

**A COMMENT ON  
THE MARCH  
MOSCOW MEETING**



FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS  
PEKING

**A COMMENT ON  
THE MARCH  
MOSCOW MEETING**

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

*March 23, 1965*

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS  
PEKING 1965

## CONTENTS

I. WHAT KIND OF MEETING WAS IT?	1
II. WHAT ARE THE DEEDS OF THE NEW LEADERS OF THE CPSU?	7
III. ANSWERS TO SOME QUESTIONS	21
IV. UNITE ON THE BASIS OF MARXISM-LENINISM AND REVOLUTION	27

## I. WHAT KIND OF MEETING WAS IT?

The schismatic meeting contrived by the new leadership of the CPSU which inherited the mantle of Khrushchov was finally held from March 1 to 5, 1965. On March 10 a statement entitled "Communique of the Consultative Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow" was issued.

After making Herculean efforts and combining hard tactics with soft to knock something together, the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union finally managed to convene a fragmented meeting. The divisive meeting was quite small and most unseemly. It was a gloomy and forlorn affair.

Attending this meeting, besides the Soviet Party, were representatives and observers of fifteen Parties, plus the two splinter revisionist factions of Australia and Brazil and the notorious clique of the renegade Dange, which was also dragged in to swell the total, adding up to nineteen units in all.

Of the twenty-six Parties whose attendance was ordered by the leaders of the CPSU, the seven fraternal Parties of Albania, China, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Rumania and Viet Nam firmly refused to take part in the divisive meeting. The fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties of Australia, Brazil and India likewise condemned and opposed the meeting.

The nineteen units in attendance were rent by contradictions and disunity. Some of them whole-heartedly supported Khrushchov's revisionism and splittism; some did so half-heartedly; others, for reasons they might find it awkward to divulge, had to attend under orders to serve as a claque at the show; and still others may have temporarily fallen into the trap from naïveté.

No one can deny that this meeting was the selfsame illegal and schismatic meeting which Khrushchov had ordered to be held on December 15, 1964 in the CPSU's letter of July 30, 1964.

People may ask, what grounds are there for saying so? Didn't the new leaders of the CPSU postpone the meeting? Didn't they change its name from a drafting committee meeting to a consultative meeting? Didn't

they speak of unity against the enemy and other good things in the communique?

By playing tricks, in appearance the new leaders of the CPSU made some changes and a number of Khrushchov's original aims which were based on wishful thinking have not been fulfilled. But in essence, the new leaders of the CPSU have taken over Khrushchov's revisionism and splittism lock, stock and barrel, and they carried out his behest for a divisive meeting very faithfully. Please consider the following facts:

The new leaders of the CPSU repeatedly declared to us that the international meeting of fraternal Parties and the meeting preparatory to it must be linked with the illegal and schismatic meetings for which Khrushchov issued the order on July 30, 1964.

The new leaders of the CPSU reiterated Khrushchov's order in the letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party dated November 24, 1964, in the letters addressed to other fraternal Parties around that time, as well as in the "Announcement on the Convocation of the Drafting Committee for the Preparation of the International Conference of the Communist and Workers'

Parties" carried in *Pravda* on December 12, 1964. They insisted that the preparatory meeting for the international meeting of fraternal Parties be held on the basis of the drafting committee which the leadership of the CPSU had decided on. They also said that they had reached the conclusion that "the fraternal Parties which have declared themselves for the convening of the drafting committee have the right to embark on practical preparations for its meeting".

They adhered to and carried out Khrushchov's order by telling only the twenty-six Parties — no more and no less — which had been members of the long defunct drafting committee of 1960 to attend the meeting.

They adhered to and carried out Khrushchov's order by insisting on convening the meeting no matter how many Parties refused to attend. And so they held the meeting despite the firm opposition of a number of fraternal Parties and their flat refusal to participate.

They only postponed the meeting because under the circumstances they could not do anything else. Nevertheless, in the manner of a patriarchal party they still issued orders

that it be held on March 1, 1965. And so the meeting began on that date.

On the eve of the meeting they changed its name, giving it the cloak of a "consultative meeting". In fact, this change of name did not change the nature of the divisive meeting which had been ordered by Khrushchov.

