

**CONFESSIONS  
CONCERNING THE LINE OF  
SOVIET-U.S. COLLABORATION  
PURSUED BY THE NEW LEADERS  
OF THE CPSU**

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS  
PEKING

**CONFESSIONS  
CONCERNING THE LINE OF  
SOVIET-U.S. COLLABORATION  
PURSUED BY THE NEW LEADERS  
OF THE CPSU**

by Commentator of *Hongqi (Red Flag)*

*(February 11, 1966)*

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS  
PEKING 1966

SOVIET-U.S. collaboration for the domination of the world is the soul of the Khrushchov revisionist line. Since coming to power, the new leaders of the CPSU have tried hard to appear different from Khrushchov and to don an anti-U.S. mask in their attempt to cover up the essential fact that they are continuing this line. But an increasing number of facts show that they have acted even more thoroughly and gone even farther than Khrushchov in the matter of Soviet-U.S. collaboration.

The new leaders of the CPSU are greatly annoyed at the exposure of their true features by the Marxist-Leninists. They have poured out torrents of abuse and attacked our articles exposing them as full of "utterly groundless, slanderous, provocative fabrications".<sup>1</sup>

Abuse and sophistry cannot alter the facts. The new leaders of the CPSU are daily exposing themselves by their numerous words and deeds and by the articles in their own press. An outstanding instance is the publication of a batch of books advocating Soviet-U.S. collaboration by the new leaders of the CPSU in 1965. Typical among these are *The Motive Forces of U.S. Foreign Policy* and *The U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. — Their Political and Economic Relations*.

What are the main theses of the two books?

*The Motive Forces of U.S. Foreign Policy* was edited and published by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Soviet Academy of Sciences in 1965. Although the book cannot well remain silent about certain facts of U.S. aggression abroad and has to say something denouncing U.S. aggressive activities, it tries hard to prove that these evil deeds are the doings of the reactionaries in the U.S. monopoly capi-

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, November 16, 1965.

talist class, while the chieftains of U.S. imperialism, who likewise represent monopoly capital, are not included among these reactionaries; in other words, the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism can change. Denunciation of U.S. imperialism is but a screen; the substance of the book consists of covering up its aggressive nature.

The book divides the U.S. ruling circles into two groups, "the sober and sensible" and "the bellicose and aggressive". It says: "The struggle between the two tendencies in foreign and military policy — the adventurist and aggressive on the one hand and the sober and sensible on the other — is more and more intensely enveloping the ranks of the real rulers of the United States — the country's biggest monopolies." It also speaks of "the struggle that has intensified to the extreme between the two tendencies in foreign policy, the two groups in American social life — i.e., on the one hand, the ultra-reactionary and wildly aggressive and, on the other, the moderate and sober who are inclined towards a reasonable assessment of the balance of power that has now taken shape, and towards peaceful coexistence".

Who are "the moderate and sober who are inclined . . . towards peaceful coexistence"? According to this book, they are the chieftains of U.S. imperialism, the successive U.S. presidents since the War. It speaks of Eisenhower as representing "more moderate circles, which were not inclined to put into practice their adventuristic doctrines and go to the risk of a big war"; of Kennedy as "the President popular among the people", who had "breadth of vision and a sober approach to the burning problems of international life" and "understood the possibility and necessity of peaceful coexistence"; and of Johnson as "a cautious and moderate political figure" who is "not given to political risks" and as enjoying "an absolute mandate from the people to carry out a policy directed towards consolidating peace and liquidating 'the cold war', and towards Soviet-U.S. rapprochement".

