestimation nor an underestimation of the forces of imperialism. This definition, like the analysis of capitalism given by Marx, has long ago instilled in the ranks of politically conscious working people the conviction that they are bound to triumph over the forces of capitalism and imperialism. What need was there to counter these definitions of Marx and Lenin with a different, home-made "paper tiger" thesis, which is an underestimation of the forces of imperialism?

To impose on the communist movement their definition of modern imperialism and to ignore its atomic fangs, some people claim that "paper tiger" thesis is tantamount to Lenin's definition of imperialism as "a colossus with feet of clay." It is common knowledge, however, that the figurative expression does not cover or substitute for the whole substance of Lenin's all-round definition of imperialism. Moreover, this expression stresses that imperialism is still strong, ("colossus"), but it stands on an unstable basis and is rent by internal contradictions, ("with feet of clay").

The "paper tiger" definition of imperialism speaks only of its weakness. The main point, however, is that what we need are not paper definitions, stubbornly thrust upon us, but a genuine analysis of contemporary imperialism: the disclosure of its vices, weaknesses and laws which lead to its ruin,

and at the same time a sober assessment of its forces, including its huge atomic and other military potential.

The expression "paper tiger" actually leads to the demobilisation of the masses, because it conditions them to the thought that the strength of imperialism is a myth and must not be taken into account. Such phrases can only sow complacency among the peoples, and blunt their vigilance. The sowers of these phrases also say that it is necessary to despise the enemy from the strategic point of view, and approach him with all seriousness from the tactical point of view. But this "double entry" is in contradiction with Marxism-Leninism. From the Marxist viewpoint, strategy and tactics are linked by a profound unity. Tactics are called upon to serve the purpose of achieving the strategic goal; strategy is not in contradiction with tactics, but is aimed at achieving more important historical goals.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us to approach the enemy with a sober evaluation both of his historical prospects and his actual forces today, and to work out strategy and tactics on this basis. The international communist movement is well aware that imperialism is on the decline, that it has, historically speaking, outlived its day, but the movement is also aware that it has atomic fangs, to which it may resort.

A nuclear war would lead to the annihilation of hundreds of millions of people and to vast destruction of productive forces. This would complicate exceedingly the building of a new society on the ruins left after a world nuclear conflict. Communists must not keep silent about this, but must tell the masses frankly and openly about this threat. This contributes to the rousing of the peoples to struggle against imperialism and for a lasting world peace.

The communist movement holds that if the imperialists unleash a war, that will signify the final end of the rotten capitalist system. But the socialist revolution has no need to pave its way with atom and hydrogen bombs.

Is it or is it not possible to prevent a world war? Is it possible or not to consolidate peace? Is it or is it not possible to carry out a programme of general and complete disarmament, to implement the ideals of the masses of the people and create a just society, a "world without weapons, without armies, without wars?"

These are questions of cardinal importance. Those who say that to put forward slogans in defence of peace means spreading "illusions," are coming out against the positions of the international communist movement, are demobilising the masses, and are telling them, so to speak, that efforts to prevent a world war are doomed to failure, and are thereby

helping the forces of war. The true revolutionary optimism of communists is manifested by the fact that they are confident that a world war can be averted and the aggressive forces can be curbed, that they urge the broad masses of the people to active steps against the warmongers, and by the fact that they believe that all revolutionary processes develop and can make further progress in conditions of peaceful co-existence and that socialism can triumph throughout the world without a devastating nuclear war.

This is the optimism of revolutionary fighters; the opposite view is nothing but a philosophy of suicides. The struggle for peace and for the prevention of a destructive thermo-nuclear war meets the vital interest of the working class, the peasantry and all working people, the absolute majority of mankind.

Communists consider it their duty, to quote Marx, to "see to it that the simple laws of morality and justice, by which individuals should be guided in their relations, become supreme laws in the relations among nations too." (*Collected Works, vol. 16, p.11, Russian edition*).