It thus became clear that despite their many tricks and conjuring feats the new leaders of the CPSU were still peddling Khrushchov's old wares. Their purpose was simply to put up a false front and inveigle people into attending the meeting, into acknowledging their status as the patriarchal party, into recognizing their right to do one thing today and another tomorrow and to wave their baton, and into following them down the blind alley of Khrushchov's revisionism and splittism.

Things could not be plainer. If the new leaders of the CPSU really wanted unity and not a continuation of Khrushchov's old practice of plotting sham unity and a genuine split, why did they not discard the order issued by Khrushchov on July 30, 1964? Why did they come out with another letter on November 24, 1964? And why could they

not accept the advice of fraternal Parties, abandon this illegal schismatic meeting, change their direction and make a fresh start?

Indeed, if the new leaders of the CPSU had not been determined to carry out Khrushchov revisionism after Khrushchov's fall, they could have very well used that fine opportunity and made a start by abandoning the divisive meeting and thus shown a desire to eliminate the differences and strengthen unity on a new basis. We sincerely hoped that the new leaders of the CPSU would make use of that fine opportunity and seek new ways to eliminate the differences and strengthen unity in conjunction with us as well as the other Marxist-Leninist Parties.

But what did we get instead? When the Chinese Party and Government Delegation made contact with the new leaders of the CPSU in Moscow in 1964 during the anniversary of the October Revolution, the latter explicitly stated that there was not a shade of difference between themselves and Khrushchov on the question of the international communist movement and in their attitude towards China. They obdurately held to their stand on an illegal schismatic meeting. What is more, the plan for the divisive meet-

ing which Khrushchov had not had time to fulfil was carried through by his successors.

It is now possible for people to see more clearly that these new leaders of the CPSU had to oust Khrushchov, not because they had any difference of principle with him, but because Khrushchov had become too odious and had been too stupid in some of his practices and because Khrushchov himself had become a serious obstacle to the carrying out of Khrushchov revisionism. In replacing Khrushchov they simply changed the signboard and employed more cunning methods and subterfuges in order the better to push through and develop Khrushchovism and to carry out the general line of revisionism, great-power chauvinism and splittism which Khrushchov had put forward at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, systematized at its 22nd Congress and embodied in the Programme of the CPSU.

## **II. WHAT ARE THE DEEDS OF THE NEW LEADERS OF THE CPSU?**

Of late the new leaders of the CPSU have uttered quite a few fine words, and the com-

munique of this divisive meeting is also larded with many high-sounding hypocritical phrases, such as "oppose imperialism", "support Viet Nam against U.S. imperialism", "support the national liberation movement", "support the people's revolutions in various countries", "unity against the enemy" and "concerted action". The new leaders of the CPSU have taken over certain slogans advanced by the Marxist-Leninists in an attempt to create the illusion that they have changed somewhat and taken a stand differing from Khrushchov's revisionism and splittism.

What a striking similarity there is here to the adoption by U.S. imperialism of some of the main slogans of the leaders of the CPSU! Peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition, peaceful transition, relaxation of tension, general and complete disarmament, the two-power domination of the world, joint assistance to India, joint support to the reactionaries of all countries, joint efforts to undermine the world revolutionary movements through the United Nations, joint efforts to oppose China, and so on—these slogans and schemes of Khrushchov's have all been taken over by U.S. imperialism! The

leaders of the CPSU and the U.S. imperialists have joined in a love feast, exchanging information and working in common against communism, against the people, against revolution and against the national liberation movement for the purpose of maintaining imperialism, revisionism and reaction everywhere against all revolutionaries. But we are not the United States, we are Marxist-Leninists. We shall expose the intrigues and plots of the new leaders of the CPSU.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that just as an individual must as a matter of course be judged "not by his professions, but by his actions; not by what he pretends to be, but by what he does, and what he really is",<sup>1</sup> so must a political party. "In historical struggles one must distinguish still more the phrases and fancies of parties from their real organism and their real interests, their conception of themselves from their reality."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Frederick Engels, *Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, Eng. ed., International Publishers, New York, 1933, p. 93.

<sup>2</sup> Karl Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte", *Selected Works of Marx and Engels*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1958, Vol. I, p. 272.

If in the light of this principle we examine what the new leaders of the CPSU have done since Khrushchov's fall, we shall be able to understand that all their fine words only amount to selling horse-meat as beefsteak and that they are saying one thing and doing another. We shall likewise be able to understand the real meaning of certain slogans contained in the communique.