How is it that these arch war criminals have suddenly turned into partisans of peace? How is it that these common enemies of the people have suddenly become presidents popular among the people? In so lavishly embellishing the leaders of U.S. imperialism, the book has no other aim than that of peddling the wares of "peaceful coexistence" and "peaceful competition" between the Soviet Union and the United States. It says, "The ruling classes of the United States are beginning to realize in one measure or another that peaceful economic competition is the decisive field of struggle between world class forces at the present time." In "the nuclear age", "only a madman or a suicidal person can resort to war as an instrument of policy" and "the U.S. Government has in many cases shown a desire for compromise". The book asserts that provided there is "peaceful coexistence" between the Soviet Union and the United States, "the competition between the two socio-economic systems and the ideological struggle between the two main antagonists on the international arena will proceed within the confines of broad economic, diplomatic, scientific and cultural competition and cooperation, without sanguinary collisions and wars".

The book proclaims that "Soviet-American relations, the relations between the two greatest powers in the world, constitute the axis of world politics, the main foundation of international peace". Using the words of U.S. Secretary of State Rusk, it preaches that "the two great powers — the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. — bear special responsibility for the destiny of the world and of mankind". It says that the Soviet Union "strives for peace and cooperation with the United States, realizing that Soviet-American relations are the primary thing in contemporary world politics and in the question of war or peace".

Then will aggression against Vietnam by U.S. imperialism, its bombing of the socialist Democratic Republic of Vietnam and massacre of the Vietnamese people interfere with Soviet-U.S. relations? No, according to this book, they will not. Even in these circumstances, there is no conflict whatsoever between

the Soviet Union and the United States. The book stresses that an "extremely important feature in Soviet-American relations" is the so-called "community of national interests of the two countries". It says, "Except for the black spot — the U.S. participation in the military intervention against Soviet Russia from 1918 to 1920 — Russian-American and Soviet-American relations have not been clouded by any military conflicts or wars." "At the present time, too, no territorial or economic disputes or conflicts exist between the two countries, and their national interests do not clash either on a world scale or on any regional scale."

*The U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. — Their Political and Economic Relations* was published in 1965 on the authorization of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. It deals with the history of Soviet-U.S. relations from the October Revolution to the time of World War II. It cannot very well omit the historical facts of U.S. aggression against and hostility towards the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, its underlying objective is Soviet-U.S. collaboration, and it stresses "the immutability of the Soviet policy directed towards all-round cooperation with the United States".

In its efforts to defend the policy of "all-round cooperation" between the Soviet Union and the United States as pursued by the new leaders of the CPSU, the book does not scruple to distort history. It asserts that "from its very first days, the Soviet state has immutably and consistently steered a course towards all-round cooperation with the United States" and that "the history of Soviet-American relations between 1917 and 1941 convincingly proves that peaceful coexistence and friendly cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. accord both with the interests of the Soviet and American peoples and with those of the people of other countries". It adds, "Soviet-American cooperation during the years of World War II created favourable conditions for the final termination of the unrealistic and short-sighted pre-war policy of the ruling

circles of the U.S.A. towards the U.S.S.R. and for the development of fruitful Soviet-American relations in the post-war period."

In its efforts to justify the policy of Soviet-U.S. collaboration, the book spares no effort to create the impression that the present ruling clique of the United States is peace-loving. It says that at present "the more far-sighted and sober-minded representatives of influential circles in the United States are speaking out in favour of pursuing a more realistic foreign policy", and that "they clearly understand that in the contemporary international situation the only acceptable basis of cooperation between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. is peaceful coexistence and competition in the economic, scientific and technological, cultural and other fields".

The book emphasizes that "the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government have always attached primary significance to the normalization of the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. and still do so". It cites one argument contained in the resolution on Khrushchov's report at the 21st Congress of the CPSU: "The normalization of the international situation could be helped to a decisive degree by an improvement in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, as the two great powers which shoulder special responsibility for the fate of general peace."

It is thus clear to all that the tune of these two books is the same as that of Khrushchov's statements. Khrushchov said that "the international situation as a whole depends to a large extent on the relations between the United States of America and the Soviet Union",<sup>1</sup> that "history has imposed on our two peoples a great responsibility for the destiny of the world",<sup>2</sup> that as regards the Soviet Union and the United States "our interests do not clash directly anywhere, either territorially or

<sup>1</sup> N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at the Soviet-Indian Friendship Rally, September 8, 1961.