The banner of peace gives communism an opportunity to rally round themselves the broadest masses of the people, and to create a mass political army of which the bourgeoisie and its parties cannot even dream. Communists are called upon to continue to bear this banner high.

Marxist-Leninists have held and continue to hold that the destinies of mankind are determined by the masses of the people. That is why they do not elevate the might of armaments, including nuclear weapons, to the absolute. One must not, however, artificially counterpose the might of the masses to the might of armaments. In order to safeguard peace, to prevent a world war, we must bring all the forces into play: the struggle of the masses of the people and the defensive might of the socialist camp; the correct foreign policy of the socialist countries, which must be firm, based on principle, and which must at the same time take into account the correlation of forces, which must be flexible and not rule out—depending on conditions—the method of "spear against spear" or the method of talks. To support one of these methods and arrogantly reject the other, is a senseless un-Leninist policy. Lenin wrote:

"It would be absurd to formulate a recipe or general rule ('No compromise!') to serve all cases. One must use one's own head and be able to find one's bearings in each separate case. That, in fact, is one of the functions of a party organisation and of party leaders worthy of the title, namely, through the prolonged, persistent, varied and comprehensive efforts of

all thinking representatives of the given class, to evolve the knowledge, the experience and—in addition to the knowledge and experience—the political instinct necessary for the speedy and correct solution of complicated political problems.” (*Collected Works, vol. 31, p. 50*).

Only the combination of all forces, all methods and forms of struggle for peace, offers the opportunity to prevent a new war. And this is a task of primary importance. After all, the end goal of the working class is not to die “spectacularly,” but to build a happy life for all mankind.

As long as the military danger from the imperialist camp persists, as long as there is no general and complete disarmament, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union considers it to be its sacred duty to maintain the defensive might of the Soviet Union and the combat readiness of its armed forces at a level which guarantees the complete rout of any enemy. Mankind knows what great military might is wielded by the Soviet Union and this steadily growing force is placed wholly at the service of the cause of peace.

If a war is forced upon us, the Soviet Union will be able to stand up for itself and for its allies. No one can have any doubts about that. But we, communists, genuine humanists, are called upon by history to create the most just society and this is why we must do everything in our power to ensure peace for the peoples and favourable conditions for their struggle for a bright future, for communism.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union maintains that true happiness can be achieved by the peoples only on the lines of socialism and communism. The CPSU, like the whole international communist movement, maintains that for the working class and its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist parties—it would be desirable to carry out the socialist revolution by peaceful means. At the same time the CPSU always stresses that in conditions in which the exploiting classes resort to violence, it is necessary to bear in mind the possibility of a non-peaceful transition to socialism, of the need for an armed struggle. In the report to the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, Comrade Nikita Khrushchov said :

“The possibility is not to be ruled out that the monopoly bourgeoisie may fall back on the most extreme and sanguinary means of retaining its domination. In these circumstances Lenin’s words are more significant today than ever before. The working class, he said, must ‘gain mastery of all forms or aspects of social activity without exception,’ and must be prepared for the ‘most rapid and sudden replacement of one form by another.’” Those who, like the Albanian dogmatists, allege that the CPSU “elevates the peaceful way of taking

power by the working class to the absolute” and “orientates itself only towards it,” are simply engaged in stubbornly disseminating an untruth that is contrary to the facts. Rejecting, in fact, the possibility of the working class gaining power by peaceful means, the dogmatists do not see real life, do not see the growing might and organisation of the working class movement, the growing attraction of the masses of the people to socialism, and deny the growing influence of the socialist system on the world revolutionary process. But this means that, far from advancing the cause of the world revolution, they are actually throttling it.

In their opposition to the thesis of the variety of forms of transition to socialism, the dogmatists usually invoke the following argument: “Up to our days, history has not yet known a single instance of a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism.” But had Marx and Engels proceeded from such “argumentation,” they could not have drawn the conclusion concerning the inevitability of the victory of socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, because it did not then exist anywhere in the world.