The communique says, "Divergences in the communist movement weaken its unity and thereby do damage to the world liberation movement, to the communist cause." We would like to ask: Whence the divergences? What is actually weakening the unity of the international communist movement and doing damage to the cause of the people's revolutions in different countries? Quite plainly, it is Khrushchov revisionism, as expressed in concentrated form in the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU and the Programme of the CPSU. The divergence between Marxism-Leninism and Khrushchov revisionism is a divergence between two roads, between defending Marxism-Leninism and opposing Marxism-Leninism; it is a divergence between two antagonistic classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Since the new

leaders of the CPSU are now following Khrushchov's whole revisionist general line of "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition", "peaceful transition", "the state of the whole people" and "the party of the entire people", this only goes to prove that they are still bent on deepening the differences, wrecking unity and doing fresh damage to the international communist movement.

The communique reads, "The participants voiced their conviction that what unites the Communist Parties greatly outweighs that which at the present time disunites them." This assertion is sheer hypocrisy; it is an attempt to whitewash the actions of the new leaders of the CPSU in openly splitting the international communist movement.

In the incipient stages of Khrushchov revisionism and in the course of its development, we invariably proceeded from the desire for unity and offered our advice and criticism, in the hope that Khrushchov might turn back. We indicated on many occasions that the points the fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties had in common were basic while the differences among them were partial in character, and that they should seek common ground while reserving their differences. But

Khrushchov and his like turned a deaf ear to these words. They kept widening the differences and going farther down the revisionist road. They formulated a revisionist general line and a whole set of revisionist internal and external policies and worked out a revisionist programme. Hence, the nature of the differences clearly became one of fundamental opposition between the Marxist-Leninist general line and the revisionist general line. In addition, Khrushchov issued his order for the convening of the divisive meetings and went a step further in setting the revisionists against the Marxist-Leninists in the organizational sphere and in splitting the international communist movement.

After Khrushchov's downfall, we hoped that the new leaders of the CPSU would proceed from the common interests of the international communist movement, abandon Khrushchov revisionism and return to a Marxist-Leninist and proletarian internationalist stand. But the new leaders of the CPSU have obstinately clung to the whole of Khrushchov's revisionist theories, general line and policies and have declared that there is not a shade of difference between Khrushchov and themselves on the question of

the international communist movement and in their attitude towards China. And they have taken the serious step of convening the divisive meeting regardless of the consequences. Quite obviously, the new leaders of the CPSU have gone a step further in destroying the basis for the unity of the Communist Parties. In these circumstances we would like to ask: When they exclaim, "what unites the Communist Parties greatly outweighs that which at the present time disunites them", what is this if not an effort to conceal their revisionist and schismatic essence?

The new leaders of the CPSU claim that we can take "concerted action against the enemy" and adopt "united action"! This is likewise a swindle. One of the important characteristics of Khrushchov revisionism is its complete reversal of enemies and friends. The new leaders of the CPSU are continuing to practise Khrushchov revisionism, and they regard U.S. imperialism, the common enemy of the people of the world, as their friend and all Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries as their enemies. This being the case, what concerted action against the enemy or what united action can one speak of?

Let us now examine the actual policy the new leaders of the CPSU have pursued towards U.S. imperialism since they came into power.

In a nutshell, they are continuing to adhere to Khrushchov's reactionary policy of Soviet-U.S. co-operation for the domination of the world. They are proclaiming that there are "sufficiently broad areas for co-operation" between the Soviet Union and the United States and extolling the U.S. chieftain Johnson as being "sensible" in their efforts to prettify U.S. imperialism.

In their dealings with U.S. imperialism, the new leaders of the CPSU do not make as much noise as did Khrushchov, but they are "men of action". After taking office, they hurriedly struck several bargains with the U.S. imperialists, on some of which no agreement had been reached for a long time during Khrushchov's leadership. What deserves special attention is the fact that the new leaders of the CPSU should have agreed to contribute, in the guise of a donation, to the expenses incurred by the United States in its armed intervention in the Congo in the name of the United Nations. Moreover, for the purpose of helping U.S. imperialism to

suppress and stamp out the people's revolutions in various countries they have given active support to the United States in its scheme to utilize the U.N. "Special Committee for Peace-Keeping Operations" to establish a standing U.N. armed force. They have taken over Khrushchov's policy of fraternizing with, currying favour with and capitulating to U.S. imperialism.