<sup>2</sup> N. S. Khrushchov and L. I. Brezhnev, New Year Greetings to U.S. President Kennedy, December 30, 1961.

economically" and that "we can co-exist very well".<sup>1</sup> The disciples and followers of Khrushchov are merely parroting their master.

Obviously enough, these two books were written in full conformity with the revisionist line of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses and the Programme of the CPSU. The statements in them are the very ones the new leaders of the CPSU would make themselves. Their publication is another proof that these new leaders are carrying on Khrushchovism without Khrushchov, that their conception of Soviet-U.S. collaboration is not fortuitous but consistent, and that their pursuit of Soviet-U.S. collaboration is no mere matter of a few isolated words or deeds but is their basic line. The two books are confessions concerning the line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration pursued by the new leaders of the CPSU.

At first glance, the two books seem to devote a lot of space to describing U.S. imperialist aggression and to denouncing the U.S. reactionaries. But a careful perusal reveals that, while perfunctorily condemning U.S. imperialism, they laud the dominant group in the ruling circles of the U.S. to the skies. They say the Soviet Union is against the United States' acts of aggression, but for all their talk they are begging for Soviet-U.S. collaboration. This sort of minor attack but major help is simply trickery to deceive the people of the Soviet Union and the world, and to give better service to U.S. imperialism.

The two books have attracted public attention. They are fine texts for teaching by negative example. They expose all the different tricks the new leaders of the CPSU are now playing.

These leaders claim that they are opposing U.S. imperialism. But what are the facts? It was precisely in the year 1965, when U.S. imperialism was frantically extending its war of aggression in Vietnam, that they published these books advocat-

<sup>1</sup>N. S. Khrushchov, Interview with Gardener Cowles, an American publisher, April 20, 1962.

ing Soviet-U.S. collaboration and proclaiming "the immutability of the Soviet policy directed towards all-round cooperation with the United States". On many occasions, they have personally made statements to this effect. L. I. Brezhnev, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, declared on May 8, 1965: "We are in favour of developing and improving our relations with the U.S."<sup>1</sup> In the interview he gave to the *New York Times* reporter James Reston on December 6, 1965, A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., said that for the Soviet Union and the United States, "from the standpoint of these long-term concepts, the most important idea should be the mustering of all forces to oppose war" and that they must mobilize their own forces "for developing cooperation and solutions to various points at issue".<sup>2</sup> Where is the opposition to U.S. imperialism in this? Are not these words all confessions by the new leaders of the CPSU that they are clinging fast to Soviet-U.S. collaboration?

The new leaders of the CPSU ostentatiously say that "the aggressive nature of imperialism has not changed". But let people examine what they are really trying to prove in the books they have published. Like Khrushchov, they say that the dominant group in American ruling circles are "sensible", are "inclined to peaceful coexistence", have come to a "knowledge of the realities of the nuclear age" and understand that "only a suicidal person can resort to war as an instrument of policy". Does this not amount to saying that the representatives of U.S. imperialism are not pursuing policies of aggression and war and that U.S. imperialism is no longer the main force of aggression and war? Are these not arguments brazenly proclaiming that the nature of imperialism has already changed?

<sup>1</sup>L. I. Brezhnev, Report at the Rally in Commemoration of the 20th Anniversary of Victory in the Soviet People's Great Patriotic War, May 8, 1965.

<sup>2</sup>A. N. Kosygin, Interview with the American Correspondent James Reston, December 6, 1965.