The strength of Marxist-Leninist theory lies in its ability to make a profound analysis of the key features of an epoch, and to draw from this analysis conclusions which light the way for the revolutionary forces for decades to come. The dogmatists seek to orient the fraternal parties, in all circumstances and in all conditions, only towards an armed struggle for power.

These views deviate from Leninism. Criticising the “left-wing communists,” Lenin wrote in the article *Strange and Monstrous*:

“Maybe the authors believe that the interest of the world revolution require that it should be prodded, and that it can be **prodded** only by war—and in no case by peace, which might give the masses the impression that imperialism was being ‘legalised’?”

“Such a ‘theory’ would be completely at variance with Marxism, which has always been opposed to ‘prodding’ revolutions, which develop as the acuteness of the class antagonisms which engender revolution ripens. Such a theory would be tantamount to the view that armed uprising is a form of struggle which is obligatory always and under all conditions.” (*Collected Works, vol. 27, p. 49*).

Of course, revolutionary theory can provide only orientation, and it is up to the proletariat of each country, and above all its communist vanguard, itself to determine the forms and methods of struggle to be chosen by the proletariat

of the given country in the specific historical conditions. To believe that a recipe for a socialist revolution can be invented to suit all times and all countries, and to thrust it upon the fraternal parties operating in the specific conditions of their own countries, is to do a harmful thing, to display an arrogance that is foreign to communists, to set oneself up as a teacher of all communist parties, and a teacher divorced from life at that, and therefore incapable of offering anything but dogmatic formulas.

The Soviet Union does its best to promote the development of revolutions of national liberation and to achieve the earliest abolition of the shameful colonial system. It has invariably extended as it is doing now, a helping hand to all peoples rising up against imperialism and colonialism. The programme of the CPSU says that the party and the entire Soviet people "regard it as their duty to support the sacred struggle of the oppressed peoples, their just wars of liberation against imperialism." And this is real, not just verbal support. The USSR is rendering considerable political, diplomatic and economic assistance, including aid in arms, to states which ask for support in the struggle against the imperialists and colonialists, in the struggle to consolidate their independence.

The young national states as a rule come out for peace, and form an important link in the zone of peace. It is of the utmost importance to extend this zone of peace, to strengthen the militant alliance of the socialist and the newly independent states, to solve patiently—through negotiation—the disputes which arise, and to prevent all actions which might undermine the positions of the progressive forces in these states and weaken the friendship between the states that have newly achieved their freedom and the countries of socialism. It would be extremely harmful to try to fit revolutionary processes in this extremely varied world into ready-made moulds, as the dogmatists are trying to do.

What is the conclusion that emerges from a consideration of all these questions? It is obvious: The Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics worked out collectively by the fraternal parties at their meetings in 1957 and 1960 are the only correct strategy and tactics.

The consistent implementation of this strategy and tactics guarantees to the communists and to all the revolutionary forces decisive victories in the struggle for peace, democracy, national liberation and in the struggle for socialism. At the same time it means that struggle against all attempts to blunt, to weaken the weapons of the communists of the world is now becoming a most important condition for the further successes of our revolutionary cause.

The struggle for the purity of Marxism-Leninism and for

the cohesion of the ranks of the international communist movement is the international duty of each Communist Party. The Statement by the representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties pointed out that revisionism is the chief danger in the world communist movement. At the same time, the statement stressed that "dogmatism and sectarianism in theory and practice can also become the main danger at some stage of the development of individual parties unless combated unrelentingly." This is a correct and farsighted conclusion.

The CPSU has steadfastly fought, as it does now, both against revisionism and against dogmatism and sectarianism. But some people lay one-sided emphasis on the struggle against revisionism only, and moreover at times decry creative Marxism-Leninism as "revisionism," introducing obvious confusion into the communist movement. Marxist-Leninists are duty bound to analyse the specific situation and see who, at each specific moment, is retarding the advance of the common revolutionary cause. Approaching the matter from this, the only correct position, one cannot fail to acknowledge that the dogmatic approach to the solution of the key problems of the communist movement is the source of the gravest mistakes.