The leaders of the CPSU have been trying in every possible way to bring within the orbit of Soviet-U.S. talks for the "settlement of problems" all revolutionary struggles in the front line of the battle against U.S. imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the storm-centres of world revolution. The new leaders of the CPSU are now loudly proclaiming their support for the revolutionary struggle of the people of southern Viet Nam, but in reality they are trying to gain political capital for their dealings with the U.S. imperialists and to carry out plots for "peace talks", in a futile attempt to extinguish the revolutionary struggle of the South Vietnamese people against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

At a time when the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam is being wantonly bombed by

the U.S. gangsters, all the countries of the socialist camp and the revolutionary people throughout the world should, as a matter of course, unite and wage a tit-for-tat struggle against the U.S. aggressors. Instead, in order to serve U.S. imperialism the new leaders of the CPSU insisted on holding the schismatic meeting and took this grave divisive step. The statement against U.S. imperialist aggression in Viet Nam which they issued in the name of this divisive meeting was itself an irony of the first magnitude. Within twenty-four hours after the statement had been issued, they dispatched troops as well as ordinary and mounted police brutally to suppress the demonstration of students in Moscow against U.S. imperialism, an action which resulted in bloodshed, and they have persecuted foreign students who took part in this struggle. At the same time, the Soviet Government made prompt and obsequious apologies to U.S. imperialism.

The new leaders of the CPSU have exposed their fraudulence by their deeds. They have revealed themselves in their true colours to the whole world. They are directing the spearhead of their struggle not against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys but against the

revolutionary people of all countries who are fighting imperialism and its lackeys.

It seems that "what unites" the new leaders of the CPSU and U.S. imperialism is becoming stronger and stronger and is making them well-nigh inseparable. Naturally, what separates them from the Marxist-Leninists will become greater and greater and "what unites" them with the Marxist-Leninists smaller and smaller the longer this goes on.

Next, let us consider the policies the new leaders of the CPSU have adopted towards fraternal countries and fraternal Parties.

In a nutshell, the new leaders of the CPSU have persisted in Khrushchov's policies against China, Albania, the Japanese Communist Party, the Indonesian Communist Party, the New Zealand Communist Party and all the fraternal countries and Parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism.

The new leaders of the CPSU still cling to the views expressed in the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU of July 14, 1963, in Suslov's anti-Chinese report at the February 1964 plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU and in the resolution adopted on this report. They are still energetically mobilizing the whole Soviet

Party and the entire Soviet people to read these anti-Chinese documents. In other words, they have taken over all the worn-out weapons from Khrushchov's anti-Chinese and anti-Communist arsenal. Moreover, they continue to give all kinds of support to the Indian reactionaries in the latter's opposition to China.

The new leaders of the CPSU have persisted in the entire set of erroneous policies against Albania which Khrushchov adopted at and around the period of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU.

The new leaders of the CPSU continue to practise Khrushchov's great-power chauvinism towards fraternal socialist countries and to carry out a policy of exerting control over them.

The new leaders of the CPSU continue to follow Khrushchov's policy of unscrupulous interference in the internal affairs of the fraternal Parties and engage in disruptive and subversive activities against them. They have been colluding with Japanese Trotskyites, right-wing social-democrats and renegades from the Japanese Communist Party, and have perpetrated every kind of disruption and subversion against the Japanese Com-

munist Party which upholds Marxism-Leninism. Moreover, they publish articles in their press attacking it and giving open support to a handful of renegades such as Yoshio Shiga, Ichizo Suzuki and Shigeo Kamiyama. They have been supporting Indonesian Trotskyites and other counter-revolutionary forces in opposing the Indonesian Communist Party which upholds Marxism-Leninism and in disrupting the anti-imperialist national united front of Indonesia. They have been attacking the New Zealand Communist Party which upholds Marxism-Leninism and trying to subvert its leadership. And they have been carrying on all kinds of disruption and subversion against the Communist Party of Burma and other fraternal Parties upholding Marxism-Leninism.

The new leaders of the CPSU continue to pursue Khrushchov's policy of strenuous support for the clique headed by Dange, that renegade from the Indian working class and running dog of the Indian big bourgeoisie, in its anti-Communist, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary activities.