Although there are groups with different interests within the monopoly capitalist class in the United States and although there are acute conflicts of interests among these groups, they are completely at one in their fundamental interest, the enslavement of the people at home and abroad; they are all reactionaries. Although the U.S. ruling groups hold different views with regard to the methods of counter-revolution and frequently quarrel among themselves, one preferring this counter-revolutionary method and another that, they are completely at one in their basic policy of maintaining reactionary rule at home and of committing aggression abroad. There is no such thing as supra-class "sensibleness". If the representatives of U.S. monopoly capital are "sensible" at all, they are "sensible" only in safeguarding the fundamental interests of their own class, in oppressing the American people at home and plundering other peoples abroad, and in executing their policies of aggression and war. The new leaders of the CPSU are keen on dividing U.S. ruling circles into the "sensible" and the "reactionary", but what other interpretation of their real intention is possible except that it is to provide a cover for U.S. imperialism and help the U.S. imperialists lull the people of the world?

Sometimes the new leaders of the CPSU mouth a few phrases attacking Johnson. This is only a smokescreen. These books of theirs demonstrate that, like Khrushchov, they portray the presidents of the United States as angels of peace and absolute representatives of the American people. The reason is very simple. It is that the Khrushchov revisionists invariably put their stakes on the chieftain of U.S. imperialism. They always do their utmost to prettify the president of the United States whoever he is.

Facts have given the Khrushchov revisionists one slap in the face after another. Of all the contemporary U.S. presidents, has any single one not been the tool of monopoly capital? Johnson himself does not conceal this. He told the U.S. monopoly capitalists at the 1964 annual conference

of the American Chamber of Commerce, "You are stockholders in this government", and spoke of doing "the things that you have hired me to do". From Truman and Eisenhower to Kennedy and Johnson, they have been following the same policies of aggression and war for world domination. These policies, moreover, have become more and more articulated and rampant. The "Johnson Doctrine" is contemporary fascism. It blatantly proclaims that force will be used for intervention in all parts of the world and for the overthrow of every government which is not to the liking of the United States. The Johnson Administration is escalating its war adventures. The "Johnson Doctrine" is a manifestation of the increasingly bellicose and adventuristic nature of U.S. imperialism. By trying desperately to beautify the U.S. imperialist chieftains, the new leaders of the CPSU only reveal their own ugly features.

The new leaders of the CPSU say that they "strictly follow Lenin's behest". But how do they present Lenin? In these books of theirs, they have gone so far as to describe Lenin as the initiator of the policy of "all-round cooperation" between the Soviet Union and the United States, and the history of Soviet-U.S. relations as that of "all-round cooperation". What is this if not a betrayal of Lenin and a distortion of history?

After the victory of the October Revolution, U.S. imperialism took an active part in the imperialist crusade of armed intervention against the new-born Soviet state. After the failure of this intervention, it attempted to prevent the growth of the Soviet Union by resorting to "the noose of famine". In the period of Lenin's and Stalin's leadership, Soviet-U.S. relations were filled with acute and complex struggles, which were an expression of the fierce world-wide conflict between the international proletariat and the international bourgeoisie. In trying to erase class struggle from the history of Soviet-U.S. relations, the new leaders of the CPSU adulterate history and insult the Soviet people.

Lenin pointed out that the U.S. imperialists were acting "as the hangmen of Russian freedom, as gendarmes",<sup>1</sup> and that they were "the throttlers and executioners of the world revolution".<sup>2</sup> Lenin called on people to be "uncompromising enemies of American imperialism — the freshest, strongest and latest in joining in the world-wide slaughter of nations for the division of capitalist profits".<sup>3</sup> How fresh these words of Lenin sound to us even today! The Khrushchov revisionists are trying to hide themselves behind the flag of Lenin. But it is precisely Lenin's words which most powerfully expose them for what they are.

The new leaders of the CPSU say that they are loyal to the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960. But these books give them the lie. The Declaration and the Statement point out that U.S. imperialism is the common enemy of the people of the world. But these books prate about Soviet-U.S. friendship. The Declaration and the Statement point out that the people throughout the world must form the broadest united front to oppose the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war. But these books actively boost Soviet-U.S. co-operation. These leaders are still loyal to the Khrushchov revisionist general line of "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition". When they wave the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, the new leaders of the CPSU are merely repeating the old tactics of the revisionists of the Second International — to emasculate the revolutionary principles of a document while paying lip service to it, to cover up their own anti-revolutionary essence with fine phrases.