The disease of leftist sectarianism is fed by nationalism and in turn, feeds nationalism. As is shown by experience, it becomes particularly intolerable when it manifests itself in the activities of a party in power. It becomes especially dangerous also because it is directed against the line of the communist movement on such vital questions as those of war and peace, which affect the destinies of all mankind. This is why left-wing opportunism, dogmatism and sectarianism are increasingly emerging as a grave danger in the world communist movement. The fraternal parties have amassed a wealth of experience of combating revisionism, which, by the way, is easier to discern. Left-wing opportunism, on the other hand, is more difficult to expose, because it hides its essential trend towards capitulation behind an "ultra-revolutionary" phraseology, playing on the feelings of the masses. In these conditions, there can be only one correct line for communists: resolute struggle against both right-wing and left-wing opportunism, against both revisionism and dogmatism and sectarianism, implacable struggle against any distortion of Marxism-Leninism.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, like the other Marxist-Leninist parties, considers it its international duty to abide scrupulously by the provisions of the documents of the Moscow meetings, and to build its relations in accordance with the principles established in them. This is why communists cannot but feel gravely concerned over the thesis

launched recently that there is a "temporary majority" in the international communist movement which "persists in its mistakes," and a "temporary minority" which "boldly and resolutely upholds the truth." To insist on this thesis would in effect mean to lead matters to the fragmentation of the international communist movement, to undermine the ideological and organisational principles on which it is built and which have provided the foundation for the historic victories of socialism. This thesis only serves to justify a split in the communist movement and the abandonment of the common positions of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

This contention is especially harmful in that it is associated with an incredible pretention to proclaim one party the true heir of Lenin, and all other parties to be apostates from Marxism-Leninism. To proclaim to the whole world that a situation has now developed in the international communist movement similar to that in the period of the Second International, on the eve of its split, and similar to that in the ranks of the Social Democratic Party of Germany in December 1914, when its leadership stood on positions of chauvinism, means in effect to say to the entire international communist movement that it has sunk in the morass of opportunism and social democratic revisionism, and to set oneself up as the only party which stands on correct Marxist-Leninist positions. Who has the right to put himself in the place of the great Lenin who upheld the principles of revolutionary Marxism and raised high the banner of struggle against opportunism?

There is no doubt that the communist parties will reject these inordinate pretensions of people to put themselves in the place of Lenin, and to proclaim themselves to be the sole guardians of the "truth." These pretensions are not only basically wrong, but absolutely unwarranted. Who does not realise that an attempt to draw an analogy with Lenin's struggle against the opportunism of the Second International, and thereby justify any splitting activities among the communists, is completely out of keeping with the historical realities and the real state of affairs in the international communist movement, which is advancing steadily along the revolutionary, Leninist road? It also bespeaks of incredible arrogance, a complete absence of any sense of respect or desire to heed the unanimous view and the appeals of the overwhelming majority of the fraternal parties, each of which has done great services to the international proletariat, and has great revolutionary experience.

Lenin regarded the creative activities of the fraternal parties with great respect, understanding full well their difficulties and the grim conditions in which they fought against the yoke of capital. And when he needed to form a picture of the

situation in this or that country he first of all carefully studied and attentively regarded the opinion and conclusions of the communist party of the country concerned. The CPSU, the Soviet communists, firmly abide by this, Lenin's method. Those who criticise the communist parties which for decades have fought courageously against imperialism, who criticise their leaders who have deservedly won the profound respect of all the revolutionaries of the world, act in anything but Lenin's way. Was it in Lenin's way, for instance, that foreign guests acted recently at the congress of a big fraternal party when they used its platform to accuse that party of opportunism and of betraying the interests of the people of its country?

In the opinion of the Albanian "theoreticians" only "cliques of revisionists" have now remained in the world communist movement. In vain they appeal to the "rank and file communists," now of this, now of that communist party, urging them to "overthrow" these "cliques." And there are people who offer their services to distribute such writings throughout the world.