From all this, people can see at whom the new leaders of the CPSU are aiming when they speak of "concerted action against the

enemy", and what they are actually about when they speak of "united action". People can also see that the new leaders of the CPSU do not want to strengthen what unites the fraternal Parties but ceaselessly aggravate what disunites them.

Numerous facts show that the clamour of the new leaders of the CPSU against U.S. imperialism is a sham while their capitulation to U.S. imperialism is the essence, that their issuing of the statement against U.S. imperialism is a sham while their suppression of the masses struggling against U.S. imperialism is the essence, that their support for revolution is a sham while their disruption of revolution is the essence, that their statements such as "unity against the enemy" and "concerted action" are a sham while their actions to undermine unity and create splits everywhere, even to the point of convening a meeting to create an open split in the international communist movement, are the essence.

To sum up, what the new leaders of the CPSU have been doing can be described as "three shams and three realities": sham anti-imperialism but real capitulation, sham revolution but real betrayal, sham unity but a

real split. They are still doing what Khrushchov did, which can be described as "four alignments with and four alignments against": alignment *with* imperialism *against* socialism, alignment *with* the United States *against* China and the other revolutionary countries, alignment *with* the reactionaries everywhere *against* the national liberation movements and the people's revolutions, and alignment *with* the Tito clique and renegades of all descriptions *against* all the fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties and all revolutionaries fighting imperialism.

### III. ANSWERS TO SOME QUESTIONS

The communique of the schismatic Moscow meeting once again strikes up the old tune about the cessation of public polemics, saying that "the Parties represented at this meeting have declared themselves in favour of discontinuing open polemics, which are in character unfriendly and degrading to the fraternal Parties". It adds that "they consider it useful to continue, in a comradely form and without mutual attacks, an exchange of opinions on the important contemporary issues of mutual interest".

The communique dare not face this basic fact: it is the leaders of the CPSU themselves who started the public polemics in complete violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and who have taken an "unfriendly" attitude towards fraternal Parties and launched "degrading" attacks on them. Nor dare it touch on the crucial matter of whether the numerous resolutions, statements and articles attacking the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist Parties, which the leaders of the CPSU and their followers published, still stand or not.

We understand full well what is really meant when the leaders of the CPSU and their followers call for the ending of the public polemics; it means drawing no distinction between right and wrong, showing no respect for the truth, and allowing the revisionists to slander and attack the Marxist-Leninists while forbidding the Marxist-Leninists to answer and refute the revisionists.

So far, we have published only a small number of articles in reply to the attacks and slanders levelled at us by the leaders of the CPSU and their followers and are a long way from having completed our replies, while in

many cases we have not yet made any reply at all. Unless they openly announce the withdrawal of these anti-Chinese resolutions, statements and articles and publicly admit their mistakes, it will be absolutely impossible to silence us. Can the whole affair be reckoned as ended when Your Lordships go off, shrugging your shoulders, after abusing others? Can it be that you may abuse people whenever you please and then call a halt whenever you want to, while forbidding us to make a fair answer? Is there any such unequal and wholly unreasonable principle governing relations among fraternal Parties?

The Chinese Communist Party has on many occasions made clear its stand on the question of the public polemics, and we now once again announce it to the world: Since there are differences of principle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism and since the modern revisionists have maligned us so much and refused to acknowledge their mistakes, it goes without saying that we have the right to refute them publicly. In these circumstances, it will not do to call for an end to the public polemics, it will not do to stop for a single day, for a month, a year, a hundred years, a thousand years, or ten

thousand years. If nine thousand years are not enough to complete the refutation, then we shall take ten thousand.

The communique also declares itself "against the interference by any Party in the internal affairs of other Parties". As everyone knows, what is meant here is but another version of the "denunciation of the factional activities of the Chinese Communist Party".

For years we have heard this kind of talk about opposing "factional activities" from Khrushchov, the greatest splitter in the international communist movement. There are indeed quite a few persons who have engaged in factional activities, namely, Khrushchov and his disciples, and since his downfall, those who cling to Khrushchov revisionism without Khrushchov and those who want to make Communist Parties degenerate into social-democratic parties. They direct their factional activities against Marxism-Leninism, against revolution and against the proletariat and the masses of the people who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population of the world. To oppose revolution and undermine the revolutionary unity of the proletariat they have carried out subversive activities in all the Communist and Workers'

Parties by every conceivable means. Acting thus, they will inevitably be deserted by their followers and eventually become a miserable and negligible faction. And the "faction" which these gentlemen are attacking consists precisely of the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries who stand with the masses of the people. It should be stressed that the small schismatic Moscow meeting was itself grave factional activity.