The new leaders of the CPSU say that they recognize the role played by the people of all countries in the struggle

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, "Moscow Party Workers' Meeting", *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, Vol. XXVIII, p. 209.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, "Extraordinary Sixth All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers', Peasants', Cossacks' and Red Army Deputies", *op. cit.*, p. 159.

<sup>3</sup> V. I. Lenin, "Letter to American Workers", *op. cit.*, p. 62.

against imperialism. But in these books, they undisguisedly advocate power politics and shamelessly flaunt their big-power chauvinist arrogance. In their eyes, the destiny of the world should be decided by the rulers of the Soviet Union and the United States, the more than one hundred countries on this globe should revolve round the Soviet-U.S. axis, and the very existence of the people of the world must depend on the mercies of the ruling circles of the Soviet Union and the United States. Doesn't this show that what the Khrushchov revisionists hanker after is nothing but Soviet-U.S. collaboration for world domination?

The new leaders of the CPSU hypocritically declare that the socialist countries and the revolutionary people of all countries have "a common aim" and "common interests". They have repeatedly professed loyalty to proletarian internationalism and support for the revolution of the people of all countries. But what they play up in these books are the "common interests" of the Soviet Union and the United States. How can these two kinds of "common interests", which are as diametrically opposed to each other as fire and water, be mixed together? U.S. imperialism is the common enemy of the people of the socialist countries and all other lands. The Khrushchov revisionists' eager pursuit of "common interests" with the U.S. imperialists merely testifies that they have gone over to the side of U.S. imperialism and pitted themselves against the people of the socialist countries and the world who are opposing U.S. imperialism.

In the very nature of things, there are irreconcilable contradictions between the socialist Soviet Union and the imperialist United States. As a socialist country, the Soviet Union should support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, and sharp struggles between it and U.S. imperialism both on a world-wide scale and in particular regions are inevitable. Today, however, the new leaders of the CPSU stress that between themselves and U.S. imperialism there are no clashes "either on a world scale or on any regional

scale". This only shows that the world-wide contradiction between revolution and counter-revolution, as well as the duty of supporting the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, have long since ceased to exist for them. They have sunk in the mire of bourgeois national egoism, and not a trace of proletarian internationalism can be found in them.

The new leaders of the CPSU stress the "common interests" of the Soviet Union and the United States in order to cater to the needs of U.S. imperialism. Kennedy long ago exhorted the leaders of the CPSU to "merely seek to protect its own national interests" and to reach agreement with the United States on "protecting the interests of our two great countries".<sup>1</sup> Both Khrushchov and the new leaders of the CPSU have readily responded to the call of U.S. imperialism. For they do indeed have common interests with the U.S. imperialists; these are the common interests shared by the privileged Soviet bourgeois stratum, whom they represent, with the U.S. monopoly capitalist groups and the common interests of Soviet-U.S. partnership against world revolution.

The ideas guiding the policy of Soviet-U.S. collaboration as expounded by the new leaders of the CPSU in these books have long been put into practice. Recently, in pursuit of their "common interests" with the United States, they have greatly accelerated their ganging up with U.S. imperialism.