The methods used by the Albanian leaders and by those who support them in the struggle against the international communist movement are methods alien to Leninism. They consist in essence of misrepresenting, distorting and falsifying the views of the CPSU and other fraternal parties, ascribing to them positions which they have never held, as, for instance, allegations that in their opinion the peoples of the capitalist countries should not make revolutions, the oppressed nations should not fight for their liberation, and the peoples of the whole world should not fight against imperialism, etc. It must be said that since the time of Trotskyism no other opportunist trend has ever resorted to such a monstrous method which completely distorts truth, and misleads the people of its country and world opinion.

Is it worthy of a communist to allege that the glorious fraternal parties of France, the United States, Italy, Spain, Britain, Greece, Belgium, Denmark, Portugal, Iraq, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay and many other countries, which are in the fire of class battles and daily wage truly heroic battles against capitalism, for which they are subjected to persecutions and reprisals by the police machine of the imperialist states, keep aloof from the struggle of the masses of the people and support imperialism? But this is slander of selfless fighters! In fact this is aid to the enemy against whom the communists are fighting!

The Albanian leaders and those who support them try to cover up their subversive actions against the positions of the international communist movement with the cry about defence

of the Declaration and the Statement. But actually, as is evident to everyone, they have departed from the letter and spirit of these programmatic Marxist-Leninist documents.

Take such a most important question as the unity of the communist movement. The Statement declares:

“The interests of the struggle for the working-class cause demand of each communist party and of the great army of communists of all countries, ever closer unity of will and action. It is the supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist party to work continuously for greater unity in the world communist movement.”

Is there anything in common between this Marxist-Leninist provision and the thesis about a “temporary majority,” and “a minority defending truth”? Absolutely nothing. This thesis, unworthy of communists, means an unceremonious attack on the unity of the communist movement, means banking on disunity in the ranks of our movement, on splitting it. The authors of this anti-Marxist and anti-internationalist thesis, against facts, are trying to assure everybody, that they are defending the Declaration and the Statement!

As has been shown by the results of an objective analysis, the dogmatists grossly trample upon the conclusions of the Declaration and the Statement also on such cardinal questions as the struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence, the form of transition to socialism, the principles of mutual relations between the fraternal parties. And no matter how the Albanian leaders and their backers may try to pose as supporters of the documents of the Moscow meetings, the facts and their deeds show that on all the most important questions they are following a line which is directed against the agreed positions of the international communist movement—the Declaration of 1957, the Statement of 1960, against the Peace Manifesto and the Message to the Peoples of the World.

The pretension of a single communist party to lay claim to infallibility and to ignore at the same time the opinion of other communist parties is entirely wrong and damaging to the interests of the communist movement. This is impermissible in assessing the situation in some particular country where another fraternal party is working and fighting. It is all the more impermissible in respect of most important questions which concern not only one party or the parties of several countries, but all the communist parties of the world and the general question of the struggle of the international working class and communist movement against the forces of international reaction, imperialism and war.

The positions of the communist movement of the whole world on these questions are set forth in the documents of

the 1957 and 1960 Moscow meetings. Every communist party must fully take into consideration and stand by this unanimous opinion of the world communist movement. There is no other way.

Lenin was in favour of recognising international proletarian discipline. He wrote:

“We take pride in the fact that we solve the great questions of the workers’ struggle for their liberation, obeying the international discipline of the revolutionary proletariat, taking into consideration the experience of the workers of the different countries, taking into account their knowledge and their will, thus realising in practice (and not in oratory as the Renners, Fritz Adlers and Otto Bauers did) the unity of the class struggle of the workers for communism throughout the world.” (*Collected Works, vol. 31, p. 244.*)

Lenin taught that every politically conscious worker must feel himself a member of the international family of Marxists and must not for one minute dissociate himself from the international army of workers.