The Communist Party of China never conceals its views. We approve of and support all the world forces, including all the political parties, groups and individuals, that persevere in revolution and in opposition to imperialism and reaction. As Lenin taught, the only correct policy is one based on principle. We shall never barter away principle. The more the revisionists abuse us, the stronger the proof that we are right, and the more firmly shall we maintain our principled stand. In this connection, if we need to make self-criticism, we should say that, in comparison with the support given by the leaders of the CPSU to the revisionist groups in many countries, we have not given enough support to the revolutionary Left in some countries

and henceforth must greatly intensify our endeavours in this respect.

To put it bluntly, it will never work in the future any more than it did in the past to allow the adherents of Khrushchov revisionism to conspire with each other in opposing the Marxist-Leninists of all countries, while forbidding the Marxist-Leninists to support each other and unite in their struggle against Khrushchov revisionism and its adherents.

The communique says not a single word about whether the so-called new international meeting, which was to have been held in the middle of 1965 according to Khrushchov's order last year, has been cancelled or postponed. It equivocates by talking of "active and all-sided preparations" and of the meeting "to be held at a suitable date". At the same time, the communique advocates the holding of a so-called "Preliminary Consultative Conference of representatives of the 81 Parties that gathered at the 1960 Meeting". What does this mean? Doesn't it mean that they are desperately hanging on to the so-called drafting committee in Khrushchov's order of July 30, 1964? Or does it mean that they are insisting on the 81-Party meeting

ordered by Khrushchov? Or are they up to some new trick?

We must solemnly tell the new leaders of the CPSU: In convening the illegal schismatic meeting you took a most serious step to effect an open split in the international communist movement. You must be held responsible for all the grave consequences.

In calling the divisive meeting, you have placed new and serious obstacles in the way of convening an international meeting for the unity of the fraternal Parties. We said before that in order to hold a successful meeting for unity, some four or five years of preparatory work might be required to remove the obstacles, but now it seems that a period twice as long, or even longer, will be needed.

#### **IV. UNITE ON THE BASIS OF MARXISM-LENINISM AND REVOLUTION**

The new leaders of the CPSU have now held their schismatic meeting. They probably think that they can thereby curry favour with imperialism and somehow maintain their revisionist "legitimacy", and that they can use it for some political sleight of hand. But

their action can neither intimidate nor deceive the Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionary people of the world. They were unable to block the advance of the people's revolutionary struggles in the past, and they will be still less able to do so in the future.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has taught us time and again that the people — including those of the Soviet Union — who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population of the world, want to make revolution. The overwhelming majority of Communists and cadres in the international communist movement, including those in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, want to make revolution. Persons like Khrushchov, whose thinking is ossified and who obtusely pursue the revisionist road and are bent on opposing communism, the people and revolution, are a mere handful, a tiny minority. For a while some people may not see things clearly or may be hoodwinked or may commit mistakes, but so long as they want to make revolution, having once understood the true situation and seen revisionism in its true colours, they will eventually break with revisionism and come over to the side of Marxism-Leninism in the course of their revolutionary practice. The

masses of the people and the revolutionary cadres, who constitute over 90 per cent of the population of the world, will certainly unite.

The number of those believing in Khrushchov revisionism was already dwindling in any case. Now, of course it is even harder to make others believe in Khrushchovism without Khrushchov. Similarly, the number of those obeying Khrushchov's baton was already decreasing. Now, of course it is even harder to make others obey the baton taken over from Khrushchov. The small divisive meeting so painstakingly contrived by the new leaders of the CPSU turned out to be neither fish nor fowl; this not only shows that Khrushchov revisionism without Khrushchov is wrong and bankrupt, it also shows the great importance of the persistent struggle of the Marxist-Leninist Parties and the Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism and against this divisive meeting.

All the same, we have to thank the new leaders of the CPSU for insisting on calling the divisive meeting. This bad thing can be turned into a good thing. It has helped people quickly to strip the new leaders of the CPSU of their veil of Marxism-Leninism and

to expose their true revisionist features. It is helping people to see through their fine words to the essence behind the appearance. It is helping all Communists and revolutionary people the world over to realize that the emergence and development of Khrushchov revisionism is by no means a matter of a few individuals or an accidental phenomenon. It has profound social and historical causes. So long as imperialists and reactionaries exist and so long as there are classes and class struggle in the world, Khrushchov revisionism will inevitably recur in one form or another and the struggle against it will not come to an end.