The tripartite Soviet-U.S.-Indian meeting in New Delhi in January 1966 openly strengthened the united front against China. U.S. Vice-President Humphrey made no secret of his satisfaction after his long talk with Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. In a television interview Humphrey said that the talk was "frank and candid", and that he had explained the U.S. government's positions and "had a response from Mr. Kosygin". He said that "the Soviet

<sup>1</sup> John F. Kennedy, Interview with A. I. Adzhubei, Editor-in-Chief of *Izvestia*, November 25, 1961.

is attempting to build a containment wall, so to speak, around communist China" and that "the government of the Soviet Union is much more concerned today about its relationships throughout the entire world vis-a-vis communist China than it is over anything that the United States may be doing in any part of the world". Humphrey held that "looking ahead for the next few years . . . the contacts between ourselves . . . and the Soviet Union will expand, that the relationships can and should improve".<sup>1</sup>

Humphrey's comments show how chummy the Soviet Union and the United States have become in their collaboration. It is because they have confided to each other what they have in mind that Humphrey is so very sure of the policy of the new leaders of the CPSU and has dared to make these comments publicly. The policy of the new leaders of the CPSU is to unite with U.S. imperialism and the reactionaries of various countries in forming a counter-revolutionary ring of encirclement against China. This policy fully meets the desires of U.S. imperialism and it is only natural that the U.S. imperialists should acclaim it and give it their support and encouragement. This is what the Soviet-U.S. talk in New Delhi boils down to. This is a most flagrant betrayal on the part of the new leaders of the CPSU. If this is not how things stand, why haven't the new leaders of the CPSU repudiated Humphrey's allegations?

Soviet-U.S. collaboration has been further stepped up on the question of Vietnam. While the United States was making a "pause in the bombing" and raising a hue and cry about "peace talks", Shelepin took pains to visit Hanoi in close co-ordination with this U.S. "peace talks" plot. The new leaders of the CPSU have also reached a tacit understanding with the United States on the European situation, so that the United States can transfer more and more troops from Europe to

<sup>1</sup> Hubert Humphrey, Television Interview with American Correspondents, January 16, 1966.

expand the war in Vietnam. The new leaders of the CPSU have uttered some words of support for Vietnam and given her some aid, but their aim in all this is to get more of a say for themselves on the Vietnam question, sow dissension in Sino-Vietnamese relations and help the United States to realize its "peace talks" plot. In the final analysis, they want to find a way out for U.S. imperialism on the Vietnam question, enable it to occupy south Vietnam permanently and strike a political deal with it.

The U.S. imperialists are very well acquainted with this stand of the new leaders of the CPSU. McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to the U.S. president, said: "It has been made clear to us over a long period of time that the Soviet government hope there can be a peaceful settlement."<sup>1</sup> One American paper stated, "Evidence is piling up that the Soviet Union and the United States are, in fact, moving on parallel tracks toward certain objectives they hold in common."<sup>2</sup> Another American paper said that if the Soviet Union would "ultimately help an acceptable Vietnam settlement", the United States could "extricate itself from a critical situation". "The fundament of present Soviet-American relations in this complex situation is that they must be tacit. . . . the conflict between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. must remain explicit; agreement must remain implicit." They "are simultaneously thus both explicit enemies and implicit allies".<sup>3</sup>

The line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration pursued by the new leaders of the CPSU has recently been extended to include Soviet-Japanese collaboration. U.S. imperialism has accelerated the fostering of Japanese militarism as its major war accomplice in Asia, directed the Japanese reactionaries and the south Korean puppet clique to conclude the "Japan-ROK Treaty", and thus in effect rigged up a Northeast Asia

<sup>1</sup> McGeorge Bundy, Television Interview with American Correspondents, January 16, 1966.

<sup>2</sup> *Christian Science Monitor*, January 13, 1966.

<sup>3</sup> *New York Times*, January 17, 1966.

military alliance. Instead of condemning these grave war moves by U.S. imperialism, spearheaded against China, Korea and other Asian countries, the new leaders of the CPSU have done their utmost to please and woo the Japanese reactionaries. High-ranking Soviet and Japanese officials have exchanged frequent visits. Recently, the Japanese Foreign Minister made an official visit to the Soviet Union. The new leaders of the CPSU have, in fact, recognized the Japan-U.S. military alliance, and what is more they want to contribute their share to rigging up a Soviet-U.S.-Japanese alliance to oppose China, Korea and the people's revolutionary struggles in other parts of Asia.