The communist parties do not have rules common for all, but they do have the decisions of the Moscow meetings, which are common and binding for all of them. Devotion to these decisions is an international duty of every communist party. Not to carry out in the present conditions the collectively drafted decisions of the Moscow meetings would mean to disrupt the unity of the communist movement, to withdraw each into its own “national house,” would mean, in the final analysis, to help imperialism in carrying out its plans and to put a brake on the liberation struggle of the peoples.

What the communists need is not a division into a “majority” and a “minority,” but unity, unity and once more unity. The supreme law of the communist movement, its important distinguishing feature from reformists of all hues, is the sacred safeguarding of its cohesion and unity.

“Unity,” Lenin wrote, “is needed by the working class. Unity is effected only through a single organisation whose decisions are carried out scrupulously by all politically aware workers. To discuss a question, pronounce and hear various views on it, find out the view of the **majority** of organised Marxists, express this view in a decision communicated by correspondence, and carry out this decision conscientiously—that is what **unity** means all over the world, among all sensible people. And such unity is endlessly dear, endlessly important for the working class. Disunited workers are nothing. United workers are everything.” (*Collected Works, vol. 19, p. 470.*)

These words of Lenin should never be forgotten.

In the period of the Second International, the world bourgeoisie acclaimed the treason of the social democratic leaders and proclaimed war on Lenin and Leninism. And today the world bourgeoisie fights against the Communist Parties with no less fury than it fought in its time against Lenin and the Bolsheviks, for it justly sees in the Communist Parties its principal adversaries, the staunchest fighters for the interests of the people, for the elimination of capitalism and of the exploitation of the popular masses. To describe a great army which daily wages a real, truly heroic struggle against imperialism, for the happiness and freedom of the peoples, and for the victory of socialism, as a "temporary majority" which "persists in its mistakes" and, like the leaders of the Second International, allegedly follows the way of revisionism, means to strike a blow at the main force of the revolution and to hamper the victory of the cause of the revolution.

The whole of progressive mankind is now deeply aware that the Soviet Union, the socialist camp, the international communist, working class, and national liberation movements are waging a great historical battle against imperialism, and for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. The policymakers and ideologists of imperialism see their principal adversary primarily in the Soviet Union, in the socialist camp, in the Communist Parties and the forces supporting them. The entire vast machine of imperialism directs its main blows against communism, against the ideas emanating from the countries which are victoriously building socialism and communism, and against their policy.

One cannot fail to see that the imperialists seek to gain an advantage for themselves from the differences which have appeared among the communists. They openly say that this is "to the advantage of the West" and that it "hampers communist success." It is highly indicative that simultaneously calls are made for the "strengthening of the free world," the "consolidation of the western alliance," and so on. To these attempts by the leaders of the imperialist camp to weaken the forces of peace, democracy and socialism and thereby strengthen the positions of reaction and aggression, the international communist movement must reply by further consolidating and strengthening the unity of its ranks.

The communist movement is faced with extremely complex and responsible tasks. The vital interests of the masses of the people, the development of successful struggle against imperialism, for the abolition of the disgraceful system of exploitation and national oppression, for the triumph of socialism and communism, insistently require consolidation of the international alliance of the Communist Parties, and its solid, indestructible unity.

History will not forgive any leader who, in this crucial period of history, fails to recognise the main thing which is required of him—persistently to strengthen in every way the unity of the Communist Parties—and acts contrary to the vital interests of the peoples. The existing differences between the world communist movement and the Albanian leaders and their supporters cannot be allowed to obscure from the communists of the world the tasks of the struggle against imperialism, for national independence, peace, democracy, socialism and communism.

The differences between individual communist parties on this or that matter do not have deep roots in the social system of the socialist countries. Whereas in the conditions of capitalism the contradictions have an objective foundation, and are therefore antagonistic in character, the differences between Communist Parties are primarily subjective. Consequently there are all the conditions for successfully overcoming these differences. One must proceed from the higher aims and interests of the international communist movement, and seek ways of drawing closer together, ways of co-operation and unity. If one does not persist in one's special position, if one is guided by Marxism-Leninism, proceeds on the basis of the higher interests, common to all, and finds the "strength of mind" to march in step with the whole movement, then the cause of the international cohesion of the communist movement will be guaranteed.