The communique of the schismatic Moscow meeting states that the Communists of all countries should concentrate on what it calls "the urgent tasks". What are the urgent tasks? In our view, the most urgent task facing the international communist movement is to unite with all the forces that can be united in order to oppose U.S. imperialism and its lackeys, to oppose the reactionaries of all countries, and to win victories in the struggle for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism. The Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960

have explicitly pointed out that modern revisionism is the main danger in the international communist movement at the present time. In order to wage the struggle against imperialism and reaction successfully and further strengthen the unity of the international proletariat, it is imperative to continue to expose the true features of the modern revisionists, help those who lack an understanding of the true situation to acquire it, and help those who hesitate on the road of revolution to march ahead with the revolutionary people. It is likewise imperative to isolate to the maximum the modern revisionists, who are the accomplices of imperialism and reaction, and to carry the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism through to the very end.

The grave action of the new leaders of the CPSU in calling the divisive meeting has given the Marxist-Leninist Parties and the Marxist-Leninists of the world the right to take the initiative. There is all the more reason now why we should openly criticize and thoroughly expose the revisionist line of the new leaders of the CPSU, give more vigorous support to the people's revolutionary movements and the revolutionary Left in

different countries, and promote the speedier development of the Marxist-Leninist forces and the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and revolution.

The struggle between the two lines in the international communist movement has now entered a new stage. At this crucial juncture, we would like once again to give the new leaders of the CPSU a piece of sincere advice. Why should you put your neck into the noose left by Khrushchov? Why can't you start afresh?

In our view, it is at once difficult and not difficult for you really to take the side of the fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties and the revolutionary people in concerted action against the enemy and in unity against imperialism. The question hinges on whether or not you will do the following:

Publicly declare that all orders for convening divisive meetings are wrong and illegal. Openly admit the error of illegally convening the schismatic meeting.

Publicly and solemnly admit before the Communists and the people of the world that Khrushchov's revisionism, great-power chauvinism and splittism are wrong.

Publicly admit that the revisionist line and programme adopted at the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU presided over by Khrushchov are wrong.

Publicly admit that all the words and deeds of the leaders of the CPSU against China, Albania, the Japanese Communist Party and the other Marxist-Leninist Parties are wrong.

Publicly pledge yourselves to desist from the error of Khrushchov revisionism and return to the road of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and to the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

It is imperative to solve these questions of principle if the genuine elimination of the differences and genuine unity against the enemy are to be achieved. Unless these questions of principle are solved and the serious obstacles placed in the way of the unity of the international communist movement are removed, then all words about eliminating differences, strengthening unity, ending public polemics and calling an international meeting of the fraternal Parties are empty talk.

The show put on by Khrushchov was but a brief interlude in the history of the inter-

national communist movement, much briefer than the performances of the old-line revisionists, Bernstein and Kautsky. The subsequent performance of those who want Khrushchovism without Khrushchov can only be a brief interlude too, and no better than the show put on by Khrushchov himself.

The victorious advance of the revolutionary struggle of the people of the world represents the trend of history, and this trend is independent of the will of the imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the modern revisionists. As always, they keep on exposing their reactionary features by their deeds and will thus serve as teachers by negative example for the proletariat and revolutionary people of the world. We are convinced that over 90 per cent of the people of the world will join the revolutionary front against imperialism and that over 90 per cent of the people in the ranks of the international communist movement will advance along the road of Marxism-Leninism. We are also convinced that the revolutionary people of the world, the great international communist movement, the great socialist camp and the great Chinese and Soviet peoples will finally sweep away all obstacles and unite on the

basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The future is infinitely bright for the cause of world revolution. In the end monsters of every description will be completely destroyed.

Let all the Parties upholding Marxism-Leninism and all the revolutionary people of the world unite in the great struggle against imperialism, against the reactionaries of all countries and against modern revisionism! The Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionary people of the world will undoubtedly win even greater victories in their struggle for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism!

評莫斯科三月會議

\*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1965年補珍本第一版

編號：（英）3050-1109

00015

3-E-7002c