After all these events, the new leaders of the CPSU still claim that all Communist Parties and socialist countries should put aside their differences and take "united action" in the anti-imperialist struggle. How can their words be trusted? Isn't it clear enough whom they are uniting with and whom they are against?

The new leaders of the CPSU are taking united action with the U.S. imperialists, the Japanese reactionaries, the Indian reactionaries, and all the lackeys of U.S. imperialism. Since they are so enthusiastic about taking counter-revolutionary united action, how can Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionary people take united action with them? In the contemporary world the greatest difference, the fundamental difference, between Marxist-Leninists and Khrushchov revisionists, between genuine revolutionaries and pseudo-revolutionaries, is whether to oppose U.S. imperialism or unite with it. How can this vital difference be put aside?

We will never take any united action with the new leaders of the CPSU so long as they do not abandon the Khrushchov revisionist line, do not change their line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration and do not abolish the Soviet-U.S.-Indian-Japanese alliance.

The Khrushchov revisionists have thrown in their lot with U.S. imperialism. In order to oppose U.S. imperialism,

Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionary people must inevitably oppose Khrushchov revisionism. Only by drawing a clear-cut line of demarcation between oneself and the Khrushchov revisionists and by carrying the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism through to the end can one wage a successful struggle against U.S. imperialism.

Since the Khrushchov revisionists are spreading the idea of worshipping the United States, we must foster the idea of scorning U.S. imperialism and see through its decadent essence. Since the Khrushchov revisionists are spreading the idea of toadying to the United States, we must foster the idea of hating U.S. imperialism and clearly identify it as Enemy Number One of the people of the world. Since the Khrushchov revisionists are spreading the idea of fear of the United States, we must foster the idea of despising U.S. imperialism and see it for the paper tiger it is. Since the Khrushchov revisionists are spreading the idea of uniting with the United States, we must foster the idea of striking down U.S. imperialism, and strengthen and expand the broadest united front against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has formulated a series of theses on the question of how to appraise and deal with U.S. imperialism, which have creatively developed Marxism-Leninism and become a powerful weapon in the hands of the people of the world in their anti-U.S. revolutionary struggle. He has called for the formation of the broadest united front by relying on the workers and peasants, and uniting with the masses of the people who constitute over ninety per cent of the world's population, as well as with all the forces subjected to U.S. aggression, control, interference and bullying, so as to isolate U.S. imperialism, the main enemy today, to the maximum extent and concentrate our attacks on it. All forces that can be united must be united, all contradictions that can be utilized must be utilized, and all positive factors conducive to the struggle against U.S. imperialism must be brought into play. This great strategic concept of Comrade Mao Tse-tung

points to the correct way of defeating U.S. imperialism. Its correctness has been proved by the whole process of international class struggle in the post-war period. Not only has this strategic concept armed the Chinese people, but it is exercising an increasingly far-reaching and profound influence throughout the world. It is what U.S. imperialism fears most and what most upsets the Khrushchov revisionists; but it is most warmly welcomed by the people of the world.

The domination of the world through Soviet-U.S. collaboration is nothing but a wild dream. The real masters of the world are the people. It is absolutely impossible for the ruling circles of any country, be they imperialists or revisionists, to ride roughshod over the people of all lands and dominate the whole world.

A new and great revolutionary storm against U.S. imperialism will soon sweep across the world. The anti-popular policy of the Khrushchov revisionists, which proceeds from the motive of harming others, can only end by hurting themselves. Those who are against the people will be overthrown by the people and those who run counter to the tide of history will be submerged by it. Whatever the struggles and the twists and turns, there is only one future for the world — U.S. imperialism and its accomplices will certainly perish and the revolutionary cause of the people throughout the world will certainly triumph.

苏共新领导奉行苏美合作路线的供状

\*

外文出版社出版(北京)

1966年第一版

编号: (英) 3050-1396

00015

3-E-711P