The 1960 meeting, in the interests of the cohesion and unity of the ranks of the international communist movement, defined the principles of mutual relations between the parties by which they are called upon to be guided in their activities. These principles have two interconnected aspects: examination of all questions on the basis of equality, through meetings; at the same time it was emphasised that the "resolute defence of the unity of the world communist movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and the prevention of any actions which may undermine that unity, are a necessary condition for victory in the struggle for national independence, democracy and peace, for the successful accomplishment of the tasks of the socialist revolution and of the building of socialism and communism."

It is impermissible to separate from one another these closely interconnected laws of our movement. Splitting activities must not be tolerated in the ranks of the international communist movement. Disregard of this demand is tantamount to undermining the very foundations of the fraternal unity of the communist parties, to encroaching on the very principles of proletarian internationalism. It may lead, first of all, to the appearance of a "minority" trend and

then to the emergence of the danger of a split in the international communist movement, to the joy of its common enemy—international imperialism.

The course of the CPSU, defined by its 20th and 22nd Congresses, is a course aimed at rallying all the forces of socialism, at consolidating the unity of all the fraternal parties, and at rallying all the forces of the anti-imperialist front. This course underlies our position in the development of our relations with socialist Yugoslavia.

The steps taken recently by the Yugoslav communists and their leaders in their home and foreign policy have removed much of what was erroneous and damaging to the cause of building socialism in Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav communists have taken steps towards *rapprochement* and unity with the entire world communist movement. Those who allege that "capitalism has been restored" in Yugoslavia, that "new bourgeois elements" have occupied a dominant position there, are deliberately lying, refusing to analyse facts and phenomena, substituting fabrications for them, and trying to expel the people of a whole country from the ranks of the fighters for socialism. The CPSU declares openly that there still exist differences with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia on a number of ideological questions. But the *rapprochement* between Yugoslavia and the country that is building communism can, without doubt, help to overcome the differences on a number of ideological questions much more quickly. Is the consolidation of the forces of socialism in the interests of the communist movement? Undoubtedly it is! What the CPSU is striving for is the rallying, not the division of the countries of socialism and of all communist parties.

There are no "superior" and "inferior" parties in the communist movement. The communist parties are fraternal parties. They have one and the same ideology—Marxism-Leninism, one and the same aim—struggle against imperialism, for the triumph of communism. All communist parties are equal and independent. All are responsible for the destinies of the communist movement, for its victories and setbacks. Our party was the first to put forward these propositions. The CPSU, on its own initiative, proposed that the Statement and other documents of the communist movement should not say that the Soviet Union stands at the head of the socialist camp, or the CPSU at the head of the communist movement. This is but one of the indications of how scrupulously the CPSU observes the principles of the equality and solidarity of the fraternal parties, how boundlessly loyal it is to the principles of proletarian internationalism. Loyalty to proletarian internationalism has become the lifeblood of our party, and the peoples of all countries see this daily in numerous examples.

The party of Lenin, which was the first to blaze the trail to socialism, which is now the first to scale the heights of communism, which is rendering all-round fraternal assistance to the builders of socialism in other countries and to the fighters for national liberation, and which is tirelessly rallying the communist movement, which has raised high the banner of the struggle for peace, for saving mankind from the horrors of thermonuclear war, is fulfilling its international duty with honour by all these and other actions. And those who, in defiance of the facts, seek to discredit the internationalism of the CPSU and its great contribution to the world movement for liberation, are harming the liberation struggle of all peoples.

The communist parties have a tried and tested method for settling contentious issues by means of collective discussion. Our party has always advocated this method. The CPSU is deeply convinced that collective discussion of the most important questions of modern world development makes it possible to ensure the cohesion of the international communist movement.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue to fight tirelessly for the unity of the great socialist community of nations, against any splitting actions, for strengthening the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of the great principles of Marxism-Leninism.

All quotations are re-translations from the Russian.—Ed.

